

*Farmers' Weekly* of the 11th August this year—only a few days ago—the President of the Farmers' Union, Mr. Grant McDonald, had the following to say:—

"It seems that one of the most important features which induced the State Government to increase freights is what almost amounts to a fear of the attitude of the Commonwealth Loan Council.

"Either that or the Loan Council's views have been used as an excuse. In either case it is most regrettable that this Federal body can have such a marked effect on the progress and potential development of a claimant State," Mr. McDonald said.

At the present time if a State was prepared to offer encouragement, by way of lower charges, to its populace to promote greater progressive activity then it was penalised by the Loan Council.

"One would think that the Loan Council would be anxious to assist any State towards greater development but the obvious effect at the present time was to the contrary.

"I am convinced that the State and Federal Governments need to give consideration to formulating other ways of allocating loan funds.

"There is the aspect also that Western Australia's prosperity depends entirely on the prosperity of its primary industry and if restriction is placed upon farmers' activities the whole State must suffer."

I understand there is going to be an increase of 20 per cent. on the cartage of wheat; and increases of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. and  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. respectively will apply to wool and livestock. Members representing farming areas will be in a much better position to tell us what effects these increases will have on the farmers and other producers in the country areas.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: They will be in a spot of bother with their farmer friends.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: No; they realise their responsibilities.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: It is amply evident that the primary producers will have to carry an undue burden. To sum up the position, the increases in freights impose a penalty on those parts of the State and those sections of the community least able to bear them. They will inevitably have the effect of increasing living costs on the goldfields and in the country; they will be another burden on the long-suffering mining industry which, for years past, has been in a most unfavourable position as compared with other primary industries.

I do not want to take up any more of the time of the House, but I view the position so seriously that I now move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the motion:—

We wish to protest strongly against the burdens of additional cost which increased railway freights will soon place upon those country people and rural industries not able reasonably to bear such burdens, and also against increased railway fares in the metropolitan area.

We deeply regret the breaking by Country Party Ministers of the promise given by and on behalf of the Country Party to the people of the State during the last election campaign, the promise being—

The Country Party will not agree to any further increases in rail freights, about ninety per cent. of which are paid by country residents.

We regret also the breaking of the assurance given at that time by the present Premier to the effect that the whole of the Liberal Party's policy would be directed against rising costs.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I suppose there is a similar motion in the Legislative Assembly.

On motion by the Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.21 p.m.

## Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 16th August, 1960

### CONTENTS

	Page
<b>MEMBERS' SPEECHES—</b>	
Leave to Continue at a Subsequent Sitting	404
<b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—</b>	
Agriculture and Stock: Production in wheatbelt areas, 1955-1959	407
Cabinet Ministers: Cost of improvements to offices	409
Carnarvon Clerk of Courts: Erection of house	409
Cheyne Beach Mineral Sands: Lessees and lease conditions	407
Cottesloe Signal Box: Name of contractor, and estimated cost	408

## CONTENTS—continued

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—continued

East Carnarvon : Provision of water supply .....	409
East Perth School : Enrolments .....	410
Government Departments—	
Floor space in rented premises .....	407
Housing in old printing office .....	409
Itinerant Teachers : Cost in Murchison and North-West .....	412
Kimberley Research Station : District allowance .....	412
Malformation of the Heart : Surgical treatment .....	406
Medical Practitioners : Entitlement to designation of "Dr." .....	405
Merredin Railway Cottages : Road board election franchise for tenants .....	409
Merredin Road Board : <i>Ex gratia</i> payment for Government-owned property .....	410
Milk : Samples taken by health authorities .....	405
Motor Vehicles : Title ownership certificates .....	406
New Industries : Number introduced, and country quota .....	405
North Perth Police Station : Extensions .....	406
Pilbarra Street, East Perth—	
Sanitation at adjacent sawmill .....	410
Value of houses to be demolished and eviction of tenants .....	410
Railway Property : Use for timber stacking at Guildford .....	406
Road Buses : Substitution for country passenger trains .....	412
State Building Supplies : Debt, interest, and sinking fund .....	404
State Purchase Homes : Analysis of arrears .....	411
Tourism : Western Australian Bureaus in Eastern States .....	411

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—

Cement : Prices to State Governments .....	413
Water Restrictions : Prospects for coming summer .....	413

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY : SEVENTH DAY—

Speakers on Address—	
Mr. J. Hegney .....	413
Mr. Moir .....	426
Mr. Rowberry .....	417
Speakers on Amendment—	
Mr. Court .....	430
Mr. May .....	433
Mr. Brady .....	436
Mr. Hawke .....	437
Mr. Watts .....	443

## ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE ..... 444

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

## MEMBERS' SPEECHES

*Leave to Continue at a Subsequent Sitting*

The SPEAKER: Over the last few years the practice seems to have developed of interrupting members' speeches to suit the convenience of the House. I refer to instances such as that which occurred last

Thursday when the member for Middle Swan started his speech about 27 minutes before the House would, in the normal way, have risen for tea and, in accordance with past custom at this stage of the session, adjourned for the week.

Standing Order No. 139 allows only three grounds on which a member's speech may be interrupted; namely—

- (1) To request that his words be taken down.
- (2) To call attention to a point of order.
- (3) To call attention to the want of a quorum.

Standing Order No. 157 permits leave being granted to a member, then speaking, to continue his remarks later in the same sitting or at some future sitting.

The matter of interpretation arises on whether the member speaking should initiate the move for leave to be granted to him to speak at some other stage of the sitting or on some future occasion, or as to whether this motion can come from any member of the House.

Subject to the concurrence of the House, in future I intend to interpret Standing Order No. 139 as being the only grounds on which a member's speech may be interrupted.

This will not preclude the possibility of the procedure that was followed last Thursday in connection with the speech of the member for Middle Swan being substantially continued. What it does mean is that the motion—

That leave be granted to continue the speech at the next sitting of the House. must emanate from and be moved by the member who is speaking at the time.

I think this matter can be arranged quite simply by the Whips. It is only a question of the Whips arranging with the honourable member who is speaking when the House is normally expected to adjourn, for he himself to ask for leave to continue his speech at some future time.

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

## STATE BUILDING SUPPLIES

*Debt, Interest, and Sinking Fund*

1. Mr. ROWBERRY asked the Minister for Industrial Development:
  - (1) What is the total debt, if any, on State Building Supplies?
  - (2) What total of interest and sinking fund is paid by these instrumentalities each year?
  - (3) What is the total amount paid into consolidated revenue by State Building Supplies?
  - (4) In the event of the sale of State Building Supplies, will the interest bill be a continued charge against the State?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) As at the 30th June, 1960, loan funds, overdraft, and other liabilities to the Treasury—£3,063,061.
- (2) For the year ended the 30th June, 1960—£153,105.
- (3) It is not clear whether the honourable member means profits since inception or for current years, or whether he means the total interest and sinking fund payments since inception.

If he refers to profits, the answers are—

During the year ended the 30th June, 1960, the Treasury recouped to State Building Supplies net losses incurred during the year ended the 30th June, 1959, totalling £46,867.

The total profit paid into the Treasury since 1913 up to the 30th June, 1960, is £706,198 after recouping losses to the 30th June, 1959.

- (4) Only to the extent that any sale price falls short of total liability to the Treasury.

## NEW INDUSTRIES

### *Number Introduced, and Country Quota*

2. Mr. ROWBERRY asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

In the Governor's opening Speech, there appears the following, viz: "The Industries Advisory Committee has continued to do work of great value to the State." Can he give details of this work, such as—

- (a) the number of new industries this committee has been instrumental in bringing to this State, if any;
- (b) how many of these new industries are available to country districts, or will be in the foreseeable future?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (a) and (b) The committee works in an honorary capacity and its activities cover a wide field of industrial development including—  
Examination, advice, and negotiations in respect of prospective new industries and existing industries which should be encouraged to expand.  
Examination of the State's indigenous resources to advise on potential industrial uses.  
Advice to local industries which seek assistance with financial and other problems often related to reorganisation.

Examination and advice on industrial projects submitted to the Government for assistance and industries which are indebted to the Government.

The number of new industries already attracted to the State, and in the negotiations for which the committee was directly involved, number six of a total value of nearly £14,000,000. This takes no account of numerous smaller industries which have been under consideration by the committee. Others of great importance to the State are under negotiation.

The number of new industries for establishment outside the metropolitan region now, or in the foreseeable future, and in the negotiations for which the committee has been directly involved, is four.

The committee is actively working on the project to assist local authorities to attract industries outside the metropolitan region.

## MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS

### *Entitlement to Designation of "Dr."*

3. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Health:
  - (1) Under what statute or authority do medical practitioners prefix their names with "Dr." (doctor)?
  - (2) How many medical practitioners registered in this State have a doctor's degree in any medical subject?
  - (3) Is it lawful for any person in the community not possessing a qualification by examination or bestowal to prefix his name with "Dr."?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) The Medical Act, 1894-1956.
- (2) Most European countries and the United States of America give a doctorate degree as the qualifying degree in medicine. In the United Kingdom and Australia the doctorate degree is a post-graduate degree. There are in Western Australia 28 of the former and 33 of the latter.
- (3) No.

