

means must be devised whereby finance can be made available to some of these places, because it is in the public interest that they be improved.

Therefore my view is that the money derived from the sale of these hotels should be earmarked for the improvement of other hotels. If it goes into the tourist fund it will no doubt be put to good use, but I think its use should be restricted to the betterment of hotels. Those are my comments on the Bill. I presume it will be passed; but I urge the Government, through the Minister, to place every facility possible in the way of the local authorities to purchase or lease these places, because I think that will be to the good of all concerned.

On motion by the Hon. W. R. Hall, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Tuesday, the 13th October.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.32 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 1st October, 1959

CONTENTS

	Page
CONDUCT OF THE HOUSE :	
Application of Standing Order No. 66	1912
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :	
Housing Loan Guarantee Act, review of scheme	1913
Bullsbrook Junior High School, electrical wiring	1913
Iron ore—	
Tonnages and percentages	1913
Exclusion of Tailoring deposits from sale and export	1915
Fremantle railway bridge, Tydeman report on slitting	1913
Wittenoom water supply, adequacy	1914
Pilbara pastoral industry, completion and implementation of report	1914
Bruce Rock State Hotel, trading figures	1914
Steel products, shortage	1914
Child welfare officer, appointment at Albany	1915
Navigation lights, installation on North-West Islands	1915

CONTENTS—continued

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—continued	
Belmont High School, gymnasium and canteen facilities	1915
Northampton School, regrading	1915
Perth Girls' High School, enclosing of tennis court	1915
Electricity poles, removal from Walcott Street	1916
Tobacco supplies, withholding by manufacturers	1916
Water shortage, position at Marble Bar	1916
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE :	
Malformation of the heart, specialist treatment	1916
Public Works Department, dismissals	1917
Pilbara pastoral industry, implementation of report	1917
Water shortage—	
Lessening of restrictions	1917
Watering of schoolgrounds	1917
Child welfare officer, appointment at Albany	1918
Sale of TV sets, inquiry by Director of Investigation	1918
Ayrshire cattle, inclusion of herd in recording scheme	1918
Restrictive trade practices, Government action	1918
Collie coal, carbonisation plant	1919
SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE :	
Thursday nights	1919
BILLS :	
Kalgoorlie-Parkeston Railway, 1r.	1919
Western Australian Industries Authority, 2r.	1919
Land Agents Act Amendment, returned	1935
Marriage Act Amendment, 2r.	1935
State Electricity Commission Act Amendment (No. 2), returned	1935
Fire Brigades Act Amendment, Council's alternative amendment	1935
Main Roads Act Amendment—	
2r.	1936
Message—Appropriation	1937
Builders' Registration Act Amendment—	
2r.	1936
Message—Appropriation	1937
Country Areas Water Supply Act Amendment, 2r.	1938

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

CONDUCT OF THE HOUSE

Application of Standing Order No. 66

The **SPEAKER**: I would like to draw the attention of members, particularly the new members, to Standing Order No. 66 on page 50. There has been far too much movement about the Chamber recently and far too much irregular talk going on during debates. If the Standing Order is observed, there will probably be less talking while debates are in progress.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE ACT

Review of Scheme

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

On the 26th August, in reply to a question, he stated that changes of policy and procedure in respect of the housing loan guarantee scheme were then under review:

- (1) Will he advise whether any decision has been made in respect of—
 - (a) the total amount to be guaranteed;
 - (b) the rate of interest chargeable;
 - (c) any institutions already approved;
 - (d) the number or type of institutions to be approved;
 - (e) the giving of guarantees where approved institutions borrow;
 - (f) any other matter pertaining to the Act or its operation?
- (2) When does he anticipate the review will be completed?
- (3) What defects or circumstances, if any, have caused him to review the operations of the scheme?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) (a) £1,300,000 at present.
 (b) A maximum rate of 6½ per cent to the home-builder.
 (c) The approval of an "approved institution" has since the inception of the Act been subject to the issue of a guarantee only when a satisfactory and acceptable proposition was submitted to the Government.
 (d) This will depend on circumstances.
 (e) Yes. A number of guarantees under section 7A of the Housing Loan Guarantee Act are in process of preparation.
 (f) No.
- (2) In the near future. In the meantime, any proposition submitted by an approved institution will be given proper consideration.
- (3) A comparison with the operations of true terminating building societies in other States is being made.

BULLSBROOK JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Electrical Wiring

2. Mr. CRAIG asked the Minister for Education:

When can it be expected that electrical wiring of the Bullsbrook Junior High School will be completed?

Mr. WATTS replied:

The wiring of the school will be completed by the commencement of the next school year. Quarters will be wired by the end of this month.

3. *This question was postponed.*

IRON ORE

Tonnages and Percentages

4. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

What are the locations, approximate tonnages, and percentages of known iron-ore deposits in this State?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

Information is set out in the attached report.

The report was tabled.

FREMANTLE RAILWAY BRIDGE

Tydemans Report on Siting

5. Mr. FLETCHER asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Is he aware that in paragraph 87, page 28, vol. 11, Colonel Tydemans had this to say:

A site for a rail bridge is a possibility beside the road bridge at Fremantle, but that there are disadvantages with a 12 chain curve and a bad gradient of 1 in 60 on the southern approach to the bridge. Continued use could be permitted of the existing Fremantle yard station, but the train line entry into the port system and port line operation would be inefficient.

If a 1 in 100 grade (railing in the metropolitan area) were introduced, it would cause disturbance and inconvenience at Fremantle on the south side. Grading would be satisfactory on the north side, but a new North Fremantle station and reorganised yard would be necessary, entailing at its best, inconveniences and inefficient operation to berths and railway alike. Further, that the

scheme is feasible from the engineering side, but not from the operating angle?

- (2) Has not the Railway Department sufficient difficulties of operation without accepting those outlined above?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) I assume the honourable member refers to volume 2 of the Report on Port of Fremantle by F.W.E. Tydeman of August, 1948. If so, I am aware of the paragraph to which the honourable member refers but the verbiage of which is not strictly in accordance with the wording set out in the question.
- (2) The proposal as now presented for a new railway bridge at Fremantle is regarded as a suitable and workable proposition from a railway point of view.

WITTENOOM WATER SUPPLY

Adequacy

6. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) What is the latest position regarding water supply at Wittenoom?
- (2) Will the town have sufficient water for the summer months?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) Two bores have been drilled in the Fortescue River depression approximately four miles from the town, and drilling of a third bore is in progress. Initial pumping tests indicate that reasonably good supplies will be obtained. Further drilling and pumping tests are required before a final decision can be made and plans prepared.
- (2) The supply to the town this summer will to some extent be influenced by seasonal conditions which cannot be predicted.

PILBARA PASTORAL INDUSTRY

Completion and Implementation of Report.

7. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for the North-West:

- (1) Has the detailed work of collating information concerning the Pilbara pastoral industry, as described in the answer to my question of the 2nd July, been completed?
- (2) What are the Government's findings in regard to this matter, and how does the Government intend to assist this industry?
- (3) What action is the Government taking to implement the report?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) No. More collating of detail and investigation of scientific data is required.

- (2) and (3) Answered by No. (1).

BRUCE ROCK STATE HOTEL

Trading Figures

8. Mr. KELLY asked the Chief Secretary:

- (1) What was the total turnover of the Bruce Rock State Hotel for each of the years ended the 30th June, 1956-1957; 1957-1958; 1958-1959?
- (2) What was the profit in each of these years?
- (3) Of the turnover disclosed, what respective amounts were derived from—
(a) bar trade;
(b) house receipts?
- (4) What were the net trading expenses under the following headings:
(a) Wines, beers, spirits;
(b) freight;
(c) tobacco and sundries;
(d) provisions;
(e) wages;
(f) repairs and renewals;
(g) fuel and light;
(h) other?
- (5) Of the wages disclosed in (e), what amount is paid to the management?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59
	£	£	£
(1.) Total Receipts	32,828	34,079	36,160
(2.) Trading Profit	2,354	3,377	3,664
(3.) Bar Trade (a)	25,638	26,627	27,985
House (b)	7,190	7,452	8,175
(4.) Wines, Beers and Spirits (a)	14,260	14,570	15,340
Freight (b)	1,152	1,156	1,145
Tobacco and Sundries (c)	1,663	1,909	2,194
Provisions (d)	3,225	2,990	2,796
Wages (e)	7,728	7,569	8,077
Repairs and Renewals (f)	778	405	679
Fuel and Light (g)	531	516	497
Other Stationery (h)	13	9	7
Sanitation	388	703	596
Rates and Insurance	211	212	225
Miscellaneous	269	293	332
Freight and Cartage	255	272	280
(5.) Management Wages	930	841	959

STEEL PRODUCTS

Shortage

9. Mr. CRAIG asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Is it known what is the cause of the serious shortage in supplies of fencing wire, barbed wire, piping, and other steel products, stocks of which are practically non-existent in this State?
- (2) Will he make representations towards having normal supplies made available, as developmental

and other work is seriously hampered by the shortage of these materials?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) The shortage in supplies of fencing wire, barbed wire, piping, and other steel products, has been aggravated by an irregularity of shipping from Newcastle, which caused a temporary shortage of wire rod and piping. It is expected that the position will improve within the next three or four weeks with the arrival of two steel ships from Newcastle.
- (2) Representations are now being made for a better shipping service to overcome this position and, if possible, prevent its recurrence.

CHILD WELFARE OFFICER

Appointment at Albany

10. Mr. HALL asked the Attorney-General:

In view of the increased population in Albany and its surrounding districts, will he give earnest consideration to the appointment of a child welfare officer at Albany?

Mr. WATTS replied:

The Minister for Child Welfare stated in the Press in August, 1959, that he had approved of the establishment of a district office of the Child Welfare Department at Albany.

NAVIGATION LIGHTS

Installation on North-West Islands

11. Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for the North-West:

- (1) Will he have navigation lights installed at the Abrolhos Islands, Hummock Island, and the north end of East Island, Wallaby Group, for night navigation?
- (2) Have the Geraldton fishermen offered to assist with the erection of navigation lights which are needed urgently for the next cray-fishing season?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) The installation of navigation lights at the Abrolhos Islands, Hummock Island, and the north end of East Island, Wallaby Group, is at present under consideration.
- (2) Yes. The Geraldton Professional Fishermen's Association has offered to assist in the erection of two small navigational lights, one on the Hummock Island and the other on the northern end of East Island in the Wallaby Group.

BELMONT HIGH SCHOOL

Gymnasium and Canteen Facilities

12. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Education:

When is it anticipated that a start will be made on the building of the final stage of the Belmont High School to provide the amenities of a gymnasium and canteen, as in other metropolitan high schools?

Mr. WATTS replied:

Provision of a gymnasium in several high schools, both metropolitan and rural, has been delayed owing to the necessity of providing maximum funds for classrooms, etc. The matter will be reviewed later.

NORTHAMPTON SCHOOL

Regrading

13. Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for Education:

In view of the importance to the district served by the Northampton State School and the increase in the number of children attending adjacent district schools, will he have the Northampton School graded up to the status of a Junior High School, as was intended when additions and improvements were made to the school?

Mr. WATTS replied:

The matter is under consideration. The district superintendent is investigating the position.

IRON ORE

Exclusion of Talling Deposits from Sale and Export

14. Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

Will he explain why the Talling iron ore deposit in the Mullewa district was not included in the Government's proposal to call tenders for the sale and export of 5,000,000 tons of iron ore from this State?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

The deposit under exploration has turned out not to be of the grade required by the present demand for export ore.

