

# Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 11th August, 1948.

## CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Housing, (a) as to applications for homes	343
(b) as to supply of baths and sinks	343
(c) as to effect of 40-hour week on building	344
Railways, (a) as to engines awaiting repairs	344
(b) as to children's concession fares on departmental buses	344
Milk Board, as to legislation to alter constitution	344
Causeway, as to surface top-dressing	345
Potatoes, as to Commonwealth subsidy and prices	345
Water supplies, as to reduction in Goldfields rates	345
Leave of Absence	345
Suspension of Standing Orders, as to introduction of price-fixing Bills	345
Address-in-reply, eighth day	348
Do. do. do.	374
Bill: Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act Amendment, introduction, 1r., 2r.	386

Scheme on hand at the 31st July, 1948, was as follows:—

Married couples without family			
2 unit	..	..	2,008
3 unit	..	..	3,794
Other	..	..	3,544

9,346

This number includes applicants who have applied under other sections as well as those who submitted an application under the recently-announced special scheme for small-unit families.

This number includes applicants who have applied under other sections as well as those who submitted an application under the recently-announced special scheme for small-unit families.

Married couples without family			
2 unit	..	..	1,101
Married couples with 1 child			
..	..	..	1,009
Other	..	..	871
2,981			

This number includes applicants who have applied under other sections as well as those who submitted an application under the recently-announced special scheme for small-unit families.

(3) See (1) and (2).

(b) *As to Supply of Baths and Sinks.*

Mr. STYANTS asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) Is there a shortage of cast iron baths and sinks in this State?

(2) How many were used in Commonwealth-State houses and war service homes during the past 12 months in the metropolitan area?

(3) How many were used in workers and war service homes on the Eastern Goldfields during that period?

(4) How many Commonwealth-State houses and war service homes were equipped with galvanised iron sinks and baths during the same period in the metropolitan area?

(5) How many galvanised iron baths and sinks have been, or were being, installed in workers and war service homes on the Eastern Goldfields during the past 12 months?

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

## QUESTIONS.

### HOUSING.

(a) *As to Applications for Homes.*

Mr. NEEDHAM asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) What is the number of applications before the Housing Commission for Commonwealth-State tenancy houses from—

(a) married couples without families;

(b) married couples with families?

(2) What is the number of applications for permits to build homes before the Housing Commission from—

(a) married couples without children;

(b) married couples with children?

(3) What is the number of applications for homes before the Housing Commission from two- and three-unit families?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The number of applications under the Commonwealth-State Rental Housing

(6) What are the percentages of galvanised iron baths and sinks installed in all homes built under the jurisdiction of the State Housing Commission, in the metropolitan and Eastern Goldfields areas, respectively, for the past 12 months?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Cast iron porcelain enamelware baths and sinks used in Commonwealth-State homes and war services homes during the past 12 months were:—

	Baths.	Sinks.
Commonwealth-State ..	379	301
War service homes ..	281	256

(3) Three cast iron porcelain enamelware baths and three sinks were used in war service homes and workers homes constructed on the Eastern Goldfields during the same period.

(4) During the same period the following houses were equipped with galvanised iron baths and sinks in the metropolitan area:—

	Baths.	Sinks.
Commonwealth-State ..	326	—
War service homes ..	1	—

(5) During the same period 24 houses were equipped with galvanised iron baths on the Eastern Goldfields, and three were equipped with galvanised iron sinks.

(6) Respective percentages of galvanised iron baths and sinks to all homes constructed:

	Baths.	Sinks.
Metropolitan .. ..	31%	—
Eastern Goldfields ..	88%	11%

The allocation of baths and sinks is governed by the supply position at the time of completion of the home and the use of galvanised iron baths is a temporary measure to facilitate early occupation. Most galvanised iron baths are made up locally and are readily available.

(c) *As to Effect of 40-hour Week on Building.*

Mr. YATES asked the Minister for Housing:

What effect has the introduction of the forty-hour week had on the building of Commonwealth-State rental homes?

The MINISTER replied:

The introduction of the 40-hour week has slowed down the effective building rate and

has resulted in an increase of approximately 10 per cent. in "on site" labour costs. In addition, since the 1st January there have been substantial increases in the cost of materials which, however, may be not wholly attributable to the introduction of the 40-hour week.

## RAILWAYS.

(a) *As to Engines Awaiting Repairs.*

Mr. MARSHALL asked the Minister for Railways:

What was the total number of engines, excluding A.S.Gs., which were out of traffic awaiting repairs at the 30th June for the years 1945 to 1948 (inclusive), respectively?

The MINISTER replied:

1945, 47; 1946, 32; 1947, 43; 1948, 58.

(b) *As to Children's Concession Fares on Departmental Buses.*

Mr. MURRAY asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Is he aware that concession rail fares to school children attending country high schools, etc., travelling to and from home during the holiday period, do not apply to buses operated by his department?

(2) Is he aware that it is intended to charge full adult fare of 2d. per mile?

(3) Will he take action to ensure that concession fares are applied on all bus routes where no alternative mode of transport is operating?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Children 14 years of age and over are charged full adult fares.

(3) It is not proposed to introduce concession fares on railway road service.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: So you are going to put up children's fares!

## MILK BOARD.

*As to Legislation to Alter Constitution.*

Mr. MURRAY asked the Minister for Lands:

Following my previous questions relating to the constitution of the Milk Board—

(1) Does the Government intend to introduce legislation to alter the board as at present constituted?

(2) Will this legislation be introduced during this session?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The matter is receiving close consideration.

(2) If decided upon, a Bill will come forward this session.

### CAUSEWAY.

#### *As to Surface Top-dressing.*

Mr. YATES asked the Minister for Works:

As it appears unlikely that the new causeway will be completed within three years, will he authorise expenditure on the top-dressing of the present causeway—similar to Adelaide Terrace—as a safeguard to motorists?

The MINISTER replied:

The maintenance of the road surface and the timber bridges will be continued until the new causeway is opened to traffic.

The type of maintenance on any particular section will depend on local circumstances. Large irregularities in the deck, which have resulted from slight subsidence of some of the supporting piles, have been checked by the strengthening of the timber substructure at these localities, but the elimination of these irregularities in the pavement by placing extensive quantities of bituminous macadam is generally inadvisable as this increases the total weight of the deck system and so increases the possibility of further subsidence.

### POTATOES.

#### *As to Commonwealth Subsidy and Prices.*

Mr. HOAR asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) In view of the possibility of the Commonwealth subsidy on potatoes ceasing on the 31st October, 1948, as a result of the lack of agreement on acreage between the States, has the State Government any plans prepared to protect the State's growers against unfair competition and throat-cutting that could easily arise out of this lack of agreement?

(2) If such plans exist, what action does the Government propose to take to compensate growers for the loss of the subsidy?

(3) Will this action result in a marked increase in the price of potatoes to the consumers in this State?

(4) Does the Government feel that a State marketing scheme, where no unanimity exists between States on prices and acreage conditions, can be regulated to the advantage of both growers and consumers in this State? If so, what steps does the Government propose to take to achieve this?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) This matter is receiving consideration.

(2), (3) and (4) Further information will be provided as soon as possible.

### WATER SUPPLIES.

#### *As to Reduction in Goldfields Rates.*

Mr. STYANTS asked the Minister for Water Supply:

(1) Was he correctly reported in "The West Australian" on the 13th July last as having notified the secretary of the Leonora branch of the Liberal Party that a general reduction of water rates will be made soon in the Goldfields area?

(2) If so, in view of this and the promise made by the Chief Secretary when he was in Kalgoorlie assisting the Liberal candidates for the South Province and North-East Province elections last May, will he give Parliament some indication of when this will take place, and what the extent of the reduction will be?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No, the reduction is to be on water charges.

(2) Adjustments to such charges are nearing finality. New charges should be ready for announcement within two or three weeks.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. Styants, leave of absence for four weeks granted to Hon. P. Collier (Boulder) on the ground of ill health.

### SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS.

#### *As to Introduction of Price-fixing Bills.*

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. D. R. McLarty—Murray-Wellington) [4.41]: I move, without notice—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the "Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act Amendment Bill," the "Prices Control Bill" and the "New Tractors, Motor Vehicles, and Fencing Materials Control Bill" to be introduced and, if necessary, passed through all their

stages in one day; and the aforesaid business to be dealt with before the Address-in-reply is adopted.

The repossession of houses and other premises has hitherto been governed by Commonwealth regulations. Following on the recent referendum, the Commonwealth has announced that those regulations will terminate on the 16th of this month. It is therefore proposed to suspend Standing Orders to enable legislation to be placed before the House so that the State may control the repossession of premises when the Commonwealth control expires. It is further proposed that the Bill shall proceed to the second reading stage and, after it has been explained, that the debate shall be adjourned till tomorrow, so as to give members an opportunity to consider that Bill and the other Bills referred to. The Bills have not yet arrived at Parliament House and I understand that only one, the Bill controlling rents, will be available for this sitting. As it will not arrive here until later in the evening, I suggest that the Minister who will introduce it—the Minister for Housing—should move the second reading after the tea suspension. I am sure members realise the necessity for passing this legislation through Parliament before the Commonwealth regulations expire.

**HON. F. J. S. WISE** (Gasecoyne) [4.44]: It is most unusual in this Parliament to interrupt the Address-in-reply even by the suspension of Standing Orders, except in the case of the introduction of a Supply Bill. Even in that case, it is also unusual to move the suspension of Standing Orders without notice. It will require an absolute majority of members to pass the motion, since notice of it has not been given. I have no objection to the proposed course, if the matter is one of such urgency that, when the Commonwealth control ends, this Parliament should pick it up as the Commonwealth relinquishes it.

The Premier: The control expires on the 16th of this month.

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The legislation first mentioned in the motion, I think, does not expire until the 30th September.

The Premier: No, on the 16th of this month.

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I have a recollection of the Bill introduced last session, when it was proposed that it should be continued until December, but I think the Leader of the Opposition moved then to have the date altered to September. I am speaking of the Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act Amendment Bill of 1947.

The Minister for Education: But that Bill did not contain any provisions relating to repossession and to ejectment of tenants, and that is what it is desired to insert in this Bill; or, at least, the other Bill did not contain sufficient provisions.

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: If the Commonwealth regulations expire, then we would lose control over evictions?

The Minister for Education: That is so.

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: As I said, I have no objection to the proposed course and to assisting the Premier from this side of the House to pass the motion. However, in fairness to the House—and not only to this side of it—I consider that after the Bill has been introduced and the second reading moved, it should with the other Bills, be adjourned for a day, when the present motion will still suffice to pass the Bill through in one day. If that is the case, I am sure this side of the House will have no objection to the passing of the motion.

The Premier: We agree to that.

**HON. J. B. SLEEMAN** (Fremantle) [4.46]: I think the Government is indeed fortunate to have such a generous Leader of the Opposition as we have in this Chamber today. Personally, I have no great objection to some control; but for this Government to rush in, as one member said the other night, bald-headed, and ask the House to pass this motion, when only one Bill will be ready tonight, is not fair, as the same procedure will have to be gone through tomorrow. I want to know where members of the Government stand. Are they anxious for the continuance of these controls? Have they forgotten what they told the electors, namely, that they were against controls? How does the Honorary Minister think she can support the motion, when she is so against controls? But since she has been a member of the Government she has changed her mind. That was because the Premier had said that any mem-

ber of Cabinet who did not agree with what Cabinet thought should get out of it. The Honorary Minister seems to have altered her mind completely.

The Honorary Minister: I still am in favour of control.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: That is the reason. The Honorary Minister is one of the members of Cabinet and she knows that that is so. As I said, I consider the Leader of the Opposition is indeed generous, but I for one am not prepared to give this Government permission to suspend the Standing Orders. If the members of the Government were sincere, I would have no objection; but they have said for the last three or four years that they were against all controls. Now they want to disturb the peace and harmony of the House by moving the suspension of the Standing Orders. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether in your long experience—and you became a member in 1924—have ever known of such a request to be made, with the exception of the suspension of Standing Orders for the introduction of a Supply Bill? That has always been the custom. In view of what members of the Government have said about control, it is hardly credible that they should now come along and ask for the suspension of Standing Orders to introduce legislation relating to motorcars, tractors and other machinery. This is what the Honorary Minister said at the recent election—

Pacific Trade Essential to W.A.  
Prosperity!

What is retarding this State's growth in the Pacific market? The old story again—Boards, Permits, Bureaucracy, distance from Canberra, Taxation, Muddlers' policy.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Who said that?

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: The Honorary Minister. I am quoting from her pamphlet. She now favours the continuance of controls and permits, as well as muddlers' policy. She is supporting the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders in order to do that. The following is a Christmas card which the Honorary Minister sent to her electors:—

Greetings for 1947 from Cardell-Oliver.

The War is over—but Peace is not with us. In this vast land abounding with untold wealth we are facing serious problems and unrest. Homes are being built but slowly, many are still homeless.

They are still homeless, and apparently will remain so. A man and his wife, with no children, will still be unable to get a house.

Mr. Yates: What would you do?

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: The member for Canning knows what I would do. The Government of which I was a member told the public that the most important people came first, and that those with large families would get houses before the two-unit families. The members of the present Government said they would provide houses for two-unit families, but they have done nothing. I will continue reading what the Honorary Minister had to say—

Houses are being built but slowly; many are still homeless. Rail and shipping transport is faulty and inadequate.

If we go through the questions on the notice paper, we can see that it is still faulty. Half our trains run late.

Member: There are no ships coming here.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: There are ships coming, but the Honorary Minister does not have much to do with what is on board them. Her remarks continue—

Boards and controls still block the path to progress.

The Honorary Minister tonight is going to block the path of progress by suspending Standing Orders in order to bring back another board. I think—I was going to say something that you, Mr. Speaker, might object to, and I would not like to incur your displeasure. The Honorary Minister's statement continues—

Food is dug into the ground, thrown away or production restricted, whilst many children are under-nourished.

The Honorary Minister is going to restrict something tonight and upset this House by helping to do something that has not been attempted in the last 30 years in order to see how quickly the Government can bring in controls, restrictions, etc. Although I am in favour of some controls, I do not agree to suspending Standing Orders so that this Government might do something which, it told the people at the elections, should not be done. Members of the Government then said that the country would be better off without restrictions and controls. Why not let them go ahead and see how they get on? I object to the suspension of Standing Orders.

**HON. A. A. M. COVERLEY** (Kimberley) [4.53]: I wish to speak on this motion, particularly because I recently had the pleasure of the genial company of our Premier, who was opposed to my ideas of control. He spent 22 minutes in the town of Broome advising the electors there to vote "No" at the recent referendum.

The Premier: I did not know you had timed me.

**Hon. A. A. M. COVERLEY**: He told the people how superior State control was to Commonwealth control. I took particular note of his story. He waxed enthusiastic, as he did during the last election, and made promises I was convinced he would never fulfil. One of his promises was that if the "No" campaign was successful and the Commonwealth Government dropped its proposals on the Saturday night, his Government was prepared to put them into operation on Monday morning.

Mr. Fox: He did not say which Monday morning.

**Hon. A. A. M. COVERLEY**: He qualified it by not saying which Monday morning it would be. I think, when replying, the Premier might explain, so that I will be able to tell the electors in Broome that he was not exactly fooling, that he did not have in mind a particular Monday morning. He should say why he made that extravagant promise. I realise this is a serious matter and, for the sake of the people of Western Australia, we must support the motion. I thought the Premier, after the warnings he has had over his electioneering promises, might have been a bit more careful. Perhaps in future he and his Ministers might be more cautious in making public promises. I would like some explanation from him before the motion is agreed to.

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. D. R. McLarty—Murray-Wellington—in reply) [4.54]: I did not realise that the member for Kimberley had the watch on me when I was speaking at Broome but, still, it would not have upset me even had I known. It is true that I advised the people to vote "No" on the referendum, but I did not tell the people of Western Australia that all controls would be lifted.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: I never said you told them that.

The PREMIER: I said that some controls would be necessary, and that the States were quite competent to exercise them.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: All your Ministers did not say that, either.

The PREMIER: The position has arisen that certain legislation is necessary immediately. I do not think any member of this House wants to see the provisions under the Commonwealth regulations, in regard to tenancies, expire with consequent wholesale ejectments and hardship. In order to prevent those things, and so that we may have efficient control, I have moved for the suspension of Standing Orders so that the necessary legislation might be introduced. I do not know what other means I could adopt to give this protection. I was surprised to hear any criticism at all of the Government's proposals. What the Leader of the Opposition has said, that this is a most unusual course, is true. I realised it was unusual when I moved for the suspension. I think, however, that members will agree we are facing a most extraordinary state of affairs. I feel there is every justification in asking for this suspension of Standing Orders so that the legislation might be dealt with before the regulations expire. Members will still have the opportunity of saying their piece on the Address-in-reply.

Question put.

The PREMIER: There is a dissentient voice.

Mr. SPEAKER: Ring the bells.

Bells rung.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have counted the House and assured myself that there is an absolute majority of members present. I declare the question duly passed.

Question thus passed.

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

*Eighth Day.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

**MR. GRAHAM** (East Perth) [4.58]: It is not my intention to make any direct reference to the Speech delivered by the Lieutenant-Governor because I realise that he had an exceedingly difficult job to make interesting a very dull document prepared by someone else. On the last occasion that I

addressed myself to this debate, I had the happy experience of hearing the Deputy Premier and Minister for Education say at a later stage that there had been something constructive in my remarks. I trust there will be the same impression regarding at least portion of my address today, but I want to indicate now that before I have concluded I shall be quite severe in my criticism of the Government and therefore there will probably be a totally different description of my speech this afternoon.

The Minister for Education: We can sift the chaff from the wheat, you know.

Mr. GRAHAM: I assure the Minister for Education that there will be just as much fact and truth in my criticism as there will be concerning those matters which I regard as being more or less non-party political. Of course, there is this point; every member has to address himself to the question as to whether or not any remarks he makes in a general debate of this character have any effect, whether it be on party or non-party political matters. Notwithstanding that a tribute was paid to certain utterances of mine, I very much doubt whether any serious consideration was given to any of them and whether in fact they had any effect whatsoever.

Members might recall that I dwelt rather extensively with traffic problems. I notice that one only has been dealt with, that is—although there was doubt expressed in the Chamber at the time I was making my speech—that trams are no longer to run to the other side of the river when the new Causeway is constructed. I am not deceiving myself for one moment that any remarks of mine were responsible for that. Therefore, it is discouraging to members, who very often have devoted a considerable amount of time and energy towards the preparation of speeches, that they should be meaningless so far as any results are concerned.

The Minister for Education: I had the same sensation for 13 years and nobody even replied to the debate in this House.

Mr. GRAHAM: What I am voicing is that that has been the common experience of members of all or no party.

The Minister for Education: You did last year.