## MILK

### *Samples Taken by Health Authorities*

4. Mr. O'CONNOR asked the Minister for Health:
 

How many official samples of milk have been taken by the health authorities in—

  - (a) Perth City Council;
  - (b) Nedlands Road Board;
  - (c) Fremantle Municipality;

for the years ended the 30th June, 1958; the 30th June, 1959; the 30th June, 1960?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

Official samples of milk taken by the health authorities are as follows:—

Year ended the 31st August, 1958—

Perth City Council	773
Fremantle City Council	106
Nedlands City Council	29

Year ended the 31st August, 1959—

Perth City Council	1092
Fremantle City Council	66
Nedlands City Council	9

Year ended the 12th August, 1960—

Perth City Council	840
Fremantle City Council	24
Nedlands City Council	5

## NORTH PERTH POLICE STATION

### Extensions

5. Mr. O'CONNOR asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) Has any further action been taken regarding extensions to the North Perth police station?
- (2) If so, what action?
- (3) If not, when is it contemplated these extensions will be commenced?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Plans have been drawn for extensions to the North Perth police station.
- (3) The extensions will be proceeded with as soon as finance is available. It is not known when this will be.

## MOTOR VEHICLES

### Title Ownership Certificates

6. Mr. O'CONNOR asked the Minister for Police:

Following question No. 39 of Tuesday, the 9th August, what decision was made as regards title ownership certificate for motor vehicles and what action is contemplated?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

Owner certificates as issued in Victoria, for example, would not confer legal ownership since the certificate does not record liability under hire purchase, bill of sale, or any similar encumbrances; and as such certificates would, in effect, merely record the names of persons in which vehicles were registered, they would not seem to be worth the complex administrative system necessary in Western

Australia where licensing of motor vehicles is done by the Police Department in the metropolitan area and by the various local authorities elsewhere in the State.

## RAILWAY PROPERTY

### Use for Timber Stacking at Guildford

7. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Is it a fact that certain railway property at Guildford is leased for stacking of timber?
- (2) Is it a fact that the area of land has not been gazetted as required under the Town Planning Act?
- (3) Will he see that any existing lease is cancelled or not renewed?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) It is a railway reserve, and such gazetting is not required.
- (3) No. The present use of the area is important to the railways. It is inevitable that such timber-stacking sites, where practicable, be located close to the railways.

## COTTESLOE SIGNAL BOX

### Name of Contractor, and Estimated Cost

8. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) What contractor is performing the work of erecting the signal box at Cottesloe?
- (2) What was the estimate of the cost of the work when tenders were called on the first occasion?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Mr. R. F. Sampson.
- (2) £6,791.

## MALFORMATION OF THE HEART

### Surgical Treatment

9. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is he aware of the article in the *Daily News* dated the 2nd August, 1960, and entitled, "Heart Surgeons will have more room to operate"?
- (2) If so, was a committee ever formed to go into ways and means of assisting in heart cases as requested by myself (Questions Without Notice, page 1916, *Hansard*, 2, 1959), which are relative to malformation of the heart, and in the opinion of the Minister a committee was not necessary?

- (3) With the further demand for heart treatment becoming more evident, is he still of the opinion that a committee is not necessary, bearing in mind that the duties of the committee would be to assist the unfortunate parents of children forced to have heart treatment, and assist people unable to afford this expensive surgical treatment?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) and (3) The National Heart Foundation is raising funds for various matters concerned with heart disease. The W.A. branch of this foundation has a scientific advisory committee to advise on the expenditure of its funds for the benefit of persons suffering from heart disease.

Heart surgery and the treatment of heart disease is well advanced in this State and the same treatment is available to all persons irrespective of financial means.

### CHEYNE BEACH MINERAL SANDS

#### *Lessees and Lease Conditions*

10. Mr. HALL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Are leases for mineral sands in the Cheyne Beach area still held by P. R. Jackson, F. A. Moore, and Hancock?
- (2) If so, why, seeing that the exemption from working the leases expired in December, 1959?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) P. R. Jackson, F. A. Moore, and Hancock Prospecting Pty. Ltd. hold the following tenements in the Cheyne Beach area:—

Dredging Claims Nos. 41H, 49H, 50H, 51H, 52H, and 59H.

They recently abandoned the following tenements in the Cheyne Beach area:—

Dredging Claims Nos. 40H, 53H, 54H, 55H, 58H, 60H, and 61H.

- (2) The Mines Department does not, and could not, police the working conditions of the thousands of mining titles issued. The Mining Act provides that any person holding a miner's right can apply

to the Warden's Court for forfeiture of any mining title not being manned in accordance with statutory requirements, and not under exemption. The court hears both parties (the applicant and the owner) and, subsequently, submits a recommendation to the Minister.

### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

#### *Floor Space in Rented Premises*

11. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Premier:

What floor space is involved in each of the following departmental suites rented from private sources—

- (a) Crown Law Married Women's Court, etc;
- (b) Architectural and Electrical Section, P.W.D.;
- (c) Research, Statistical and Technical Section of Education Department;
- (d) Electoral?

Mr. WATTS (for Mr. Brand) replied:

- (a) 4,900 square feet.
- (b) 3,700 square feet.
- (c) 4,180 square feet.
- (d) 2,500 square feet.

### AGRICULTURE AND STOCK

#### *Production in Wheatbelt Areas, 1955-1959*

12. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What was the production of wheat, wool, oats, and barley in the road districts of Westonia, Yilgarn, Kondinin, Mukinbudin, Mt. Marshall, Kulin, Wyalkatchem, and Koorda, in the years 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959?
- (2) What acreage was under crop (all grains) in those same years?
- (3) What was the number of cattle, sheep and pigs in each district?
- (4) What was the average annual rainfall?
- (5) What other recorded production took place in the above districts and years indicated?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) to (5) The following information was extracted from the Statistical Register:—

		PRODUCTION OF WHEAT (Bushels)				
		1954-55	1955-56	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59
Westonia	.....	305,685	616,236	183,319	233,608	717,038
Yilgarn	.....	435,583	857,235	238,287	255,192	1,205,742
Kondinin	.....	629,270	1,095,068	538,270	673,412	1,199,793
Mukinbudin	.....	489,338	746,837	273,168	286,127	1,035,429
Mt. Marshall	.....	738,255	1,321,510	602,110	671,238	1,764,425
Kulin	.....	688,919	1,158,157	810,692	681,683	1,181,719
Wyalkatchem	.....	1,038,603	1,249,136	698,956	842,966	1,518,899
Koorda	.....	681,009	1,122,923	555,685	612,136	1,484,746

## PRODUCTION OF WOOL (Lb.)

Road District	1954-55	1955-56	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59
Westonia	556,334	629,569	747,247	761,385	825,385
Yilgarn	1,192,300	1,364,403	1,438,482	1,293,943	1,353,965
Kondinin	1,619,437	1,925,579	1,757,208	1,772,404	1,876,066
Mukinbudin	858,966	963,470	1,020,044	957,940	1,008,104
Mt. Marshall	1,516,907	1,499,049	1,674,294	1,664,997	1,775,170
Kulin	1,762,743	2,372,268	2,107,517	2,197,140	2,148,074
Wyalkatchem	1,198,093	1,149,460	1,245,586	1,271,737	1,265,263
Koorda	1,057,055	1,099,677	1,245,038	1,194,610	1,378,686

## PRODUCTION OF OATS (Bushels)

Road District	1954-55	1955-56	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59
Westonia	52,350	107,591	26,388	44,659	182,942
Yilgarn	68,742	168,976	31,707	57,524	280,684
Kondinin	143,964	335,301	153,666	266,367	446,453
Mukinbudin	83,724	137,827	43,102	88,295	251,161
Mt. Marshall	144,843	250,229	108,468	153,301	337,099
Kulin	184,845	387,097	318,669	314,131	481,078
Wyalkatchem	232,818	308,448	145,328	208,649	316,224
Koorda	137,313	207,630	89,054	139,558	311,543

## PRODUCTION OF BARLEY (Bushels)

Road District	1954-55	1955-56	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59
Westonia	2,160	17,250	2,350	8,483	22,378
Yilgarn	14,406	38,877	7,841	7,635	71,196
Kondinin	47,352	116,806	76,497	67,886	145,293
Mukinbudin	.....	1,740	2,224	2,414	1,930
Mt. Marshall	1,971	10,119	12,243	16,618	50,531
Kulin	60,426	121,828	95,385	75,077	116,951
Wyalkatchem	15,312	45,002	28,995	40,350	39,252
Koorda	6,120	17,857	13,878	11,997	40,433

## (2) ACREAGE UNDER CROP (ALL GRAINS) (Acres)

Road District	1954-55	1955-56	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59
Westonia	33,514	41,904	43,659	49,190	55,845
Yilgarn	66,783	78,372	79,424	96,721	96,335
Kondinin	102,690	100,895	102,729	114,184	122,830
Mukinbudin	64,658	72,922	71,971	72,651	80,307
Mt. Marshall	98,633	106,626	109,727	121,085	133,851
Kulin	117,837	124,177	125,392	131,206	139,623
Wyalkatchem	104,680	108,379	105,204	109,623	118,661
Koorda	78,791	92,802	93,515	102,973	115,601

## NUMBER OF CATTLE

Road District	1954-55	1955-56	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59
Westonia	173	179	176	170	134
Yilgarn	722	705	596	467	457
Kondinin	445	465	494	542	670
Mukinbudin	511	674	553	618	763
Mt. Marshall	366	364	443	443	551
Kulin	499	600	621	628	737
Wyalkatchem	536	561	612	624	563
Koorda	208	225	226	246	305

## NUMBER OF SHEEP

Road District	1954-55	1955-56	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59
Westonia	66,546	69,632	74,112	87,617	97,074
Yilgarn	135,508	148,904	154,681	139,717	172,742
Kondinin	156,765	166,099	166,424	172,688	183,093
Mukinbudin	99,085	106,304	114,364	104,594	115,811
Mt. Marshall	166,981	164,964	190,207	180,780	199,245
Kulin	178,012	193,718	197,566	203,433	211,435
Wyalkatchem	132,840	116,342	124,995	128,299	128,131
Koorda	125,701	124,841	141,675	140,793	155,103

## NUMBER OF PIGS

Road District	1954-55	1955-56	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59
Westonia	387	510	543	878	611
Yilgarn	559	606	1,137	1,006	615
Kondinin	598	1,002	1,627	3,173	973
Mukinbudin	1,292	1,242	2,164	2,463	1,821
Mt. Marshall	841	944	1,283	1,686	927
Kulin	619	1,084	1,673	2,385	1,304
Wyalkatchem	1,106	1,365	1,777	1,852	1,235
Koorda	750	411	830	1,440	795

- (4) The average annual rainfall was as follows:—

Road District	Points
Westonia (recorded at Westonia) .....	1,281
Yilgarn (recorded at Southern Cross) .....	1,051
Kondinin (recorded at Kondinin) .....	1,375
Mukinbudin (recorded at Mukinbudin) .....	1,026
Mt. Marshall (recorded at Bencubbin) .....	1,208
Kulin (recorded at Kulin) .....	1,561
Wyalkatchem (recorded at Wyalkatchem) .....	1,348
Koorda (recorded at Koorda) .....	1,122

- (5) Other recorded production appears to be for use on the holdings, and includes milk, farm butter, poultry, eggs, pasture, green feed, hay, and horses, all of which are of a minor nature.