PERTH GIRLS' HIGH SCHOOL

Enclosing of Tennis Court

15. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has a decision yet been made to enclose the tennis courts adjacent to Perth Girls' High School, so as to enable them to be used by the students?

- (2) When is the work likely to be undertaken and completed?
- (3) What is the total cost of the work so far completed?
- (4) What is the approximate cost of the work remaining to be done?

Mr. WATTS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The matter is receiving consideration.
- (3) £3,540.
- (4) £3,500.

ELECTRICITY POLES

Removal from Walcott Street

16. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Electricity:

Wooden electricity poles having been removed from the northern side of Walcott Street, Mt. Lawley, and steel poles erected for the trolley-bus service having been used instead:

- (a) What are the reasons for similar action not having been taken on the southern side?
- (b) When is it intended that the number of poles on the south of the street will be reduced by making use of the steel poles and removing the wooden ones?

Mr. WATTS replied:

- (a) After tram services were abandoned the commission's mains and poles were removed from the north side of Walcott Street. When trolley-buses were introduced on the same route it was necessary to re-erect the low tension mains on the new steel trolley-bus poles on the north side. The mains on the south side of Walcott Street have always been in existence and will remain.
- (b) As soon as possible the mains on the south side of Walcott Street will be transferred to the new steel trolley-bus poles and most of the wooden ones removed.

TOBACCO SUPPLIES

Withholding by Manufacturers

17. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Has he received any complaints from metropolitan grocers, that they are being denied tobacco supplies by tobacco manufacturers?

- (2) Would the withholding of supplies be unfair trading?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) I would need a specific case before expressing an opinion.

WATER SHORTAGE

Position at Marble Bar

Mr. WILD: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to a question asked yesterday without notice by the member for Pilbara in connection with a water supply at Marble Bar. I understand that the connecting pipes have all been laid and the pump is being unloaded from the ship at Port Hedland today. It is expected that the pump will be installed over the weekend and, all being well, there should be a flow of water on Monday.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

MALFORMATION OF THE HEART

Specialist Treatment

1. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Health:

- (1) As the sum of £4,000 was involved in sending a case of malformation of the heart to a specialist in Houston, U.S.A.; and bearing in mind that there are many cases needing treatment in this State, would he give consideration to the sending of a specialist in that field overseas to further his studies so that other cases needing treatment in this State could be cared for?
- (2) Would he appoint a committee to study ways and means to raise the finance?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) I would point out that very recently an eminent heart specialist in Western Australia did return from the United States where he studied very closely the methods employed by Dr. Cooley of Houston. Although this doctor has not performed a similar operation to that which would have applied with the lad Alan MacKenzie, I believe he is qualified so to do.
- (2) In regard to the setting up of a committee, I do not think there is any necessity to do so at this juncture. However, if the honourable member would like to pursue the matter further and communicate with me in this regard, I will be only too pleased to make further investigations.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Dismissals

2. Mr. WILD: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct a figure given yesterday in answer to a question by the member for Mt. Hawthorn as to how many men are under notice of dismissal at the Public Works Department. I gave the answer as being 13, but the figure should have been 10. The mistake was due to a clerical error.

PILBARA PASTORAL INDUSTRY

Implementation of Report

3. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for the North-West:

Arising out of question No. 7 on the notice paper, has anything been done in connection with the report outside of the collation of information? There were things in that report which required urgent attention, such as additional vermin control, improvements to fencing, and additional water supplies. I would like to know whether any of those matters that did not require detailed investigation and collation have been acted upon?

Mr. COURT replied:

Consideration has been given to the matters raised by the committee's report, which do not need us to wait on the final submission; but no announcement can be made as to what action can or will be taken by the Government, as it is hoped eventually to have a comprehensive proposal rather than deal with the matter piecemeal. I am afraid that at present I cannot give any exact indication of the date when the final report will be ready for the Government.

WATER SHORTAGE

Lessening of Restrictions

4. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

While acknowledging the regrettable necessity for water restrictions in the metropolitan area, I ask the Minister—

(1) Will he admit that those who will suffer under the restrictions are the ones who have developed gardens about their properties; and that the more extensive the garden development, the greater will be the penalty to the householder?

(2) In view of this position, will he have investigated the possibility of allowing, perhaps, one day a fortnight

during which sprinklers may be used in order that something might be saved from the shipwreck? That is to say, where perhaps hundreds of pounds have been spent on the development of gardens—in addition, no doubt, to many hundreds of hours of work—that it might be possible at least to keep these gardens and extensive street lawns alive during the difficult period?

Mr. WILD replied:

I recognise that the restrictions will cause extreme hardship to people who have gardens of any kind—whether they be large or small. Those with the larger gardens will suffer more than the ones with small gardens because they will not have the time to water by hand, as I am afraid they will have to do for the rest of the summer. I can only say that the department has gone thoroughly into this question and looked at it from every angle. I would have been failing in my duty if I had not, at this stage, imposed the restrictions that have been imposed; because unless we get some torrential rainfall which can do some good for our dams, we will probably find ourselves, if we do not have extreme restrictions with hardly any water at all before the end of the summer. However, I will have consideration given to the suggestion put forward by the member for East Perth; but I want to be perfectly frank and say that I do not think there is much possibility of acceding to his suggestion.

Watering of Schoolgrounds

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

I preface my question by saying that I have a full appreciation of the Minister's difficulties. There are many parents and citizens' associations that have spent hundreds of pounds in providing grassed areas as playgrounds at various schools. These associations are faced with the definite possibility of losing their money and the results of their labour because it will not be possible to keep the grass alive without water. As it is proposed to permit bowling-greens, tennis courts, and municipal grounds to receive some attention by watering with sprinklers, I ask the Minister whether he will give consideration to the

possibility of drawing up some method by which the parents and citizens' associations will be permitted to water schoolgrounds at the various schools?

Mr. WILD replied:

I certainly will have another look at this one, but I can assure the honourable member—and I know that he, having been in the same position as I am, knows what occurs—that within the last 48 hours I have had representations made to me by people who have good, sound, logical cases. But we still come back to the same point that we have not got the water to give them. I cannot make water; I only wish I could.

CHILD WELFARE OFFICER

Appointment at Albany

6. Mr. HALL asked the Attorney-General:

Am I to assume from his reply to question No. 10 on the notice paper that the officer now engaged in operations between Katanning and Albany has two offices; or is his office at Albany?

Mr. WATTS replied:

The honourable member must allow me to inquire from the Minister exactly what his intentions are. All I know is that at the moment he intends to place an officer at Albany.

SALE OF TV SETS

Inquiry by Director of Investigation

7. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Labour:

I understood the Minister to say the other day that he had not made any request to the officer in charge of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act. I ask him now whether it is his intention to ask that officer for a report on the action taken by the electrical traders, in which it would appear that pressure is to be brought to bear in order that the public will be made to pay more than otherwise for certain articles. Will he cause inquiries to be made through the appropriate officer, at an early date, and advise the House of the outcome?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

I point out that the officer in question is not under my direction. He operates under an Act of Parliament, and to that extent he is advised by his principal and the Advisory Committee that is set up under the Act.

Mr. Graham: Couldn't you ask him?

Mr. PERKINS: If the member for East Perth makes a specific request I can, of course, pass it on; but the officer would not be compelled to take action. However, I would like to say that my information is that there is very keen competition in this trade.

AYRSHIRE CATTLE

Inclusion of Herd in Recording Scheme

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

- (1) Is it not a fact that Ayrshire cattle are a recognised dairy breed of high standing throughout the world?
- (2) Is he aware that Messrs. Offer & Sons of Benger have made application to his department for their Ayrshire herd to be included in the pure-bred herd recording scheme?
- (3) Does he know that Offer & Sons' application to test was lodged many months ago and has not yet been approved, and that these breeders have been caused very considerable inconvenience and financial loss because of the attitude of his department?
- (4) Will the Minister give this House an assurance that this herd will be included in the pure-bred herd recording scheme forthwith?
- (5) If not, why not?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Ayrshire cattle are a recognised dairy breed.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Application was received on the 23rd July for testing in August.
- (4) and (5) The matter is under consideration and will be finalised in the near future.

RESTRICTIVE TRADE PRACTICES

Government Action

9. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Premier:

Following the answer given by the Minister for Labour to the question I asked, do I properly appreciate the position if I assume that the Government is prepared to sit idly by and allow a coterie of business interests to apply pressure on certain of their number for the purpose of compelling the public to pay more for certain articles than certain firms are prepared to sell those articles for? Does he not regard it as a matter of paramount interest and concern to his Government that some action should be taken in order

to give the public in this instance the benefit of private enterprise and free competition?

Mr. BRAND replied:

In view of the anxiety of the honourable member to get a satisfactory answer, I would like him to put the question on the notice paper and it will be given full consideration.

COLLIE COAL

Carbonisation Plant

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

I apologise to the Minister for not giving him prior notice of this question. Is he aware of the possibility of the establishment on the Collie coalfield of a plant for the carbonisation of Collie coal, being financed by Japanese interests? Should this materialise, will the Minister give an assurance that this Government will assist in every way possible to facilitate this very desirable industry?

Mr. COURT replied:

I can only say that any information I have regarding the possibility of the establishment of a carbonisation plant at Collie, to be financed through Japanese interests, could be classed as hearsay or rumour. I have certainly had no official information of it; but if such a proposition were proposed by Japanese interests the Government would give it consideration when the proposition was officially placed before it.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Thursday Nights

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier): Mr. Speaker, I would like to be permitted to mention to the House that it is our intention to sit after tea on Thursday nights, beginning next Thursday.

KALGOORLIE-PARKESTON RAILWAY BILL

First Reading

Bill introduced by Mr. Court (Minister for Railways), and read a first time.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN INDUSTRIES AUTHORITY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 29th September.

MR. HAWKE (Northam) [2.45]: The Minister for Industrial Development explained the main provisions of this Bill to us when he spoke on the matter a few

days ago. Briefly, the measure proposes to constitute by statute an authority which is to be known as the Western Australian Industries Authority. The Bill proposes that three members should constitute the authority, and they are to be appointed by the Governor. The members of the authority, in the activities which they would carry out under the proposed law, would be subject to the Minister, who is the Minister for Industrial Development. The tenure of office proposed for members of the authority is a term not exceeding five years, or a term at the Governor's pleasure.

Before going on to mention some other provisions in the Bill, I should like to say a few words about the matters to which I have already referred. Firstly, as regards the name of the proposed organisation—the Western Australian Industries Authority—I think the choice of the word “authority” could hardly be worse. When the average person sees the word “authority” in print, or hears it mentioned, he thinks immediately that some organisation is around clothed with very great powers; and he also thinks that the authority referred to is likely to attempt to do much more than it would be reasonable to do in any particular situation.

I think I might be summing up fairly correctly the thought of the average person in regard to the word “authority” when I say that he thinks an authority is something somewhere between bureaucratic and totalitarian. When we look at some of the provisions in this Bill we could certainly agree that the average person's idea in that direction is correct; because some of the provisions—and at least one of them—give a power which is certainly highly bureaucratic, if not totalitarian.

So, should the House by any chance agree to this Bill, then I should hope the term “authority” which it is proposed to put in the title of the organisation if set up would be deleted and some more suitable word substituted. The part of the Bill that deals with the tenure of office is a little mystifying, because it states that a member of the authority may be appointed for a term not exceeding five years, or is to hold office during the Governor's pleasure.