Mr. GRAHAM: On account of rationing and the shortage of newsprint it is

unfortunate that very little of what members say in this House appears in the Press, and that of course applies to all members. It is necessary in a democracy that the people should have some idea of what their members are doing and of their views as to particular matters. I want it understood that I am making no criticism of the Press because the rationing of newsprint is inevitable. It is a further unfortunate fact that there is very little inducement for a member to devote the time necessary for intensive research if, as the result of what may be an exceedingly fine speech, only a few lines dealing in passing fashion with one aspect especially ultimately appear in the daily Press and therefore that portion only is available to the people. It is disheartening to say the least.

I suggest, therefore, in an endeavour partly to overcome that state of affairs, that the Government should, as a matter of urgency, make an approach to the Australian Broadcasting Commission. My proposal is that the time between when the 9 o'clock news finishes, and 9.30—approximately 20 minutes—should be devoted to a review of the proceedings of the State Parliament and some of the highlights conveyed to the people. Of course, I appreciate that if that were done part of a night's proceedings would be missed, but it could be caught up with in the succeeding night.

The Minister for Education: They gave some of the highlights of last night's debate.

Mr. GRAHAM: The A.B.C. does give some of the highlights of every debate, of course, but what I am asking for is that there shall be some extension of the proceedings so that the people can become enlightened as to what is being done in this House, and they are certainly not having any proceedings broadcast at the present moment. We only sit for approximately three days a week and it would mean only about one hour a week of broadcasting time whilst Parliament is sitting. There are so many hours devoted to the proceedings of the national Parliament that I feel that we in this House, as with all other State Parliaments, have a right to at least one hour a week being given to a summary and review of the State Parliament. The Government might give consideration to what I have suggested and then perhaps these reviews or digests could operate night-to-night from

the conclusion of the Address-in-reply debate.

There is a criticism I desire to make of this Government and of Governments generally; that is, the lack of courtesy shown to private members. I venture to say, with regard to undertakings that are being effected in various areas, that the members who are responsible for them, and responsible to the people, are completely in the dark as to what is being done. In very many cases the first intimation we as members receive is a pronouncement in the Press or protests from some of our constituents who, through some means or other have been successful in securing this information. I say that this is not fair to members.

We have a right to know what the Government proposes to do. After all, irrespective of what party they may be affiliated with, those who occupy the front bench are merely in temporary occupation; they are members of Parliament only and have a responsibility to the State as a whole. Surely an individual member, when matters vitally affecting his constituency are dealt with, is entitled to be consulted or, at any rate, be given some prior information with regard to the projected steps. I will give an illustration to bear out what I mean.

Recently an area of land in East Perth was resumed by the State Electricity Commission. It comprises part of the foreshore of East Perth immediately north of the existing power station. It was the belief of people in that area, certainly of myself and I think of very many others, that when reclamation works proceeded upstream there would be a broad expanse of esplanade, gardens and recreation reserves with, of course, a stone embankment and a riverside drive. To the consternation of all concerned, and without consulting me in any way whatever—and after all I am responsible to 8,000 people who live in that locality—the Government, or one of its departments, resumed that land and I am unable yet to find out for what purpose it was resumed. This was many months ago. It may be in use in perpetuity as a dump for ash, or it may be used for the purpose of dumping all sorts of gear and wheels and other such accessories of an important institution and undertaking like the State Electricity Commission. For all I know—and it

would only be running true to form—it might be the intention to erect a whole lot of galvanised tin sheds there.

The first intimation I had that this action had been taken was a protest signed by a number of electors in that particular locality. I do not think it was playing the game with the member for East Perth, whoever he may be. I know, in conversation with other members on both sides of the House, that from time to time they, too, are incensed when a member on the Government side has temporarily been promoted to the fiendish position where he can apparently walk into the electorate of a particular member without that member, who is responsible for it, being consulted in any way. I think it is time that sort of procedure was brought to a sudden stop. I repeat what I said at the outset, that this is nothing new or novel to this particular Government. It probably has existed right throughout the years.

I think the time is long overdue for some vigorous protest to be made against that procedure. Later on I may feel disposed to initiate steps for the purpose of forming a committee of members whose purpose and function it shall be to take appropriate action—if it is possible for them to do so on a non-party basis—to protect the individual rights of private members irrespective of party altogether.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: That is in their own hands, you know.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is in their own hands though it is far too late, of course, after the land or area has been resumed. Probably no other member will be interested in this particular matter after I have spoken and then the member for Geraldton may have something to bring forward that will concern his electorate. However, I do not intend to pursue that matter further.

With regard to traffic and transport generally, I made some suggestions during last session and in respect of one point I imagined the Minister for Transport was giving it his immediate consideration and, as a matter of fact, would have taken some positive action. I am referring to the fact that vehicles for hire, whether they be taxis or vehicles for the transport of goods, have set aside areas of public highways which they use for the purpose of trading.



If I wanted to sell potatoes or something else in Wellington-street, or any other place, I would not be permitted to do so. If I desired to sell a vehicle for hire I could have as my sole prerogative a certain area of the public highway. Many people operating such vehicles have premises of their own; they are easily accessible by telephone. I think that should be the common rule as we have congestion in many of the main streets. On account of that sort of thing, I am surprised that the Minister for Transport has not taken some action to give effect to what I thought he intended to do some twelve months ago.

With regard to garages and the sale of fuel, and particularly petrol, members will recall that about two years ago this House passed legislation to restrict the sale of petrol to certain hours, in connection with which, the Legislative Council was permitted to tinker with that particular Bill so that there was a loophole inserted providing that in case of emergency petrol could be secured outside the ordinary trading hours. In consequence of that, I venture to say that you know, Mr. Speaker, and every member in this House knows, that about half a dozen garages in Perth are now trading 24 hours of the day. People are backing in and getting as much petrol as they have coupons for. Therefore, all that the legislation has brought about is that a certain isolated few, who do not fall in with the principle or the spirit of it, have carte blanche to operate 24 hours a day to the disadvantage of the honest trader who is endeavouring to do the right and proper thing in regard to his employees. I suggest, therefore, that the Government should review the provisions of the Act in order that some equity may be imported into it.

I wish to make a short comment on another transport matter, namely, the restrictions that are imposed upon privately-owned vehicles. On account of the confusion, the overcrowding and the impossibility of the Government's providing adequate transport in many localities, the restrictions now imposed in favour of Government transport should be lifted. I have had experience in recent times, because of the meagre petrol allowance granted to me, of standing at certain street corners waiting for transport to the city and of three or four half-empty private buses passing. Yet

I must needs wait there 15, 20 or 30 minutes until such time as a trolley-bus comes along. Those have been rare occasions in my experience, but my heart wells in sympathy for those people who have to suffer that experience week by week over the years. In the circumstances, the Government should make some definite relaxation of the restrictions.

The time has arrived, too, when there must be some staggering of hours. It is impossible to transport 50,000 people to their places of employment within an hour, and then have all the vehicles and operatives idle for the better part of the day until the evening rush begins. A logical approach to this problem is to stagger starting times. A starting point could be made with the school children who go to school at 9 o'clock. If the hour were made 9.30, the great majority of business people would already have travelled to the city. There are people, even in such a long-established community as that of ~~East~~ Perth, who have to spend half-an-hour or so waiting on street corners and who finally get to work late or are compelled to walk. On school days, many of the vehicles carry 20 or 30 school children, who board the trams at more distant points and are transported to central schools in Perth. I suggest that some alleviation could be afforded if staggering were adopted in respect to school children at any rate.

I wish to deal specifically with two matters before touching on the third, which is the Government. The first is that all-important one of immigration. For the nine months up to the 31st March last—these are the latest figures available—a total of 65,159 migrants arrived in Australia. Of that number 46,634 were British, leaving only 18,525 other than British. In other words, 71½ per cent. of those who have arrived in Australia are of British stock. That in itself is an answer to so many of those carping critics who are assailing the Federal Minister for Migration on the score that he is swamping this country with aliens of various sorts, especially when we bear in mind that Australia, requiring population and having wide open spaces, has an obligation to the people comprising the displaced persons of Europe. Those figures were secured from the Minister for Migration himself.

I appreciate the concern implied by the member for Swan in a series of questions he asked recently regarding a company that is taking advantage of a particular situation to rob—I use the word advisedly—certain unfortunate people. I intend to give specific details presently. Over the past 12 months or so, I have interested myself in Italian people by endeavouring in some small way to make them better Australians, to make them realise that this is their country and that they have friends here. Believe me these people are anxious to accommodate themselves to Australian conditions. But members know perfectly well that we impose certain hardships or limitations upon their free interchange and association with us. I have only to refer to some of the coarse terms applied to them. Educated persons of a better type are exceedingly resentful of that sort of treatment.

The Italians who are here, members will agree, are hardworking to a degree. We do not find them coming to this country and purchasing huge blocks of flats and then sitting back and living on the rentals; we do not find them seeking employment in Government positions; we do not find them going in to certain sorts of shops and becoming traders; but we do find the Italians—and this also applies largely to Yugo Slavs—going out and developing the country, doing some of the really hard and difficult work, opening up vast areas and developing market gardens and applying themselves to potato growing, firewood cutting, timber hewing, mining and other such tasks. This, I suggest, is the type of migrant we want in Australia, and not those of the other category to whom I have referred. These people, I repeat, are a real asset to a country like Australia.

As regards the Italians, a sad tragedy is being enacted at the present time. Very many of those migrants arrived in Australia upwards of 10 years ago. They came here to find a niche for themselves, to establish themselves in industry, with the idea later of bringing their families to Australia. Owing to the intervention of the war and of troubled times since, it has been impossible for many of them to be re-united with their families. These people are battling desperately to have their families join them here and, because their plight is so

desperate, the situation is being taken advantage of by unscrupulous people.

It is possible to travel from Australia to Italy for between £90 and £113. If those men are unable to bring their families to Australia, the natural thing is for them to return to Italy so that they may once more be with their families, and they can travel there for an average of £100. But what is the position? If they want to bring their families out to Australia, the cost is far more than they possess in cash and far more than they can realise on their assets because of the activities of unscrupulous people.

I understand that there are about 1,500 Italian people, close relatives and members of families ready to come here. Therefore, it would not be a tremendous task to bring that number to Australia. After all, there are being transported to Australia at present Poles and Balts and people of that sort, of whom I offer no criticism and upon whom I cast no reflection, but these Italians have been here for years and have become accustomed to our way of life and can speak and understand our language. They are developing and improving the country, but they are now faced with the position of having to return to Italy while, at the same time, we are bringing out brand-new migrants who know nothing of Australia. That is a tragedy, and everything possible should be done to bring those Italian families out to Australia.

I have mentioned that the cost to return to Italy is from £90 to £113. I shall quote actual figures—"Tide Water," £95, third-class; "Talissee," £112 10s., one class; "Strathnaver," £98 15s. to £113, two-berth cabin; and via England, £90 tourist-class on a 22,000-ton boat, plus only £8 15s. 7d. for the journey from London to Italy. I mention those figures so that members may appreciate not only the tremendous cost but also the disparity in the fares. Now let me show what it costs for people to come from Italy to Australia. The figures are—"Misr," £270 to £290 in filthy dormitories; "Sudan," £270 to £290; "Toscana," which is about to leave now, £200, third-class. Members will appreciate how this boat will be crowded when I mention that she is of 10,000 tons and carries 826 passengers.

To come by air by one of the B.O.A.C. planes costs £285 10s. on the regular service

but, as no seats will be available on those planes until June next, the fare by chartered plane is £386 per head. For these people to bring their families out is an impossibility except for those who happen to have won wealth of some magnitude in the few years they have lived in Australia. Let me give a few examples of what some of these people have had to pay. One man, D'Alessandro, brought his son here by air via the United States—the only way he could get a passage—and it cost £414. This young man's services would be important to Australia because he is a stonemason by trade. Another man, Frank Mariotti, who incidentally is an Australian ex-Serviceman, had to pay £2,290 to bring his wife, four children and a young Australian-born niece to Australia. Another man named Dorigo had to pay £1,920 for his family, and yet another, Azzola, had to pay £880 to bring his two Australian-born children to this country.

Thus members may have some appreciation of what these people in desperation are paying in order to bring their families to Australia, but so many cannot afford the terrific price and so they are leaving Australia. Only the other night a man told me with tears in his eyes that he had been here about ten years, and that his only crime had been to go to Benger or some such place and undertake the growing or digging of potatoes.

Mr. Reynolds: He must have been a good man if he was working there.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not want any inane interjections while I am discussing a serious matter. That man has been endeavouring to have his family brought to Australia. He has tried all things possible, without success. He has sunk money into this Anglo-Italian Trading Company and feels that the money has been lost; and, crying to me, he said, "And now I have got to give up all I possess. I am not going to be separated from my family any longer. I am going to book my passage back to Italy by some means or other." That is the tragedy: that we are bringing aliens to this country and others are going out of it notwithstanding that they want to remain here and have proved themselves good and useful citizens.

I will give a few facts about this Anglo-Italian Trading Co. It was advertised in the Press that the "Medina" of 17,000 tons

would have accommodation for 2,500 passengers. Actually the tonnage is 5,426 tons, less than one-third of what was advertised. The ship "Wharton" was advertised as being of 22,000 tons and capable of transporting about 3,000 passengers. Actually it is a 6,000-ton vessel. The fees to be charged were £202, plus £5 booking fee, a total of £207. Yet people are being transported in the opposite direction for less than half that amount. The information I have is that neither of those ships is in a fit condition to sail; but it is stated that another vessel, the "Napoli," is leaving somewhere in the middle of this month to bring some of these people out. There have been rumours and questions regarding the bona fides of this company, as a consequence of which people are fearful that they have lost their money. It seems almost impossible to catch up with the principals of the Anglo-Italian Trading Co. In Western Australia alone, I have been informed by the President of the Italian community in this State, a sum that he estimates at no less than £50,000 has been subscribed by these people to this company; and yet now the general feeling is that all or the greater part of the money has been lost.

In one case there was a widow who lodged £1,500 to bring her children here. She fears that all the money she has subscribed, or a considerable portion of it, will be lost. I have referred this see-saw arrangement of bringing aliens to Australia while aliens in Australia—naturalised Australians many of them—are leaving the country, to the Commonwealth Minister for Migration. Unfortunately, no success whatever attended my efforts. I suggested that in view of the circumstances, the Commonwealth Government should endeavour to charter a vessel to bring the families of these people out here, or subsidise their passage so as to put the figures on to a reasonable basis, instead of their having to pay £290 to £386 to travel by sea or air as at present. I was informed that it was impracticable to do this; and I am now appealing to the Government to make approaches, if it thinks there is some validity in the proposition I have espoused, so that something can be done to relieve the plight of these people.

I repeat that they are useful, industrious citizens who have become acclimatised and used to our ways and conditions, and we

should do everything to make them happy and retain them here. After all, in the majority of cases, there are homes ready to accommodate these people. If there be any prejudice at all against non-British people, at least there would be this advantage: we would be getting the majority of these Italians as young people, as children, and would consequently have a far better opportunity of instilling Australian idealism into their make-up than would be the case if adults were brought here. In the broad sphere of humanity there are just as many people suffering one way and another in Italy as in any other of the European countries.

What I have said regarding Italians can be said to a very great extent in connection with Yugoslavs, so far as service to this country is concerned. Unfortunately—I am not going to judge the merits or demerits of the situation—there is some strong appeal from the country of their origin, and many of them are returning to Yugoslavia and very few are coming here. That is why I have confined my remarks almost exclusively to the Italian people.

Mr. Marshall: Do you not think that the activities of this company should be subject to investigation by the C.I.B.? I had a similar case yesterday.

Mr. GRAHAM: Definitely! The Premier, or one of the Ministers, in reply to a question last week, by the member for Swan, indicated that certain inquiries were being made, and that in view of the questions addressed to the Government steps would be taken to expedite matters.

Mr. Bovell: I am informed that it is not an English company.

Mr. GRAHAM: I referred to its title. I am not suggesting it is an English company. I now wish to touch on the question of housing. Those members who expect from me a bitter attack upon the State Housing Commission or upon the Royal Commissioner who inquired into the activities of that department, are, to a very great extent, going to be disappointed. After all, while I was disappointed in many respects over the conduct of the Royal Commission, I suppose I can find a certain amount of satisfaction in the fact that of the eight terms of reference seven were found in my favour, and the eighth was not so found

very largely because of circumstances with which members of this Chamber are familiar and upon which accordingly I do not intend to dilate. The Royal Commission conducted by Mr. Moseley indicated to me, at any rate, if it is a fair sample of Royal Commissions, the utter futility of them, perhaps in this case particularly because there was evident a decided laziness on the part of the gentleman concerned. He seemed to think that all that was required of him was to sit back in an office and people would come running to him with evidence. There was no proper endeavour on his part to go out and see what was to be seen; to glean and garner information. No, he preferred to adopt the procedure he did, and the great bulk of the matters he inquired into—the overwhelming bulk—were politely placed in his lap by me. Had I not made data available to him—and I was under no more obligation to do so than anyone else—there would not have been a Royal Commission at all, or only a few isolated cases would have been investigated.

I suggested quite a number of steps that could be taken, but they were not; and I think that apart from a jaunt he took to the country, there was only one excursion he made around the metropolitan area, apparently without taking anybody with him. At any rate, I had no opportunity to indicate to him where he might go in order to see some of the sights. Apparently Mr. Moseley decided, for reasons known to himself, that it was best not to do that. Perhaps I should overlook the fact that he tried desperately to rob members of this Parliament of their inherent right of protection when speaking in the House. Because Mr. Moseley was unsuccessful in his assault against me, he went out of his way deliberately to vilify me in the report he made. After all, the terms of reference made no mention of Graham whatsoever. Yet he devoted a whole section of his report to an attack upon me. He was not requested or required to investigate Graham in any respect whatever, yet he did it, probably suffering a frustration because he was unsuccessful with regard to the action he sought to take. In other words, he did it out of pique. This is all I wish to say about Mr. Moseley: That without my assistance, notwithstanding his remarks, there would have been no inquiry worthy of the name.

So far as his counsel, Mr. Negus, is concerned—and I mention him because rumour has it that the Government is toying with the idea of creating him a King's Counsel—I am informed that he sought a fee which was practically staggering to the Premier, when he was given the task of being counsel to the Royal Commissioner. I endeavoured to ascertain what was the figure originally asked—that is before he commenced and not afterwards—but the answer to the question did not convey that information. In any case, he received £402 8s. The Royal Commission sat for 32 days, a total of approximately 100 hours. Therefore he received in the vicinity of £4 an hour, and about the only service he rendered is evident from the fact that with two or three exceptions not one person before the Royal Commission gave evidence.

From the moment the witnesses went into the room they were subjected to a series of questions, and therefore all that was given to the Royal Commission was what Mr. Negus thought they should give. Anyhow, he did rather well out of it and, if he receives this additional honour from the Government, I suppose it will have been worthwhile. I would say, in fairness, that it might be thought that as the Royal Commission sat for—I do not think it could be much more than—100 hours, there was a lot of research and other work to be undertaken. But I know perfectly well that before 10 o'clock in the morning Mr. Negus was attending to his private practice in town, and the Royal Commission adjourned early every afternoon so that he could return to his private practice. So he was not perusing the evidence and the minutes with a view to seeing whether there were contradictions and as to whether he could pick up his tracks next day to make a better job of that for which he was being so handsomely paid.