### CABINET MINISTERS

#### *Cost of Improvements to Offices*

13. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Treasurer: What are the respective amounts spent on reconditioning, remodeling, and enlarging the Premier's Department and each of the other nine sets of office accommodation occupied by Ministers and their immediate staff, during the last two financial years?

Mr. WATTS (for Mr. Brand) replied:

Premier's Department—	
Premier's Suite ..	£ 4,504
Cabinet Room and	
Premier's Department	
Offices ..	£11,718
	£16,222
Minister for Mines ..	£ 1,244
Minister for Industrial	
Development ..	£ 5,414
Minister for Works (ex-	
pended prior to the 2nd	
April, 1959) ..	£10,177
Minister for Education ..	£ 846
Minister for Agriculture	£ 5,670
Minister for Transport ..	£ 1,965

### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

#### *Housing in Old Printing Office*

14. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Premier:
- (1) What is to become of the old Government printing office buildings?
  - (2) Could not these premises be renovated so as to provide space for some of the Government departments now paying rentals for privately owned accommodation around the city?

Mr. WATTS (for Mr. Brand) replied:

- (1) No decision has yet been made.
- (2) The building in its present state is quite unsuitable for office accommodation. Architectural advice indicates the cost of conversion is uneconomic. A small section is now being used for office accommodation and a substantial portion for important storage.

### EAST CARNARVON

#### *Provision of Water Supply*

15. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has any decision been made regarding a reticulated water supply for East Carnarvon, as referred to in his letter of the 5th February this year?
- (2) If not, why not?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) Yes; most of the pipe required is now in Carnarvon.
- (2) Answered by No. (1).

### CARNARVON CLERK OF COURTS

#### *Erection of House*

16. Mr. NORTON asked the Attorney-General:

- (1) Is it the intention of the Government to build a house for the Clerk of Courts at Carnarvon this financial year?
- (2) If not, when is it intended that one will be built?

Mr. WATTS replied:

- (1) and (2) It is hoped that provision can be made, but a definite answer cannot be given until allocation of loan funds is finally determined.

### MERREDIN RAILWAY COTTAGES

#### *Road Board Election Franchise for Tenants*

- 17A. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

Is he aware that occupants of railway-owned cottages in Merredin pay the local authority 3s. 6d. per week, but do not enjoy the privilege of a vote at road board elections?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

I am not aware that occupants of railway-owned cottages pay 3s. 6d. per week to the Merredin Road Board, but I am aware that occupants of these cottages do not enjoy the privilege of a vote in road board elections. The Railways Commission pays a sum to the Merredin Road Board and the

occupants pay to the commission an addition to their rental ranging from 1s. per week to 4s. per week to cover the payments made to the road board.

### MERREDIN ROAD BOARD

#### *Ex Gratia Payment for Government-Owned Property*

17B. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Does the Government make an *ex gratia* payment to the road board in connection with Government-owned property?
- (2) If so, how is this payment designated?
- (3) What is the total amount?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) It is designated an *ex gratia* payment in lieu of rates.
- (3) Total amount paid by the Railways Commission last year to the Merredin Road Board was £628 8s.

### EAST PERTH SCHOOL

#### *Enrolments*

18. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many children are enrolled at the East Perth School?
- (2) What were the numbers for each of the preceding five years?

#### *Area of School Grounds*

- (3) What is the area of the school grounds?
- (4) What will be the area if portion is used for other purposes, as is proposed?
- (5) What is considered a reasonable area for primary schools currently built in the metropolitan area to cater for a school population of the present numbers of East Perth?

Mr. WATTS replied:

- (1) 286.
- (2) 1959—300.  
1958—288.  
1957—263.  
1956—279 primary, 230 post-primary, total 509.  
1955—248 primary, 171 post-primary, total 419.
- (3) 2 acres 0 roods 23 perches.
- (4) A quarter of an acre less.
- (5) This would depend entirely on circumstances.

### PILBARRA STREET, EAST PERTH

#### *Value of Houses to be Demolished, and Eviction of Tenants*

19. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) What is the value of the four houses proposed to be demolished in Pilbarra Street, East Perth?
- (2) How much has been spent on maintenance, repairs, and improvements to the four properties during the last ten years?
- (3) What were the reasons for the tenants being evicted?

#### *Sanitation at Adjacent Sawmill*

- (4) Approximately how many men are employed in the adjacent sawmill?
- (5) What are the sanitary arrangements at that mill?
- (6) Has he (if not, why not) consulted the Public Health Department in order to ascertain whether those premises comply with its requirements?
- (7) If the answer to No. (6) is in the negative, will he inquire and advise the result?
- (8) If the sawmill property is non-conforming, will he initiate eviction proceedings?
- (9) If not, would it be a reasonable deduction that he is more reluctant to disturb business interests than he is to evict families from their homes?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) The residual value against the railway capital account is £208.
- (2) Individual maintenance costs are not recorded.
- (3) The tenants were given notice to vacate in February, 1960, because of the condition of the premises and heavy maintenance requirements which rendered continuance of tenancies uneconomical in view of the ultimate planned use of the area for other purposes.
- (4) 22.
- (5) Deep sewerage at western end and earth closet at mill.
- (6) No. The terms of the lease stipulate that the lessee shall comply with the requirements of the health authority.
- (7) This is a matter between the health authority and the lessee.
- (8) Answered by No. (7).
- (9) No.

**STATE PURCHASE HOMES***Analysis of Arrears*

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

Will he supply a copy of the analysis of arrears on purchase

homes under the State Housing Act, to which he made reference in reply to a question asked by me on the 3rd August?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

**STATE HOUSING ACT—LEASEHOLD  
RELATIONSHIP OF DEPOSIT TO ARREARS  
Source of information—Arrears Section**

£	Deposit	Arrears		Total	Percentage of 538
		Under £40	Over £40		
0-49	....	97	39	136	25.3
50-99	....	198	39	237	44.0
100-149	....	73	9	82	15.2
150-199	....	41	4	45	8.4
200-249	....	19	2	21	4.0
250-499	....	16	1	17	3.1
Totals	....	444	94	538	100.0

**FURTHER EXAMINATION OF ABOVE:—**

£	Under £40		Over £40		Total		Percentage of Total	
	No.	Amount	No.	Amount	No.	Amount	No.	Amount
0-50	264	4,751	71	5,823	335	10,574	62.2	67.5
51-99	31	543	7	671	38	1,214	7.1	7.7
100-149	73	1,429	9	725	82	2,154	15.2	13.8
150-199	41	785	4	206	45	991	8.4	6.3
200-249	19	338	2	105	21	443	4.0	2.8
250-499	16	247	1	46	17	293	3.1	1.9
Totals	444	8,093	94	7,576	538	15,669	100.0	100.0

**TOURISM***Western Australian Bureaus in Eastern States*

21. Mr. KELLY asked the Premier:

- (1) What are the locations of the new Tourist Bureau premises acquired in—  
 (a) Sydney;  
 (b) Melbourne;  
 (c) Adelaide?

- (2) Have these premises been purchased—

- (a) outright;  
 (b) weekly tenancy;  
 (c) lease?

- (3) What are the terms of occupancy in each case?

- (4) Has the Government paid key money in any instance?

- (5) If so, what was the consideration?

- (6) Has it been necessary to undertake alterations?

- (7) If so, what will be the cost in each case?

- (8) What floor space is available in each branch?

Mr. WATTS (for Mr. Brand) replied:

- (1) (a) Sydney—22 Martin Place.  
 (b) Melbourne—10 Royal Arcade.  
 (c) Adelaide—62A King William Street.

- (2) (a) No.  
 (b) Sydney—Weekly tenancy but not terminable unless premises required for re-building.  
 (c) Adelaide—Lease.

Melbourne—Purchase of shares in Melbourne Arcade Pty. Ltd. entitling Government to premises during such time as the Government remains a shareholder in the Company.

- (3) Sydney—Monthly rental of £110 5s. 8d.

Melbourne—Monthly payment of £53 7s. 6d. to cover proportion of cleaning, rates, taxes, and other expenses associated with the Arcade.

Adelaide—5 years from the 30th September, 1959, at a weekly rental of £27 10s. 0d. plus rates and

taxes. If head lessee obtains renewal of his lease in September, 1965, option of renewal.

- (4) No, but payments were made as follows:—

(a) Sydney—£5,100 paid to the head lessor.

