

A. E. Freeman is an American, born of Scottish parents. As a young man he entered the United States Navy and served his time in submarines. He married a Victoria Park girl and they have two excellent children. Being trained as an electrician, he went to firms who required electricians. He was asked, "Have you apprenticeship papers?" He replied, "No, we do not have them in the Navy, but give me a job at anything to do with electricity or electrical wiring and, if I cannot do it, give me the sack in a week." He was not employed.

The last place he went to was the telephone workshop in Lord-street, where one of the workmen told him there was a vacancy. There again he was asked for apprenticeship papers and, when he gave the same reply as before, he was told, "We will let you know in due course." He was not advised. That man was sent into the bush to paint railway sheds or something of the sort. On his return to Perth, I went to see him and undertook to speak to the Minister. He replied, "Thanks, do not do that. I am fed up and am going home. I have tried and tried but have been unsuccessful, so am going to take my wife and two children with me." He and four others similarly situated left for the United States on a tanker the week before last, and we shall not see them or their dependants again. Thus there have been lost to this country several valuable citizens in the making. This is one matter I would earnestly commend to the Minister's attention. I did have a talk with the American Consul and he informed me that there were quite a number of these men returning to the United States. Some of them are doing ordinary pick and shovel work until a chance comes to join one of their own boats and take their dependants to America. Such people are too valuable for us to lose.

His Excellency's speech contains the following paragraph:—

In order to expedite the settlement of ex-servicemen on the land, it has been decided to supplement the Commonwealth-State agreement by a collateral State scheme.

I have no wish to discuss details of the scheme, but the blocks to be made available to these men are now being cleared and improved and put into a fit condition for

them to occupy. This work is being done by five or six workmen and possibly a foreman. That is not the way to make these holdings available quickly to the returned men. The way to do it is to put all the men at work on one block and get it cleared in a week or a fortnight. Then, instead of the soldier settler having to wait week after week, or month after month, we shall be able to get him settled on his holding promptly. I saw this exemplified many years ago when I was interested in farming at Bruce Rock. The late W. N. Hedges had a ten-thousand acre block to be cleared. He brought 130 Italian workmen from the woodline to clear it. By team work they cleared those 1,000-acre blocks in about three weeks. That would be a better method of clearing land and making blocks available quickly. It would not cost any more than the present method, because so much is paid per man-hour for the work that is done and it matters not whether it is spread over six months or is done in a week.

The Minister for Lands: What we are endeavouring to do is to bring the bulldozer into action.

Mr. READ: It should be in action. We should take advantage of this modern machinery. Those are a few of the matters which I wish to bring under the notice of the Ministers concerned. One of my principal requests is for action to relieve the distressed residents of Victoria Park in the matter of sewerage. One section of Victoria Park is already reticulated and the deep drainage is available but although we have been promised connections for many years past the houses are not yet linked up with the system. There are 1,100 houses past which the deep drainage goes, but they are not connected. We therefore have the spectacle of possibly ten houses in one street that are sewered while five other houses are not. They still have the filthy pan system, which is so detrimental to the health of the people, especially during the summer when flies are prevalent. I ask the Minister concerned to take that matter in hand.

MR. MURRAY (Bunbury) [8.23]: I join with previous speakers in congratulating you, Sir, on your elevation to your high office. I am confident you will display both dignity and impartiality in the discharge of your responsibilities. I also tender my

congratulations to the Chairman of Committees and to all members of the Ministry. I support the member for Beverley in stressing the wide concern regarding our transport services. Any Government which denies the people the right to use the most efficient and economical form of transport denies to the people the right to compete on an equitable basis in the world's markets. I believe the future progress and development of the State will be governed to a great extent by our making full use of modern transport, and private enterprise must be allowed its full share. Government monopoly of transport will retard rather than promote development and if past history is taken as a guide, will add further burdens to the taxpayers. Review should also be made of which class of traffic should be left to motor transport and which retained and catered for by rail.