I raised my protest on two occasions during the last session of Parliament because I was dissatisfied and disappointed with what was occurring, not because I personally had any housing problem or was individually concerned about any bricks or timber or other building material. I felt that hardship was being imposed and allowed to continue and that a proper allocation of permits and houses was not being made. I did everything I could in this House and

outside with one reservation—that is, the breaching of confidence. Based on what I stated in this House, I did everything I could in order to effect an improvement, and I am wondering now whether any endeavours a member can make with regard to any matter can really achieve anything. Now that the Royal Commission is over I say that I have no hard feelings towards the State Housing Commission, and I hope—though it may be too much to expect in certain respects—that they have no hard feelings towards me. As far as I am concerned, that was an episode which is now closed.

I wish now to quote to the House a letter, and I would like members to follow it closely because it will reveal my point. I will make no comment about it but will leave it to members themselves. The following is my communication to the Minister for Housing which is dated the 23rd July, and in respect of which the Minister yesterday conveyed to me the information that something was being done; but members will realise that this activity is only because of my intervention.

The Minister for Housing: And had been previously done, too.

Mr. GRAHAM: This letter will tell its own story and is as follows:—

Because of the shocking nature of the circumstances of the people living at 72 Brisbane Street, Perth, in a double-storeyed tenement house, I submit the particulars of it to you in the hope that your intervention will result in humane treatment being accorded the unfortunate inmates.

The other day I made an inspection of the place, in connection with which Mr. Needham, M.L.A., during my absence from the city, communicated with the Housing Commission on the 8th inst.

Mr. Douglas—who was in the first A.I.F., also served in the second world war—lives with his wife in a front room. He is a public servant who is, unfortunately, receiving radium treatment at the Royal Perth Hospital for suspected cancer.

Mrs. Douglas is suffering some form of nervous disorder and is being treated by Dr. Watson. They have in their room with them a grandson, aged four years, and I might mention that this room is also used as their sitting-room.

In another room Mr. and Mrs. N. D. Suiter (the latter being a daughter of the Douglasses) live with a son 4-years-old, who sleeps in the double bed with the parents; a daughter

aged two sleeps in a cot, and a baby aged six months in another cot. This bedroom is also used as a sitting-room for the Suiter family.

Mr. Suiter recently suffered a painful accident and is in St. John of God Hospital, being expected home in a few days. He is ex A.I.F., having served for four and a half years, including a period overseas.

Mr. and Mrs. Suiter have been living under these conditions for two and a half years, and made application for a rental house about 18 months ago, following which they were issued with a No. 1 priority, but no further progress has been made. Mrs. Suiter has been under Dr. Georgeff, suffering from womb and bladder trouble which recurs from time to time, and she is now receiving treatment from Dr. Watson.

Mr. and Mrs. A. H. Sebbs (the latter being another daughter of the Douglasses) occupy another room in which they have been existing for two and a half years, it being used for bedroom, sitting-room and dining-room. They have two children, a boy aged four, who sleeps with his grandparents (Mr. and Mrs. Douglas) and a girl, aged two, who sleeps in a cot. Mr. Sebbs served with the A.I.F. for five years. He made application for a house about two years ago and approximately 18 months ago was informed that he had been given a No. 1 priority, since when there has been no change.

Last March there was an unfortunate accident when the Sebbs's boy, aged four, fell from the upstairs balcony, 16 feet to the ground, from the effects of which he is recovering under difficulties owing to the crowded nature of the house. This episode had the effect of interfering with the health of Mrs. Sebbs, who is in a shocking nervous condition, which can be appreciated on sight, and her mother informed me she has periodical hysterical outbursts, and other violent turns, even to the extent of having run away on occasions. There is no prospect of any improvement in her condition whilst she continues to live as she is.

In another room, Mr. and Mrs. Hatton, who have a son aged nine and a daughter aged five, are domiciled, but they also have a combined kitchen and living-room. The daughter sleeps in the room with her parents, the boy in another room with a Mr. Wyld. This lad suffers from a thickening of the lungs, and the overcrowding in the house is bad for his health, a doctor's certificate to this effect having been given to the Housing Commission.

Mr. and Mrs. Hatton have lived for the past eight years here, and applied for a home about three years ago. Mr. Hatton served with the A.I.F. for nearly five years.

There is only one bathroom at this place, it being upstairs, and has to suit the requirements of everyone. Kitchen, bedroom and other furniture is occupying part of the passageway. There are steep stairs in the dwelling which must be blocked top and bottom owing to the danger to the children.

The backyard measures only about 20 feet square, and portion of it is occupied by a

wood heap, and other appurtenances to the household. The upstairs verandah leaks to an extent that makes it impossible for anyone to occupy, and approaches to the landlord and the Health Department have not resulted in any improvement being effected.

The deplorable conditions under which all of these people, being nine adults and seven children, live, can be appreciated from the foregoing, particularly when account is taken of the state of health of the occupants, the fact that the menfolk are all ex-servicemen and the length of time that has passed without an allocation being made, and other conditions pertaining to this family.

I am further informed that, owing to the necessity for taking meals in relays, the evening meal, for instance, extends from about 5.30 p.m. to sometimes as late as 8 p.m., and all the cooking is done on a small wood stove and a small gas stove.

It is extremely difficult for me to believe that houses have been allocated only to cases which are more deserving than this. I appeal to you to do all you possibly can to see that the lot of these unfortunate victims of the housing situation is alleviated.

I received an acknowledgment from the Housing Commission that the matter was being investigated. The Minister also informed me yesterday that the Suiter family is to be given a home. I ask members to bear with me whilst I quote two other cases. I will not mention names, although I have discussed both these cases with the Minister and also with the Secretary of the Housing Commission. The first case—and this will explain why I asked a question of the Minister for Housing yesterday—concerns a gentleman who arrived in Australia only a few months ago. He is a reverend gentleman and has a wife and a son aged I believe 16 years. He has been granted a home in South Perth. This gentleman informed the Housing Commission that there is a need in the Kensington area for the services of a clergyman to minister to the religious needs of the people. I make no comment.

The other case which is slightly different, deals with permits and these may have some relationship to electioneering promises. Again, there is only a man and his wife, and the name of the person has been given to the Minister and also to the Secretary of the State Housing Commission. The man and his wife, whose ages I should say are somewhere between 50 and 60, had a business with a house attached, which they sold approximately 12 months ago. There is only a husband and wife to

be accommodated and they are living in a hotel where the tariff is only £2 10s. per week each. It could not be more conveniently situated because the working place of this man is in the building immediately next door. There is no hardship on that account because he has a good position in that business and he recently paid £700 for a motorcar and also paid for a trip to New Zealand and back for his wife. I only mention these matters to demonstrate that there was no financial hardship. Three months ago this man applied for a permit to build and that permit has already been granted. The contract is for approximately £1,600.

I do not know whether it is necessary for me to say anything on that case, but the point is that I informed the Minister that I could not understand the matter. If the Government were issuing this permit to a young couple it would be all right but is any member going to suggest that this family was suffering any hardship whatsoever? In other words, if any member suggests that there are not other young couples who have been waiting for a long period for a home and are more deserving, then I do not know what I am talking about.

The Minister for Housing: I think you will find that there was hardship.

Mr. GRAHAM: One of the grounds given to support hardship was that both the man and his wife have a slight limp when they walk. They are residing next door to the man's place of employment and any man who suffers with a slight limp could not be in better circumstances, particularly when that man can afford to stay at an hotel. These people have quite a decent room there, and the wife does not have to cook meals or do any housework. When the house is built, this lady will have to set about her housework and other duties attached to the upkeep of a home. I do not want to say any more about housing but I submit those cases which can be investigated by anybody. In spite of all my remarks 12 months ago, these things still seem to continue. I do not want to be constantly fighting with anybody but it is exceedingly disheartening. Naturally people who are the sufferers are incensed when they know, perhaps not of the cases I have quoted but of others, and they realise what is going on when they are enduring real hardship. If they become Communists in

outlook or revolutionaries generally, then it is not their fault.

I have now come to the stage where I wish to say something about this Government. I am sorry that there are one or two unoccupied seats on the front bench, since I feel I am entitled to speak critically because of the fact that approximately half of the Government's term of office has expired. I make the charge that this Government would be hard to beat for incompetence and ineptitude and I trust that I can establish this fact before I complete my remarks.

The Premier: That is the usual remark of Opposition members, is it not?

Mr. GRAHAM: There is very little indeed that this Government has done and hardly anything at all that this Government has started. It is exceedingly fortunate that it has been shielded and protected and patted on the back by the Press, and so the public is unaware of the true situation.

Mr. Grayden: That is in your opinion.

Mr. GRAHAM: If my youthful friend will be patient for a few moments I will demonstrate a few of the ways in which this Government has not been shaping up to its task. Had there been a Labour Government in office the leading articles in the Press would have given a different twist to all the items and a totally different picture would have been presented to the people of this State. However, I ask the member for Middle Swan to be patient and I will endeavour to illustrate a few of my points. First of all, I wish to state what I consider to be an axiom, and that is that this Government is wallowing in the reflected glory of or credit for the bulk of the works that were set in motion and planned by its predecessors.

To mention a few, I refer to the Causeway, the Royal Perth Hospital, the South Fremantle Power House, the raising of the wall at Mundaring Weir, the completion of Stirling Dam, and I could mention many more. There are exceptions, but I ask the Government to realise the fact and acknowledge the credit which is due to the previous Government for laying the foundations. All that this Government is doing is sitting idly by and watching these projects, planned and organised by the Labour Government, coming to

fruition and indirectly claiming all the credit for such undertakings. This Government goes blissfully on.

I do not want to touch on the financial side because the Leader of the Opposition addressed a few homilies to the Treasurer on that question, but since the first Supply Bill was introduced we have been given the figures for the first month of this financial year.

On perusing these figures I find that at the rate we are going we can expect—notwithstanding that this Government has received so much more at the hands of a Commonwealth Labour Government and one which it is eager to condemn so critically—a deficit to the tune of over £3,500,000. Perhaps it might be suggested that the July figures show a larger deficit than for other months. If that is so, then it indicates that we are reverting to a state of affairs that existed before the corrective was applied by a Labour Government where throughout the various Government departments any payments that could be postponed were generally postponed until the next financial year.

Therefore, if there has been any of this delay in the presentation of accounts which has been responsible for the tremendous deficit for July of this year, it simply goes to show that the deficit for the financial year ended the 30th June last was, in fact, even greater than the figures revealed. To start at the beginning: With regard to the legislation that the present Government has submitted to Parliament, we will consider its actions during the first session. At that time I claim we were confronted with a weak anaemic legislative programme. There were not half a dozen measures possessing any real merit. We dealt with dentists and stallions, tort-feasors and a number of other suchlike matters. I defy members who are sitting behind the Government to indicate half a dozen Bills submitted to us last session that had any real merit or for which there was any great necessity.

The Minister for Education: There were at least 20 of them.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Government certainly brought down a sham Bill to reform the Legislative Council.

Mr. GRAHAM: Of the Bills submitted in this Chamber, most were sponsored by two

Ministers—the Minister for Education and the then Attorney General, who is now the Minister for Housing. Such was the exhibition that quite a number of Bills were wrongly introduced into this House. We had the spectacle of a number of the other Ministers, apart from the two I have already mentioned, reading every single word of the Bills they introduced, even though they were quite simple and comprised only one sheet. In one or two instances they may have covered two pages.

The Minister for Housing: I have seen that done for a good many years.

Mr. GRAHAM: They were not complex Bills, yet the Ministers concerned revealed the fact that they did not understand the measures at all. They knew nothing of what was contained in the Bills, and that was made clear at the Committee stage when a few questions were asked by members sitting on the Opposition side of the House. The public of Western Australia have not even yet been informed of the incompetence of which we had such a terrible experience during the first session of the present Parliament. It is all very well to urge that it was a new Ministry; the majority of those on the Treasury bench have been members of Parliament for many years and have seen hundreds of Bills introduced, so that they were familiar with parliamentary formulae and procedure. There was no excuse for them whatever. Surely it is the responsibility of a Minister to know something about the Bills he or she happens to introduce.

With regard to the Honorary Minister for Supply and Shipping, I give her honourable mention because of the ridiculous situation with which we have been confronted, of the Government intent upon booming and blazoning forth actions on her part that constitute an entire myth. It has been sought to make this House and the people believe that the Honorary Minister has been doing a marvellous job of work for Western Australia. It is time that silly tripe was dispelled, and regard was had to the true facts of the situation.

The Minister for Housing: You ask the merchants about that.

Mr. GRAHAM: One would naturally expect that there would in the course of time be some improvement in the volume of shipping and cargo arriving in Western Aus-



tralia from the Eastern States. As there is now a Minister whose full time or specific duty has been in connection with the department concerned, one would expect a considerable improvement. What are the facts regarding the situation? For the last six months—I refer to the period ended the 30th March, 1947—when the Labour Government was in power and there was no Honorary Minister for Supply and Shipping, whether from Subiaco or elsewhere, the cargo from the Eastern States to Fremantle represented 206,770 tons. For the latest period of six months, at a time when we have had the Honorary Minister in charge of operations and who is said to have been doing such a powerful job for Western Australia—I refer to the six months ended the 30th June last—one would at least expect an increased tonnage to 300,000 or 400,000 at least.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: More like 2,000,000 tons.

Mr. GRAHAM: The latest figures, which are reliable, show that the imports fell to 186,193 tons or, in other words, there was a falling off of some 20,000 tons. We have been treated repeatedly by the Honorary Minister herself, by Ministers and by the Press of this State, to the story that the Honorary Minister has been doing a remarkable job in the interests of Western Australia. It is all just so much hooey.

The Honorary Minister: That is your story.

Mr. GRAHAM: My figures are taken from the Fremantle Harbour Trust returns.

The Honorary Minister: I will give you some figures later on.

Mr. Bovell: Anyhow, the falling off was due to hold-ups and strikes in the Eastern States.

Mr. GRAHAM: There would be some honesty about it if the Honorary Minister had explained the position by saying, "I cannot do much about it. Instead of improving, the imports are slipping back, and I can do nothing because of external factors." She does not do that, but we are all led to believe that she has been working wonders. Any poor fool, as the member for South Fremantle pointed out, could go to the telephone, ring up the shipping company, ask when the next boat was due in, what her name was, what tonnage of cargo

she would have to land at Fremantle and what goods were contained in the shipment, and then make a statement in the Press over his name. That is what has been going on from week to week. I could do that.

The Honorary Minister: Well, why do you not do it?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not be foolish enough to put that sort of thing in the Press and appear to be responsible for the arrival of the cargoes when in reality, as with the Honorary Minister, I had nothing whatever to do with it, not so much as a snap of the fingers. If she is able to claim responsibility for anything, I think it is that she is responsible for the falling off of the inward cargoes to the extent of 20,000 tons over a period of six months, according to the latest figures available.

The Honorary Minister: Try to be truthful—just try!

Mr. Marshall: Why do you not go out where you could do something to more purpose, and not stay here?

Mr. GRAHAM: Whatever the Government does seems to be executed in a slipshod manner. I do not desire to refer to Royal Commissions generally except to say that apparently whenever the Government has been confronted with a sticky problem or has been unable to make up its mind, it has referred the issue to a Select Committee or a Royal Commission. I shall refer only to the report of the Commission that dealt with the redistribution of electoral boundaries for this State, and I shall do so in a manner different from what members might expect of me. Here was a glorious opportunity for the State electoral districts to be made to conform to some extent with the Federal electoral districts.

The Minister for Housing: We have been trying to do that.

Mr. GRAHAM: Instead of that, the situation has resolved itself into a higgledy-piggledy state of affairs. Our boundaries are cutting across those of the Federal electorates, and there has been no co-operation in any direction.

The Minister for Housing: There has been. I was over in Canberra, and while there impressed upon the authorities the desirability of this.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am speaking of the results. The Government removed the only official who might have acted as liaison officer between us and the Federal authorities. That was done when the Surveyor General was removed from the commission and replaced by the Under Secretary for Lands. We now find that the new electoral boundaries are brought into conformity, by and large, with those of the road board districts, and this at a time when a Royal Commission is sitting to alter the boundaries of the local governing authorities. The Government has not shown any foresight in dealing with the problem, and so the map will be criss-crossed with the lines indicating local government boundaries, State electoral boundaries and Federal electoral divisions and subdivisions. However, I am not surprised at it, because that sort of thing is just typical of the present Government.

The Premier: We did not instruct the Electoral Commission how the electoral boundaries should be defined.

Mr. GRAHAM: No, but it should have been the responsibility of the Government, if it had been awake to the situation, to have the necessary provisions embodied in legislation so that certain factors would be taken into account by the Electoral Commission.

The Premier: That was done.

Mr. GRAHAM: It was not done.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: At any rate, they took a seat from the North-West.

The Minister for Housing: Special legislation dealt with the matter.

Mr. GRAHAM: It was a matter with which members on the Opposition side of the House had nothing whatever to do. In my opinion, the readjustment of the boundaries of local governing authorities could well have been delayed. I consider there is a proper sequence that should have been followed without dealing with the matter in the haphazard way we have seen. First of all, the Federal divisions that are to be set up under the new legislation should have been fixed and then our State electoral boundaries could have been determined. If that had been done, we would not have this criss-crossing of boundaries that will now be apparent. After that had been carried out, then the matter could have been referred to the Royal Commission so that it

could fix the boundaries for the local governing authorities. As it is now, we shall have more confusion than ever.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: At any rate, the Royal Commission dealing with municipal boundaries is only a time-wasting method employed by the Government.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am of that opinion myself. I want to say a few words about controls, respecting which we continue to hear so much. I shall not particularise in this matter, but never before last session have we had before us so many Bills providing for the setting up of controls, and this by a Government that professes to be opposed to such a system.

Mr. Marshall: Oh, yeah!

Mr. GRAHAM: Last session we had before us Bills to control bread, to control building operations, to control dried fruits, to control gas, to control rents, to control optometrists, to control street photographers, to control the marketing of wheat, and for controls in other directions as well. I dare say there never was a time before when so many control Bills were placed before Parliament as was the case last session, which was remarkable from a Government professing to be opposed to such controls.

The Minister for Housing: Which one of those controls would you not have had?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is something that I cannot be expected to answer. Previously the Government maintained that there was too much red tape and so on about all these matters, but there certainly has been too much hypocrisy and covering up on the part of the present Government. It does not matter what the members of the Government may do, they are featured in the news columns and the photographic section of the Press, and in those circumstances they can get away with practically everything, except, perhaps, murder.

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

Mr. GRAHAM: I now wish to refer to the performance of the Government and its apparent policy, which was not enunciated during the election campaign, of appeasement and the awarding of consolation prizes to its supporters. Some reference was made to the fact that in future appoint-

ments to public bodies would be made on the basis of knowledge and merit, and not because of political favour. I think I am right in saying that there are but few instances indeed when a person, other than a sworn supporter of the Liberal Party or the Country and Democratic League, has been appointed to any public body or instrumentality.