(b) Melbourne—£3,300 for shares in Melbourne Arcade Pty. Ltd. All 34 tenants are shareholders and ownership of shares entitles shareholder to occupation of premises while shareholding continues. This is a very desirable situation as the values are likely to increase. If so, share values would appreciate.

Also £14,200 for ingoing to previous tenants—Nettleburg Furs Pty. Ltd.

If it were decided to make a move to other premises in a few years' time this could be recovered from following tenant in whole or in part, but if tenancy continued as long as 16 years, including payment of amounts referred to in respect of Melbourne in question (3) the annual cost would be approximately £2,000, representing a favourable rental in such a situation.

(c) Adelaide—Nil.

(5) Answered by Nos. (3) and (4).

(6) Yes.

(7) Sydney—estimated at £2,000.

Melbourne—£2,992 16s. 8d.

Adelaide—£509 9s. 7d.

(8) Sydney—approximately 300 sq. ft.  
Melbourne—310 sq. ft. street level  
and 310 sq. ft. first floor.  
Adelaide—300 sq. ft.

## KIMBERLEY RESEARCH STATION

### *District Allowance*

22. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister for Agriculture:

Would he ascertain the amount of district allowance paid to Commonwealth Government employees and State Government employees at the Kimberley Research Station?

Mr. NALDER replied:

District allowance for both Commonwealth and State wages employees is £3 10s. per week.

## ROAD BUSES

### *Substitution for Country Passenger Trains*

23. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) On what routes have road buses replaced country passenger trains?

- (2) What percentage increase in patronage has resulted?

Mr. COURT replied:

The following information is based on the assumption that the questions refer to the routes where road buses have replaced passenger trains since the 30th May, 1960.

- (1) (a) Perth - Toodyay - Milling (complete service).
- (b) Perth - Northam (three services only).
- (c) Perth - Wyalkatchem - Mukinbudin (complete service).
- (d) Perth - Wyalkatchem - Merredin (complete service).
- (e) Perth - Narrogin - Albany (diesel services only).
- (f) Geraldton - Mullewa (complete service).
- (2) A comparison of the results of the census of the trains concerned made in February last in the course of the investigations which led to the changes referred to in question No. (1) with the assessment of the earnings of the omnibuses taken from the drivers' statement of running for one week in June shows that passenger earnings for omnibuses were greater than for the trains they replaced as follows:—

	Per cent.
Perth - Toodyay - Milling	169
Perth - Northam	156
Perth - Mukinbudin	86
Perth - Wyalkatchem - Merredin	28
Perth - Narrogin - Albany	32
Geraldton - Mullewa	15

In considering these figures it must also be borne in mind that the curve in passenger journeys would be at its lowest in June.

## ITINERANT TEACHERS

### *Cost in Murchison and North-West*

24. Mr. WATTS: On Thursday last the member for Gascoyne, in referring to the approximate cost of £3,700 for two itinerant teachers in the North-West, asked me whether that amount included the cost of running the teachers' vehicles plus the depreciation and interest on them. I undertook to obtain this

additional information for the honourable member and I now advise him as follows:—

Running costs and depreciation were included but not interest on initial outlay. At 5 per cent. an additional £134 should be added to the given total.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### CEMENT

#### *Prices to State Governments*

1. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

On the 2nd August I directed a question on notice to the Minister for Industrial Development asking for the cement prices to the various State Governments. The Minister was unable to supply full information on that date and said that he had communicated with the other States, and that when information was obtained it would be made available. As a fortnight has elapsed, which appears to me to be a reasonable time, could the Minister give any explanation for the information not having been made available?

Mr. COURT replied:

I will check to see whether all the answers are back; but if the member for Melville confers with the Leader of the Opposition, he will find that on a similar mission last year we had extreme difficulty in getting answers back from all the States. I think it is better to deal through the various Governments rather than through private channels. However, I assure the honourable member that as soon as the information is to hand, it will be passed on to him.

### WATER RESTRICTIONS

#### *Prospects for Coming Summer*

2. Mr. HEAL asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

I asked the Minister recently whether he could give any indication as to whether water restrictions would be applied in the metropolitan area. He indicated that he might be able to give some answer at the end of August. However, since then we have had considerable rain and I now ask the Minister whether he is in a position to indicate whether or not restrictions will be applied?

Mr. WILD replied:

I am still not prepared to make a statement. When I feel the time is propitious I will do so.

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

### *Seventh Day*

Debate resumed from the 11th August.

MR. J. HEGNEY (Middle Swan) [4.53]: When I was interrupted on Thursday evening, I was referring to the financial position of the Australian Paper Manufacturing Co. Ltd., which is to receive very substantial loan fund assistance from the Government. There is no question about the fact that because of this substantial loan which it is proposed to make to this company, such departments as the Education Department will have to go short of many necessities.

The fact that this company has made millions of pounds' worth of profit during 1959, and has built up other substantial reserves, is absolutely no justification for making such a substantial contribution to this company for the purpose of inducing it to establish its industry here.

I can just imagine the position if one or two other companies indicate their willingness to come to Western Australia and are advanced a similar amount as an inducement. There is no doubt that an unbalance will be created in the distribution of loan funds in this State. We know only too well how the State requires more and more loan funds for its development in a multiplicity of categories.

One of the departments which we know is in need of a considerable sum from loan funds is the Education Department, in order that it might be built up to a standard such as exists in other parts of the world.

In regard to technical education, I had an opportunity at a meeting a few weeks ago of talking to a very eminent man who came from the University of Birmingham. He is in the technology section; and I had the opportunity, as I was representing the Leader of the Opposition, of meeting Dr. Venables and conversing with him. He expressed his opinion as to what was taking place in other parts of the world, notably in England; and there is no question that our State, and even the Commonwealth, is a long way behind other countries in regard to technical education and technology.

Because of this fact, it is very important that our loan fund should be appropriated to where it will do more good; and in this case I consider that it would be far more profitable to spend it on education rather than hand it over to a very wealthy company. The action the Government has taken in connection with this company is not worthy of the support which it might expect to receive. If further funds were made available on a similar pattern to other companies, there is no doubt that the reserves would diminish considerably.

Mr. Court: It does not follow that that is to be the pattern for all cases.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: We judge the future by the past. That has been the case always, even in regard to history. From the judgment of the past we endeavour to predict the future.

Mr. Hawke: Hear, hear! Very logical.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: That is why I say that the pattern has been set and there is no question about what other companies will think in regard to this over-generous treatment which the paper manufacturing company is to receive.

Mr. Court: You do not know the case at all. You have not the faintest idea.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: Other companies will say to the Government—whatever Government is in power—"You did this for the Australian paper manufacturing company, so why not give us the same privilege?" They will be justified in saying so, too; because, as everyone knows, the company in question has made such a substantial profit.

Mr. Graham: Two million pounds last year.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I suggest that this company is not coming here primarily for the benefit of Western Australia. In the final analysis it is coming here mainly to establish itself, having in mind the consumer market which will be available when the population increases. That is the position. Again I say: If we have to extend the same loans to other companies as has been done in this instance, the financial position will be very difficult.

There are many industries in our State in need of financial assistance. I know of a small one in my own electorate which has been seeking an extension of the electric light system to help it along. This man, who has set out on his own and is endeavouring to assist the agricultural industry, is what we call a pure scientist, and is a university graduate. He is only a few hundred yards from the Great Eastern Highway; but because he cannot obtain an extension of the electric light poles, he has only been able to go so far with his manufacturing processes in Redcliffe and has had to take the balance to an area represented by the member for Darling Range. This is in spite of the fact that he has been recognised as performing a very estimable service to this country, and particularly to the banana industry, in that he is manufacturing a certain preservative which so far has had to be imported from the Eastern States. I do not think this particular person has been helped because of the policy of the Electricity Department. And in his case the expenditure of only about £100, or less, would be necessary.

Mr. May: How long ago was this?

Mr. J. HEGNEY: That was less than 12 months ago.

Mr. Court: Did you approve of the programme of inducements put up by the previous Government?

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I approve of a reasonable programme of inducements. I do not think the Government is justified in offering up to £2,500,000 of loan funds on the basis of repayment at £300,000 a year. The repayments would continue until beyond 1980 when most of us will be gone from this Chamber. Therefore I do not approve of such a proposition. I do not think the Government of which I was a supporter ever had as much money to fritter away in that manner.

Every member gets correspondence from the various parents and citizens' associations urging that we should support the resolutions of the national educational councils that the Commonwealth Government be asked to contribute more to the educational systems of the Commonwealth. Some years ago—shortly after the war ended—the Commonwealth Government was requested by a conference of State Ministers, which was held in Adelaide, to make available £10,000,000 to help primary education and allied activities. Unfortunately the Commonwealth Government would not agree—it was always a bit of a laggard in that respect.

The Prime Minister adopted the easy get-out the other day when he said that the matter was one that definitely concerned the State Governments. We realise that the Commonwealth Government is the controller of the exchequer; that the resources of the country are pouring into its coffers; and that for the most part the States are just mendicants waiting on what the Commonwealth will give them. The time is opportune to insist on our Commonwealth representatives and the State Minister for Education making representations to the Commonwealth Government to become more liberal in the allocation of funds for educational purposes.

Another matter with which I wish to deal concerns the Perth Airport at Guildford. There has been considerable agitation to extend the airport because of what is known as the jet age. The Premier and the Chief Secretary are leading the band in this direction. In this Assembly we hear a lot about town planning, and we know that an eminent town planner in the person of Professor Stephenson was brought to our State by the McLarty-Watts Government for the purpose of drawing up a town-planning scheme for the development of this city. Professor Stephenson's recommendation was that a large airport should be built in the Lake Gnanagara area near the Wanneroo Road where there is a substantial acreage of land at present not built on, which could easily be developed for a future airport.