His Excellency indicated that large sums of money were to be spent on the railways. No Government in my opinion is justified in spending large sums of money on the rehabilitation of the railways if the expenditure is to be used as a rod to force the people into using an uneconomic and inefficient transport service. With modern transport development we must also have efficient outports. Whilst I cannot claim to be an engineer or to have the knowledge of my friend the member for Albany, who has made a lifelong study of this matter, I feel that with the fulfilment of the plan outlined by the member for Northam in Bunbury last October, Bunbury will have a port worthy of the rich hinterland which it serves. But in carrying out those plans I would suggest that two items should be dealt with immediately. First, there is the provision of two berths to cater for vessels of a draft of 27 ft. 6 inches. These will be necessary for the handling of present available cargo. Secondly, a matter of urgent importance to harbour development is the open-cut suggested above Turkey Point.

Members are probably not sufficiently versed in the geography of that part of the State to know where that point is, but the member for Northam will know. On that cut depends the success or failure of overcoming the siltage problem, which has resulted in reducing the efficient service at the port, blocking the estuary to pleasure craft and fishing vessels and to a large

degree in being responsible for the heavy yearly flooding at Glen Iris and Leschenault. This flooding has resulted in heavy losses to the settlers each year. The member for Victoria Park has just told us about fowls roosting on boards. The fowls at Leschenault and Glen Iris were not so fortunate; they finished up somewhere near Cape Naturaliste. It is the urgent responsibility of the Government to proceed with the erection of levees and the drainage of this area to ensure that the settlers shall not again be faced with these tragic losses.

Grave concern is felt in my electorate over fishing. Commercial and net fishers appear to have an open go. Nets have been strung across the Collic River while the bream are on the move towards the estuary. The result is that sporting fish are denied to our sporting fishermen. In the harbour at Bunbury itself, or adjacent thereto, net and commercial fishers are allowed to string their nets too close to the entrance of the harbour, with the result that the incoming fish are turned away and the people who appreciate sporting fish have to go without. If action is not taken to prevent this I am afraid that Bunbury tourists will soon have to look elsewhere for fishing grounds and that will be a serious loss to the town's economy.

Having very briefly traversed those matters, I pass now to industry. We are indeed fortunate in this State that we have had very little serious industrial unrest. But while that is so, there is distinct evidence of a feeling of disquiet in industry, which should not be hastily disregarded. On all sides we hear a cry for increased production. I believe that full production goes hand in hand with full employment and I regret that many of our most vocal advocates of increased production do not understand that this cannot be maintained unless we solve two problems: industrial harmony and restoration of incentive employees. This is not just a question of wages and conditions which can be solved by the Arbitration Court. Real harmony and restoration of incentive can only be achieved by open and frank discussion of all associated problems by employers and employees working as co-operators in the promotion of economic stability.

From the employers there must be a recognition of the fact that the workers and in using the word "workers" I mean all

those who labour with their hands and brains in the production and distribution of goods—are a vital part in our industrial, social and economic structure; and from the employees we must have a recognition that the only sound basis for full employment lies in an expanding prosperous private enterprise and a frank recognition by each that the interests of both are not opposed. Those seem to me to be principles which should prove successful in bringing us closer to a complete solution of these problems. I fully realise that cannot be brought about by legislation. But it is the duty of all members of this House to endeavour to contribute their full share towards this end. The first gesture must come from the employers; for, after all, they own the business.

- In introducing this subject, I said it was not a matter of wages or conditions which can be granted by the Arbitration Court. On account of its importance, this may be further explained. The disquiet and the lack of incentive in industry today are governed by two factors. One of these is the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government namely, high taxation. The other is that employers have in the main—or perhaps I should say the great majority of employers have—adopted the principle that the awards of the Arbitration Court are the maximum that must be paid to their employees irrespective of whether those employees are good, bad or indifferent workers in the industry concerned. This has unfortunately also been applied in regard to margins for skill. Surely when it comes to the skill of an employee the matter is one that should remain for personal adjustment on the job! The court gives a margin for a tradesman with the minimum of skill necessary to carry out some particular function. Note that I said the minimum of skill. That is all the court can say anything about. It cannot assess the value to the employer of an expert in the different trade functions.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Before you get away from that matter, there is nothing to prevent an employer giving over the minimum. Is there?

Mr. MURRAY: I did not say that there was anything to stop him. I was drawing attention to the fact that in the main employers do adopt that attitude. The next item in regard to encouragement of incen-

tive comes back to amenities. The member for Forrest stressed one particular problem of the timber industry. He pointed out what was going to be the dire results of overcutting in his area. I would sooner have heard the hon. member stress the fact that in many cases the employees in that very important industry have unsatisfactory working conditions and very few amenities. Amenities, again, are not something that can be assessed by the court. The degree of isolation and other factors must be taken into consideration.