Clearly, this part of the Bill would allow a strange set-up to develop. We could have one of the members of the authority appointed for three years, for instance; and we could have the other two members of the authority appointed at the Governor's pleasure, which would mean they might remain on the authority for a month, three months, or six months. At any time when they disagreed strongly enough with the Minister, or offended him, they would, of course, cease to have the pleasure of the Governor in their favour and would be out on their ears, so to speak.

Accordingly, the proposed tenure of office for members of the authority could be most unstable. Surely, if an organisation of this kind is to be set up under

statute, Parliament should be extremely careful to ensure the stability of the organisation once it commences to function. So I think quite strongly that there should not be any appointment which would be held only at the Governor's pleasure. Appointments should be made for fixed terms.

I can think of some reasons which might be put forward to try to justify this idea of appointment at the Governor's pleasure; but none of the reasons in that regard, which I could think of, appear to me to be effective. For instance, it might be said that initially someone well over 65 years of age would be appointed; that it might not be desirable to appoint him for any set term, not even for 12 months. My answer to that would be that if a person is not capable of being appointed for at least 12 months, he should not be appointed at all.

It might also be said that if members are to be appointed for a set term they might be found unsuitable after a few months' practical experience. Here again the Government of the day should take such great care in the selection of the personnel of the proposed authority as to be certain beyond any doubt that the persons finally chosen would be certain to give the services required of them.

Mr. J. Hegney: Subclause (3) says that a person shall not be eligible for appointment after 65 years of age unless the Governor directs otherwise.

Mr. HAWKE: That particular provision is put in the Bill because the Government probably proposes to appoint Sir Russell Dumas as a member of the proposed authority. I am not certain of his age, but I think at this date he might easily be 70 or 72 years old. So the provision to which the member for Middle Swan refers is placed in the Bill because the Government would probably wish to appoint Sir Russell Dumas as a member of the authority.

The functions of the proposed authority are several in number, and they range over a fairly wide field. They were read to members of the House by the Minister when he made his second reading speech, so there is no need for me to read them again. I notice that the functions contained in the Bill which the authority is to be authorised by law to carry out are such as to enable them to be carried out without any reference at all to the Minister and without being subject to him.

But the first function is one which the authority will be able to carry out subject only to the Minister's approval. The first function is to assume and discharge the functions hitherto discharged by the Department of Industrial Development and the Government of the State. It is true that in an earlier part of the Bill there appears to be an overriding provision which would make the authority subject in all things to the Minister. Therefore

I am not able to understand why, in the detailed statement of the functions of the authority as set out in the Bill, the authority is declared to be subject to the Minister in regard to one of them and not subject to him in regard to all of the others.

As the Minister explained, the proposed authority is to supersede completely the existing Department of Industrial Development. In other words, should this Bill become law, there would be no Department of Industrial Development at all once the proposed authority came into operation. I think the proposal in this regard is open to very strong objection and capable of being strongly criticised. I would presume that a majority of the members of this proposed authority—if not all—would be outsiders, if I might use that term.

In other words, they would not be employees of the Government, except in the special sense which would be covered by the proposed legislation. The proposal is dangerous because of the very considerable powers which the Bill proposes to give to the authority in question. The probable fact that a majority—if not all—of the members of the authority would themselves be associated directly with private companies, makes the proposition of wiping out of existence the Department of Industrial Development and setting this authority up in its place all the more dangerous.

The fact that most or all members of the new authority will have considerable private business interests of their own could very substantially influence their judgment, either consciously or unconsciously, and therefore influence the recommendations of the authority. When we consider that this Bill proposes to give the members of the authority power to make decisions also, then the danger to which I have been referring becomes underlined and emphasised.

The authority is to be a body corporate and is to be capable, in law, of suing and being sued, of purchasing, taking, holding, selling, leasing, taking on lease, exchanging, or disposing of real and personal property, and so on. Even in that part of the Bill it becomes clear that this authority will be given very considerable powers—powers which should be given to an organisation which, in fact, is not a Government department, only after the very closest scrutiny by members of this House.

In another part of the Bill the authority is given power to enter in and carry on the negotiations for contracts in regard to an existing or proposed industry. The use of the word "contract" in this context is somewhat mystifying. There is no definition of contract in the Bill; therefore one is left to imagine what is intended by the framers of the legislation in the use of this word. One is left to wonder more just how far this word "contract", should

this Bill become law, could be stretched in the activities which this authority would be undertaking.

Another part of the Bill raises the same sort of doubt and confusion. I shall read a brief portion which refers to that matter. The Bill states that in relation to an industry, the subject of a contract, referred to under this Act to the authority, the authority may take either directly or in a liaison capacity whatever action is necessary. It may be that the courts of this State have laid down a legal interpretation of the term "liaison capacity". However, I would be extremely surprised if that has been done. It seems that the use of that term in the Bill will lead to a lot of trouble later on, should Parliament place the Bill upon the statute book.

This proposed authority is to be given power to borrow money from the Treasurer. Therefore it becomes clear that the authority is to be set up to supersede, as it were, the Treasury in the matter of finance. That could lead to a considerable amount of trouble in practice, and certainly to a lot of disputation and confusion between the authority and its officers, and the Treasury Department, in the future.

Mr. Brand: It can borrow only with the Treasury's approval.

Mr. HAWKE: I know that. That is clearly set out in the Bill. The point is that the Treasurer, as a member of the Government, will probably agree from time to time to lend money to this authority. Once the authority comes into possession of money borrowed from the Treasury, there could subsequently in the distribution of the money be less scrutiny exercised than if the officers of the Treasury Department were still directly concerned.

The bureaucratic-cum-totalitarian part of the Bill proposes to give the authority, by itself or by its officers, servants or agents, the legal right to enter upon any land, street, or place, and survey and take levels thereof, and take, fell, remove, and carry away from the land any earth, stone, gravel, sand, or other soil, or timber, or trees required to be used in any industry—the subject of any actual or proposed contract, as mentioned in the Act. Clearly that is a very wide power to give to an authority such as the one proposed to be set up under the Bill.

Once this type of authority is set up and given powers as extensive and wide as those proposed in the Bill, the authority will feel there is an obligation upon it to do things and to use the powers. Before many private persons knew where they were or what was happening, and even before they knew the authority possessed these powers, they could find their properties being invaded under the powers given by this Act to the authority, and earth, stone, gravel, sand, other soil, timber, trees, and so on being taken away,

because somebody somewhere in Western Australia wanted those things in relation to some industry or other. I suggest the power proposed in this part of the Bill is a power which most certainly should not be given.

In his second reading speech in connection with the Bill the Minister for Industrial Development said some things which are worthy of a little attention. He said, "There is no easy or royal road to attracting industry." I presume he meant into Western Australia. This statement was, of course, very surprising to me; and all the more surprising because, when he was a member of the Opposition, he used to give members of this House to understand that there could be nothing easier than attracting industry to Western Australia, provided the right Government was in office.

With all the noise going on in relation to the extensions to Parliament House, I think the carpenters must be under notice of dismissal at the end of this week!

The SPEAKER: I have a message that they are making a more useful noise than we are.

Mr. HAWKE: If they are under notice of dismissal at the end of this week, I suggest the Premier take action to have the notices withdrawn for at least one week.

It is surprising to have a confession from the lips of the Minister for Industrial Development that there is no easy or royal road to attracting industry into Western Australia. I remember very vividly some of his performances in this House last session when he was a member of the Opposition. At that time there was only one impediment, according to him, and only one obstruction preventing entrepreneurs from rushing into Western Australia from the Eastern States and other countries of the world to establish large-scale manufacturing industries here. That impediment and obstruction was, of course, the Government of the day, plus the monopoly and restrictive trade practices legislation!

Now the position has changed dramatically, in the mind of the new Minister for Industrial Development. The position has so changed in his mind because today he faces the realities of the situation, and he has upon his shoulders the ministerial responsibility for attracting industries to this State—industries which he so glibly talked about a few months ago, and which he then said would come rushing into our own State, in the event of there being a change of Government at the forthcoming elections.

I have said many times in this House that the task of attracting additional manufacturing industries into Western Australia is tremendously and basically difficult; and I have on those occasions explained the reasons. Briefly this afternoon I want to summarise the main difficulty.

The main difficulty is that the bigger States of Australia became industrialised years ago when there was almost an unanimous agreement among the people of Western Australia that our future was bound up almost totally with the continued development of our primary and mining industries. The fact that manufacturing industry was developed in the larger Eastern States a great many years ago and has been expanded very considerably ever since, means—especially in these days of machine production—that those factories are capable, in the productive sense, of turning out not only all the goods required for the markets in Eastern Australia, but also—and very easily—all the goods of the same type required by the people in this State.

In other words, manufacturing activity in Eastern Australia has been developed on the basis of supplying the total needs of the Australian people. It should not be necessary to point out more than by way of passing that any manufacturing industry set up in this State to supply only the needs of the people of Western Australia would have a very difficult struggle to make the grade because that industry would be supplying the needs of only a small proportion of the Australian population, resident in Western Australia. Therefore, the Minister for Industrial Development is totally correct when he says, as he did the other day, that there is no easy or royal road to attracting industry into Western Australia.

However, there is a very great responsibility upon the Minister to do what he said—when he was a member of the opposition in this House—he could easily do. I think the Minister used these words which I have quoted, not only because he knows they are factual, but also in the hope that they would sort of provide a somewhat soft place on which he might fall now that he is Minister for Industrial Development with direct responsibility upon his shoulders to make good the prophecies which he spread around in this House in such a great number only a few months ago.

In his speech he made the rather strange statement, and I quote—

It is no good arguing whether we must get population before we get industry. The fact remains that we have to be prepared to press on with population increases, confident in the knowledge that our industrial promotion will be vigorous and successful. This is no time for pessimism or defeatism.

To the uninitiated, that sounds all right. It reads all right; but it is a queer jumble, really, when it is sorted out and analysed. It rather suggests that the Government is going to press on with bringing great numbers of additional people from overseas into Western Australia, irrespective of

whether industry expands, stays still, or goes backwards. I submit that would be a very dangerous policy to follow—a very dangerous policy.

No Government would be justified in bringing large numbers of additional people from overseas countries into Western Australia simply in the hope, or even in a confident thought, that industry in this State is sure to expand some time in the future. I say, without any qualification whatever, that there is a tremendous obligation on any Government, to any people which it brings into the State from some other part—a tremendous obligation and a very direct obligation, too. It is one from which it should never be allowed to escape.

I know the attitude which some members opposite adopt in this matter. When it is pointed out and emphasised to them that so many people are unemployed, they immediately take refuge in statistics by saying that only two point something per cent. of the total work force is unemployed; or only five per cent., or one per cent., or whatever it might be. That is wonderful comfort for those who happen to be unemployed and cannot get any employment anywhere! Therefore, I hope the Ministers of the Government will be very careful before they rush into any policy of bringing large numbers of additional people into Western Australia without having any real certainty in their minds that these people can be absorbed into our economy in a manner which would be beneficial to the people concerned as well as to the economy.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You are not thinking of people here as against people coming here, are you? You are thinking of them both?

Mr. HAWKE: I am thinking of them both because it would be equally wrong to bring people in from overseas who would get employment by displacing others already in employment here.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You don't think we could better the position of some of those people from overseas as has been our endeavour in previous years?

Mr. HAWKE: We would not if, when they came here, there was nothing for them to do.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: But there is less unemployment now.

Mr. HAWKE: We would not better their position by doing that; and no Government is entitled to bring people in simply for the sake of bringing them in; and no Government is entitled to bring them in unless there is a reasonable certainty—not a prospect, but a reasonable certainty—of being able to usefully place them within the economic system of the State: I mean, in some field of production or distribution in relation to goods.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I think you are thinking of protecting the people here in the main.