Mr. Mann: What about your own party?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not apologising for or excusing that state of affairs. At least, the Labour Party was not so blatant and dishonest as to inform the public that it would make appointments irrespective of party considerations and simply on merit. That is something that the present Government has not stood up to. Irrespective of how it affects my personal relationships in the House, I go to the extent of saying that, because of the Government's weakness—when it could not make up its own mind—it appointed a Royal Commission. It has bestowed favours and honours on its own supporters and also appointed them to Royal Commissions, with a view to appeasing and silencing them because they were disappointed at certain internal ballots of their political parties. Every member in this Chamber knows that what I have said is perfectly true, no matter how unpalatable it may be to acknowledge it. It is disgraceful when a Government violates its pledges by making such appointments. It has even to placate its own supporters in this House by granting them honours and bestowing favours upon them.

The Premier: That is absolutely untrue.

Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. GRAHAM: The Premier has displayed little courage. I have seen very little of it since he has been in office. He should be man enough to acknowledge it.

The Premier: I repeat, it is absolutely untrue.

Mr. GRAHAM: Then there is the matter of reform of the Legislative Council. The Government was elected on a pledge that it would introduce legislation to broaden the franchise for that Chamber. It was the policy of the Liberal Party and the Country and Democratic League to do so; but I accuse members opposite of espousing that proposition safe in the knowledge that their

counterparts in another place, when the legislation came before it, would reject it. That is sheer and utter dishonesty on the part of the Government. It proves there is no discipline among the members of the irresponsible parties comprising the Government. In Australia, there is one Labour Party, not half a dozen. Each member of it subscribes to the principles and platforms of that party, whether he stands for the Federal or for a State Parliament, whether for the Upper or the Lower House.

The Attorney General: Do you stand for Communism?

Mr. GRAHAM: I will have no red herding of that kind. Had the Government parties been sincere in the matter of reform of the franchise for the Legislative Council, they would have taken action immediately to expel the members who rebelled against the principles and platforms of the Liberal Party and the Country and Democratic League. That is the action which would have been taken by the Labour Party in similar circumstances. Each member opposite knows perfectly well that if I stood here in my place and spoke and voted against the cardinal principles and platform of the Labour Party, as enunciated by my Leader in his Policy speech, I could expect to be ex-communicated from the Labour Party and would deserve to be.

The Government parties thrive upon duplicity and lack of sincerity and decency and they are assisted by a friendly and kindly-disposed Press, which at all times camouflages this and covers up that, screening and protecting them all the while. So it is possible for them to perpetrate these dishonest political practices upon the people of Western Australia. Scarcely anybody speaks in protest, because what is said here does not reach the people and the Labour Party has not the funds to buy scores of hours over the broadcasting network every night of the week to explain the position that has developed in the political life of Western Australia.

Mr. Yates: I would like to see your balance sheet.

Mr. GRAHAM: If it suits the member for Canning, and if he thinks he has made a point, I undertake to produce to him the balance sheet of the Australian Labour Party.

Mr. Fox: Let him produce his balance sheet.

Mr. GRAHAM: I resent these interjections and statements, which are unfair. The suggestion is that there is something sinister in the proposition, when in fact there is not. I suppose the member for Canning thought there was something to hide.

Mr. Yates: Not at all.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am prepared to do what I said. I throw it back to the member for Canning that he is not prepared to disclose the financial position or balance sheet of the Liberal Party, or of any of its appendages.

Mr. Yates: Why not?

Mr. GRAHAM: Because I know something of them and of their funds and how the concerns are financed.

The Premier: We need a lot more.

The Minister for Lands: You only think you could do it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not think this is the time and place to do it. It may come on later in the debate when I shall tell members something about the funds of the Citizens' Rights Association, which is an appendage of the Liberal Party.

The Premier: Will you say something on the banking decision? That is mixed up with citizens' rights.

Mr. GRAHAM: When I have concluded my address, I am prepared—if the Premier so desires—to make a dissertation—

The Premier: I do.

Mr. GRAHAM: —on the banking legislation and the decision of the High Court. I shall be only too happy to accommodate him; but I assure him he would be delayed in his wish to rush through the emergency legislation of which he gave notice early this evening. It is not my intention to traverse the promises made by members opposite during the election campaign, but I warn them that, before the session is concluded, they will be definitely reminded of the false statements and promises they made, and these will be contrasted with their performances.

There has been much talk not only in this State, but throughout the Commonwealth, about strikes, and how they interfere with the production, progress

and development of the Commonwealth. We were led to believe that when the present Government assumed the Treasury bench, we would see some evidence of their determination to overcome that problem. I intend briefly to give several examples showing once more how this spineless, jelly-fish Government has shaped up to its high stand in this matter.

The Minister for Lands: You are talking a lot of rot. Your trouble is that there have been no strikes. You tried to engineer some, but were not successful.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for East Perth!

Mr. GRAHAM: I have been a member of this Chamber for five years and have learnt during that time that nothing but tripe emanates from the member for Toodyay, whether he has a portfolio or not.

The Minister for Lands: The trouble with you is that you are so sincere!

Mr. GRAHAM: He is so inflated with ego and a sense of his own importance in the scheme of things in this Parliament—

The Minister for Lands: You have all the glory here, you mug!

Mr. GRAHAM: There is scarcely a question which has been asked of him during the time he has been Minister to which he has given a civil or complete answer.

The Minister for Lands: That is your idea, you mug!

Mr. GRAHAM: He evades the issue. To return to the subject of strikes and the stand which this Government was going to take! First of all, we had a strike—although, of course, it was politely put in other words—of the wholesale butchers, who refused to carry on their business. We saw then a most inglorious display. The Government stood idly by, hoping, Micawber-like, for something to turn up. That was a strike not by trade unionists, but by some of the big boys. There was no forthright condemnation of them, no strong action on the part of the Government. I personally do not know of any action that the Government took to rectify that situation. It did not matter that the people had to go short of meat on account of the action taken by the wholesale butchers.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Government supported the wholesale butchers in the strike.

Mr. GRAHAM: They supported the Government with finance when there were no strikes, and through the ballot.

The Honorary Minister: Now drink the water!

Mr. Marshall: I shall quote "Hansard" to the Honorary Minister later and then she will be finished.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Honorary Minister has successfully erected a facade and created the belief that she is doing something when, as I have demonstrated, Western Australia's plight has gone from bad to worse under her aegis. I think it is time she retired to her little funk hole and took stock of the situation, instead of continuing in the way she is doing. I have heard no word of condemnation either from any member of the Ministry or its supporters regarding the action of the doctors in Australia. They are all on strike by refusing to prescribe the free medicine, in accordance with the Government formulary, which would operate in about 75 to 80 per cent. of the prescriptions.

The Minister for Lands: Lolly water!

Mr. GRAHAM: That is what the doctors themselves prescribe and it is a condemnation of them.

The Minister for Lands: It is not.

Mr. GRAHAM: It might be said that the doctors are not compelled by law to operate under the scheme, and are therefore not breaking the law. That is very pretty and, as far as it goes, perfectly true. In the same way, there is not industrial conscription in this country, so by law no coalminer is compelled to stay at his job. If a doctor is not compelled to prescribe medicine I say a coalminer, or any other person, is in exactly the same position. If this Government condemns workers for refusing to co-operate in the scheme of things, it should be equally condemnatory of the doctors throughout the Commonwealth and particularly those in Western Australia. But no! All the bias, prejudice and criticism in the world are levelled against the poor menial worker, but the Government turns its blind eye to people of its own ilk. Recently we had a strike by milk retailers. There was to be some strong, serious and resolute action taken in that case. An assurance was given by the Honorary Minister for Agriculture

that preparations had been made and everything was in readiness to institute an emergency supply of milk. There was the threat of strike, and the day before it occurred, or thereabouts, the Minister hopped on a plane and disappeared over East. So much for him.

The Minister for Railways: That is a rotten thing to say!

Mr. GRAHAM: That is what he did.

The Minister for Railways: That is what we would expect from you.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is a statement of fact. Subsequent events revealed that full and adequate preparations had not been made. The Premier was still in the State, but he shrugged his shoulders and said, "The matter is not in my hands."

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: He washed his hands of the whole affair.

Mr. GRAHAM: He said, "There is the Milk Act, and the matter is in the hands of another authority." I suppose he has never heard of the Arbitration Court in regard to other disputes. He has endeavoured to get the Prime Minister, Mr. Chifley, to take the big stick and lay about the workers with it. But when some of the big boys in the community, his own kith and kin, hold the people to ransom, he shrugs his shoulders and disclaims responsibility.

The Premier: I told them to go to the tribunal set up by this Parliament to deal with the matter.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is precisely what Mr. Chifley has been saying, namely, that arbitration courts have been set up to deal with industrial troubles. The Premier, over the air and in pamphlets and so on, has derided the Prime Minister and suggested he should do something else—in other words, interfere with the prerogatives of the Arbitration Court.

The Premier: I have never suggested that.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Westralian Farmers Ltd. had a lot to do with the strike.

The Minister for Lands: That does not make it right.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is time we had some honest and straight talking in regard to these things. It is all very well, verbally and otherwise, to assail the workers and then totally ignore the bigger interests in the community when they refuse to conform

to the law. We had another example of this sort of thing in our own Parliament during last session when a tribunal, constituted by the authority of the Government, over the signature of the Governor, was appointed to hear evidence and determine the amount to be paid as an allowance to members of Parliament. Owing to pressure and action by Liberal Party and Country and Democratic League members of the Legislative Council some other arrangements had to be made.

Mr. Nimmo: You were very disappointed.

Mr. GRAHAM: That illustrates quite clearly that the old chaps in the Legislative Council talk with their tongues in their cheeks about the sanctity of determinations made by independent tribunals when, at the very first test, they refuse to abide by a decision properly arrived at. When one seeks to discuss Liberal Party and Country and Democratic League supporters of the Government one finds their hypocrisy knows no limits. They pretended to us that they were members of Parliament just as we are, and were entitled to the same consideration. It was not my place to argue that point because there was an independent tribunal to assess the amount. I searched the records and made some calculations, and I found that during the last session of Parliament the Legislative Assembly sat for a total of 297 hours 38 minutes, and the Legislative Council for only 113 hours 56 minutes.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Too long!

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, it is possible to do a great deal of damage in a very short time. I realise that attendance here is only one phase of a Parliamentarian's work. In addition, there is contact with the electors and many public duties to be attended to. Next Saturday it will be five years since I was elected a member of Parliament. During that time I have been in personal contact with hundreds of my electors and have attended functions ranging from the annual meetings of social and sporting bodies to the inauguration of parents and citizens' associations, kindergartens and other organisations of practically every conceivable kind. Yet, during the whole of the five years, at not one single function have I seen any of the three Legislative Councillors who represent the area of East Perth. I venture to say that

not one elector in a hundred, if confronted with the question tomorrow, could tell us even the names of his Legislative Councillors. Those are the people who, at the first test, repudiated the determination of an independent tribunal, and in the very next breath turned around and started lecturing the working classes as to their obligations. It all reeks of insincerity and hypocrisy.

If we seek our Legislative Councillors during the day, where do we find them? One is performing in an office in St. George's Terrace; another is managing his business; another is secretary of some business concern. The great majority—I am speaking now of the anti-Labour members because the Labour members of Parliament, with very few exceptions, depend entirely on their Parliamentary allowances for a living—of these people use their position in Parliament for the purpose of protecting the particular interests with which they are associated. They spend practically all day in their private businesses and scarcely go amongst their electors. In addition, they sit very few hours in Parliament, and the whole of their work is destructive and negative. The Government, to which they subscribe and which the people endorsed at the elections, put forward certain proposals such as the broadening of the franchise of the Legislative Council, but the members of the Government parties at the other end of the building entirely ignore the pledges made to the people by their leaders. Why? Because they are not responsible to the electors of Western Australia. They know perfectly well that they can say or do what they like and they will still be returned by the bricks and mortar and the broad acres which send them to this State Parliament.

So we arrive at the position where no party leader, whether he be Labour, Liberal or Country and Democratic League, can honestly submit a programme to the people of Western Australia, because, irrespective of what the majority might be at the poll, there is an institution associated with this Parliament that is not responsible to the people but is unresponsive to the desires of the people, and it can excise every single word and clause from whatever Bills it desires. I hope the members of the Legislative Council—

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: The honourable members.

Mr. GRAHAM: Honourable, so we say as a matter of form. When I say that, I am not reflecting on them personally at all, but purely in a political sense.

Mr. Yates: Do you count your own in that? Do you include them all?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am talking of the members of the Legislative Council who are adherents, allegedly, of the Liberal Party and the Country and Democratic League. We have not half a dozen Labour parties in Australia. There is the Federal and State platform to which every member subscribes. The penalty for any who defy that platform is expulsion from the party. But Liberal Party members can put forward what propositions they like to the people, and it matters nothing, because they can later oppose them without any bother whatsoever. I hope we will not have an exhibition of dictatorial tactics beyond what we have experienced over the years, and such as were witnessed in Victoria and Tasmania. I say quite sincerely that to my mind those two episodes were the most shocking examples of autocracy that Australia has produced since responsible government.

The Attorney General: The people of those States did not think so.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would expect the Attorney General to make an interjection such as that, knowing him as I do. If certain propositions had been submitted to the people of Germany there is no doubt that the majority would have voted in support of Hitler.

Mr. Grayden: You do not believe in rule by the majority.

Mr. GRAHAM: I believe in the constitution of a country and the rights of democracy. I do not believe in the right of individuals, who are not responsible to the people, to terminate the period of office of any Government, whether it be a Liberal Government, a Labour Government or one of any other political complexion. It was a most dishonest and diabolical trick that was played on the people in the East, and only those trained to represent the interests they do, would act so contrary to the concepts of democracy as to perpetrate that particular deed. I hope there will be no recurrence, but I am afraid there is in Western Australia and in the Common-

wealth, evidence of that sort of thing. We have the spectacle of municipal councils embarking on heresy hunts so far as political organisations are concerned. I addressed some questions to the Minister for Education regarding the National Fitness Council. I say it will be a sorry day when such matters as the constitution of sporting bodies, or the right to hold meetings, are to be determined on party political grounds, or any other grounds extraneous to the real issue.

The Minister for Housing: They were banned from the Labour Day march.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is only natural that when a political party has an assembly, members of other parties should be excluded. If Labourites sought to attend a Liberal Party conference, they would be excluded, and rightly so.

Hon. A. H. Panton: They are admitted by ticket only.

Mr. GRAHAM: Where there is an organisation comprised of 30 youth bodies, and one of them is Communist—and I have no doubt about it, although I have no proof—I consider it is wrong that, the National Fitness Council should take political questions into consideration.

The Attorney General: I suppose you say the same thing about Malaya now.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am concerned about what is happening in my own country of Australia, with particular reference to Western Australia. If it is possible for this movement to do some damage, I say that the others ought to be ashamed of themselves, especially when it is realised that there are 30 of them.

The Minister for Education: The question was not in regard to politics but in regard to belief in God and loyalty to His Majesty.

Mr. GRAHAM: It was with regard to politics and because the move was unsuccessful the council has sought to have some amendments made to the constitution with a view to securing the same object.

The Minister for Education: When you asked me the question, there was no mention of amendments to the constitution.

Mr. GRAHAM: No, but there was an intimation in the Press that this particular course of action was to be pursued.

The Minister for Education: We do not propose to take from them the right to make their own decisions. Do you?

Mr. GRAHAM: I wish to conclude my remarks, but I would stress that we have to be extremely careful about this upsurge of the extreme Right and ultra-Conservatism which is becoming a menace to Australia. Apparently there are no limits to the lengths to which they will go. The sums of money and resources at their disposal apparently have no limits. If we can assume that what we see and hear is correct, the expenditure in Western Australia must be far in excess of £200 per week, and that sum of money comes from certain sources, and it is diabolical propaganda and wicked in the extreme. When we remember the sources that financed Adolph Hitler and persons of that type into power, and when we see the rabid Conservatism in Australia, and what it is doing and seeking to do, then it is appropriate that there should be a warning, just as we should be careful of the extreme Left. We do not want Communists or Communistic ideals, neither do we want Fascist or any other type of ideals of the extreme Right, but as we are proceeding, and as the powers of finance and propaganda are apparently increasing, I say it is time that we took stock of the situation.

I was interested on Sunday morning last to hear a review over the air of Mr. McMahon Ball's latest book dealing with Japan. He stated that America's policy is to build up an extreme Right Wing organisation with tremendous power and influenced by capitalistic groups confined to a few people, the idea being to make Japan a bulwark against Communistic Russia. Mr. Ball is of opinion that by the time we reach the nineteen-fifties, we in Australia will be confronted with a situation very similar to that which confronted us in the nineteen-thirties. I say that, whilst we can be strong, determined and definite with regard to Communists and the like, we also have to be particularly vigilant in connection with doctrines of the extreme Right. It is easy and cheap for one or two members on the Government side to make jibes at certain members on this side of the House and state that they are perhaps painted with a crimson hue, but I sat as chairman of the Perth Trades Hall for four years, and during that time it was my duty—and I performed it—to expel certain per-

sons who were found to be members of the Communist Party. I do not think that such action has been taken by members of the Governmental parties.

During the last election, I was opposed by a Communist, who abused me up hill and down dale in an endeavour to unseat me from my electorate. However, this candidate lost his deposit, but I believe that the Communists are going to make another attempt at the next State elections. The next candidate will be just as welcome as the last one, and, I trust, will have the same results. In order to make the position perfectly clear, I think everybody knows just where the Labour Party stands with regard to Communists. I have issued a warning with regard to the trend in Australian politics at the present time, and the possible course to the extreme Right. It may be impossible or too late to stem the tide, and we will ultimately find that we are dominated by small cliques and groups, like the Legislative Council of Victoria and Tasmania, or perhaps even smaller. I do not want to see this state of affairs existing in our country, for it would mean the extinction of democracy.

On motion by Mr. Grayden, debate adjourned to a later stage of the sitting.

## **BILL—INCREASE OF RENT (WAR RESTRICTIONS) ACT AMENDMENT.**

*Leave to Introduce.*

**THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING** (Hon. R. R. McDonald—West Perth) [8.8]: I move—

That leave be given to introduce a Bill for an Act relating to the Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act Amendment Act, 1948.

**HON. J. B. SLEEMAN** (Fremantle) [8.9]: I do not consider that the Government should be given the right to introduce this Bill. I am not concerned about what the Government is prepared to do but I want to know what it is going to do before leave is given to introduce this measure. We have heard so many promises from the Government that we do not know where it stands. It has said that it does not want controls, but I want to make sure that we are going to get somewhere. I favour controls, although members of the present Government do not, and I want to be satisfied



that, after what they have told the people, this measure will be in conformity with the promises given. We have heard the statements of a number of members of this Parliament that they did not believe in controls. So how can we trust them and give way to them by giving the Government leave to introduce a Bill of this nature? If they had done the right thing they would have voted "Yes" at the referendum and given those who were able to do this job the necessary power to do it, instead of going round asking people to vote against the referendum and saying there was no need for permits and then in the next breath declaring they are necessary.