In other parts of the world, helicopters are supplanting the motorcar or motorbus in providing transport to and from airports. An airport might be 15 miles from the city it serves, and helicopters can fetch passengers into the city in about 10 minutes.

I have read the files dealing with certain resummptions of land from the State Housing Commission, and it would appear to me that the State Ministers put up no real opposition to the further extension of the Guildford airport to accommodate the larger planes—the jet planes—whereas they could have stood by the decision made by Professor Stephenson and urged that the Commonwealth establish the airport in the Lake Gngangara area.

As a result of what has transpired, the Belmont district will undoubtedly be considerably damaged by the extension of the airport; and the repercussions will extend beyond Belmont to the Darling Range area because there will not be direct access to the city from those parts. I understand it was proposed that in the development of this civil airport a tunnel should be built under the airport to carry the arterial road—the Maida Vale Road—through the centre of Belmont to the hills. But it is well known that this project is beyond the ability of the engineers, because the airport is at the foothills and the area is so waterlogged that the tunnel could hardly ever be kept dry; the cost of keeping it dry would be too great.

When I was in London, six years ago, I had the opportunity of seeing the London airport. A tunnel runs under that airport for three-quarters of a mile. One goes into the airport grounds and then through the tunnel to where the planes leave every quarter of an hour for the various parts of Europe. But the authorities in England were able to build the tunnel because there were no engineering difficulties at all. But certainly our engineers would be immediately confronted with engineering difficulties in the location where it is proposed to extend the airport.

The proposed extension will undoubtedly affect certain housing activities. Already I have noticed the resumption of 93 acres of State Housing Commission land which had been taken over by the commission for the purpose of extending its building activities. Also, the properties of some private builders will be affected.

The Chief Secretary went out to the airport; and he is quite an advocate for the airline companies. If what is happening there were to happen at Cottesloe or some other of the more select areas, there would be a hue and cry; but because this extension affects an outlying district where workers live, there is no fight. The State Government ought to put up a fight on the sound ground that the eminent town planner who was brought here by the McLarty-Watts Government recommended in his

report that the airport should be out along the Wanneroo Road; and that is where it should be.

But, no, a Commonwealth committee comes here and takes evidence; and our representatives—the Government for the time being—rush in to support the Commonwealth scheme and to urge that more money be made available to extend the airport at Guildford. Not one word is said about trying to establish the airport at Wanneroo, or of putting the airport where it should be, having regard to the future of the State. In 50 or 100 years' time there will be cramping in the metropolitan area. There is no doubt that noise, fumes, and other disturbances that will arise will be experienced by the people adjacent to the airport. Therefore I, as a member for that part of the State, make my protest.

The Governor's Speech contains a paragraph stating that the Government is going to try to encourage more migration to our State. I suggest to the Minister for Immigration that he be careful to see that the people asked to come to Western Australia are properly screened, because only the other day a businessman, returning to New South Wales—he was not a Laborite but a businessman—made certain comments. In the *Daily News* dated the 9th August, under the heading "Scathing Blast at Migrants", appeared the following:—

Australia was getting misfits and deadbeats from Britain and Europe to boost migration figures, retired Sydney businessman Ralph Randell said today.

He said that Australian migration officials were scraping the bottom of the barrel—

Mark those words—"scraping the bottom of the barrel"—

—because of improved economic conditions in Britain and Europe. Randell, of Vaucluse, returned to Sydney last week after a seven months' overseas tour with his wife. He travelled 40,000 miles and visited more than 20 countries.

He said that most migrants from Scandinavian countries were unhappy misfits. At present, there were a big number of misfits and deadbeats applying to come to Australia from Britain.

That is a scathing comment on people who were invited to come to Australia!

Mr. Graham: I bet this fellow has never mixed with workers.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: The last paragraph is the best—

They were being accepted firstly, to maintain the quota and preserve the racial balance and, secondly, to keep our immigration staffs busy.

Whether that is true or false, I cannot say; but I suggest it is something that should be deeply probed by our Minister

for Immigration, who is evidently very anxious to fetch in migrants from overseas, particularly skilled tradesmen. I point out, as the Minister for Education well knows, that each year we have young people leaving school, and they have difficulty in finding employment. In addition, our own men are leaving the State because of the way the Government has attacked many of their conditions during the last 12 months. It is no wonder the men are getting out and going to other parts; and this applies particularly to workers in the building and engineering industries. It is evidently the intention of the Minister to make up this deficiency by bringing in migrants from England and European countries.

Another matter I wish to deal with is inflation. There is no doubt that this is the great economic problem of the day. It will be interesting to know what the Federal Treasurer will say tonight, in this regard, and what proposals he will put forward to arrest inflation. The Commonwealth Government has gone along in its even way, and has had plenty of money to spend during the last 10 or 11 years that it has been in power, with the result that, short of trying to prevent the workers' wages from being increased, no activity has ensued to deal with this problem. The Commonwealth Government has been represented in the Commonwealth Arbitration Court and has urged that the wages of the workers should not be increased, because of the inflationary spiral. But no other action has been taken to curb prices or profits or otherwise to stabilise the economy.

Mr. Graham: You would not expect it from this mob, would you?

Mr. J. HEGNEY: It used to be the cry that the Chifley pound at least had the purchasing power of one pound, when Mr. Chifley was Prime Minister and Treasurer; but the value of the pound has slipped in the intervening years.

On the 22nd June, 1960, this paragraph, headed, "Survey Shows Threefold Rise in C.O.L." appeared in *The West Australian*—

Today the Australian £1 will buy only as much as 6s. 8d. did in 1940. Between then and now the cost of living has trebled—and prices are still rising.

This is stated by the Institute of Public Affairs, Victoria, in a new booklet on inflation.

That is not a Labor organisation. The article goes on to show how the increases have come about.

Only the other day the Governor of the Reserve Bank indicated that that organisation is making some policy effort to curb what is known as the volume of credit. Beyond that neither the Commonwealth Government nor the State Government, in its own sphere, has tried to reduce prices.

What the Government has done, by virtue of its numbers in Parliament, is to get rid of the only legislation that had some controlling influence on prices.

I now come to a few matters that affect my own electorate; and I refer firstly to one which I have frequently advocated in this Parliament—the need for a subway at the Rivervale crossing. Although lights are fitted at the Rivervale crossing, motorists claim that in the late afternoon, when the sun is shining in their eyes, it is difficult to see the lights, and this can be dangerous when trains are using the line. I think the time has arrived when a subway should be built. This position lends itself to the building of a subway, and I recommend that it be built at the earliest opportunity.

I should now like to refer to the question of improving the Swan River by dredging. For some years the Swan River, at least as far up as Bassendean, flowed through the Middle Swan electorate, and I have stood up in this Chamber in years gone by and advocated that the dredge should be taken past the Causeway and put to work dredging the river from East Perth through as far as it can go upstream. This deepening of the river, and the improving of the banks, would make the river much more beautiful. Through its representatives on various committees, the Belmont Park Road Board has frequently urged that this work be done; and I think that the time is opportune for it to be done.

I do not expect much assistance from Government members in this connection; because when dredging work was done on the river during the depression days, country members in this Parliament used to say it was a waste of money as it was not being spent on reproductive work. But one has only to see what has happened around the foreshores of the Swan River, with all the reclamation work that has been done, to see what beauty has been created by that work. The banks of the river have been improved as far down as Nedlands, and this has created an asset of which we might well be proud. Now that the new Causeway has been completed, and the channels have been deepened, I believe the dredge could be taken in an easterly direction up the river with a view to deepening the river and improving it. This would do much to obviate the mosquito nuisance, and from a health point of view, would be well worth while.

Because of the density of motor traffic on our highways, it is essential that a number of our bridges be widened. I refer to one in particular—the Garratt Road bridge, which joins Bayswater and Belmont. Unquestionably the road which leads to the bridge is an arterial road and needs widening. Another bridge which needs to be widened is the one at South Guildford, on the Eastern Highway. Many vehicles that cross the bridge are wider

than the older-type vehicles that were formerly used and, consequently, are a danger to motor traffic.

In my view the time has arrived when another bridge should be built across the Swan River, somewhere in the eastern suburbs because of the difficulties occasioned by the multiplicity of vehicles on our roads. The Garratt Road bridge was built at the end of my first term in Parliament—1933—and no other bridge, except the Narrows Bridge, which was established while the previous Labor Government was in office, has been built across the Swan River since then. Undoubtedly there is need for another bridge because of the large number of vehicles now using our roads.

One other matter to which I would like to refer is the extension of the sewerage main into the Rivervale and Belmont districts. The Rivervale crossing is approximately two miles from Perth, and the sewerage main ends there. From that point on there is no sewerage, even though there has been a build-up of industry in those areas. The only hospital near there is the St. John of God Hospital; but there are a number of hotels, and the only system they have is the septic tank system. Considerable extensions have been made to the hospital in recent years, but the hospital authorities are having great difficulty with the septic tank system.

I raised this matter, by way of deputations to the Premier, when he was Minister for Works; and I raised it several times with the member for Melville, when he was Minister for Works in the Labor Government, and also with the present Minister for Works. I have always been told that it is a question of loan funds not being available. Tonight I have been hammering away at the point that loan funds can be made available in liberal doses to assist a paper manufacturing company to establish itself at Spearwood; yet when one wants to initiate an extension of the sewerage system into the Belmont district, it appears that this project still has to wait for a few more years. It is amazing how often one has to stand up in Parliament and advocate certain requirements before any notice is taken of one's comments.