Mr. HAWKE: I am out to protect all the people I can possibly protect; and I am trying to say to the Ministers of the Government, and especially now to the Minister for Health, that the Government would not be justified in any situation in bringing additional people into Western Australia simply in the hope that industry might expand some day, or that there might be employment for them some time in the future.

I know the old argument only too well, because it has been voiced in Australia for donkey's years, that the more people we bring into the country the more activity there will be in the country. But we have seen how false and illogical that proposition can be. However, that matter is only indirectly related to the Bill before us. I would not have mentioned it at all except for the emphasis the Minister gave to it during his second reading speech.

Mr. Wild: Have you ever been to Tel Aviv where there are over 100,000 refugee Jews?

Mr. HAWKE: No; I have not been to Tel Aviv; and I would like to know what the Minister was doing when he was there.

Mr. Wild: If you had been there you would have found out that population does bring employment and industry, because those people came as refugees without anything at all; and within a matter of four or five years, they are all making a living.

Mr. HAWKE: I would like to investigate that personally in preference to taking the easy assurance which the Minister for Works would like to give me.

Mr. May: A lot of people here are not making a living at present.

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister could not resist the opportunity, during his speech, of saying something about the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Control Act. He tried to make out that the existence of that legislation was frightening the very lives out of companies and individual businessmen who would come here and establish industry very quickly were the legislation repealed. He said, and I quote—

It is basic to our approach that the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Control Act be repealed and replaced by legislation that will not cause the same fears in the minds of industrialists, and will make them feel welcome in the State.

We know only too well how the Minister for Industrial Development, particularly when he was a member of the Opposition, worked overtime to spread falsehoods about this legislation, thereby creating doubt, confusion, and fear in all the States of Australia, and in some overseas

countries. We know, too, that *The West Australian* newspaper backed him, or he backed it—I am not sure which; probably they backed each other a bit. We know that the Liberal Party propaganda machine outside Parliament worked overtime on this, and we know that Mr. Johnson's famous trade bureau worked to the death.

Mr. Wild: You have a fair share of machinery yourself with £5,000 help from the bookmakers.

Mr. HAWKE: And, by the way, now that I am talking about Mr. Johnson, I would like the Minister for Works to have some inquiries made to see whether this great champion of private enterprise, and this terrific hater of Government enterprise is not at present having some meat-rollers made at the State Engineering Works at North Fremantle.

Mr. Wild: If the price is right, I suppose that is fair enough.

Mr. HAWKE: There is something—

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition will keep to the Bill.

Mr. HAWKE: I can appreciate your desire not to have this discussion go on very long under this Bill, and I think your ruling would be correct. However, I am sure you, Mr. Speaker, would have no objection if I placed some questions on the notice paper in connection with this matter.

The SPEAKER: No.

Mr. HAWKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister then went on at a later stage in his speech to say—

In framing this legislation the Government has had to break new ground to a large extent.

I am not quite sure what the words "to a large extent" mean. I will have to make some allowance in favour of the Minister in connection with those words. However, I have examined quite closely a Bill which I myself, in 1938, introduced into Parliament, when I was Minister for Industrial Development.

The Bill was described as being one for an Act to provide for the encouragement of employment and the development of industry; to constitute and establish a bureau of industry and economic research; and for other purposes. Comparing the provisions of that measure with those of that which is now before us, I find there is great similarity indeed in regard to many of them.

Mr. Roberts: Then I suppose you are going to vote for this one.

Mr. HAWKE: I think the member for Bunbury is ahead of himself; and it is comforting to find that on this occasion he is in that position. I will not say anything about the position in which we find him on most occasions.

The great difference between this Bill and that which I introduced into Parliament in 1938 is that the measure before us proposes to set up a bureaucratic authority, almost totalitarian in some directions; and to give that authority very great powers, all of which, in a general way, will be used by that authority subject to the Minister, but some of which in a specific way will not be so carried out.

There was no suggestion, in the 1938 Bill, that the organisation then proposed to be set up should replace the Department of Industrial Development; and that, of course, is the vital and fundamental difference between that Bill and this one. It is mainly upon the fact that this Bill proposes to wipe out the Department of Industrial Development and set up this new authority in its place, that I oppose the second reading of the measure. I am most decidedly not in favour of wiping out the department. Should this Bill become law, the Minister and the Treasurer could, in a year's time, deeply regret that the proposed authority had ever been set up.

I have already said that the authority will consist almost, if not entirely, of outside persons, who will have great private business interests of their own. Therefore there could be considerable, if not constant, conflict between what they should do in the direction of benefiting the State, and the extent to which anything they might do in that direction might also benefit the industries with which they are directly and particularly associated.

As I said earlier, when discussing this point, they might not do that consciously; but certainly they would do it unconsciously. So the wiping out of the Department of Industrial Development and the setting up in its place of this proposed authority would mean that the Minister and the Government would lose an organisation, in the form of the department, which is part and parcel of the Government; which belongs to the Government; which is directly under the control and direction of the Government; and would substitute for it an organisation which, although set up by statute and subject to the Minister in a general way, would have an existence which would be partly governmental and partly non-governmental.

Had the Minister brought down a proposal to set up this foreshadowed organisation to advise or investigate or report and recommend, there might have been and would, I think, have been, considerable justification for it; but the Minister and the Government have gone miles beyond that objective. I suppose that the next thing we will see in this regard will be the Minister for Works introducing a similar Bill in connection with some of the departments under his control. Probably other Ministers in the Government will be introducing similar measures in relation to certain of the departments under their control.

Mr. Court: They have them already.

Mr. HAWKE: No; they have not got them at all.

Mr. Court: Yes they have.

Mr. HAWKE: Where are they?

Mr. Court: What about the State Electricity Commission?

Mr. HAWKE: The State Electricity Commission is set up in such a way as to be directly under the Minister; and it is, of course, a State trading concern. It is a productive agency, and it produces a commodity and sells it. The authority proposed under this Bill will not do anything like that; and therefore it is not in any way comparable with the State Electricity Commission.

For those reasons I do not think this Bill should be passed by Parliament. However, should the measure survive the second reading, some drastic amendments should be made to it in Committee. I restate my opposition to the Bill.

MR. W. HEGNEY (Mt. Hawthorn) [3.40]: I cannot say that I am very enthusiastic about this measure; and I am strongly inclined to oppose it at all stages. I listened attentively to the Minister's introduction of the measure the other evening; and the phraseology he used was quite familiar. We heard the same sort of language from him on many occasions, when he was on this side of the House; and since he has adorned the ministerial bench—since the opening of this Parliament—the language he has used has been almost identical. It sounds very highfalutin, but there is nothing in it—it is just like the Bill.

When we examine the provisions of the measure it is found that, so far as enhancing industry in this State is concerned, there is nothing to it. But I believe there are some very subtle provisions in this Bill; some of them diabolical in character. Yet the Minister, when introducing the legislation, tried to lead the House to believe that, if the Bill were passed, industry in this State would expand illimitably. But I do not believe that.

I believe there are provisions in this measure which would enable the Government to put the skids under some of the industrial activities carried on by the State. The Department of Industrial Development, which has operated for some time in this State, has done a very good job under difficulties. It has given technical and other advice to those who proposed to establish industries here; and in many ways it has assisted in the development of industry in Western Australia.

Although members of the present Government on more than one occasion criticised the previous Government for its lack of interest in expanding industry in this State, the accounts of the Treasury show that, over a period of six years, a gigantic

amount of money was advanced and loaned by the Government to private individuals, firms, and companies, for the purpose of establishing industry in this State. Without going into detail, I will mention one instance where a prominent firm operating in the City of Perth and producing important commodities, went to more than one private bank to obtain finance to expand its operations, but was refused.

That firm could get no accommodation from private financial institutions; and so it approached the State Government Insurance Office, which has often been vilified and criticised by members of the Government. That institution, acting in accordance with the policy of helping Western Australian industry, advanced that firm £80,000; and that did not need any industrial authority such as is envisaged in this Bill. Let us examine some of the provisions of the measure. Although the Leader of the Opposition efficiently and ably dealt with the contents of the Bill, I feel that it will stand further examination; so let us look first at the definition of "department".

It will be found that the definition of "department" is of an all-embracing character. "Department" does not mean the State Engineering Works only, or the State Electricity Commission, for instance. It means any department under the administration of a Minister of the Crown; and includes any State trading concern, the Rural and Industries Bank, the Fremantle Harbour Trust, and any Crown instrumentality which controls or carries on an industry. Those last few words "carries on an industry" are significant. "Industry" includes any trade, business, activity or undertaking which has association with commerce or industrial activity, whether carried on by a department or otherwise.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.6 p.m.

The SPEAKER: I understand that in another quarter of an hour the hammering and noise will cease. I am sure that the member for Mt. Hawthorn will be able to tolerate the noise for another 10 minutes.

Mr. Hall called attention to the state of the House.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House, and there is a quorum present.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I do not mind the noise, Mr. Speaker; it is unavoidable. I do not mind noises from the other side of the House as far as that goes. Previously, I was indicating that the word "industry" was all-embracing. I do not think the Government would be silly enough to do anything in regard to it, but this definition of "industry" could include a technical school. It certainly would include the State Government Insurance Office, the Government Printing Office, the abattoirs,

and the Wyndham Meat Works—just to mention a few. Some of these are not actually Government departments, but they come within the definition of "industry"; and consequently this authority will have jurisdiction over those activities as set out in the Bill.

Mr. Court: You say under what circumstances they will have jurisdiction.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I am dealing with the definition of "industry"; and I repeat, without reading it, that it is all-embracing and includes the industrial activities to which I have just referred.

Mr. Court: Can you explain when it applies?

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The Minister can.

Mr. Court: I did.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I am talking about the provisions of the Bill. Most of the machinery and administrative clauses will be found in the back portion of the Bill dealing with such matters as investment of profits, the allocation of funds, annual estimates, books and accounts to be balanced and accounts to be audited, and annual report, and so on. They are what might be termed the machinery or administrative clauses, and I have no great quarrel with them.

The first important provision in this Bill is that which provides for a trio or triumvirate of advisers to be set up, ostensibly to advise the Minister. At the present time, there are only two officers, and their names have been mentioned. The third member has not been appointed.

I asked a question in this Chamber on the 25th August last of the Premier as follows:—

- (1) How many meetings of the Industrial Development and Advisory Committee have been held since he announced the establishment of the committee on the 29th April last?
- (2) Has the third member yet been appointed to the committee?
- (3) If so, what is the name of the appointee?
- (4) Have any recommendations or suggestions been made by all or any members of the committee with respect to the sale of Government undertakings to private interests?
- (5) If so, what is the nature of such recommendations?

Mr. Brand replied as follows:—

- (1) Almost daily.
- (2) No.
- (3) Answered by No. (2).
- (4) and (5) General discussions only have taken place between the committee and the Minister.

The Government, immediately after taking office, or within a week or two, determined that there would be an industrial advisory committee of three members, but it only proceeded to appoint two members. Why was not the third member appointed then? Why was Mr. Brisbane appointed? Why was Sir Russell Dumas appointed?

Mr. J. Hegney: He was out of a job.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Why was not the third person appointed? Was there any great obstacle confronting the Government concerning the appointment of the third person? This Bill provides for an advisory committee of three, which I suggest is entirely unnecessary. Some time ago this Parliament altered a set-up in regard to the management of the railways. For a long number of years there was a sole commissioner in charge; and there is a sole commissioner in charge today.