I want to know that we are getting somewhere if we give the Government leave to introduce this Bill. I stand for controls myself but the members of the Government do not stand for them, or they said they did not. From what members of the Government told the people many months ago I cannot think that the Bill will be in conformity with what it should be. They have said they do not believe in controls. Therefore, what right have we to give the Government liberty to introduce this Bill? The matter should have been left with the Commonwealth Labour Government, the people who really are able to do a job of that sort. Members opposite urged the defeat of the referendum and told the people that no controls were required and yet in the next breath they ask for leave to introduce the Bill, indicating that they now want to have control. The Honorary Minister sent out a Christmas card to the electors of Subiaco and this is how she started—

Cardell Oliver builds to serve.

The war is over—but Peace is not with us. In this vast land, abounding with untold wealth, we are facing serious problems and unrest. Houses are being built but slowly, many are still homeless. Rail and shipping transport is faulty and inadequate. Boards and controls still block the path to progress. Food is dug into the ground, thrown away or production restricted, whilst many children are undernourished.

Whom is she going to serve? Is she going to serve the poor classes of this country, or is she going to serve the rich people? Unless she has changed her mind, she will not vote for the introduction of this Bill. The other members of the Government also have claimed that they do not believe in control. I want to find out what they intend to embody in

this Bill before leave is given for its introduction. I do not think the leaders of the parties opposite are honest with the people. On the bottom of this Christmas card the Honorary Minister goes on to say—

We thank God that politically we are still free. A decision to retain understanding, able and honest leaders still rests with the people.

Members opposite went to the country and told the people that they wanted one thing and now they tell them that they want something else; therefore they are not being honest with the electors. Members opposite should have told the people what they thought in the first place and stuck to that. If they are opposed to controls, let them go on with the job now. Personally, I am in favour of controls, but I am not prepared to give this Government authority to introduce a Bill of this kind. I do not think the Government is sincere, nor do I think it is capable of doing the job it is setting out to do.

Question put and passed; leave given.

#### *First Reading.*

On motion by the Minister for Housing, Bill introduced and read a first time.

#### *Second Reading.*

**THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING** (Hon. R. R. McDonald—West Perth) [8.12] in moving the second reading said: Members will recollect the Increase in Rent (War Restrictions) Act of 1939 passed by this House. That Act can be divided into two parts. The first part dealt with the control of rents. Under the first part the rents of all premises were all fixed or frozen at the amount which was being paid on the 31st August, 1939 and, subject to exceptional cases which were prescribed by the Act of 1939, those rents remained the rents and still remain the rents of the houses which were let on that date—the 31st August, 1939. Another provision, which members will recollect, had application to premises which were let for the first time since the 31st August, 1939. Under the terms of the first part of the Act those premises could be the subject of a rental fixed by a court sitting as a Fair Rents Court, and by an amendment of 1947, as the Leader of the Opposition will recollect because he took a part in the framing of it, the power to fix the fair

rent in respect of premises which were let for the first time after the 31st August, 1939, was given a wider application.

The second part of the Act of 1939 referred to the obtaining possession of premises, or to use another phrase, ejectment of the tenant from the premises of which the tenant was in occupation. So the Act of 1939 contains those two parts; the first part being for the control of rents, and the second part being in relation to the repossession by the owner of premises which had been let. As regards the first part of the Act, dealing with the control of rents, that has been in application in this State ever since 1939 and has not been affected by Commonwealth regulations, although in a number of other States, Commonwealth regulations did take charge of the control of rents in the State concerned. However, in regard to the second part of our Act of 1939, relating to the repossession of premises, the Commonwealth, by its regulations, took over the legislation or legislative provisions as to the repossession of premises or the ejectment of tenants from those premises.

The Commonwealth acted by virtue of its defence powers under the Act which was known as the National Security Act. By regulations under that Act called "Landlord and Tenant Regulations," which applied in each State, the legal position with regard to the repossession of premises was determined and regulated. Later, in 1946, the Commonwealth regulations applying in this State with regard to repossession of premises, were carried forward from the National Security Act to an Act known as the Defence Transitional Provisions Act. Under that Act, legislative sanction was given to the continued operation of Commonwealth regulations regarding repossession of premises to the end of the current year. As a result of the referendum, the Commonwealth decided to relinquish control in respect of a number of things. One was in regard to landlord and tenant matters, another was the regulation of land sales, and another the regulation of prices. In this Bill, we are dealing with the landlord and tenant law which the Commonwealth decided to relinquish, regarding which its regulations will terminate on the 16th of this month.

It would have been desirable if the Commonwealth had not retired quite so precipi-

tately from the field of some of these regulations. I am sure it did not do so by the wish of State Parliaments, and I think the people generally, but while the States should resume control of the various matters there should have been a short period of time before the Commonwealth regulations or controls cease, to enable the necessary provisions to be made. However, the Commonwealth decided to retire from this field of landlord and tenant regulations, and I think it is desirable in this State that we should pass legislation to take over that aspect of landlord and tenant matters dealing with the repossession of premises which hitherto have been covered by Commonwealth regulations.

I said that in our Act of 1939, by what I call the second part, provision was made as to the repossession of premises in this State, but it did not operate because, when the Commonwealth, by regulation, decided to control the matter of repossession of premises, the provision of our own State Act became inoperative, for the simple reason that where there is legislation by the Commonwealth and by a State on the same matter, the Commonwealth legislation takes precedence over that of the State.

The Bill now before the House, although it may look a little technical, is really very simple in principle. It proposes to make applicable in this State the same law regarding the repossession of premises or ejectment of tenants as has been applying in this State under Commonwealth regulations. The idea is that there is sound reason for a continuity in the law regarding this matter and, therefore, at the present juncture, the wisest and the most sensible course is to carry on, under the authority of State legislation, the code of regulations that has been operating under Commonwealth control.

When in 1939 this Parliament, by the Increase of Rents (War Restrictions) Act of that year, made provision by Section 15 for recovery of possession of premises, the whole of that provision was contained in a single section and, as that section has not operated over all these years because it was superseded by Commonwealth regulations, naturally no step has been taken to amplify it in a way that I am sure would have been done if it had had application in this State. On the other hand, the Commonwealth regulations regarding repossession have been applying in the various

States since 1939-40 and, with the experience of some eight years of those regulations, they have been extended and amended in many respects until they form a fairly complete code in connection with matters of ejection or repossession of premises.

When those Commonwealth regulations have been extended or amended from time to time over the last eight years, it has been in the main for the purpose of protecting the reasonable rights of tenants, of safeguarding people who were in possession of premises and particularly houses and who, in the absence of those safeguards, might be placed in a position of very considerable difficulty if they were ejected from the premises and experienced the usual difficulty in finding other accommodation. I shall return to that point before I conclude my remarks, because I believe that members would like to be made aware very shortly of some of the features of the Commonwealth regulations for the protection of tenants that do not exist in Section 15 of our own Act.

If we did not, as we propose to do by this measure, make Commonwealth regulations applicable to this State, we would not be without legislative provision in respect of the ejection of tenants or the repossession of premises because we have Section 15 of our Act of 1939, but members who look at that section will realise that it is, I will say not a perfunctory but a very short section, which does not take into account very many of the factors in relation to ejection from premises that experience has shown should be taken into account if the fair position of tenants is to be recognised. Therefore, instead of allowing Commonwealth regulations which have applied here for the last eight years to lapse and then falling back on Section 15 of the Act of 1939, it has appeared to the Government to be fairer and more satisfactory to carry forward the regulations regarding repossession and ejection under which the people of the State have been working during those eight years.

Those regulations afford a code that has been developed by experience, and tenants, estate agents and various people who may be concerned in landlord and tenant business have come to know very largely just what those regulations say, and it is more satisfactory to allow this aspect of landlord and

tenant law to continue on a basis that the people have come to know, than to revert to the section in the 1939 Act under which there has been hardly any experience as to its operation.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: There is another section of the 1939 statute before Section 15. Will you explain the repeal of Subsection (3) of Section 12A?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I take it the Leader of the Opposition is referring to the new Section 12A which was inserted by the amending Act of last year.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That is so. This Bill proposes to repeal Subsection (3) of Section 12A.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: That subsection refers to the right of a rent inspector to enter upon and inspect premises, and by the terms of the amendments which are now before the House, the right of the rent inspector to enter on and inspect premises has been inserted in the terms in which it appears in the Commonwealth regulations.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I think Section 12A refers to the standard or fair rent.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: It does. It refers to the standard rent; but in one of the amendments contained in the Bill the rights of the rent inspector are declared in enlarged terms, and because they are so declared, that particular subsection, I think, is no longer necessary, as we have amplified, by the Bill now before the House, the powers of the rent inspector to enable him to carry out his duties both in respect of fixation of rent and any other matters which may come under his jurisdiction in relation to repossession of premises. What the Bill therefore proposes to do is to continue the operation of the law relating to repossession or ejection which has been in operation under the Commonwealth regulations. No alterations are proposed, apart from adaptations of a Commonwealth regulation to a State regulation. No alterations are proposed in the substance of that law.

Hon. E. Nulsen: The Courts would be in exactly the same position as they were under the Commonwealth regulations?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: Exactly. It is what I might call, for the sake of convenience at the present time, a walk-in, walk-out measure.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: Why is it proposed to exempt Crown instrumentalities?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I was coming to that point, because it is a question which I think might very reasonably be asked.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Is it not affected by the Crown Suits Act?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: No. Under the parent Act of 1939, by Section 19, it is provided that the Act shall not apply in relation to any lease granted by the Crown or by any Crown instrumentality. That has always been so since the parent Act was passed in 1939. The Act does not apply to any lease granted by the Crown or by a Crown instrumentality. That has been somewhat amplified in the Bill and it is a matter on which the House can, of course, make any provision which it may think fit.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Did you say the Crown Suits Act did not affect that?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I do not think so.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Refer to Section 7 of the Crown Suits Act. Other instrumentalities are not exempted.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: My attention has not been drawn to that.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: It is not enough that you should not think so; you should be sure.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I am reasonably sure, but my attention was not drawn to this particular matter. What we have done is to carry forward, in the case of the Crown, part of the original Section 19 inserted in the parent Act. I wish particularly to draw the attention of the House to this point, because it can pronounce its own will on it. When it comes to the McNess Housing Trust, I am suggesting here that it should not be bound by the terms of the Act, because it is a trust that is under the direction of the Crown and administered by two independent trustees. The peculiar position which has arisen and which I intended to deal with at a subsequent time in connection with other legislation, is that the trustees of the McNess homes have been advised that under Commonwealth regulations, as drawn, they were not able to get repossession of their homes, unless there were certain specified cases or

grounds as set out in the regulations. The result is that a number of those homes which were meant by the Government, and by the terms of the original trust, to be occupied by people with small means, such as widows, are now in the occupation of families with a total income up to £12 and £15 a week.

I have the figures—not with me—but this means that whereas people went into possession perhaps 10, 12 or 15 years ago in very poor circumstances and were very proper tenants of homes of that kind, they have, as their children grew up, improved their financial position until the family incomes have in some cases reached very large figures. While some of these tenants have been good enough to vacate the houses, recognising the position, others have not been willing to do so. Therefore, people who really should be in those houses, such as widows and invalid persons with small means, cannot get into occupation because the trust has been advised that it has no power to repossess the houses on the ground that they are at present occupied by people who are not the class of people the trust houses were meant to receive. I have therefore suggested in this Bill that it might be left to the good judgment and fairness of this independent body of trustees of the McNess Housing Trust to exercise their discretion as to whether they should retake the homes because the tenants are not the class of people which the trust was meant to house.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Would that mean an amendment to the McNess Housing Trust Act?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I think this Bill would be effective; but, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition, an amendment will be necessary, in my opinion, to the McNess Housing Trust Act for a variety of reasons. One of these, if I may be allowed to mention it in order to make my position clear, is that by the existing Act it is not possible to charge more than 5s. a week rent; and, with the increased cost of houses, it is possible in that case, in a comparatively short time, that the capital of the trust will be exhausted. So I shall ask the indulgence of the House at a later stage to consider that position and assist me with any amendments it might think desirable.

But the trustees have been alarmed and concerned at the fact that some of the houses are occupied by persons with large incomes and that is the reason why this provision has been inserted in the Bill.

The principle of the Bill is this: By force of the Bill, when it becomes an Act, the existing Commonwealth regulations as to ejectment and repossession will apply in this State as if they were State regulations. But the Act goes on to say—in fact, the original Act by Section 18 so provides—that the Government may make regulations for the purposes of the Act, and the intention of this measure, read in conjunction with the parent Act, is that regulations shall be brought in without delay and tabled in the ordinary way, and these regulations will be in the same terms as the existing Commonwealth regulations with such adaptations as are needed to give them a State application instead of a Commonwealth application. I have here an advance pull of 15 copies of the regulations which it is intended shall be made regulations under this Act.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: They are identical with the present Commonwealth ones?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: They are the same as the existing Commonwealth regulations, with the adaptations needed to make them applicable to State conditions.

Mr. Hegney: Could you arrange for all members to have copies?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I have 15 here and I will get more tomorrow and will be glad to give members copies. These are pulls in advance of the regulations proposed to be issued.

Mr. Marshall: Those regulations were amended by the Commonwealth Government on two or three occasions.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: On many occasions.

Mr. Marshall: Are those the latest?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: Yes, they are the regulations that apply today. In this Bill we are following the system which the Commonwealth adopted and has exercised during the time it has controlled this aspect of landlord and tenant law. The Commonwealth realised that in relation to a matter like ejectment or repossession, variations of the provisions would be needed

from time to time to meet conditions as they might from time to time exist. Therefore, in a matter of that kind, the control could be most suitably and flexibly exercised by means of regulations and, as those regulations were to be laid on the Table of the House, if any amendments were made, it would be within the power of members of Parliament if they were not in accord with any amended regulation to move in the usual way for its disallowance. There are people who think—and no doubt some members of this Parliament think—that the time has come when there should be some modification of these Commonwealth regulations to meet certain cases.

One case that occurs to my mind—perhaps one of the most frequently raised—is that the owner of a house should be allowed rather more opportunity to get back his house for his own occupation than he has under existing regulations. As we have to act in relation to the transition of certain Commonwealth controls to the State Parliament without delay—and in this case we have to act very promptly—we thought it not desirable to start at this stage suggesting amendments to the regulations that have been operating in this State under Commonwealth control, because that is a matter to which members would need to give some consideration. Therefore we have thought it wise by this Bill to effect the transition stage in the simplest and fairest way by just providing for the re-promulgation of the existing Commonwealth regulations as State regulations, leaving it to a later stage—very possibly in this sitting—for consideration to be given to any amendments which might be thought to be desirable and equitable.

Hon. A. H. Panton: You mean this session, not this sitting.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: It could be done this session. The regulations which we will take over and carry on from Federal control to State control will be regulations under which we are operating today. At the Committee stage, when members have had an opportunity to look at the Bill, I shall be glad to deal with any matter on which I may be able to afford any further information; but I might just make one or two further references. This Bill and the

promulgation as State regulations of the existing Commonwealth regulations regarding ejectments will not affect the special protection which is given to ex-Servicemen. That special protection to ex-Servicemen as tenants has been enjoyed by them under the Commonwealth War Service Moratorium Regulations. It still exists and is not affected in any way by the measure now before the House; because when it comes to the special protection which has been given and is being given to returned Servicemen, that is exercise of the defence power which the Commonwealth undoubtedly retains and which it intends to retain, as was expressed in a statement by Senator McKenna in today's Press.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: So even if it acted harshly you could not interfere.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: No. The rights of ex-Servicemen are not in any way affected by this measure as regards their occupation of premises.

Mr. Smith: Have the British ex-Servicemen protection?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I think the member for Northam would say that I should be able to answer that; but, in fact, I cannot. The member for Leederville might be able to do so.

Hon. A. H. Panton: I do not think they have.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I do not think they have. From my recollection, the protection is confined to Australian ex-Service people.

Mr. Fox: Yes; and the returned soldiers' lawyers appear against British soldiers in the courts.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: Yes; I do not think unfairly. With regard to all Servicemen there is a certain natural feeling that their rights should be reasonably protected.

Mr. Marshall: What is the duration of the Commonwealth law that protects returned soldiers?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: That law was to expire about August of this year, if I remember rightly, but was extended by the Commonwealth—I think for a further year. Senator McKenna has now stated

that he is bringing in a new measure with regard to the prolongation of the protection to ex-Servicemen. How long he will propose I do not know, but I should say it would probably be for the better part of a year at least. This Bill is also a continuance Bill. It provides for the continuation of this measure, as amended, until the 31st December, 1949. This Act has always been an annual Act and at present it is operative to the 31st December of this year. The measure provides that it shall continue for another year, until the 31st December, 1949. Parliament will have to consider, next year, whether it shall be again extended. I did propose to say a few words as to the additional protection which the Commonwealth regulations give to tenants, beyond that which would be given if we allowed those regulations to lapse, and the operation to start of Section 15 of our own Act. I do not want to detain the House, but I will mention one or two.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: It is very important that you should tell us as much as possible.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I think it is important. One of the safeguards of the rights of tenants which is in the Commonwealth regulations that we propose to adopt but not in Section 15 of our 1939 Act, is that every tenant is assured of reasonable notice to quit, even if he has to get out. If he has been there for only a short time, the notice may be seven days, but if he has been there for five or ten years, he would get much longer notice. The length would be commensurate with the time he has been in occupation. That is a fair and necessary provision. Moreover, under the Commonwealth regulations, if a house is sold by the owner he cannot turn the tenant out until six months afterwards. That is to say, if an owner likes to be a rentier and take rent, he cannot, by selling his house, throw the tenant on to the house market with, perhaps, 14 days' or a month's notice.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Are you speaking of the old owner or the new tenant?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: The new purchaser cannot do so. He must allow the tenant six months in which to turn around.

Hon. A. H. Panton: It is a bit of a gag to sell a house.

Mr. Fox: You sell a house and then get an eviction order. It usually takes nine or ten months to get it.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: Even so, the new owner would have to show the court that he was reasonably entitled to the use of the house for his own occupation. In addition, the Commonwealth regulations we propose to adopt are very comprehensive, in directing the court as to what factors are to be taken into account in determining whether there shall be an eviction order or not. That is to say, the hardship of the tenant as opposed to the hardship of the owner who is seeking possession must be considered. Further, if an owner under the Commonwealth regulations should get possession of a house, on the ground that he desires to occupy it himself, he cannot then turn round and let it. He is not allowed to let it for 12 months. That is a pretty good guarantee that people will not get possession on that pretext and then, having got the tenant out, use the house for rental purposes. That confers on the tenant some reasonable degree of protection.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: That would take some policing.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I do not know. The dispossessed tenant is usually pretty active in reporting if the landlord has abused the grounds on which he obtained possession.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Have you had a chance of making sure of the position under the Crown Suits Act?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I will examine that aspect and make sure of it. Under the Commonwealth regulations, if a tenant, who is a husband and father, dies, the widow and children are able to continue as tenants in the same way as the breadwinner was. That is a protection of some value which is carried forward, and which we do not find in the 1939 Act.