From the question of industry, I move on to a subject which gives me some concern as it affects my electorate. The member for North-East Fremantle said that if a member of a board was appointed for a term of years, and was not re-appointed at the end of that period, he had to suffer the stigma of having been sacked. I am sorry I cannot agree with the hon. member on that point. I would hate to think that was an established principle. I understand that the reason for a time limit on the appointment of board members is to enable them to be dropped from such boards without incurring the stigma of having been sacked. I said earlier that this matter concerns my electorate. In that electorate we have the Bunbury Harbour Board. It consists of five members of whom two can rightly claim to be representatives of the users of the port. I refer to the chairman of the board and the secretary of the Waterside Workers' Union. Those two have just cause to be on the board.

The other three gentlemen—and they are gentlemen and worthy citizens of Bunbury—have no justification for being on the board because they do not represent the users of the port. In fairness to whoever may have recommended them for the position, perhaps when they were recommended there were circumstances which fitted them for inclusion on the board. If that is so, I feel that they would have been doing justice to whoever recommended them if they had retired when they no longer had the slightest vestige of claim to remain on the board. I hope, despite what the member for North-East Fremantle says on the subject, that when by effluxion of time the term of office of those three men expires they will be replaced by others who definitely represent the users of the port irrespective

of political affiliations, with which I am not concerned. I am concerned with representation of the users of the port.

I have not spoken for very long, and I do not intend to take up much more of the House's time, but it did strike me, as a new member, that members on the opposite side should have produced political scrap-books. I have brought one with me, and I say to members that if they have not got copies of this, I think they are still procurable. This particular document in my scrap-book states—

The Wise Labour Government stands high with the Chifley Labour Government, and has secured, and will secure, a greater measure of financial assistance for its national plans than any Liberal-cum-Country Democratic League Government could possibly secure.

That statement is one of two things. It is either true or it is not true. If it is true, it casts a grave reflection on two high bodies in Australia, namely, the Commonwealth Grants Commission and the Loan Council. If it is the reverse of true, then it amounts to a kind of political blackmail.

On motion by Hon. E. Nulsen, debate adjourned.

#### ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

**THE ACTING PREMIER** (Hon. A. F. Watts—Katanning): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 4.30 p.m. on Tuesday, the 19th August.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 8.12 p.m.*

---



---

### Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 19th August, 1947.

Address-in-reply, 5th day ... .. PAGE 201

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

#### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

*Fifth Day.*

Debate resumed from the 13th August.

**HON. E. M. HEENAN** (North-East) [4.35]: In supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply, I should like to join with other members in expressing sympathy with our President in his severe illness. I also join with them in the hope that he will soon be fully restored to good health. I am pleased to be able to report that I saw him on Sunday and, judging by his appearance, he is well on the road to recovery and should be with us again in two or three weeks' time.

I should like to add my congratulations to the three new members. Mr. Logan made a very creditable beginning in moving the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply, and I am sure we are all quite satisfied that he will acquit himself well in this House. Mr. Boylen will be a valuable acquisition to this Chamber. He has lived on the Goldfields practically all his lifetime and is well acquainted with the needs of the vast province he represents. He has an excellent record of public service on the Goldfields, and I am sure that he also will prove to be a great asset to the Chamber. Mr. Davies, too, comes to us with a very fine record, and his knowledge, particularly of industrial matters, should be of great assistance to us.

Hon. G. W. Miles: What about Mr. Latham?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I am glad that I have been prevented from overlooking our friend, Mr. Latham. He is not in the same category as the three gentlemen to whom I have referred, because he is a capable parliamentarian well known to all of us, and I should not like to miss the opportunity of including him in the welcome to new members. Our late highly respected member, Mr. Drew, is missed by all the old members of this House. The State and this House in particular are the poorer for his loss. However, we are pleased to have the memory of one who certainly maintained the highest standard that can be expected of a public man. His record should be a fine and enduring example to all.

His Excellency's Speech this year seemed somewhat longer than usual, but in spite of this, it was disappointing to note that there was only a short reference to the goldmining industry. I earnestly hope that this brief reference cannot