However, for a certain period a board of commissioners or a Railways Commission was set up consisting of three members; and this commission had statutory powers. There is no need for me to reiterate what a mess that commission made of the railways, and how the State suffered as a result of the maladministration of that triumvirate or board of commissioners. This body will have statutory powers and will only be subject to the Minister, as is usual in a multiplicity of Acts where boards or authorities are set up.

I quite agree with the Leader of the Opposition, who indicated that the word "authority" used in a proposal of this kind would be, if not objectionable, distasteful to quite a number of people who might be thinking of establishing industry in Western Australia. This is particularly so when we have regard for the words, "subject to the Minister." Apparently members of this Government are anxious to transfer ministerial responsibility from their own shoulders to those of boards. Despite this, on many occasions protests have been made by members of the Liberal Party against the extension of boards.

Mr. Court: This Bill does not do that.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I propose to refer to some of the powers of this authority. Incidentally, when the present Minister—I am not being disrespectful—was on this side of the House, he would give the impression that he was a full bottle on all industries, and there was nothing left for anybody else to worry about; and there was no need for any authorities, let alone a board of three, to advise the Minister.

The proposal is to set up this triumvirate for the purpose of advising the Minister, or the Government, on industrial activities and promotions, and the extension of industry in the State. I have been advised already—and the Minister, as far as I know, has not made reference to this

point—that the salary of two members of the commission will be at least £3,000 a year.

Mr. Court: Who said that? The two gentlemen are acting in an honorary capacity at the moment.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I am not saying that what I have been told is correct; but when the Minister replies he can explain, in view of the proposal in the Bill, whether it is intended to continue to appoint members in an entirely advisory capacity. The Bill contains provisions for remuneration and allowances to be made.

Provision is also included so that the superannuation or pension of a member shall not be affected by virtue of his appointment to this board, authority, or commission. Incidentally, the Minister might tell us whether it is proposed to appoint the present two members to the authority; and, if so, whether they are going to be appointed in an honorary capacity or whether they will receive remuneration. The Minister might also indicate, if the two people I have mentioned are to continue as members, who the third member will be, or the type of person who will be appointed the third member. Will the third member be an engineer, as these two men are, or will he be a scientist, a technician, or one skilled in industry?

I mentioned the matter of remuneration and allowances; and I would like the Minister to say, when he replies, whether it is proposed to appoint members who will receive allowances. The Bill states—

Each member and deputy member is entitled to such remuneration as, prior to his appointment or re-appointment, is fixed by the Governor, and to allowances as determined from time to time by the Minister.

The next provision states that superannuation and pension rights shall not be affected. If an ex-Government employee is appointed to the commission and is paid some remuneration or allowance, will his superannuation or pension be affected? As far as I can see, this provision will entitle a member or deputy member to the payment of both.

I wish now to refer to another provision in which there is a certain amount of ambiguity. The Leader of the Opposition pointed out the anomaly, and I hope the Minister will take notice of what he said. This provision states—

Subject to this Act, a member or a deputy member may be appointed for any term not exceeding five years or to hold office during the Governor's pleasure.

The term could be any period from one day to five years. I understand this provision to mean that a member or deputy member could have his or her appointment terminated at a moment's notice. I

do not think there is any need for the reference to "the Governor's pleasure." As the Leader of the Opposition said, if anyone is worthy of appointment, he should be appointed for at least one year.

The board or authority is to consist of three persons. In regard to the validating of any meeting that is held, the Bill provides—

Such number of members as the Governor from time to time determines shall be a quorum of the Authority, and unless otherwise so determined two members shall be a quorum of the Authority.

Any member of this Chamber would realise that if there were three members, one would not constitute a quorum; at least two would be required. So the provision that two members shall constitute a quorum will meet the position.

Another part of the Bill makes reference to the authority being a body corporate with perpetual succession and a common seal, and so on. I have no quarrel with that provision.

I now come to the functions of the authority, which is the next important provision. This clause states that the functions of the authority are to take over the duties now performed by the Department of Industrial Development. The next function is to make inquiries and investigations with respect to the industrial development of the State.

Then the authority is to advise the Minister concerning the industrial development of the State, on desirable methods thereof, on problems associated therewith, and on related matters; and to assemble statistics and general information concerning existing and possible or desirable industries established or to be established within the State. This is all so much padding; and in my opening remarks I said that the Minister used high-falutin language, but it means nothing. I come now to this function of the authority—

To advise the Minister on the policy which should be adopted in regard to, and the best methods of undertaking, the transfer of State trading concerns and other industry controlled or carried on by or on behalf of the State or a department to the field of private enterprise, and assisting in any such transfer.

To me that is another indication of the Government's burning desire to get rid of the State's assets. With all due respect I would say that this triumvirate is to be set up, and is to represent private interests in this community. It is time the State realised the danger in which it is being placed. The authority is to advise the Minister on the policy which should be adopted, and on the best method of getting rid of the State's assets. Will the Minister deny that the State Insurance Office would come within the provisions of the Bill?

Mr. Court: It would if the Government of the day wanted it to.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Of course it would! Realising the performance of the Government when it was in Opposition; and its forthright criticism of the State Insurance Office; and its hostility to the extension of the State office in any way, despite the fact that the previous Government received mandates to give the State office the right to engage in all forms of insurance, I view this matter with some apprehension. This measure can be interpreted by the members of the Opposition as another—I was going to say "underhand" but I will say "subtle"—method of getting rid of another State Government authority like the State Government Insurance Office.

Mr. Court: The authority has no power to do that. It is an advisory body.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The Minister cannot hoodwink me, although he might hoodwink some members of the public and the new members on that side of the House.

Mr. Court: Read the clause.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: This is what it states—

The functions of the authority are—
To advise the Minister—

if the Minister needs any advice. If the Minister gets advice that the State Government Insurance Office should be sand-bagged, or transferred, or disposed of, he will take the advice without delay. That is my opinion.

Mr. Hawke: Quicker than that.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I am not going to refer to the provision in regard to contracts.

Mr. Hawke: You might mention the meatworks at Robb Jetty.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I have mentioned a few of the Government activities that the Government can deal with. I want to know what is meant by this—

The Authority, subject to this Act—that is only subject to the Minister—

—may make inquiries and investigations with respect to any industry.

I want to know how far the authority is going to be permitted to investigate the industry of a small industrialist who may be struggling to get on his feet. How far are the members of this authority to be entitled to find out about a man's industry?

Mr. Hawke: It looks like a super bureaucracy.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Too right it is! To my way of thinking this is unnecessary, and it will cause quite an amount of protest in the community. Last night I had no hesitation in protesting when I found out that the contents of what on the surface appeared to be an innocuous Bill, were not quite so innocent. That Bill provided that where a person went on to any country land in the South-West Land

Division, and the son of the owner of the land, or an employee, made a complaint to a justice of the peace, then, if they could prove that the man was on the land, he could be fined a minimum of £2 and a maximum of £10. I thought that was getting back to the dark ages; and that is what the Government proposes the authority shall be entitled to do, although it talked about the freedom of the individual, and the setting up of a bureaucracy by the Opposition when it was in office. This will stand repeating—

Subject to this Act, the authority, for the purposes of exercising and discharging its functions, powers, rights or obligations under this Act, may itself, or by its officers, servants or agents,—

- (a) enter upon any land, street or place and survey and take levels thereof and take, fell, remove and carry away from the land any earth, stone, gravel, sand or other soil or timber or trees required to be used in any industry the subject of any actual or proposed contract as mentioned in this Act;

That is pretty sweeping. I would say that already on the statute book there are sufficient laws to ensure that any Government is entitled to enter upon land. This clause, being superimposed on other provisions, is quite unnecessary; and it is unfair to the people in the community.

The Department of Industrial Development could, under the jurisdiction of the Minister, if it were allowed to function—possibly with minor alterations that the Government might feel disposed to give effect to—carry on the task, difficult though it may be, of endeavouring to expand industrial development in Western Australia.

I do not believe that the setting up of this authority will be in the best interests of Western Australia. I am of the opinion that one of the underlying motives behind the Bill is to establish another authority for the purpose of enabling the Government to get out from under, as it were; and that the authority will from time to time give certain advice to the Government of the day as regards the disposal of the State's assets, and to whom they will be disposed. I know that the Government, by the attitude it adopted when in Opposition, and the attitude it has adopted since it has been in power, will take that advice wherever possible and dispose of the assets of the people.

Yet only the other day the Minister for Works told a deputation—and this was mentioned by the Premier during the election campaign, and it has also been mentioned by the Minister for Industrial Development since that time—that in any

move to dispose of State trading concerns the interests of the employees would be safeguarded. I believe that as time goes on, and with the policy that the Government is following, there will be very few employees left—in some of the State undertakings—to receive protection; and then this industrial authority, which is to be set up to advise the Government on the transfer and disposal of State trading concerns, will be in a better position to indicate to the Government that the State's assets should be sold.

I am convinced that this would be a retrograde step. It would not be in the interests of the people of Western Australia; and the Government has shown by its actions that it intends to take every opportunity, in the first place to undermine and weaken State enterprises; and then, at an opportune moment, to dispose of them.

MR. BRADY: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

MR. BRADY (Guildford-Midland) [4.33]: I hoped that by moving that the debate be adjourned I would be able to get more time to consider exactly what the Bill means; because in the time I have had at my disposal so far I have found that there seem to be many conflicting clauses in the measure. It appears to be a Bill that will set up an authority to supplant the present Department of Industrial Development; and yet this authority will be able to do nothing more than that department has been doing for years.

One minute when I read the Bill I get the impression that the authority will be able to run enterprises on behalf of the State. But that is contrary to Liberal-Country Party policy. The next minute I get a different impression in regard to that aspect. I wanted to analyse the whole position a little further so that I could find out exactly what the Bill does mean. However, as I was not allowed to adjourn the debate, I will have to discuss the Bill in the limited time at my disposal.

The first thing I noticed in the measure were these words—

A member shall not, in respect of his office as such, be subject to the provisions of the Public Service Act, 1904, but the office of member or of department member may be held in conjunction with any other office, appointment, duty or function which the Governor deems not incompatible.

If that means that civil servants can be made members of this authority to advise the Government, I wish to enter a protest against it. I believe we have far too many civil servants serving on boards; and the fact that they are members of certain boards is detrimental to the State and their own particular departments. I think

it is one of the biggest weaknesses in the Civil Service at present. One can go into a department and ask to see the under secretary, or some other officer, and one is told that he is away at a board meeting; and when one inquires as to what board it is, one finds that it is a board connected with some other department or authority.

I am certainly not very happy about that aspect of the Bill. Civil servants get salaries for the jobs they are doing in the Civil Service, and they should not be able to draw an additional salary as members of some board or authority connected with Government activity. Our civil servants should be specialising in the work of their own particular departments. It is my belief that in these days, when everyone should be specialising in some work or other, our civil servants should be specialising in the work of their own departments.

Other parts of the Bill refer to the functions of the authority, meetings, quorum, the chairman, and any vacancies which may occur. There is one clause which gives it authority to be a body corporate; another dealing with the removal of a member; another, with the keeping of minutes; and so on. These are all formal procedure for a board or authority of any kind.

But then we come to the clause which deals with the functions of the authority. As I understand the position, except in one or two cases—and I will deal with them particularly later on—this authority will not be able to do any more than the Department of Industrial Development has been doing over the years. The Department of Industrial Development has helped dozens of industries in this State; and those industries, when they have been able to stand on their own feet, have been able to repay the department, or the Government, for the assistance which has been given to them.