Hon. A. H. Panton: The courts are generally a bit with the occupier in my experience.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I think the hon. member is right. It has been suggested that the existing regulations are too much loaded in favour of the tenant. The time has come when the owner who seeks to get possession of his house might be given

a little more protection. But I do not propose to embark on that question tonight. If we made any amendments on that score, they would need very careful consideration to ensure that equity was preserved between the two sides.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: Has the Minister explained the reason for repealing Section 19, which is Clause 9 of the Bill?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: It has been carried forward into an earlier clause that I referred to when speaking of the Act not binding the Crown. It has been carried forward to a different clause, and therefore we would have duplication if we did not repeal Section 19. The last difference in the regulations to which I shall refer—and there are many, as members will realise—is one very useful provision by which if a person desires to let his house for a short time—up to six months, perhaps he is going on a holiday—he can approach the rent inspector, explain the circumstances and get a certificate under the hand of the Minister that the regulations shall not apply. Many people would not leave their home or let it to a tenant for a short period because of the difficulty of regaining possession. This proposal will allow a person who lets his house, in the circumstances I have mentioned, to get it back again at the end of the period without going through various formulae and difficulties which the regulations contain in relation to recovery of possession.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Bill seems to give Parliament an opportunity of looking to the generous treatment we gave last year to the owners of hotels.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: That is continued. Under the Commonwealth provisions, hotels have never been the subject of these repossession or ejection regulations. The Commonwealth, throughout the eight years, has considered that hotel-keepers could look after themselves. So it never applied its rights regarding ejection or repossession to them. If we had not amended the law last year, that amendment would have come in now automatically by adoption of the Commonwealth regulations. As it is, we have carried forward into the Act the same protection or safeguard regarding tenancies which was inserted in the amendment passed by this House last year, to ensure that the tenants

of hotels should not be unfairly treated, as regards reasonable notice to give up their premises on the expiration of their leases. That is the purpose of the measure. It is to make immediately applicable as State regulations the law which now applies as Commonwealth regulations regarding re-possession and ejection. The State regulations will then be adapted in order to preserve the proper form applicable to regulations of this State, instead of regulations of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Marshall: How long do you think you will be obliged to rest upon the Commonwealth regulations?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: The Commonwealth regulations expire on the 16th of this month, and it is desired to pass this measure so that as soon as the Commonwealth regulations expire, with the Lieut.-Governor's assent, the Commonwealth regulations automatically become State regulations.

Mr. Marshall: But how long do you propose to rest upon the Commonwealth regulations?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I think it will be two or three weeks between the expiration of the Commonwealth regulations and the adoption of these regulations. They are the same as the Commonwealth regulations with the verbal alterations required to conform to State conditions, because we do not want to carry forward unnecessary verbiage which is referable to the whole Commonwealth.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: It might be much safer to carry them on that way.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I think it is better to promulgate them with the necessary verbal alterations.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Then the Legislative Council immediately has the opportunity of disallowing any one or all of them.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: This House has the same opportunity.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: But this is a democratic House.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: This House thinks it is democratic, as does every other House. I think the measure is one which is best fitted to meet the necessity of an immediate transition of control from Commonwealth to State.

Mr. Hegney: Do you know whether the other States are adopting the same policy?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: In Victoria they are adopting Commonwealth powers or existing Commonwealth law as applicable to that State. I cannot speak for the other States, but I think in the majority of cases they will be effecting a transition in much the same way as we are doing. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. F. J. S. Wise, debate adjourned.

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

*Eighth Day.*

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR. GRAYDEN (Middle Swan) [9.4]: During the present session we have heard numerous speeches from members opposite on the question of State finances. These members have striven to paint as doleful a picture as they possibly could and the Leader of the Opposition, supported by the Deputy Leader, went on to criticise the Government for the handling of its finances. Their criticism is all very well, but they must realise that rising costs, the shorter working week and other factors have been to a large extent responsible for the present financial position. It is not possible for this State Government alone to check all rising costs, as these are the inevitable continuation of the spiral set in motion by the Commonwealth Labour Government with the support of members opposite.

Hon. A. H. Panton: That is Tommy-rot.

Mr. GRAYDEN: There is another item to consider, an item which looms very large indeed. When one Government takes over from another which has neglected its obligations and its responsibilities for many years, the new Government finds itself in the difficult position of having to make up the leeway. That is exactly what has happened in this instance.

Mr. Kelly: Was that a dream?

Mr. GRAYDEN: This Government has had to make up for what previous Governments have failed to do. It has fallen to the lot of the Government to face up realistically to the drift that has taken place in this State over many years, and put the fin-



ances of the State in order. It is a matter of tremendous importance, too, when one considers the consequences to this State of the drift which has taken place. If members would deny that such a drift has taken place, they have only to refer to the report of the Royal Commission on Railways. It can be seen from the report that this great public utility has been allowed to drift into such a state of disrepair, that it has systematically and increasingly weakened the financial position of this State. It is a position which should never have been allowed to develop, but at the same time it is a position for which the previous Government and those of its ilk before it must accept full responsibility.

Hon. A. H. Panton: A few outside the previous Government's ilk, too.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Yes, but the members opposite must remember that Labour Governments have been in office in this State for the last 14 years.

Hon. A. H. Panton: The drift started before then.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The drift started over the last 14 years. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, when speaking on the financial position, criticised Government expenditure, but when pressed to give one single item concerning which he felt that expenditure could be cut down, he could not do so.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: He certainly did. He gave the item of Royal Commissions.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The member for Northam gave one instance. I waited expectantly for him to point out one instance, and he later gave, as he says, the item of Royal Commissions. The total expenditure on Royal Commissions is but a drop in the ocean compared with the total expenditure of this State, but apparently that was the only item of which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition could disapprove. It is small wonder that members opposite disapprove of Royal Commissions and that they disapprove of commissions which have recently been appointed, because we need only take the Railway Royal Commission. The Commissioners' report was a scathing indictment of the previous Government, and particularly of its mismanagement of the State finances. Incidentally, the report also exploded the myth that the Labour members

necessarily make any sincere efforts to better the lot of the men and women working in this country when they attain office. From the Railway Royal Commission's report it would appear, very justifiably, that in a great many cases when Labour members have attained office they have done so on the hard-earned shillings of the working men and women.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Where did you hear that?

Mr. GRAYDEN: And having attained office they simply continue in the capacity of parasites on the working men and women.

Mr. Hoar: How do you know?

Mr. GRAYDEN: Have a glance at the Royal Commissioners' report on the railways with reference to the conditions at the Midland Junction workshops. I have an extract here—

Hon. A. H. Panton: We have a few extracts of what you said, too.

Mr. GRAYDEN: At page 298, paragraph 10, of the report the Royal Commissioner said—

We cannot too strongly emphasise the importance of maintaining harmonious relations between staff and management and of giving due and proper attention to their health and general welfare. Inspection showed an almost callous disregard for the most elementary human requirements and we feel that some of the conditions under which the staff was found to work and live are so bad that action should have been taken ere now to effect improvements.

Now, when members opposite are faced with such damning indictments of themselves as is contained in this report I feel it is perhaps fortunate that they had such vivid imaginations, inasmuch as their imaginations must surely help them to console themselves when they are faced with what little their Government succeeded in doing as against what the present Government has done in the comparatively short period of the 15 months it has been in office.

Hon. A. H. Panton: I think you will get a couple of stripes out of this.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The member for North-East Fremantle made some criticism concerning the North Inglewood School. He wanted to know why the present Government had not effected extensions there, as

he had heard or read that some young children starting school were being temporarily accommodated in a building other than a school building. He wanted to know why this Government had not effected extensions, although Governments of his party had been in office for 14 years and had not done so. By interjection I was able to tell the member for North-East Fremantle that something had been done; that extensive extensions had been commenced and one room will be ready within a couple of weeks. The other two rooms should be ready not very long afterwards. So the member for North-East Fremantle was misinformed on that point. We do not have to stop at the North Inglewood school if we are going to touch on the school position in Middle Swan. The £8,700 being spent on that particular school by this Government is by no means an isolated instance in Middle Swan.

I can refer the member for North-East Fremantle to Morley Park where we are going to have a school on a completely different site, and to the Eden Hill school where extensive extensions are well advanced which will cost £4,425. Those extensions were approved and commenced by this Government. In the Middle Swan electorate again, the Rivervale school extensions are already in progress and the cost will be £7,840.

Mr. Yates: That must have been neglected in the past.

Mr. GRAYDEN: It was. I point to these improvements to schools in Middle Swan alone simply to establish the lengths to which members opposite will go in order to discredit this Government. The other day we had a member of the Opposition endeavouring to convey to the people of this State that children were commencing school at North Inglewood other than in a school building. The inference was that the Government was doing nothing towards improving and extending school accommodation. What did the previous Government do in the way of extending school accommodation in the Middle Swan electorate? It authorised additions to one school but it remained for this Government to carry out the extensions. The school to which I refer is Bayswater. However, those extensions were only authorised during the last election campaign and it then remained for this

Government to make the extensions. So we have in this one aspect alone an illustration of just what the Government is doing and has done against what the previous Government failed to do.

Hon. A. H. Panton: You will be making your other colleagues jealous if you are not careful.

Mr. GRAYDEN: We see very clearly the results of what the previous Government failed to do in its obligations to the State. The progress that has been made in the establishment of schools alone is a tribute indeed to the Minister for Education and to the Government. If members opposite will not agree that it is a tribute then we can only conclude that they did not favour the assistance which is being given to education, and I think they have already made it clear from their speeches on the financial position of the State that they do not favour this assistance.

Mr. Kelly: You will be promoted to "Billy boy" yet.

Mr. GRAYDEN: There is another small matter I wish to mention before I proceed to other items.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: What about the Murdoch commission?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I will get on to that later, too. Members opposite have had a great deal to say on the question of housing. They have been endeavouring, naturally without success, to minimise the strides which have been made in this sphere since the present Government took office.

Mr. Graham: You have been apologising all the time.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The facts are that considerable progress has been made in spite of the fact that a 40-hour week has been introduced during the life of this Government.

Hon. A. H. Panton: I like that! How much money did you spend trying to stop it?

Mr. GRAYDEN: It is quite understandable that the Opposition should endeavour to discount the efforts of this Government in respect to housing. I think we can measure our progress in this connection by the extent to which the members opposite are seeking to minimise it. It is obvious that

they are perturbed indeed at having shaped so poorly in the matter.

Mr. Kelly: Has your Government done any better?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I say it has done 100 per cent. better. It must be particularly disconcerting to members opposite to find the present Government embarking upon schemes to provide a greater number of homes particularly for two and three-unit families when they realise, as everybody does, that they themselves did nothing at all to cater for such families, except to make a five per cent. allocation available. Is it any wonder, in view of the fact that they were completely incapable of initiating any schemes at all to give relief to two and three-unit families, that they should bitterly resent the progress being made by the present Government? The attitude of members opposite to the matter of housing two and three-unit families may be gauged from the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, the then Premier, prior to the last election. In his Policy speech he said—

Although earlier it was necessary to refuse permits to families without dependants, this restriction has now been relaxed and an increasing number of cases will be approved where only two persons are to be housed.

Hon. A. H. Panton: And that has been cancelled ever since.

Mr. GRAYDEN: That was all the previous Government had to offer. It would appear that what one would expect to be the fertile minds of the Opposition were singularly barren on the question of providing homes for two and three-unit families, but they are not barren in criticising this Government for doing something which they themselves failed to do and not only failed to do but had no intention of doing.

Mr. Kelly: Give us some facts on what is being done now.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Have you had any one and two-unit families housed in Middle Swan?

Mr. GRAYDEN: There have been dozens of cases. The present Government has already increased the allocation from 5 per cent., as it was under the previous Government to, I believe, 35 per cent.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: From none to none.

Mr. GRAYDEN: In addition, and more important still, it has embarked upon several schemes with the sole object of providing for the needs of those two and three-unit families. Members opposite, however, are now striving to aggravate the plight of two and three-unit families. They know they had nothing to offer such families and they know full well, too, that every family settled in the type of home especially provided by this Government is a further indictment of themselves.

During the first session of this Parliament, we listened with great surprise to the speeches of members opposite. We were surprised because the underlying theme of those speeches was a general wail against the defeat which they had suffered at the election. Not only were we surprised; the people also were surprised—

Hon. A. H. Panton: Surprised at your defeating us.

Mr. GRAYDEN. No, surprised at members opposite taking defeat with such poor sportsmanship. Nothing much was said about their wails because it was realised that defeat is very bitter indeed to them. However, it was with astonishment that we found at the opening of this session that members opposite, far from regretting the poor sportsmanship they had shown, again branched out and forced us to listen to their wails.

Hon. A. H. Panton: You are not forced to listen. You may walk out of the Chamber.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I do not object to their wailing. There is no need for me or anyone else to do so. It speaks for itself and conveys far more than could any words of mine. The people realise that this display was the measure of bitterness with which the members opposite took their defeat. I express my astonishment at the hypocrisy of members opposite—the hypocrisy in which they have clothed themselves to mask the inadequacy with which they are acquitting themselves as an Opposition. Incapable of constructively criticising, they have assumed this mantle of hypocrisy to mask their shortcomings as an Opposition. With this hypocrisy in which they are steeped, members opposite have charged this Government with obtaining office by misrepresentation.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Who said that?

Mr. Fox: You are even making the Premier smile.

Hon. A. H. Panton: And that takes some doing.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Members opposite have accused the Government of obtaining office by making lying statements, by wilful misrepresentation, wilfully misrepresenting the position, fraudulent statements, brazen effrontery, malicious lying, lying and malicious statements. Hour after hour, day after day, month after month, and now apparently year after year, members opposite are going to reiterate those statements.

Hon. A. H. Panton: If we did not, you would have nothing to talk about.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Such is the bitterness of defeat; such is the arrant hypocrisy of members opposite. The Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues have endeavoured to misrepresent the promises made by the Government party at the last election.

Mr. Fox: Did it not make those promises?

Mr. GRAYDEN: We shall see presently. The Leader of the Opposition has considerably changed his tune, the tune to which his henchmen danced and which he piped prior to the last election. It was not a question of promises before the last election; that has arisen only since the defeat of members opposite.

Mr. Triat: How long have you been a Liberal?

Mr. GRAYDEN: Members opposite would have had the people believe that this party was offering them nothing but what was already provided by themselves. Let me quote the actual words of the Leader of the Opposition. This extract is from a written statement supplied to "The West Australian"—and I take it written by the Leader of the Opposition himself—and published on the 14th March, 1947, one day before the election. Let us see what he had to say at that time about promises.

Mr. Triat: What did your own leader say?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I am pointing out the hypocrisy of members opposite. The Leader of the Opposition stated he was referring to the Policy speeches of the present Government. He said—

Their own Policy speeches contained little or nothing not already provided for in the Government's programme already in progress.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Quite right!

Mr. GRAYDEN: Yet now, in direct and flat contradiction of his words on that occasion, the Leader of the Opposition, and his colleagues, would have us believe that this Government obtained office by making rash promises. Such is their arrant hypocrisy!

Mr. Hegney: Are you an independent, or are you a hypocrite now?

Mr. GRAYDEN: It would appear to me that members of any organisation who could speak in the terms I have quoted would necessarily be paragons of virtue as regards misrepresentation. One would imagine that they would quail before any innuendo that they could be guilty of that with which they seek to accuse others. Quail before accusations of misrepresentation! On the contrary, elementary research reveals clearly that the means by which the members opposite obtained office and continued in office were fraudulent in the extreme. Hence the hypocrisy of their present charges.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Are you the same chap who stood as an Independent for Swan?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I am talking about the hypocrisy of members opposite.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Are you the same gentleman who stood for the Federal seat of Swan as an Independent?

Mr. GRAYDEN: So what?

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: As an Independent? Are you the same man?

Mr. GRAYDEN: What has that to do with it?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GRAYDEN: One would think members opposite had no independence in their party. I have a pamphlet here which was issued by members opposite, who are fond of quoting from pamphlets in this Chamber and analysing them. I have just one pamphlet. I shall not give the name of the gentleman who issued it, out of deference to his feelings, but I will tell the House by whom it was authorised.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: We have a pamphlet issued by a Mr. Grayden—issued when he stood as an Independent for the Swan seat.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The pamphlet was authorised by E. H. Gray, campaign director,

Trades Hall, and it was printed by "The Worker." The pamphlet proceeds in this strain: "Labour has given you...." Then follows a list of 34 items. They are, higher wages.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Correct.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Shorter hours.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Correct.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Social security.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Also correct.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Better workers' compensation.

Mr. May: Correct; don't miss any.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Easy access to arbitration.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Correct.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Cost of living index.

Opposition members: Correct.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Improved factory conditions.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Correct.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Workers' homes; assured water supplies.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Yes.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Transport co-ordination.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Correct.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Full employment; better schools and hospitals; many new industries.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Correct.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Mr. GRAYDEN: Profiteering prevention.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Yes.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Price-fixing.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Correct.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Public trust office; control of interest rates.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Correct.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Protection for mortgagors; good bread legislation.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Correct again.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Third party insurance; superannuation.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Correct.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Rental houses; materials control.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That is true.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Higher basic wage.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Right.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Pensions for coal-miners; regulation of dangerous trades; long-service leave; standard leave and holidays; promotions appeal board; extended electricity supplies; rent control; new award for nurses; a progressive health policy and last "Labour has given you every advance won for the workers."

Hon. A. H. Panton: Hear, hear! Name one out of that lot we did not introduce.

Mr. GRAYDEN: What malicious lies!

Hon. A. H. Panton: Be a man! Name one we did not introduce.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Take the first item in this pamphlet—higher wages. I want to know how the Labour Party could give higher wages. I want to know also whether all the statements which the Leader of the Opposition made against the present Government do not apply in this instance. "Labour has given you higher wages." That is a deliberate lie. The Arbitration Court is responsible for awarding higher wages.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Who constituted the Arbitration Court, you big mug?

Mr. GRAYDEN: In regard to the second item, shorter hours—

Hon. A. H. Panton: Who did that?

Mr. GRAYDEN: Again, not the Labour Party, but the Arbitration Court. Another deliberate lie!

Mr. Graham: Who opposed the 40-hour week?

Mr. GRAYDEN: Possibly the hon. member did.

Mr. Marshall: Sit down. You are making a bigger fool of yourself standing than by sitting down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Marshall: The hon. member does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I am endeavouring to establish the hypocrisy of members opposite and I think I am doing it successfully.

Hon. A. H. Panton: And I thought there were hopes for you!

Mr. GRAYDEN: Another item, workers' compensation.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Who did that?

Mr. GRAYDEN: What has Labour done in regard to workers' compensation?

Hon. A. H. Panton: Who introduced workers' compensation legislation?

Mr. GRAYDEN: After all the years that the Labour Party had been in office it remained for this Government to appoint a Royal Commission with a view to improving workers' compensation. Still another deliberate lie!

Hon. A. H. Panton: We did the job without Royal Commissions.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Another item, taken at random—improved factory conditions.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Who did that?