The same thing has happened with drainage works. From the time I came into politics—25 years ago—I have been asking for drainage works to be commenced in the eastern suburbs; and it is only now that such work has been carried out in the Belmont district, and certain work has been done in the Bayswater area. But, as I said, it is amazing how long one has to wait for worth-while activities such as these to be attended to. This work should have been done many years ago. The same applies to the sewerage work I have advocated this evening.

I say to the Minister for Health, who is not here, and to the Minister for Water Supplies, who is not here either, that there is another important matter which should be attended to, and which has been mentioned in correspondence. I refer to the sewerage of the Guildford airport. The Belmont Park Road Board has also written letters in reference to this matter. Unfortunately, the Guildford airport is a long way from Bayswater, where the sewerage mains end; but I think, and I have urged on many occasions, that the Guildford airport should be sewered. The health officer of the Belmont district has made frequent reports on the matter, pointing out the danger to the health of the community because of the large number of people passing through the airport from all parts of the world.

Personally, I think the Commonwealth Government should carry out the work, and I know that representations were made by a former Minister, through the then Premier, to the Commonwealth Government, or the Commonwealth Treasurer, urging that funds be made available for such a purpose. I think that this Government should make the same approach, and it is up to the Commonwealth Government to provide the money necessary to enable the Guildford airport to be connected to the sewerage system; because there is such a risk of disease being spread by people passing through the airport from overseas countries, particularly eastern countries.

**MR. ROWBERRY (Warren) [5.55]:** Firstly I should like to offer my congratulations to the member for South Fremantle on his initial speech in this Chamber. It was a typical South Fremantle fighting speech, and I look forward with pleasure to hearing more of that type. It has been said in certain places that the debates in this House lack fire, and look likely to lapse. In this connection, I think it would be a bad thing if the temporary members of the Government, and the temporary members on the back benches of the Government, were allowed to fall asleep.

I should also like to congratulate the member for Canning on the very able way in which he moved the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech.

Mr. May: You mean the way he defended the Government.

Mr. ROWBERRY: I would like to offer him this friendly advice: In future he should get his arguments straight because the "Hawke" is likely to swoop on them at any inopportune moment.

During the debate, I have heard certain criticism of members of the Government side, and particularly of members of the Cabinet; and I offer the Government my condolences and sympathy, first of all for the remarkable opportunity which the

Government lost when Mr. N. Fernie made public, at a meeting in Collie last Thursday, the details of a probable £20,000,000 sponge iron industry. I hope that when discussions take place between Mr. Fernie and his company, and the Cabinet, those discussions will not be influenced or characterised by some of the sub-adolescent pique that has been present in the attitude of the Government towards some of the propositions put forward by Her Majesty's Opposition.

I should now like to offer my congratulations to the Premier! He has set about his job with vigour, courage, and enthusiasm; and in the words of the member for Narrogin, "his Government has made great strides." Unfortunately the member for Narrogin did not indicate in what direction the strides were made. Although courage and enthusiasm are necessary, it is also essential that they be well directed.

Mr. Graham: Back to the dark ages! Anti-worker!

Mr. ROWBERRY: I noticed that during his perambulations the Premier has made the remarkable discovery that the North-West part of this State is nearer to South-East Asia than it is to Canberra. What deductions we are to draw from that I cannot understand; because that has been the case since the world was created, thousands and thousands of years ago! If it is to be deduced that we are in danger from South-East Asia, I might say that we in Australia have been exposed to the danger of invasion by South-East Asians for thousands of years, and still we have not had very many entrants from that direction into our continent. I would also point out that the Prime Minister who governs this continent of Australia is a scion of a race which had its birth 12,000 miles away, let alone 3,000 miles away. I do not think we are in very much danger from incursions from South-East Asia.

I would like now to condole with the Government, and the Premier particularly, on his obsolescent views on economics. In an announcement to the newspapers immediately prior to the sitting of the Arbitration Court to decide whether or not the basic wage of the State should be raised, the Premier said that any rise in the basic wage would cause inflation; and would price us out of the markets of the world.

To this pronouncement I would say, firstly, that if the high cost of living in Australia, and the high standard of living in Australia, had been able to price us out of the markets of the world, this would have happened many years ago; but the remarkable fact is that it did not happen. Some people say that basic wage adjustments are a social justice. That may be so; but they are also an economic necessity. Markets, I think, can be briefly described as people with money to spend. From where does money to spend come? Chiefly from wages and salaries.

Mr. Roberts: And hard work.

Mr. ROWBERRY: Therefore a basic wage rise to compensate for increases in prices is a necessary economic function, particularly if it provides wages and salaries with purchasing power. The Minister for Industrial Development believes we should develop a killer instinct. Whatever he means by that, I do not know. He could mean that we should indulge in a war of attrition; that we should drive all competitors to the wall—and perhaps up the wall—and so capture markets.

It must be remembered, however, that we have already agreed that markets are people with money to spend; and they can only get money to spend from wages and salaries; and, in turn, wages and salaries can be obtained only if there is employment. If there were no employment, we would drive our competitors out of existence. In that way we would destroy our markets.

I was glad the member for Middle Swan mentioned inflation. This is something that should exercise the mind of every right-thinking person. It should be the first question to be studied, particularly by members of Parliament. I read a pronouncement by Professor Copland several years ago, in which he said it cannot be demonstrated, logically, that wages and salaries, and rises in the basic wage, are the primary causes of inflation. It can be amply demonstrated if, as a short description of inflation, we take a state of affairs where too much money is chasing too few goods.

That certainly cannot be applied to the present day, when production has never been greater; when goods have never been more in abundance. So the question of too much money chasing too few goods cannot be sustained. Wages and salaries are paid in the production and provision of goods. Goods are provided before the wages and salaries are paid—though they do not amount in monetary value, to anything like the value of the goods and services provided.

Some years ago, when I was working in the mines in the Old Country, it was significant that wages were something like 75 per cent. or 80 per cent. of the total cost of production. Now it can be demonstrated that they are only slightly over 50 per cent. of the total cost of production. So we see that wages and salaries have provided more than their value by twice as much, approximately, in goods and services; and having come into existence after the goods and services were provided to the community, it cannot be logically sustained that wages and salaries, or rises in the basic wage, are any cause of inflation whatever.

The Premier said that rises in wages would cost us out of the markets of the world. The markets of the world, as we

have already said, are people with money to spend. What happens is really the opposite. Trade is not a one-way traffic. People on the other side of the world who buy our goods are employed only because they are manufacturing goods which we buy. If in Australia we cut down our costs, such as wages and salaries, then we destroy the market which the exporters on the other side of the world require; and we strangle trade in that way. I would ask members of the Government to have a look at a treatise on primary economics.

I wish now to bring before the House the matter of the integrity of the Government; this trustworthy attitude of the Government; the way the Government keeps its promises.

Mr. Hawke: Oh yeah! Has someone been misleading you?

Mr. ROWBERRY: On the first day of the last session of Parliament—on the 30th June, 1959—I asked the Minister for Industrial Development a series of questions as follows:—

In the event of the Government disposing of all or any of the State Trading Concerns, will the Minister give the following undertaking:—

- (1) That a fair price will be insisted upon before sale?
- (2) That employment in these concerns will continue on the same level as before sale?
- (3) That the concern disposed of will continue to operate within the economy of the State?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister inform this House of what steps, if any, he proposes to take to—

- (a) Determine what is a fair price.
- (b) Make it mandatory upon the purchasers to keep employment in each concern at the same level as before the sale.
- (c) Enforce continuance of operation within the economy of the State?

The Minister's reply was as follows:—

To the first three conditions that the honourable member read out, the answers are as follows:— The Government has already stated its intention, firstly, that it will insist on a fair and reasonable price; secondly, that it will protect the employment of existing employees; and, thirdly, that there will be insistence on the continuance of the industry within the economy of the State. The methods to be employed will be those normally employed in the conduct of any negotiation of this kind.

Last week I asked the Premier the following series of questions:—

On Wednesday, the 3rd August, in replying to debate, he stated, *inter alia*, "I have not damaged or kicked the ordinary people and have no intention of doing so," or words to that effect:

In view of this, will he give the House an undertaking that the number of men employed in Pemberton State Saw Mill will not be reduced or that alternative employment will be found for anyone found to be redundant, so that the value of Pemberton as a town will be retained?

The Premier replied—

Pemberton State Saw Mill is a trading concern as part of the overall State Building Supplies operations and no undertaking that the number of men employed at Pemberton will not be reduced can or should be given.

Members should contrast that with the former promises—

Mr. Graham: It is typical.

Mr. ROWBERRY: — that the employees would be protected in their existing employment. It is a total reversal. To continue with the Premier's reply—

For instance, the erection of a new mill as proposed by the previous Government would have brought about a reduction in the number of men needed.

The reference to the erection of a new mill was only half a truth. The proposed new mill at Pemberton was to take the place of the one that was burnt down. It would have considerably eased the employment situation; it would have eased the fear, apprehension, and doubt about which we have heard so much. There has been a tendency in the House at this time to ease our differences and difficulties with the various Ministers.

I would now like to take to task the Attorney-General, as Minister for Education. Before the by-election in 1957, Mr. Watts, Attorney-General, accused the Labor Government of spending 90 per cent. of its total expenditure on education in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Watts: Your figures are not quite right. It was 81 per cent; it was not on education; it was on Government buildings.

Mr. ROWBERRY: Near enough is good enough. On Wednesday, the 3rd August, in No. 3 of the *Votes and Proceedings* of the Legislative Assembly, it is recorded that I asked the Minister for Education the following questions:—

- (1) Has he seen an article in *The West Australian* of the 30th June, 1960, headed "Big Contract for School

at Melville," which contained (among other things) the following:—

The project includes development of the grounds with playing areas for basketball, football, cricket, and hockey?