On the other hand, I know that the department has from time to time refused to assist certain industries because it felt that they were not working on sound economic lines, and it would not be in the best interests of the State, or of the concern, to encourage them to sink more money into the industry. The department realised that it would be better to use the money in other directions, to help primary and other industries which were more in need of assistance. The department has functioned along those lines for years, and it has been helping those who should be helped and it has been discouraging those whom it considered should not be encouraged.

In addition, the department has over the years held exhibitions in the Perth Town Hall, and distributed propaganda material to help local industry. This work has been done under Labor Governments as well as coalition Governments. It has done

everything possible to publicise what local industry is doing, and I am sure all members have seen the exhibitions which have been held in the Town Hall buildings. This propaganda has been of benefit to people in our own State as well as to visitors, and the department has done everything possible to publicise the State's activities.

The last exhibition I saw was on Kleen-heat gas. We all know that the B.P. Co. is doing a good job by producing this gas, which is being used so much by country people; and I understand its use is being extended to the metropolitan area. This by-product from Kwinana will be of benefit to the State, and it is hard to visualise how the authority envisaged by this Bill will be able to do anything more than is being done by the Department of Industrial Development.

One of the big drawbacks with this authority is that it will probably cost a lot of money to get it functioning; in effect, the authority will be double-banking. There is one clause in the Bill which states that one of the functions of the authority is—

To assemble statistics and general information concerning existing and possible or desirable industries established or to be established within the State.

I take it that that has been done on scores of occasions over the years, both by the State Statistician's Department and the Commonwealth Statistician's Department, and the Department of Industrial Development as well as other people connected with industry. I am sure that those concerned with the leather industry, the aerated water industry, the whaling industry, and so on, have all collated statistics on their own particular industries. Yet this authority has to do the same work all over again. It looks to me as though it is history repeating itself.

The position in regard to this authority is much the same as we have had recently in reference to the Government Tourist Bureau. We now have a Government Tourist Bureau which is doing a reasonably successful job. All it wants is a little bit of financial assistance and it will be able to do a much better job. Yet the Government intends to set up a Government tourist authority which will be merely double-banking.

The Government tourist authority will do exactly the same work as the Government Tourist Bureau is already doing, and the same thing will apply in regard to the industries authority. This authority, if it is established, will need a staff to assemble statistics and interview people to see whether they can do this, that, or the other thing. I think the Minister, when he conceived this idea, was doing a lot of wishful thinking. During the election campaign the Government said that it intended to encourage industries to come to Western

Australia and spend hundreds of thousands of pounds; that it intended to improve commerce and make industry thrive in such a way as has never been done before. But it is beginning to find that its work in this regard has been a dismal failure. The Government is finding that it cannot do any more than the previous Government did when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition went overseas.

Mr. Court: I am sorry to disappoint you.

Mr. BRADY: By the appointment of this authority the Government is merely playing for time. It will be able to say, "We have to set up the authority and we have to get certain staff organised, and purchase certain equipment." The Government is playing for time in the hope that someone will come along and spend a few hundreds of thousands of pounds on certain projects.

To my way of thinking the setting up of an authority of this kind is a contradiction of Liberal Party policy. We have been led to believe by the Liberal Party that private enterprise can do everything if it is given the opportunity. Now private enterprise has the opportunity to do something, but the Government is setting up an authority to do the work. The Government will find that it cannot do any more than the previous Government did to bring industries to this State.

The Leader of the Opposition said something about a Mr. Johnson, and I heard the same thing. I understand that he is using a State Government enterprise—namely, the Government abattoirs—to have a lot of his export meat boned at a price which hardly pays the abattoirs to do it, because it involves a great deal of overtime. Good luck to him if he can build up his industry; but not at the expense of the State. It is a classic example of where a State enterprise is being used to further one person's particular ends. Private enterprise, if it has the initiative, the know-how, the drive, and the confidence of investors overseas should be able to interest them in coming to Western Australia without having to set up an authority to double-bank on work that has already been done.

In this Bill the Government seems to be playing for time in the hope that something will turn up to help it out of a dilemma. The member for Mt. Hawthorn got down to the gravamen of the Bill when he referred to a particular section and said that most of the rest of the Bill was padding in order to play for time. The particular paragraph reads as follows:—

To advise the Minister on the policy which should be adopted in regard to, and the best methods of undertaking, the transfer of State trading concerns, and other industry controlled or carried on by or on behalf of the State or a department to the field of private enterprise.

There is the foundation of the Bill; and there is the earnest desire of the Country and Liberal Party Coalition Government to wind up the activities of successful State trading concerns which have been in existence over the last 25 years. They will sell these concerns to their friends at a price which would pay them to form companies and take them over to boost their own particular concerns, or to set up new establishments, thus endeavouring to make out that private enterprise is doing something for the State when, in fact, it is actually exploiting the people by taking over these concerns which have operated successfully and which have paid for their capital cost. In particular, I would refer to the State Hotels.

What is going to happen? It will be very nice for the supporters of the Liberal Party to be given this opportunity, because they will be able to get right inside the workings of these organisations and find out exactly what their returns are and what they can save by amalgamating them with other concerns. We all know that ultimately the community will have to pay for these amalgamations and these absorptions by the companies formed by the supporters and friends of the Liberal Party.

The people who will pay most will be the farming community and private industry in the metropolitan area—particularly the primary producers, who are already beginning to feel the pinch because of the falling off in the price of overseas exports in such commodities as cereals, wool, etc. The farmers and primary producers will have to pay the largest share, just as they are today having to pay the cement combine.

In the case of the cement industry, it cannot be said that the farmers are able to buy their cement at a reasonable price. I understand that at Brisbane, where it is brought 15 or 16 miles down the river and handled two or three times, cement is being sold at a price which is much lower than that asked in Western Australia, where the raw material is most handy. So the primary producers and the country people will pay through the nose. I would be very surprised if the country members in another place permit this Bill to go through.

Mr. Court: What has that to do with the Bill?

Mr. BRADY: It has a lot to do with the Bill, and the Minister knows it. As the Leader of the Opposition has said on several occasions, once the Minister begins interjecting it is quite definite that he is rattled. He knows what I say is correct. If private enterprise can buy up concerns that are now run by the State Government, they will certainly do it; and they will make the public, the primary producers—and the farming community, particularly—pay.

There will be no opposition, because they will have fixed prices. Their association meeting will be held in some hotel or in

some premises in St. George's Terrace; and they will say, "Here is the price we propose to charge for this commodity or that commodity," and that will be the end of it. Let us consider the State Saw Mills as an example. One can imagine the larrydoodle that would go on if private enterprise gained control over the State Saw Mills. The farmers would have to pay sky-high prices for timber for their homesteads, extensions, and other building requirements. The price at which these private concerns bought out the State trading concerns would soon be repaid by this means.

I would like to remind the House of part of the function of this board. It is—

to advise the Minister on the policy which should be adopted in regard to, and the best methods of undertaking, the transfer of State trading concerns and other industry controlled or carried on by or on behalf of the State or a department to the field of private enterprise, and assisting in any such transfer.

Not having had sufficient time to study this Bill further, those are the only conclusions that I can draw. Had I been given more time, perhaps my conclusions would have been different. There is another provision in the Bill which says that one of the functions of the authority is—

with respect to any existing or proposed industry, to make recommendations to the Minister for the granting of financial or other assistance or for the sale, leasing or other disposal of land.

I understand the previous Government put through several Acts to allow industry to be given the opportunity to take over land where it would be in the best interests of industry to do so. As I pointed out before, the Department of Industrial Development from time to time reviewed any proposition put up in regard to financial assistance. It then advised the Treasurer or Under Treasurer whether it thought the matter should be proceeded with.

Here again it is only a question of double-banking. What has been done by the Department of Industrial Development for years will now be done by the department to be set up under this Bill. I cannot see any necessity for the department which it is proposed to establish, particularly as it will cost the State money to set it up. We have already got too many departments and too many civil servants in those departments. The number of civil servants should be reduced rather than increased. I understand the previous Commonwealth Country Party-Liberal Party Government was consistently charged by the Labor Opposition and by its own supporters for increasing the numbers of public servants in the

various departments. Yet here we find it is proposed to increase the number of civil servants.

The Governor will have power to make regulations to facilitate the vesting, transfer, and registration of estates or interests in land under this Bill, and relating to the revesting thereof. So if the regulations are made, and they are made on the basis that this transfer can take place, I can imagine myself waking up one morning and reading in *The West Australian* that overnight the Government has transferred the State Saw Mills or the State Brickworks; because everything will be cut and dried for this to be done.

The Governor is given power under this Bill to have regulations drafted to permit these things to be done. It would be wrong for the Opposition, knowing the great benefit that has been derived from the State trading concerns over the years, and the protection they have given the public—that is the important part—to permit their sale; they should continue as State utilities functioning on behalf of the people.

Can members imagine the position over the last ten years if we had not had the State Saw Mills or the State Brickworks? The sky would have been the limit in the boom period during the housing shortage. The fact that there were State trading concerns in these two industries ensured that prices were stabilised and kept at such a level as to enable Western Australia to build homes more cheaply than any other State in Australia. That was only made possible because we had such State trading concerns as the State Saw Mills and the State Brickworks.

Imagine what will occur in the future if these enterprises are sold as a consequence of this authority being able to advise the Minister; and if regulations can be drafted whereby, overnight, these State concerns can be sold! So I must protest loud and long against the proposal to set up the authority in question. Not only do I protest because of the unnecessary expense, but because it is our duty to protect these industries which are successfully established and which have given such a great measure of protection to the public. Another function of this authority will be—

On the recommendation of the authority made with the approval of the Minister, any other Minister of the Crown for the time being administering a department which has made or makes a contract with respect to any industry may, notwithstanding anything in any Act by or under which the department is constituted, by notice in writing refer the contract to the Authority, whereupon in relation to that contract the Authority shall have and may exercise the powers mentioned in section twenty of this

Act unless and until the reference is revoked by the Governor under this Act.

I may be wrong, but it looks very much as though we are going to have an autocracy set up in Western Australia to review the whole of the activities of the Government departments which may wish to enter into contracts with private enterprise or with other people in regard to their departmental functions. Those bodies must be able to review and advise as to whether they should be allowed to carry out contracts in the terms drawn up or contemplated. In my opinion that is dangerous.

Mr. Court: They only have the power if the Minister of the department requests the review.

Mr. BRADY: The very fact that the Minister has the power is sufficient. This board will ultimately be brought into the picture, and there might be scores of things which the Minister might like to have reviewed—particularly if his Party friends put the pressure on and say, "We would like you to have a look at this, that, or the other".

I would not like to be in the Minister's shoes, even though he says that would not happen. We know what happened to the previous member for Nedlands a few years back when he tried to buck the powers that be in big business in Western Australia. His Liberal Party friends told him to get into line and not proceed with his Bill. The present member for Nedlands will be told the same thing; and if he does not carry out the instructions given him, he will get what the chicken got in the neck.

I protest against the activities of departments being handed over to a small coterie of two or three people to review and advise whether the departments concerned should carry out a policy on which they have decided; or decide whether the departments' buying powers are in the best interests of certain people who do not want their buying interests interfered with. We know that a short while ago a Select Committee was appointed to inquire into matters similar to this; and one of our departments were confident that collusive tendering was in vogue, because it was found when tenders were submitted that the price for the tenders was exactly the same. That went on and is occurring at present. It will continue if this Bill is passed. If it suits some people, they will see that it goes on; if it does not suit them, they will change the situation, because they do not want people to get the business which they do not want to encourage.