Mr. GRAYDEN: "Labour has given you improved factory conditions."

Hon. A. H. Panton: You have never worked in a factory.

Mr. GRAYDEN: What is the position as to factories in this State? Is there any more tragic, more obsolete, more unhygienic factory than the Midland Junction workshops, the factory that the previous Government was in control of for 14 years? Let me quote an extract from the Royal Commission's report—

Inspection showed an almost callous disregard of the most elementary human requirements, and we feel that some of the conditions under which the staff was found to work and live are so bad that action should have been taken ere now to effect improvements.

So much for better factory conditions which Labour has given to the workers of this State! Take another item, transport co-ordination. That is a deliberate and malicious lie. No attempt was made at transport co-ordination. A farcical position existed as regards both rail and road transport when the present Government assumed office, and yet members opposite claim transport co-ordination. "Better schools and hospitals." Need I point to the tragic state of the schools and hospitals in this State when this Government took over office? I need only point out how members opposite for many years endeavoured to win votes by misrepresenting the position with respect to the Royal Perth Hospital. They told the people that it would be completed in a month, but it remained for the present Government to complete it. Had the previous Government remained in power it would not have been completed yet. Take the

next item: "New award for nurses." That new award, brought in last May, was sponsored by the present Government, not the Labour Government. So that is another deliberate lie.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You are a proper clown!

Hon. A. H. Panton: I suppose we should have gone on with that job and left you chaps oversea without arms and ammunition.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Finally, there is the statement that Labour has given every advance won for the workers. What a lying, malicious statement!

Mr. Hegney: You do not know what you are talking about!

Mr. GRAYDEN: I challenge any member of the Opposition to disprove that. Is it conceivable that members opposite owe their seats to lying misrepresentations of this nature? Is it possible that they are so steeped in hypocrisy that they can level these charges against this Government? Every foul word used by the Leader of the Opposition and his henchmen can be applied with accuracy and with complete justification to the pamphlet I have quoted. The Leader of the Opposition used such terms as "lying statements," "wilful misrepresentations," "fraudulent statements," "brazen effrontery" and "malicious lies."

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: He proved his case; you are not doing that.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Each and every one of those foul terms can be applied with complete justification to the pamphlet I have quoted, and I challenge any member of the Opposition to disprove that. They cannot disprove it. Yet they are so steeped in hypocrisy that they continue making the charges I have mentioned. The Leader of the Opposition said of something that was published by the Liberal Party that it was known, and is known, to be a lie on the part of the gentleman who authorised it: To this last sentence in the pamphlet I have read—that Labour has given every advance won for the workers—cannot the words of the Leader of the Opposition be applied with complete justification: that it was known and is known to be a lie by the gentleman who authorised it? Of course it can, and none not being a member of the Opposition

steeped in hypocrisy, as members opposite are, would deny it! But I could go further. I could quote another statement of the Leader of the Opposition. He said that never before in the history of politics in Australia had there been an election advertisement so maliciously, so fraudulently given to the public as one that had been issued by the Liberal Party. That was his statement. But again, cannot it be applied with complete justification in regard to this pamphlet?

Hon. A. H. Panton: Why did you not tell that tale to the men when you were with your brother at Midland Junction?

Mr. GRAYDEN: What tale?

Hon. A. H. Panton: The tale you are putting over here now. It would have converted the workers.

Mr. GRAYDEN: It would, if they only knew it.

Hon. A. H. Panton: You do not tell me that you did not put it up to them?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I have another pamphlet here; I have not come with only one. This pamphlet is typical of the lying misrepresentations of the party to which members opposite belong. This pamphlet states this kind of thing. Let us see what the Leader of the Opposition has to say in connection with this extract—

The Federal Leader of the Liberal Party is Mr. Menzies. Before the war, he publicly praised Hitler, Mussolini and Tojo. As Attorney General in the Nationalist Government, he forced the workers against their will to ship war materials to Japan.

Mr. Bovell: Who said that?

Mr. GRAYDEN: The extract continues—

They were used by the Japs in China, Malaya, New Guinea and Darwin. This is a pamphlet from members opposite.

Mr. Graham: And perfectly true!

The Premier: It is not true! It is a downright lie, and you should be ashamed to mention it. Talk about malicious liars!

Mr. GRAYDEN: That is a malicious and deliberate lie. I want to know whether members opposite are going to deny it. I should imagine they will not because they know full well that at the time shipments of iron-ore were stopped by the U.A.P. Government, the Western Australian Government protested most bitterly. Just to make that point

clear, let me read the actual motion which was moved and carried in the Parliament in this State. This is the motion—

This Parliament of Western Australia emphatically protests against the embargo placed by the Commonwealth Government on the export of iron-ore from Australia, in view of its disastrous effects upon the development of the State. We consider that the information available does not warrant such drastic action, and we urge the Commonwealth Government to remove the embargo.

Here is part of the speech by the then Premier—

The purpose of the motion is to enable members of this Parliament to express their views on what the Government considers to be a most iniquitous abuse of power by the Commonwealth Government. The prohibition on the export of iron-ore from Australia has struck a terrible blow at the welfare of this State.

I do not propose to continue quoting speeches from this debate. I am referring to this pamphlet, and I simply say that members opposite go about this State making capital out of this sort of thing, out of these lying misrepresentations; but they themselves actually fought most bitterly to have the ban on these shipments to Japan lifted when it was applied by the Commonwealth Government.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: To England—to Brasserts, England.

Mr. GRAYDEN: To Japan.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: It was not to Japan!

Mr. GRAYDEN: It was to Japan. So much for the misrepresentation charges of members opposite. These baseless charges have served but one purpose. They have achieved but one end. They have simply outlined in stark reality the arrant hypocrisy of members opposite. I have always been under the impression that the Parliament of any State or of any country should set an example in every way to the community in general.

Mr. Hoar: What about starting?

Mr. GRAYDEN: Members of this House should be individuals of exemplary conduct. Our actions should provide to some extent an example to the country. It should not be a case of, "Do not do as I do; do as I say." I have always been under the impression that if one is fairly beaten, as were members opposite at the last election, one should accept that defeat in a

sportsmanlike way. Taking these things into consideration, it is no wonder that the people of Western Australia generally have witnessed with astonishment the way in which members opposite took their defeat at the last election. It has been a painful experience to witness the example being set by the Opposition in the State Parliament of Western Australia.

Mr. Hoar: I suppose that after the next election you will turn Independent.

Mr. GRAYDEN: We have been paid a visit recently by the Victorian interstate football team. Victoria, as members will know, is regarded to some extent as the home of football. Over there, they are tremendously proud of their game, as they should be. One consequently does not need very much imagination to realise how bitterly disappointed the Victorian team was at losing on both occasions on which they met the Western Australians. Having in mind the pique displayed by the Opposition on being defeated at the last elections, I looked with interest in the morning paper following both matches to see how Victoria accepted their defeat. I was pleasantly surprised to see that their captain, instead of making excuses and complaining, actually admitted that the better team had won. So I say, we can safely relax in Western Australia knowing that this element of wailing at defeat is not something which is insidiously creeping into the sporting world, but is merely confined to our Opposition. I trust that members opposite will take some heed—

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: We do.

Mr. GRAYDEN: —of the lesson given by the Victorian football team. I would like at this point to mention a few other matters before getting on to something more controversial. The first is in connection with the license fees required to be paid by persons who use wheel chairs as a means of conveyance. If they wish to ease their burden by installing a power unit, they have to pay a license fee. If a man owns a wheel chair he does not have to license it as is the case with a motorear or motoreycle, but if he installs a motor in the chair to spare himself the task of propelling it by hand, he must license it. If a motoreycle engine is used he must license the chair as a motoreycle. That is an astonishing state of affairs.

I know a crippled man who lives alone about a mile from the shopping centre of his district. To obtain provisions and for other reasons, he has in the past had to propel himself by hand, daily, over that distance. After much saving, he installed a motoreycle engine in his wheel chair, and now finds that he is, with his limited invalid pension, required to pay the same license as for a motoreycle—and a motoreycle, after all, is designed principally for pleasure and licensed accordingly. It is particularly difficult in these times for an invalid to live, let alone live adequately, without added imposts of this nature. I therefore earnestly ask the Government to give these people relief by not asking them to license their wheel chairs, or alternatively to refund the license money. There are very few in this State—perhaps not more than half-a-dozen. There are no clearcut provisions for the licensing of these chairs, as is evidenced by the fact that they are treated as motoreycles, so the matter should present very little difficulty to the Government.

The other small subject I wish to raise is this: Some days ago the member for South Fremantle made some mention of the origin of the Goldfields water scheme. I did not intend referring to it tonight, as it is impossible for me to deal with it adequately in a matter of minutes. I would, however, refer members to a four-column reply published in "The Kalgoorlie Miner" of the 30th June, 1948, to Professor Murdoch's report. That reply deals with the main points in the report. The member for South Fremantle suggested that in view of the report submitted by Professor Murdoch, I should apologise to the Historical Society for the statements I made last session. My grievance was not against the Historical Society, but the sub-committee of that society for the initial investigation, which was so much in error. In view of its statements, it is the one which ought to apologise to the public.

There are too many misrepresentations of fact in Professor Murdoch's report for me to reply adequately on this occasion. I hope, however, to do so at a later date. For the time being, may I say I have made a thorough investigation of the files on which the report is based, and can find no evidence whatever that Sir John Forrest had in his possession on the Fields a plan of the adopted scheme, as was alleged. When Sir John Forrest said at Kanowna he had no plan,



he was speaking with complete sincerity, and it is most unfair to suggest that he was not. Just before I leave this subject, I might mention another point, and that is that I find it hard to credit that the member for South Fremantle should have been asked to give evidence at this recent inquiry when, on his own admission, he had not gone fully into the matter, and also because a witness who, I think, would have been one of the first to be called, namely, a Mr. Faulkner, was not asked to give evidence. He is one of the two men still alive who were present at the actual banquet. He was not called, although I went to great pains to locate him, but the member for South Fremantle was, but he did not attend because he did not know anything about it.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: You are getting your geography a bit mixed.

Mr. Fox: I am not going all round the compass, as you are.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I do not want to delay the House much longer, but may I say that I have listened with interest to some very revealing speeches by the member for Irwin-Moore on the question of Communism. We have also had members opposite endeavouring to create the impression that they are in no way connected with this ideology. I want to know just to what extent members opposite have no relationship with or sympathy for the Communist Party, because I believe many of them are sailing under false colours.

Mr. Reynolds: What rot!

Mr. GRAYDEN: That must be another of those inane expressions to which the hon. member refers. I want to know to what extent members opposite are not connected with Communism. I have before me the notice paper of the 28th July, 1948, in which the member for East Perth takes up cudgels on behalf of the Eureka Youth League. He possibly denies an affiliation with the Communists. I understand, and so does everyone else, that he has to appease other sections of his electorate, and therefore he disclaims any affiliation with them. But, as I say, I have the notice paper here, and the member for East Perth asked the following questions of the Minister for Education:—

(1) Is he aware of the move recently made and further attempts to be made to exclude the Eureka Youth League from the Associated

Youth Committee of the National Fitness Council?

(2) Does he concur with these attempts?

(3) If so, is it the intention that membership of the committee should be governed by political considerations?

(4) If not, what steps does he contemplate in order to prevent such a possibility?

(5) In any event, is it his intention to take action to prevent the expulsion of the Eureka Youth League?

Hon. A. H. Panton: I suppose you heard the member for East Perth tonight.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Irrespective of what the member for East Perth said tonight, or any of his colleagues, I take it that from these questions the member for East Perth is taking up the cudgels on behalf of the Eureka Youth League.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Do you think it ought to be expelled?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I definitely do. I repeat that the member for East Perth is taking up the cudgels on behalf of an organisation which has a great deal of sympathy among members opposite. It is evident from the questions asked by the member for East Perth that encouragement is being given to this organisation to flourish in this country, otherwise he would not have asked the questions in that strain. The Eureka Youth League is well known for its relationship with the Communist Party.

Mr. Triat: Tell us something about it.

Mr. GRAYDEN: It is possible for members opposite to say that they are in sympathy with this movement but that they do not consider that it has any relationship to the Communist Party. That is what they tell us now. It is inconceivable to me that these members should have such a close relationship with the organisation and yet not be in possession of the facts in regard to it. The aim of the Communist Party is to overthrow the Governments of this country by force and the Eureka Youth League is striving towards the same goal. Yet as I say it has the support of the member for East Perth and the sympathy of a great number of members opposite, just as the Communist Party has this same sympathy.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: You know that is not true.

Mr. GRAYDEN: We had a plea for Communism—and I was very surprised to hear

it—from the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe. I do not believe for one moment that this member is in any way connected with Communism although I do think that many of his colleagues are connected with them.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Tell us who they are?

Mr. GRAYDEN: But I am certain that the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe is not.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Point out one or two.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe realises that he has to contest a selection ballot because he has lost his seat—

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: You have lost your seat, too.

Mr. GRAYDEN: He probably realises that there may be one or two Communists on the selection committee and I think the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe has shown good Labour taste by getting in early.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Who told you we have a selection committee?

Mr. GRAYDEN: However, I do not believe for one moment that the hon. member is connected with the Communist Party but I do believe some of the other Opposition members are.

Mr. Reynolds: Why advance that theory?

Mr. GRAYDEN: Some of those members have sympathy and relationships with the Communist Party, but I wonder how many of them are actually sympathisers of the party and how many of them are sailing under false colours. The member for East Perth has openly taken up, by way of the notice paper, the cudgels on behalf of the Eureka Youth League.

Mr. Hegney: What replies did the Minister give?

Mr. GRAYDEN: Exactly where does the organisation stand? I am not concerned about the reply given to the member for East Perth, but am solely concerned about the questions that were asked. I want to establish exactly where this Eureka Youth League stands. I have a cutting from "The West Australian"—members opposite may sneer because it is from "The West Australian"—but it is a news item. It is taken from the issue of the 30th July, 1948, and

the heading is "No Subsidies for Red Groups." The report is from Melbourne, the date given is the 29th July and the extract is as follows:—

The Minister for Health (Sir Albert Dunstan) today instructed the National Fitness Council that no subsidies were to be paid in the current financial year to the Eureka Youth League or "any other organisation associated with Communism." He said that the Government gave a subsidy of £8,000 a year to the council, which in turn made grants to youth and other organisations.

Hon. A. H. Panton: What Minister for Health is that?

Mr. GRAYDEN: The Victorian Government is apparently quite convinced that the Eureka Youth League is a Communist organisation and, I repeat, this is an organisation which the member for East Perth is championing. In case that cutting has not convinced members opposite that the Eureka Youth League is a Communist organisation I will quote from another issue of "The West Australian" dated the 22nd July, 1948, and the heading is—"Youth Groups. Move for Exclusion of Member." It reads—

A motion to exclude the Eureka Youth League from the Associated Youth Committee of the National Fitness Council failed to gain the requisite two-thirds majority at a meeting of the A.Y.C. on Tuesday night.

The initiative came from the State Executive of the Boy Scouts' Association whose delegate (Mr. V. Dawe) moved under notice, that the E.Y.L. should be excluded from the committee, or, alternatively, that the committee should be re-formed to procure that end.

That motion which came from the Boy Scouts' Association was defeated.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Who defeated it?

Mr. GRAYDEN: After that the Y.M.C.A. took the matter up and moved the following motion:—

That the following be added to clause 4 of the Constitution: Eligible bodies shall be those who affirm their belief in God and loyalty to the King and British Commonwealth and are recognised as working for the welfare of youth in the community and who by reason of their programme—

Mr. Reynolds: Amen!

Mr. GRAYDEN: To continue—  
—and number average 100 (members) in the 14 to 25 age group over a period of one year before application for affiliation, become acceptable by a two-thirds majority to the recognised groups.

That matter will be debated later. And so we see the Boy Scouts are opposed to the League and they would not have taken up the matter unless they were perfectly convinced that this organisation was of a communist character. The Y.M.C.A. also would not have moved any motion unless they, too, were convinced of its communistic ideas.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: Is the Government convinced?

Mr. GRAYDEN: Now let us see what the "Workers Star" has to say about this attack by the Boy Scouts' Association on the Eureka Youth League. The heading of the "Workers Star" dated the 9th July is "Boy Scouts Attack E.Y.L. Snide Move Against Working Class Youth. What is the strength of the move by the leaders of the Boy Scouts to have the Eureka Youth League excluded from the Associated Youth Committee?" I quote from the article—

The answer to this question by Miss J. Marks, State Secretary of the E.Y.L. brings sharply before all workers and democrats the vital and urgent question, "Which Way for Australian Youth?"

Further on in this article Miss Marks had this to say—

"The form and content of the move is absolutely in keeping with rule 7 of the Scout law: A Scout obeys orders of his parents, Patrol Leader, or Scout Master without question."

She continues—

And this organisation claims to be democratic!

Miss Marks stated that when referring to the Boy Scouts' Association.

Mr. Bovell: The Boy Scouts honour God and the King, too. Do not forget that.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Here are some further remarks by Miss Marks—

The present State Government is a "Liberal" C.D.L. one—that is, anti-working class.

Why is it necessary to remove the voice, eyes and ears of working class youth from this Association? Is something being cooked up which bodes ill for the youth of W.A.?

There is another heading "Playing Fields Or Battle Fields?" and Miss Marks asks—

What then is it to be—playing fields or battle fields?

This report was given in the "Workers Star," which is the local Communist news-

paper, because of the action taken by the Boy Scouts' Association, but I do not think the members opposite are even convinced yet that this is a Communist organisation. They support the organisation in every way and sympathise with it.

Member: We do not buy "The Workers Star."

Mr. GRAYDEN: They support this Eureka Youth League in every way.

Hon. A. H. Panton: That is a deliberate lie, and you know it!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Hegney: The Minister for Education is disgusted with you.

Mr. GRAYDEN: They would have everyone in the State believe that they, the hypocrites, do not know that the Eureka Youth League is a communist organisation—

Hon. A. H. Panton: You are a deliberate liar, and you know it!

Mr. GRAYDEN:—and are associated with the Communist sympathisers opposite.

Hon. A. H. Panton: What a beaut you are! I do not know what you will be like when you are 30 if this is what you are like when you are 26!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GRAYDEN: I do not know what the hon. member is talking about. If he would speak up I might be able to hear him.

Hon. A. H. Panton: I am telling you that you are a deliberate liar! Can you hear that?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Address the Chair!

Mr. GRAYDEN: As I said before, when I was so rudely interrupted by the member for Leederville, the members of the Opposition mumble away to themselves with the sole object of having their interjections recorded in "Hansard," but they will not make those interjections sufficiently loud for anyone on this side of the House to hear.

#### *Point of Order.*

Hon. A. H. Panton: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member said that we, on this side of the House, will not make interjections loud enough for him to hear. Now that he is seated, I want to say that he

is a deliberate liar if he says that I am a supporter of the Eureka Youth League. Can the hon. member hear that? Put that in your pipe and smoke it!

Mr. Grayden: I object to the statement of the hon. member opposite and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: I ask that both statements be withdrawn.