- (2) Is this a true recording of fact?
- (3) If so, will he explain why the development mentioned is included in this contract, whilst in country areas this work has largely been left to dedicated parents and citizens' associations, which by voluntary effort and expenditure of funds, have been responsible for development of playing areas at the various schools?

I should have thought this one would interest country members, no matter what their political thought might be. The next part of the question is as follows:—

- (4) Does this not appear, on the face of it, to be discrimination between metropolitan and country schools?
- (5) If the facts are as stated in the article, will he give an undertaking that, in future, country schools will be treated the same as metropolitan schools in the matter of providing sporting facilities?

After they hear the answers, I would like to hear what members representing country electorates have to say. The answers were as follows:—

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) It is necessary for the department to develop the grounds at all high schools, where sport and physical education play a vital part in the school curriculum. It is desirable also for this to be done at other schools but available funds have not allowed and do not allow this.

(4) and (5) Answered by No. (3).

By what process of ratiocination the Minister discovered—

Mr. Lewis: That is a new one!

Mr. ROWBERRY: Look it up in the dictionary. I repeat: By what process of ratiocination the Minister discovered that Nos. (4) and (5) were answered by No. (3) is beyond me. We do not want discrimination between town and country; and we do not want to deprive any of the metropolitan high schools of funds being devoted to them for the development of sporting facilities; but we do not believe—and I think you agree with me, Mr. Speaker—there should be any discrimination in the allocation of these funds. If the funds are available they should be equitably distributed between town and country.

Mr. Lewis: Don't you get 80 per cent.?

Mr. ROWBERRY: The honourable member will have his chance to speak, particularly as he is a country member. Apparently anything the Government does is right, and the honourable member must remain quiet. But I would remind him that he was elected not only as a Country Party member of this House, but as a representative of the whole of the people in his electorate, no matter what their political views might be; and he should have the courage to stand up on his hind legs and assail the Government, even though he is a member of it.

I received a letter from the secretary of the Manjimup High School Parents and Citizens' Association, which reads as follows:—

An item of news published in *The West Australian*, dated the 30th June, 1960, was of considerable interest to the above association, and no doubt to kindred associations outside the metropolitan area.

This item was headed "Big Contract for School at Melville at £324,493". I quote the paragraph that has caused so much interest—

Mr. Curran: You would not see that in Willagee.

Mr. ROWBERRY: To continue—

The project includes development of the grounds with playing areas for basketball, football, cricket and hockey.

We would deem it a favour if you and your colleagues would—I wonder who my colleagues are?

Mr. Bovell: We wonder, too.

Mr. ROWBERRY: Who are the members of this district, which includes Warren, part of Vasse, and part of Blackwood? To continue with the letter—

—at the next sitting of the Legislative Assembly, endeavour to gain a satisfactory answer as to why schools such as mentioned above are privileged to have grounds laid out, and sporting fields developed by contract at the Government's expense, while here it has been left to a small body of parents and citizens to do what they can for the school, with the uncertainty of perhaps a subsidy for the work they have done.

We wonder that if this association had not made an effort to clear the land and create playing fields, although far from completion through lack of funds, would our high school after four years of use still be surrounded by virgin bush, and have scrub to the front doors.

It is putting it mildly to say that we, as taxpayers, are being imposed on to pay for such as the Melville contract, while we are left to shoulder the problem of our own school.

Thanking you in anticipation of your valued assistance.

Yours faithfully,  
(Mrs.) A. E. Murdoch,  
Hon. Secretary.

Mr. Bickerton: They showed good judgment in not writing to the Minister for Lands.

Mr. ROWBERRY: I know funds are short and that the money available to the Government is not adequate to cover all the requirements of education in our schools; but an equitable distribution should be made, and it could be made if the will existed to bring it about. We have no desire whatsoever to deprive any other district or area in the State of moneys being spent on their educational facilities; but I feel very strongly about this matter, as I know the type of bushland from which these playing areas are being carved. I know how much dedication and devotion went into this work by the voluntary workers and how much pride was exhibited in the development of these grounds. I say without fear of successful argument against it that we in the country are not receiving the thought and consideration in the matter of education that are necessary. Therefore, I hope the colleagues mentioned in this letter will take up the cudgels, even though they have to speak against their own Government.

Mr. Lewis: You should have made that speech four years ago.

Mr. ROWBERRY: Unfortunately, I was not here four years ago. I think the honourable member who just interjected goes to sleep for periods and then he wakes up—

Mr. Lewis: My apologies.

Mr. ROWBERRY: —and in moments of rare intelligence, makes the most inane interjections that could possibly be made.

Mr. Graham: The member for Moore-or-less!

Mr. ROWBERRY: The next matter about which I wish to speak also concerns discrimination—and I say this advisedly—between the country and the metropolitan area. On the 12th July, 1960, I wrote to the Minister for Health, and up to date I have not even had an acknowledgment of my letter. The letter which I wrote reads as follows:—

I enclose for your information a letter which I have received from the Secretary of the Nannup Hospital Board.

If the facts are as stated in the letter, then it seems to me that an anomaly has been created very much to the

disadvantage of the people of Nannup. To be able to travel to Busselton and get hospital treatment at 12s. per day less, under circumstances which to all intents and purposes are the same, seems to me to be a travesty of justice and surely not what it was intended in the first place by the increase.

Surely it was never intended that one section of the community, or in this case one town, should gain a distinct advantage over another.

It is also imperative that the principle of decentralisation should be encouraged by demonstrating that people will suffer no disadvantage by living in country areas.

This hospital at Nannup has played a very important part in the everyday life of Nannup, sometimes under great difficulties, and every effort should be made to ensure that it continues to do so, as a timber, tourist, agriculture, and possibly paper-pulping centre.

I suggest that a retention of the 3-5 bed category in the new schedule, or alternatively that wards with a bed capacity of 4 or over be considered as "all other beds" in country hospitals only, where conditions are materially different to those in the city, would go some way towards solving the problem for country hospitals, especially that of Nannup.

Trusting that you will give this matter the sympathetic consideration it deserves.

Up to this moment I have received no reply from the Minister for Health; not even an acknowledgment of my letter.

I would add this: There is an indication in the article which I mentioned earlier in my speech that Nannup may become one of the centres which is going to produce sponge iron; and it will be vitally necessary that we not only keep this hospital in existence, but that we extend it as soon as and as much as we possibly can. Nannup is a place which has been largely neglected. As I have said previously, this place lies between the devil and the deep sea—between the deep sea of Busselton and the devil of Manjimup. It has largely been neglected because of that fact.

Mr. Bovell: I assume that the member of the district is not the devil.

Mr. ROWBERRY: If the member for the district makes himself a devil of a thorn in the flesh of the Government while on his feet, he will have performed his duty towards his electorate, so far as these matters are concerned.

Mr. Bovell: You said that Busselton was the deep blue sea and Manjimup was the devil. I want to know if you are the devil.

Mr. ROWBERRY: The Minister for Agriculture believes in getting on with the job. He annihilates time and space. He sends me letters saying he is going to arrive in the district; and a letter which I receive on Friday says that he will arrive in the district on Thursday. I hope he will read this in *Hansard*.

The member for Narrogin, in a series of unsubstantiated affirmatives, made certain statements while speaking to the Address-in-Reply. He said that it would be of advantage to dispose of State trading concerns; and I believe he once advocated in this House that the State trading concerns be sold to private enterprise so as to provide substantial moneys to be used on education.

As the Minister for Railways indicated in his replies to me at question time, the profits paid into revenue by the State Building Supplies to the 30th June, 1958—that is, total profits—equalled £941,168; and the profit for 1957-58 was £11,153, making a total of £952,321. In 1957-58 there was a gross profit of £258,899. Charges included depreciation, £115,126; and interest on loan capital, £116,067.

Concerning depreciation and interest on loan capital, that money is still available to us. It does not pass out of existence, even though it is listed as deductible on the balance sheet.

In the matter of the State sawmills, or State Building Supplies, I recently advanced the theory in regard to disposing of those assets—and who disposes of his assets these days for the purpose of obtaining money?—that the farmer did not sell part of his farm in order that he could develop another part of it. He went to the bank and floated a loan on his assets; he monetized the assets he had accumulated. I suggested that the Government could do that instead of selling the State sawmills: It could float a loan. I suggested that what was legal for an individual to do, must be legal for the State; and the Attorney-General interjected and said, "Read section 105 of the Constitution." I have read section 105 of the Constitution, and all that it does is to give the right to the Federal Parliament to take over the debts of the State—that is all.

Mr. Watts: Ask your ex-Treasurer how he would get on about raising a loan without the approval of the Loan Council.

Mr. ROWBERRY: I am answering the interjection made by the Attorney-General.

Mr. Watts: I am telling you it cannot be done without the approval of the Loan Council; and no institution would loan the money without that approval.

Mr. ROWBERRY: I am answering the interjection made by the Attorney-General when he said, "Read section 105 of the Constitution." It says, firstly, that the Federal Parliament may take over the debts of the State. I am not asking

whether the late Treasurer was or was not allowed to float a loan. I am merely suggesting to the House that what is legal for the individual or organisation to do, should be possible for the State to accomplish; and there is nothing in the section quoted by the Attorney-General which prevents us from doing so. I am not very well up in Latin; all the Latin I acquired was *hic est a javelin*, and such like phrases. I had better not suggest what to do with that javelin!

Mr. J. Hegney: It would not be *functus officio*, would it?