At the moment the bigger fry in the commercial and industrial world are squeezing out the small man. Today, I asked a question of the Minister for Labour as to whether he had been advised that

some grocers were being denied tobacco supplies. What is the reason? It is because they are selling tobacco cheaper than other traders, and they are being compelled to sell tobacco at the higher level; otherwise they will not get supplies.

I know that you, Mr. Speaker, will tell me to go back to the Bill; and I shall do that. I do not like the power being given to the authority to review the contracts entered into by, and the contemplated activities of, Government departments. I do not like the power being given to the Minister to request the authority to examine any matter.

There are other provisions in the Bill to which I am opposed. One of them is that, subject to the Act, the authority may make inquiries and investigations with respect to any industry. Should there not be a proviso along these lines: "If requested by the persons in the particular industry that that should be done"?

That provision does envisage the following situation: If certain people desire some information in certain industries, they can say to the authority, "We want you to obtain some information." As I understand the position, the Minister may direct the authority to obtain that information. In doing so, that could be detrimental to the smaller businessmen. That is how that provision can be interpreted. The authority may make inquiries with respect to any industry. Why is that provision included in the Bill, if it is not intended to give the authority this power?

There is no provision in the Bill to enable the authority to make investigations to ascertain whether assistance should be given by the Government to enable a particular industry to expand and bring trade to this State, which at present is not offering. I attempted to obtain the adjournment of the debate, so that I could analyse and consider all the provisions, in conjunction with people who are vitally affected. But the Government wants to push on with the measure, and does not want a lot of discussion. I oppose the second reading and hope the Bill will not be passed.

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle) [5.3]: I feel that the Bill has a sinister purpose. I am not disagreeing without reason with members opposite when I say that; because as the member for Mt. Hawthorn said, there is a lot of padding in the Bill that is wrapped around the sinister clauses alluded to by the member for Guildford-Midland.

Under clause 17 one of the functions of the authority is to advise the Minister on the policy which should be adopted in regard to, and the best methods of undertaking, the transfer of State trading concerns and other industry controlled or carried on by or on behalf of the State or a department to the field of private enterprise, and assisting in any such transfer.

We on this side of the House have always tried to protect the State industries which have been established for the benefit of the people. That is the reason for our opposition to the measure. Members opposite believe in the freedom of private enterprise and in the right of the Government to sell the assets of the public. The other provisions in the Bill other than clause 17 are redundant.

In introducing the Bill, the Minister said that the purpose was to bring more industry into Western Australia. I applaud that objective, but to my way of thinking that is not the real purpose of the Bill. He used high-falutin language, such as, "Such slow progress—hard-slogging—no short-term method." Further on he made the statement about the scrapping of the unfair trading legislation, which is the only protection available to the small businessmen and public in this State.

One might say that what I have just said is not relevant to the Bill, but I feel that it is. The purpose of the Bill is clear: it is an invitation to the ruthless element within the business community of Western Australia to take advantage of this situation. That is the reason for the introduction of the Bill.

The Minister asked for the co-operation of all members. I suppose that implied the co-operation of the people—that they should not complain if they have to pay more for goods, or that unionists should not complain if their wages and conditions were not improved. I feel the inevitable result from the passing of the Bill will be to lower wages and conditions, if private enterprise is unfettered and is freed from any competition from Government industries. The latter have maintained high standards of conditions and employment; which have proved to be a challenge to private enterprise and which, with the aid of this Bill will go.

Reference was made to migration. The Minister implied that if industries were established in this State, migration would follow. I know what would happen now if there were migration to the State. The only industry which could be set up for the absorption of the unemployed is laundry-drying, where everybody took in each other's washing! There is no industry here to absorb the unemployed in the State.

I would like to see more migration to this State; but before that, I would like to see all the people already in the State being employed and housed. There can be no denying the fact that unemployment exists in this State. I have experience of that in my own electorate, where many New Australians are in the queue of people receiving Child Welfare Department payments—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member should confine his remarks to the Bill. The matter does not refer to unemployment.

Mr. FLETCHER: I consider that industry and migration are tied together. I am concerned that there should be migration before industries are established. Relevant to my remark on industry and employees, I refer to the Kwinana project. That was built principally by imported labour, particularly in relation to the metal trades section. Many of the tradesmen and artisans came out with the contractors, from Scotland and England. If the Minister is considering the establishment of industries he should consider it on the basis of migration and establishment at the same time—not one before the other.

Many of those tradesmen have returned to England and Scotland, but there are still some in this State. Some are still working here but unfortunately others have gone over East to seek work. The Chief Secretary showed some concern when he interjected, while the Leader of the Opposition was speaking on this subject about the refugees in overseas countries. You, Mr. Speaker, showed him some tolerance when he made that interjection. There appears to be some intention on the part of the Government to bring about migration, before the establishment of more industries. Since this Bill is designed to create industries in the State, I am anxious to see that industries are first established before migration, or established jointly with migration.

The composition of the proposed authority is a matter of concern to me. With all due respect to Mr. Brisbane and Sir Russell Dumas, although the Minister said they will not receive any remuneration, I submit that they will receive remuneration in another form.

Mr. Court: In what form?

Mr. FLETCHER: Just listen! If there is any likelihood of a firm in which they are interested, or in which they hold a share, benefiting from the establishment of an industry in this State, is it not reasonable to assume that the work will be channelled into that firm of which they are directors or shareholders?

Mr. Court: That is a shocking reflection on your part on the standing of two most reputable men.

Mr. FLETCHER: I do not feel guilty for making that assertion.

Mr. Court: You should.

Mr. FLETCHER: It is the avowed policy of the Liberal Party in this country, or the Conservative Party throughout the world, to provide unfettered freedom to private enterprise.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You are saying they will abuse their public office.

Mr. FLETCHER: I am not saying that. With all due respect, I say they are businessmen.

Mr. Court: That is still a shocking reflection.

Mr. FLETCHER: It is not. As businessmen, they will do their best in the interests of the firm of which they are shareholders or directors, rather than in the interests of the State.

Mr. Court: They are two most reputable businessmen in this State. Your remarks are snide and underhanded.

Mr. FLETCHER: I am not disputing they are reputable businessmen; but there is a difference between their legal and their moral rights.

Mr. Court: These two men are, above all, morally right.

Mr. FLETCHER: Within the law they are legally right. In support of my remarks as to their business associations I refer to *Rydge's Digest*. I read a particular article in it to find out how many of these industries are tied together in common directorates. There seems to be an unholy alliance between them in Western Australia, the same as in Australia and the rest of the world. It is a common policy. I am justified in saying that Mr. Brisbane and Sir Russell Dumas, since they have been so prominently mentioned in *Rydge's Digest* and among private enterprise circles, would be interested in advising the Minister to ensure that work which was beneficial to private enterprise was channelled in that direction.

Mr. Court: That is a shocking insinuation.

Mr. FLETCHER: I do not feel guilty.

Mr. Court: You do not, because you have no fine feelings.

Mr. FLETCHER: We, on this side of the House, represent the best interests of the public. The intentions of the Liberal Party were avowed when it went to the people on behalf of private enterprise.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FLETCHER: Be honest! Members opposite should not above all be hypocritical. That is what they allege they represent.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must confine himself to the Bill. The question of a discussion of the different beliefs of the political Parties is not included in the Bill.

Dr. Henn: You need some natural therapy.

Mr. FLETCHER: I am doing all right.

Mr. Bovell: Psychiatry would be more appropriate.

Mr. Court: No wonder it is hard to convince people to do public duties when we get this sort of thing!

Mr. FLETCHER: Public duties?

Mr. Hawke: It is a bit amusing to find the Minister for Railways pulling the mantle of purity over himself.

Mr. Court: I am not pulling it over myself—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Court: —but over two very reputable men.

Mr. Bovell: Who have made a very great contribution to the welfare of Australia.

Mr. FLETCHER: Members are not disturbing me one bit with their interjections. I now wish to refer to paragraph (m) on page 11.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot refer to a specific clause during the second reading debate. Such references can be made only during the Committee stage. Only reference in general terms is permitted during the second reading.

Mr. FLETCHER: I got away with it previously by mentioning something on page 6. There is a provision in the Bill for the authority, with the approval of the Minister, to appoint officers and other employees to employ or make use of the services of any professional or other person. I consider it is reasonable to assume that these "other persons" will not be Government employees, but agents of big business. This provision continues—

for such period or in respect of such work and upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed by the parties; Another reference is that the authority may—

do such acts, matters and things as the authority shall reasonably—

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable member reading from the Bill?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Just refreshing his memory!

Mr. FLETCHER: That is all. Refreshing my memory. "Desirable or expedient" is mentioned somewhere in the Bill. However, I am concerned to see that this Bill, and particularly the sinister clause to which I made reference earlier, does not allow the Government to bleed white—and that is how I can see it; in no other manner—such Government enterprises as the State Engineering Works; because, if the work is taken away from them and given to private firms, it is reasonable to assume the work force will fall off and thereby will the value of the enterprises which our Government—and not only our Government but other Governments—has built up over the years, be reduced. It is the object of this side of the House to see that that does not happen. Accordingly, I will oppose the Bill.

On motion by Mr. Hall, debate adjourned.

MARRIAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Chief Secretary) [5.20] in moving the second reading said: This Bill contains minor amendments to the Marriage Act, and I suggest that there is nothing of a controversial nature in it, most of the amendments being of a tidying-up nature only.

Mr. Hawke: One or two words in the Bill could be controversial.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The principal amendment gives the magistrate the power to allow a girl under the age of 16 years to marry if she is the mother of a child by the intended husband. As the Act stands at present, the magistrate may make an order only if he is satisfied that the intended wife is pregnant, and makes no provision if the child has actually been born.

It seems clear that the Act was not intended to inflict this hardship—and it is a hardship which can be inflicted under certain circumstances—and a small amendment is necessary to overcome this particular difficulty.

The next provision tidies up section 11 of the principal Act. The whole registry system is based on two registers, one at the office of the district registrar and the other at head office. In the case of marriages celebrated by a district registrar, provision has been made in the Act for the registration of the two certificates; but when a marriage is celebrated by a minister, provision has only been made in the section for the registration of one copy—the one in the district register. The amendment seeks permission for the registration of the original certificate for the general register at head office. This is a technicality as, in fact, both certificates are registered in any event and that has been done up till the present time. As I have already pointed out, this amendment is really to tidy up the Act.

Another provision in the Bill deals with marriage by special license performed by district registrars. Marriages may only be celebrated in this State after the parties have given some form of notice—either by banns or notice at the registrar's office—or by special license issued by a magistrate. Sections 12 and 13 of the principal Act set out the authority for this action in respect of ministers and district registrars respectively; but in the case of the latter, because there is no specific reference in section 13 to the special license, it might be construed that there is a prohibition to the celebration of marriages under special license by district registrars. This will be realised if members will consult the beginning of sections 12 and 13.

The proposed amendment, which will make the wording of the two sections similar, will make it possible for district registrars as well as ministers to celebrate marriages under special license which, in effect, has always been the case.

A further tidying-up provision is required in section 16 of the Act. Under this section the district registrar, receiving notice of a marriage to be posted and entered into the marriage notice book, shall charge a fee of one shilling. However, by the Second Schedule to the Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act, there is a provision for the fees to be charged for the celebration of marriages to be those prescribed in the Schedule to that Act. At present the fee for a notice of marriage posted at a district registrar's office, is 2s. This amendment proposes to delete the reference to the payment of 1s. and provides that such fee shall be that as prescribed.