Hon. A. H. Panton: The member for Middle Swan started it, so he can withdraw his first.

Mr. Grayden: Mr. Speaker, if I must withdraw, I will do so.

Mr. Reynolds: Without reservation.

Hon. A. H. Panton: As the hon. member has withdrawn his statement, I will withdraw mine.

### *Debate Resumed.*

Mr. GRAYDEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted by the member for Leederville—

Hon. A. H. Panton: Do not start again! You have withdrawn twice already.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The member for Leederville seems to take offence at being classed as a Communist sympathiser; well, I hope by interjection that he will make it plain to his colleagues that he is not a Communist sympathiser. It is all very well for members on the opposite side of the Chamber to endeavour to get around the point by saying: "We are not Communist sympathisers." We never hear them say that outright.

Hon. A. H. Panton: If you want me to say it, I will say it if you give me the opportunity.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I would like every member opposite to say: "I am not a Communist sympathiser."

Hon. A. H. Panton: I will say it: "I am not a Communist sympathiser."

Mr. GRAYDEN: I am very pleased that the member for Leederville is not, and that he has taken steps to prove that he possesses some semblance of democracy.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Where did that come from?

Mr. Reynolds: What do you know about democracy? You know more about hypocrisy.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The member for Leederville can be assured of a considerable amount of support from those on this side of the House on the question of—

Hon. A. H. Panton. I do not want it; I can get all the support I need from my mates on this side.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GRAYDEN:—this fight against his colleagues—the Communist sympathisers. Before I was interrupted by members opposite I was establishing that this Eureka Youth League is affiliated with the Communists.

Mr. Reynolds: Are you a member of it?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I am having a great deal of trouble because nothing that could be brought forward seeps into the minds of members opposite. They reek of Communism.

Mr. Hegney: You reek of hypocrisy.

Mr. GRAYDEN: However, I think the evidence I have been able to produce is such that even the members opposite must be convinced. Before I leave this point of establishing that the Eureka Youth League is a Communist organisation, I want to quote from the Melbourne "Herald." This cutting is headed—

The Kindergarten of the Reds.  
Through Eureka Youth League, Communists  
Catch 'Em Young.  
By a Special Reporter.

I do not want to detain members, but I do feel that I should read this out at some length. I will do so as quickly as I can. I continue the quote—

Song and dance at a two-storeyed hall in Queensberry Street, North Melbourne, during the past week-end, marked the seventh birthday of the Eureka Youth League. Strong-girl acts, a "working class mannequin parade," music and ballet, rounded off seven years of Communist schooling. For, whatever its more naive supporters might say, the Eureka Youth League is nothing but the Kindergarten of the Reds. Probably to counter the opposition of parents who abhor Communists, Eureka presents an innocent front. Many of its members are not Communists. Among the non-Communists are Olympic sporting figures and other well-known young people.

But turn the penny—or the rouble—over.

Eureka's national secretary is Audrey Blake, wife of Victoria's most important Communist, party secretary J. D. Blake. In Moscow in 1937 and 1938 Mrs. Blake spent half her time studying the organisation and technique of

the Komsomol, Soviet opposite number of the Hitler-jugend and the Bund Deutscher Maedel.

Mr. Reynolds: Heil Hitler!

Mr. GRAYDEN: To continue—

Another top Eureka girl is national councillor Kath Bacon.

Mr. Reynolds: Ach.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The newspaper goes on to say—

—In the Eureka Youth League paper, Youth Voice, they just call her Kath. But in this month's Communist Review they call her "Comrade Bacon."

How Red? What does Eureka work for? And just how red is it? The answers are in the monthly, Youth Voice. This paper, printed on the same press as the Communist weekly, Guardian, describes itself as "a working class youth paper." It defines the Eureka Youth League as "the organisation which says to the boss, 'look out—it's your profits we're after,' and then goes after them."

Some months Youth Voice is as innocent as the Boys' Own Paper. It writes on Sex Appeal ("no dirty fingernails, greasy hair or unpolished shoes"). It carries correspondence on "the inconsiderate male" ("the majority of boys . . . seem to regard a nod of the head as sufficient indication that they would like the next dance"). That's kid-stuff alongside the stories in the April issue. April was Queensland strike month, the last month in which there was high industrial tension.

This is, as I have said, a cutting from the Melbourne "Herald", and this is the organisation which the member for East Perth supports.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: As I have told you before, you are getting your geography mixed.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I will continue to quote from the cutting—

That issue displays prominently this piece of glorification of violence:

Mr. Reynolds: Oh, yes.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Possibly the member for Forrest approves of this. I do not doubt it. Many members opposite approve of it. They have indicated their approval on many occasions. But this is the quotation—

Apprentices "Do the Scabs Over."

Brisbane. Police are patrolling inside as well as outside Ipswich workshops, where about 20 scabs are at work. Two hundred apprentices in the workshops were "doing the scabs over," so police were drafted inside the shops.—

Mr. Hegney: You scabbed on the Independent Party.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The quotation continues—

Unless the police are withdrawn from inside, apprentices will be withdrawn.

On the front page, the same issue of the "Youth Voice" also carried this, signed by the Eureka Youth League's National president, Ron Brown:—

Mr. Reynolds: Is he a relative of yours?

Mr. GRAYDEN: That is a classic example of the inane remarks made by many members of the Opposition and particularly the member for Forrest. The member for East Perth referred to these inane remarks on a previous occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should ignore interjections, and address the Chair.

Mr. GRAYDEN: As I was going to say, on the front page of this issue of the "Youth Voice" this statement also appeared, signed by the Eureka Youth League's national president, Ron Brown—

In this, the greatest hour of Queensland trade unionism, our young workers are playing a glorious part. They stand on every picket line throughout this vast State. Outside my office now on picket duty is a young railway fireman who has not averaged four hours' sleep a night for the past fortnight. He is but one of the hundreds who have chased scabs off railway engines in the early hours of the morning, and stood up to rows of police on the picket lines all day. Multiply his actions a thousand times and you will get the answer that petty dictator Haulon is also getting.

"Youth Voice" guest writer for July is Comrade J. D. Blake. His subject: "What is Communism?"

People used to say, "Join the Labour Party and see the world" and "Join the Communist Party and see the world." Eureka Youth League members cover more miles a year than the big comrades.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Join the Independent Party and see Bill Grayden.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The article continued—

The league sent a jazz band to a youth festival in Prague. It sent a reconstruction brigade of 14 to work on the Yugoslav railway. Radio listeners might remember the gasp from one of the homecoming youths when a Melbourne shipboard radio interviewer asked him why they didn't volunteer for reconstruction on the Victorian railways.

The Eureka Youth League is sending a Mr. and Mrs. Marmach to the International Conference of Working Youth in Warsaw next month. Twenty-three Eureka members attended the World Youth Festival, staged by the red-ruled World Federation of Democratic Youth in Prague last year. Work out for

yourself what it costs to send 23 young people (but too big for half-fare) to Europe and back.

And Eureka's Kath Bacon gets about. She was spokesman for the youth of Australia at a South-East Asia Youth Conference in New Delhi in April. She is touring Queensland this month to tell of her experiences in Asia and explain how we can help and be helped by the youth of our nearest neighbours.

Her lesson: You get a clue to what Kath will be telling the adolescents of Queensland from an article under her name in this month's "Communist Review." It is called "Struggles of the Colonial Peoples." She thinks the revolutionaries in South-East Asia have been encouraged by the sight of the British retreating before the Japanese Army. Kath writes in "Communist Review," and presumably will tell Queensland youth that a lesson to be learned by Australian youth from the revolutionaries of South-East Asia is that they never hesitate to enter the struggle to battle the armed police. Kath will probably omit from her Queensland harangues this bit from her "Communist Review" piece; "We must battle for the abolition of the White Australia policy, which not only constitutes an insult to our neighbours, but also preserves rotten race theories."

Mr. Hegney: Do you suggest the abolition of the White Australia policy?

Mr. GRAYDEN: The Eureka Youth League is working to that end with the assistance of those members who support it. The member for East Perth has taken up the cudgels on its behalf. The member for Pilbara has frequently spoken in that strain for Communism and I take it he is another sympathiser.

Mr. Hegney: On a point of order, I want to tell the hon. member that that is a deliberate lie, and he is a deliberate liar if he makes such a statement.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Hear hear!

Mr. Hegney: I ask that the statement be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: What does the hon. member want withdrawn?

Mr. Hegney: The dirty inference that I am a Communist sympathiser and have spoken in favour of Communism, and I want to tell him that he is a deliberate liar.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Middle Swan must withdraw.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I must withdraw the remark and therefore I do withdraw.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: You are a squib.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The hon. member knows full well that the Speaker's ruling must be obeyed. If a member asks for the withdrawal of a statement it must be withdrawn irrespective of how true it is.

Mr. Kelly: On a point of order, I ask that the member for Middle Swan should make a withdrawal, not only on behalf of the member for Pilbara but also on behalf of myself and the rest of the members on this side of the House. I want a total withdrawal and not a half-hearted one.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Not a hypocritical one.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the hon. member refer to all members on the Opposition side?

Mr. Kelly: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member to withdraw the remark.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Again, if I must withdraw, I do so.

Mr. Kelly: It is not a matter of "must."

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Do not be a hypocrite.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I have been asked to withdraw and therefore I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I must confess that I am absolutely astonished at the hypocrisy being displayed by members opposite. We had a plea—and I challenge any member to dispute this statement—for Communism last night and we have had pleas for Communism by other speakers. I challenge members opposite to dispute the statement that the member for East Perth took up the cudgels for the Eureka Youth League. According to the rules of the House, if a withdrawal is asked for, I must withdraw and I did withdraw. I shall dismiss that point and continue with my reading, which must be extremely enlightening to members opposite.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: Extremely amusing.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Though members persist in mumbling, I shall continue my reading of the article. It says—

How many members had Eureka and what attracts them? The Eureka Youth League does not publish membership figures, but "Youth Voice" circulation figures provide a hint. Here are "Youth Voice" sales figures for June—Victoria, 3,074; New South Wales, 3,000; Queensland, 900; Western Australia, 250; South Australia, 180; Tasmania, 96.

Young people join Eureka because it is a well-run organisation that gives them a good time and provides pleasant company. Rueful workers for rival youth organisations admit that Eureka members are mostly pleasant, if misguided, young people, and that Eureka Youth League promptly expels the unpleasant.

Eureka sports organisation, with its well-disciplined sprucely turned out teams, is the main draw. But there is much more to it than sports. Melbourne activities currently listed include art classes, dressmaking, drama, camping and gymnasium. Localities listed include Northcote, Brunswick, Collingwood, East Brighton, Prahran, Kew and Camberwell. Eureka Youth League Kremlin is its two-storeyed hall in North Melbourne.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Nearly as good as the Independent Party.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The member for Northam has been clattering away to himself about the Independent Party all the evening and in total disregard of the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie, who was an Independent and changed to the Labour side. I regard it as an insult to the hon. member and bad taste on the part of the member for Northam.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: He did not denounce the Labour Party when he was an Independent.

Mr. GRAYDEN: It proves that members on the front bench, once they get into Parliament, are there to exploit the working people and do it effectively and also keep members on the back benches nailed right down. They dare not vote against them; otherwise they do not get the selection. They even coerce an unfortunate Independent to cross to their side and, having got him there, year after year indulge in slandering him. I have just read out a document which I feel must be extremely enlightening to members opposite, who, childlike in their faith, have accepted this relationship with the Eureka Youth League and sympathised with that league.

Mr. May: I wish to say for my part that I have accepted no relationship with the Communists in any shape or form. I want an unqualified withdrawal of the hon. member's statement as far as I am concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member withdraw the statement?

Mr. GRAYDEN: Once again I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I withdraw the inference that the member for Collie is directly associated with Communism.

Mr. May: I am not associated in any way with Communism, Mr. Speaker, directly or indirectly.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Mr. Speaker, I bow again to your ruling. I must withdraw the statement that the hon. member is associated with Communism, and in accordance with the Standing Orders, I do so. I compliment the member for Collie on his not being associated with Communism. I am glad of it.

Opposition Members: Boo!

Mr. GRAYDEN: Neither is the member for Leederville. That makes two.

Mr. May: I desire the member for Middle Swan to apologise to me for having made the statement that I was associated with the Communist Party.

The Premier: You are getting a bit thin-skinned.

Mr. May: If the member for Middle Swan had withdrawn in a reasonable way, I would have been satisfied, but he did not. I therefore ask for an apology.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member withdraw?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I have already withdrawn.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Why not cease being a rat-bag?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I am pleased that one by one members opposite are denying allegiance to the Communist Party. We shall be able to get more members in this House to assist us in our fight against Communism. I hope the denials by members opposite will not interfere with their chances of being returned at the next election.

Mr. May: You look after yourself at the next election.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I am pleased to note definitely where Labour members stand on this subject. It is about time more Labour members in this State adopted the same attitude. I have here an enlightening document which I shall quote to members opposite, because, as I said, in their childlike faith they more or less accepted the Eureka Youth League. They did not know it was associated with Communism, and therefore the league must have appeared inviting to them. After all, say what we like, it was the Eureka Youth League that the member for East Perth was striving to nurture when he asked

the question to which I have referred. I am not condemning him alone, as I believe he did it in good faith, not knowing that the league was associated with the Communist Party.

I condemn the whole Labour Party, not necessarily the Labour members in this Chamber, but the whole Labour Party. Let us take one section of the Labour Party, the University Labour Club, as it will demonstrate the extent to which the Labour Party generally is linked up with the Eureka Youth League. It will demonstrate what a farcical position was taken up in this House a few minutes ago, when members opposite rose and disclaimed any responsibility for the Communist Party or the Eureka Youth League. The pamphlet I have here will show clearly the relationship between the two parties. It was not published by the University Labour Club alone; it was published jointly by that club and the Eureka Youth League. Does not that establish that the Labour Party is linked up with the Eureka Youth League?

Mr. Brady: That has nothing to do with the Labour Party.

Mr. GRAYDEN: That interjection is another illustration of the way in which members opposite seek to misrepresent the position to the people of the State. I will tell the hon. member exactly where he stands in a few moments, so I will ask him to withhold his interjections.

Mr. Brady: Don't talk a lot of rot.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I have already quoted from the pamphlet. I now quote the following extract—

The Federal Leader of the Liberal Party is Mr. Menzies. Before the war he publicly praised Hitler, Mussolini and Tojo. As Attorney General in the Nationalist Government, he forced the workers against their will to ship war materials to Japan. They were used by the Japs in China, Malaya, New Guinea and Darwin.

The pamphlet is biased in the extreme, as members opposite well know. Every member is aware that at the time the shipments of iron-ore to Japan were stopped, it was the Federal U.A.P. Government that was responsible. The Western Australian Government protested most bitterly against the ban. I have already quoted from "Hansard" tonight the actual resolution passed by

the Parliament of this State. The Labour Government actually protested against the ban on the shipment of iron-ore to Japan; and yet the University Labour Club, in conjunction with the Eureka Youth League, is allowed to get away with the statements I have quoted. I have quoted this pamphlet not because of the lies and misrepresentations contained in it but to show the connection between the Labour Party and the Eureka Youth League. In spite of all this, members opposite objected to statements which I made and which, bowing to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I withdrew, irrespective of what I actually thought.

Mr. Styants: You are a liar, and know you are a liar.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The hon. member is the only liar here. I produce this pamphlet to prove the connection which does exist between the Labour Party and the Eureka Youth League. Here is a responsible integral section of the Labour Party proclaiming to all Australia an affiliation between the Labour Party and the Eureka Youth League. That will prove how an interjector opposite endeavoured to misrepresent to the people of the State the facts in regard to this University Labour Club. He said, "They were not affiliated."

Mr. Brady: It is correct, too.

Mr. GRAYDEN: At the time this pamphlet was printed, the University Labour Club was affiliated with the Labour Party, and therefore what the hon. member says is simply a misrepresentation.

Mr. Brady: You have no proof of that, either.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I can definitely establish that the University Labour Club was not expelled by the Labour Party. Do not let any member be deluded on that score. The University Labour Club sought this disaffiliation itself, because it could not continue to pay the extortionate fees demanded by the Labour Party. So we see the tie-up. We have this subversive Communist Party linked up with the Eureka Youth League. The member for East Perth, next the University Labour Club and then the Labour Party! It thus becomes crystal clear, although it is convenient for members opposite to deny sympathy or relationship with the Communist Party, that there was this linking up. Yet I have had to withdraw state-



ments made by me because of the Standing Orders. But before I leave the subject of Communism as it relates to members opposite, I want to quote again from "The West Australian" of the 26th July, 1948. This deals with a matter concerning defence work of a highly secret nature. The headlines are—"Atomic Secrets Denied to Australia. U.S. Fear Leakage through Communists." It is a message from Canberra dated the 25th July, and begins—

The United States is refusing to give any atomic research details to Great Britain unless definite assurances are given that the information will not be handed on to Australia, it was learnt on reliable authority tonight. Fear that leakages of vital details may occur through Australian Communists is believed to be the reason behind this condition.

And so on. So the country of which we are all so justly proud—on this side, anyway—cannot be trusted. We cannot be trusted simply and solely because we have a Commonwealth Labour Government and a Labour organisation throughout this country of the type upon which I have touched briefly tonight.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: You are "barmy."

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You will be in Heathcote before long!

Mr. GRAYDEN: I apologise for keeping the House till this late hour. I would have liked to continue in much greater detail and would have done so had the hour been earlier. I would add that, when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was concluding a speech earlier this session, he said, when referring to the activities of this Government, that it sowed the wind far and wide in March, 1947, and the reaping of the whirlwind was upon it. But the member for Northam was wrong. He was hopelessly wrong, and he knows it! This wind to which he refers was already at its height when the present Government took over.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: It has been in existence for the last couple of hours.

Mr. GRAYDEN: It was a wind of mismanagement, a wind of stagnation, a wind of destruction—the destruction of our democratic way of life. That was the wind and that was the stage it had reached when the present Government took office. That destructive wind has slackened and shortly it will be mastered, and the progress which has marked the history of this State in its earlier years will once again continue apace.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The ratbag has spoken!

Mr. GRAYDEN: And the South Australian reject has added his poisonous little piece!

On motion by Mr. Kelly, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.*

## Legislative Council.

Thursday, 12th August, 1948.

### CONTENTS.

	Page.
Bill : Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act Amendment, Standing Orders suspension, ... ..	391
1 r., remaining stages ... ..	402
Assembly's message ... ..	412
Leave of absence ... ..	391
Address-in-reply, eighth day ... ..	391

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

### BILL—INCREASE OF RENT (WAR RESTRICTIONS) ACT AMENDMENT.

#### *Standing Orders Suspension.*

On motion by the Chief Secretary, resolved:

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the Bill to be passed through all its stages at the one sitting.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. C. H. Simpson, leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to Hon. L. A. Logan (Central) on the ground of ill-health.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

#### *Eighth Day.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [4.34]: Like the other speakers, I congratulate you, Sir, on having been re-elected for another term as President of this House. I also congratulate those whom the King has