The next amendment is a somewhat similar one, and amends section 17 of the Act. Section 17 provides that after seven days from the giving of the notice of marriage to the district registrar, he shall issue a certificate for which he shall charge a fee of 1s. It is proposed also to remove this reference to the amount of the fee and to utilise the term "prescribed fee" in the same way as will have been done by the preceding amendment.

Perhaps I should point out that the fees referred to in the Second Schedule to the Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act may be altered from time to time by the Governor in Council who may at any time by Order published in the *Government Gazette*, direct that any fee or fees mentioned in the Schedule be amended.

As I mentioned earlier, there is nothing controversial in this Bill, the provisions mainly being of a tidying-up nature. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Evans, debate adjourned.

BILLS (2)—RETURNED

1. Land Agents Act Amendment.
2. State Electricity Commission Act Amendment (No. 2).
Without amendment.

FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Council's Alternative Amendment

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it had agreed to an alternative amendment to the amendment to which the Assembly had disagreed, and seeking the Assembly's concurrence in such alternative amendment.

MAIN ROADS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. WILD (Dale—Minister for Works) [5.30] in moving the second reading said: The purpose of this small amending Bill is to enable the Main Roads Department to provide funds for the provision of much improved lighting on the main arterial roads in the metropolitan area. The need for improving the standard of lighting on metropolitan main highways, to ensure greater pedestrian and traffic safety, has long been recognised. However, the problem to be overcome was the apportionment of the estimated cost involved in raising the lighting to a satisfactory standard. Hitherto, the cost of providing and maintaining street lighting has been the responsibility of the local authorities.

Proposals for improving the standard of highway lighting were prepared by the Main Roads Department, working in conjunction with the State Electricity Commission; and these were discussed at a meeting held on the 19th August last year, between the Commissioner of Main Roads and representatives of the Local Government Association. Agreement was reached in principle, that the cost of implementing the proposals for an improved standard of lighting on metropolitan highways would be shared between the Main Roads Department and those local authorities situated on the routes of the particular highways.

The Local Government Association has advised the Minister for Works that the scheme has been approved by the member authorities. The total cost per mile for the installation, maintenance, and electric current for the proposed new system of lighting, is £720 per annum for a highway such as Stirling Highway. Work involved in the installation and maintenance of the new lighting system is to be carried out by the State Electricity Commission. After an examination of many types of street lighting, it was decided that the most suitable type for Western Australian conditions was that using colour-corrected mercury vapour lanterns. This new type of lighting has already been installed by the State Electricity Commission in sections in Beaufort Street, Albany Highway, and approaches to the Fremantle traffic bridge. Mercury vapour street lighting is used extensively in America and Europe; and Perth motorists have already found that the new lights are a big improvement.

The new lighting proposals are based on the Standards Association of Australia Street Lighting Code; and in the case of Stirling Highway the illumination would be at the level of 100 lumens per lineal foot. An indication of the improvement which will be effected, is provided by the comparison of the present lighting on

Stirling Highway, which ranges from approximately 25 to 57 lumens per lineal foot.

As the Main Roads Act, 1930-1955, does not provide that the department can expend funds on street lighting, it is necessary that the Act be amended before the proposals for improving highway lighting can be implemented. Under the proposed Main Roads Act Amendment Act, 1959, it is provided that the Commissioner of Main Roads shall have the necessary authority to expend moneys from the department's allocation of metropolitan traffic fees, towards the cost of highway lighting. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Tonkin, debate adjourned.

BUILDERS' REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. WILD (Dale—Minister for Works) [5.35] in moving the second reading said: This Bill, to amend the Builders' Registration Act, emanates from recommendations by the Builders' Registration Board and submissions made by the Builders' Guild and the Master Builders' Association. I can assure the House that, while none of the amendments contained in the measure are very sweeping, they do contain one or two changes from what we have known over recent years. The Bill has the approbation of all the bodies I have mentioned.

At present the Builders' Registration Board has difficulty in controlling building operations carried out by architects and engineers who are not subject to registration. It is considered that where architects or engineers wish to act as builders, they should be registered under the Act; but, because of their professional qualifications, such registration should be granted without examination. The purpose of the amendment is to make this so. The Act at present provides that the chairman of the board shall be the Principal Architect; but it is felt that it would be more appropriate that the chairman should be any architect appointed by the Governor.

It was further considered that the fees paid to board members were not realistic in view of present-day money values. In 1953 the fee paid to board members was fixed at £3 3s. per meeting, with a maximum payment of £37 16s. in any one year. Since then, fees for Government boards and instrumentalities have been increased and generally stand at present at £4 4s. per sitting. In these circumstances it is considered that the board fee should be increased to £4 4s. per sitting, with a maximum payment of £50 8s. per annum.

In order to bring in the engineers and architects, it is also necessary to amend a further section of the Act; and a person who is a member of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects or a member of the Institution of Engineers shall on application made by him and on payment of the prescribed fee, be registered in accordance with the application under the provisions of either section 10, or section 10A of this Act, without the necessity of completing the prescribed course of training and passing the prescribed examination referred to in those provisions. The amendment is necessary in order to make effective the first amendment, whereby architects and engineers must be registered; but registration could be effected without examination.

At present "B"-class builders cannot undertake works costing in excess of £5,000. As a certain amount of domestic work and smaller commercial and industrial work, of which "B"-class builders are quite capable, would be outside this price limit, it is recommended that the limit be lifted to £10,000. The Act also at present requires this class of builder to carry out £5,000 worth of work per year to retain his registration. The purpose of requiring a builder to carry out this minimum amount of work to retain his registration was intended gradually to eliminate the type of person who was not actually earning his living as a builder. It is felt that the "B"-class builders who are now registered are genuine builders. Consequently, it is considered that the provision has served its purpose. It is therefore recommended that the limit should be raised, as I mentioned earlier.

I might mention that there were something like 1,600 of these builders registered; but now the number is down to just over 400. The Act at present provides that any partnership where not more than one of the partners is not registered under the Act is exempted from the necessity of obtaining registration. This provision is being used by unregistered builders to permit them to operate; and, in quite a number of cases, unregistered persons have entered into partnership with a registered builder, but the registered builder has only a fractional interest in the business and takes no part in the supervision or management of the work of the partnership.

It is therefore considered necessary that this provision be amended to provide that in any partnership which includes unregistered persons, the building work of the partnership must be managed and supervised by the registered person and the registered person's name, class, and registration number must appear in all advertisements and notices on work under construction. It is felt that this amendment will greatly assist in preventing the "dummying" which is at present appearing with partnerships.

I think this section is one with which many members could be conversant. I know of two or three cases where builders have allowed their names to be used by others carrying out building operations. I know one registered builder who used to receive £1 for each job from the person who was carrying out the work. Possibly, that builder who loaned his name, as it were, did not even know where the work was being performed.

At present the Act provides that any company or other body corporate, whose building work is managed and supervised by a person registered under this Act, is exempted from the necessity of obtaining registration. There is a considerable number of building companies operating under this provision—particularly many land agents. These companies frequently advertise themselves as "A"-class builders; and as, in many cases, the principals of the firms concerned have no building knowledge, this is misleading to the public. Consequently, it is considered that a company operating under this heading should be required to show in its advertisements and in notices on works being carried out by it, the name, class, and registration number of the person who is managing and supervising the work.

The fees paid to the board in 1953 and which are still being paid are, according to 1959 values, unrealistic. The annual fee is only £3 3s. for registered builders. Since that year costs have increased considerably and the number of registered "B"-class builders has fallen from 1,600 to approximately 400. It is suggested that an increase in registration fees be made to enable the Builders' Registration Board to carry out its functions under the Act. A careful examination of costs involved indicates that a fee of £5 5s. per annum is necessary for this purpose and an amendment to the Act is suggested accordingly.

All the amendments in the Bill are worth while because they are designed to bring the Act into line with present-day costs and modern practice, and therefore I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Tonkin, debate adjourned.

MAIN ROADS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Message—Appropriation

Message from the Lieutenant-Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the purposes of the Bill.

BUILDERS' REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Message—Appropriation

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the purposes of the Bill.

COUNTRY AREAS WATER SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. WILD (Dale—Minister for Water Supplies) [5.44] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is designed to make certain areas outside country townsites come within the provisions of the Act. This is necessary because, in recent years, country towns have become larger and the areas taken over and included in the townsites have to be covered by the Act so that correct rateable values may be obtained. With this expansion of country towns, subdivisions of adjoining rural lands are from time to time approved and developed, but local authorities concerned sometimes omit to extend their municipal or townsite boundaries to include these new subdivisions.

Mr. Graham: You mean subdivisions for the purpose of building residences?

Mr. WILD: Yes. The member for East Perth probably knows that in many country towns in recent years, expansion has become so rapid that the townsite has extended into rural lands.

Mr. Graham: I merely wanted to differentiate between, say, a large farm and a smaller subdivision.

Mr. WILD: According to the provision contained in section 5 of the Country Areas Water Supply Act, the definition of "townsite" means a townsite as defined in the Road Districts Act and includes any land—including privately-owned subdivided land—which the Governor may declare, by proclamation, to be deemed to be included in a townsite for the purpose of this Act. Although the Governor may declare, by proclamation, any land to be included in the townsite, such proclamation would give no power to rate such land as townsite land in view of the rating provisions of section 65, subsection (2), unless the definition of "country land" is amended; as is proposed in the present Bill.

It is also intended to delete a paragraph in subsection (1) of section 65 of the Act and also to delete, in paragraph (b) of the same subsection, the words "whether the maximum rate exigible in respect thereof be 2s. or 3s. in the £ on that value," which appear in lines two, three, and four. Subsection (1) of section 65, would then read—

In the case of rateable land within a municipal district or townsite, a water rate shall not in any one year exceed 3s. in the £1 on the annual rateable value of the land rated. Provided the amount of the water rate assessed at the rate fixed and computed on the basis of the annual rateable value of the holding would be less than £1, the Minister may fix the sum of £1 as the amount of the water rate to be charged against and be paid in respect of the holding.

It is felt that a continuance of the limitation of the maximum rate of 2s. in the £1 in townsites which were served by the Goldfields water supply system prior to the 1st January, 1949, is no longer justified, bearing in mind that all other towns now served from the Goldfields water supply system, as well as all but four of the separate country town water supply undertakings administered by the Public Works Department, are subject to a rate of 3s. in the £1. There is also strong justification for a more uniform basis of rating in all country towns. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by **Mr. Tonkin**, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 5.48 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 6th October, 1959

CONTENTS

	Page
MEMBERS' SPEECHES:	
Correction and return	1939
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE:	
Trade advisory committees, regulations	1939
West Midland station, widening of subway	1940
Prospectors, qualifications for assistance, and ration orders	1940
George Street, resumptions for widening	1940
State Engineering Works, dismissals, etc.	1940
Schoolchildren, travel concessions	1940
Water restrictions, alteration of hours	1941
Television, pressure on traders	1941
Land resumptions, lot 488, Inglewood ward	1941
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE:	
Crayfish industry, establishment on south coast	1941
Dieldrin, availability of spray and equipment to Goldfields	1941
Bonnie Rock and Hyden Railway Lines—	
Reopening	1942
Inquiry by Cabinet sub-committee	1942
Subsidising of cost by Treasury	1942
Recoup of losses by Treasury and increased fares	1942
Narrows Bridge, parliamentary inspections	1943