Mr. ROWBERRY: The Attorney-General utters big words in this Chamber, calculated to frighten us simple members. "You can't get a mandamus" the Attorney-General said. As a matter of fact, that is what he has done—man-damned us.

I would suggest the time is opportune for a more up-to-date venture into the world of economics; and while I am on that subject I will return to the matter of the basic wage. It is always suggested that industry and economy cannot bear any more increases. I believe, in reading between the lines, that the Government has set up, or is about to set up, a committee to inquire into the question of costs. I will offer one or two suggestions on this subject. When it decides—as it has already decided in its deliberations—that the basic wage is responsible for the rising and spiralling costs, it should give a thought to other costs in industry which to date have never been mentioned.

Nowadays we have the costs of suggestion and the costs of persuasion. Among the latter I would include radio and the Press, especially the latter. Newspapers cannot exist on the miserable 4d. or 6d. charged for each issue; they exist very largely upon advertising. Advertisements fill nearly seven-eighths of the newspapers, and this could be included in the costs of persuasion.

No-one would have any cavil with the newspapers earning income in this direction if they did not immediately attack the basic wage in the news column. We know it is a legitimate cost upon the economy for a certain amount to be paid for advertisements—and, by the way, the cost of those advertisements must be added to the cost of the articles advertised; there is no other way of its being recouped. We would have no quarrel whatsoever with the Press if the Press did not quarrel with us in the matter, and assert wrongly and with rather obstinate and pig-headed arguments—wrongly based arguments, not based on true economic fact—that the basic wage is responsible for the spiral of costs.

It could be correctly stated, I think, that it is impossible for the basic wage to rise unless it has a stimulus beforehand of a rise in prices; but it can never be demonstrated that prices must await the stimulus

of a rise in the basic wage before they rise. One can therefore see the fallacy of assuming that the basic wage is the cause of the rise in prices. I would bring this to the attention of our newspaper friends—those stalwart upholders of the right of free speech.

I would like to return now to the suggestion made by the member for Narrogin that the State sawmills be disposed of. I suggest it would be better if we retained these sawmills and the State Building Supplies if only for sentimental reasons. To hear the Government, and some spokesmen of the Government, one would almost think that it is an absolute sin for the Government to indulge in trade. I cannot find any law, either moral or divine, which lays down that trade and commerce is the prerogative of private enterprise. On the contrary, in olden days the King, or the leader of the people, controlled the whole of a country's production for the benefit of the people.

Referring to this conflict between private enterprise and State enterprise, I have here a booklet published by the Roman Catholic Church entitled, "The Natural Law." I would point out that we on this side of the House have no conflict whatsoever with private enterprise. We believe it is performing an essential function in the community—if it is private enterprise built up by the initiative, drive, and efficiency of a private individual by himself and not by exploitation of his fellow-workers or accumulation of credit at the expense of the community.

I wish to quote the following from this booklet prepared by the Catholic Bishops of Australia, which is endorsed by all, or nearly all, the Catholic archbishops and bishops in Australia. It reads as follows:—

**The Right of Private Ownership of Property:**

The right to acquire property in private ownership is something that is useful and even necessary for an orderly human life, and is thus regarded as a human right based on the law of nature.

But private ownership is not an "absolute" right. In case of utter need, for example, if a man were starving, he would be justified in ignoring the private ownership of food which he here and now needs for human life. Human life is more precious than material goods.

Private property is also a right that must be limited by the social destiny of man's nature, and is always subjected to the common good and the moral law. So Catholic social teaching, while strenuously defending the inherent right of ownership which each person enjoys, justifies its restriction whenever its abuse conflicts with the good of the community.

That is exactly where we, on this side of the House, are in conflict with members of the Government. We believe that private enterprise and all industry undertaken by man should be for the good of the community. When we quote examples of firms making huge profits, we do not do so in an attitude of enmity.

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

Before tea, I was endeavouring to indicate that we on this side of the House do not raise the subject of huge dividends and profits in industry merely as a result of envy and jealousy, but because we are convinced that the impact of these factors on prices is having an adverse effect on the economy of the country. In the same way, I was trying to indicate that inflation is due, to a large extent, to merchants having to spend too much on advertisements in trying to persuade people to buy, in some cases, unnecessary goods.

In addition, there is the agency, in the form of hire-purchase companies, that is trying to persuade people to accept money to purchase these unnecessary goods. All these influences must have an inflationary effect on the economy of the State. In fact, they have now taken up the slack between the difference of the wages impact on costs in industry compared to what it was some time ago, that difference, as I have already mentioned, being about 25 per cent.

In the short time at my disposal, I would like to bring to the attention of the House, some of the disabilities that are experienced by my electors and their desire to try to overcome them. Principal among those, and common to all the towns outside the main towns of Manjimup and Pemberton—which towns include Walpole, Nornalup, and Nannup—is the problem of a reticulated town water supply. I understand there is a movement afoot to have a survey made of the water potentialities of Walpole. As this district has distinct tourist possibilities, I would suggest that the Minister give this survey urgent priority. There is also an agreement between the people at Walpole and the local road board to finance this scheme on a pound for pound basis.

First, however, it is necessary to have the sanction of the department to the scheme and a survey made, by the Public Works Department, of the water resources of the district. The town of Nannup is in a similar position. This town also has distinct possibilities for tourism as it is in the heart of the timber industry; and, as I indicated earlier, it may be used as a centre for the manufacture of charcoal iron. Because of that, it is vital that a reticulated water scheme be provided in that town.

It may be considered by some people that in those districts which have a 50-inch annual rainfall or more, there is no

necessity to provide a water supply for the town. However, when it is learned that, during the dry months of the year, Nannup gets 590 points; Katanning, 500 points; and Narrogin, 446 points, it can be realised that most of the rainfall takes place within a short period and it is impossible to conserve it. Therefore, a large reticulated water supply for those towns is just as necessary as it is in the towns situated in the agricultural areas of the State. Those towns are in need of water over the whole of the year. It is practically impossible for householders to conserve more than 3,000 gallons of water per year in tanks or other means at their disposal. That is another good argument to put before the Minister, in favour of providing a reticulated water scheme.

It is also necessary to give due thought to the provision of a central main water scheme for the whole of the South-West. This will be most necessary in the near future if paper-pulping industries are to be established in that area, because large quantities of water will have to be made available for the successful operation of those industries, and such water must have an extremely low salinity content. However, it is possible to provide such water in the South-West. In that area the rivers have a salinity content of approximately two or three grains to the gallon. It can be realised how pure that water is when it is considered that, in the metropolitan area, we are using water with a salinity content of up to 70 grains per gallon.

The time is not far distant—if it has not already arrived—when consideration must be given to putting into operation a scheme to dam these rivers in the South-West and thereby provide the water for the whole of the surrounding districts. As I have indicated previously, some people may think that such a scheme is not necessary when the area enjoys a rainfall of 60 or 70 inches per annum. However, I would like to point out to the House that practically every year tobacco and apple crops are destroyed because of lack of water at the right time of the year. Thousands and thousands of pounds have already been spent by the farmers themselves in an endeavour to provide their crops with sufficient water. In fact, in the Manjimup district there is one farm dam which is capable of conserving nearly as much water as the town dam, which has a capacity of 65,000,000 gallons.

Therefore, it can be seen that we have already reached the stage where we should give encouragement to these people, particularly the tobacco growers, by providing an adequate water supply. During his speech, the member for Narrogin complimented the Government for setting up a committee to investigate the opening up of forest land for agriculture. I say emphatically that unless the forest land is converted into agricultural land which will give sustenance to more people than it

does as forest land, it will be a distinct loss to the economy of the State. I have sound reasons for believing that some of this forest land is to be set aside merely as grazing land and thus will sustain fewer people to the acre than it does at present.

I sincerely hope that some of this land will be set aside for the production of tobacco. Last year, the value of tobacco leaf produced in the Manjimup area, on approximately 1,300 acres, was in the vicinity of £800,000. That is a net income of £400 per acre. Some of the tobacco growers grew tobacco worth up to nearly £1,000 an acre. It will be seen, from those figures, that no other form of primary production can compare in value on the acreage of land cultivated for the crop.

We also need water for the growing of potatoes, which would probably be the second most economical crop on the basis of income per acre. However, what interests me is not the amount of money that can be earned per acre, but the number of people who can participate in the distribution of that money. That is what we on this side of the House are seeking. We desire that production which is capable of sustaining the greatest number of population. In the South-West we have the means for doing this, and therefore we should give every encouragement to those people who are already trying to produce crops there. Up to now they have used their own initiative and their own capital to build dams to enable them to grow their crops and to provide the necessary water at the right time of the year.

Nature is not very dependable, having been aptly described as being in the feminine gender. She tends to withdraw her favours when we have most need of them. This is true of nature when she provides rainfall for the growing of crops. Therefore, I consider that the time is most opportune to provide a central water conservation scheme for the whole of the south-west of this State. It has also been found that the provision of water at the right time by means of irrigation has been largely instrumental in assisting apples to withstand the ravages of dieback—and, in fact, almost preventing the effect of dieback—in the apple orchards. Provided the trees have proper sustenance at the right time, the incidence of dieback in orchards will diminish considerably. That is another reason why this water scheme should be inaugurated.

I refer once again to the remarks of the member for Narrogin, who implied that our timber country was inferior forest land which could be converted to agricultural purposes. I would point out that I have known cases where forest land was capable of growing only four to 4½ loads per acre of jarrah.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes left.

Mr. ROWBERRY: When this land was cleared by the Forests Department and converted into pine plantations, the yield per acre was increased to some 40 loads, or an increase of 10 times the production of the land in its natural state. The suggestion of converting the land to agricultural purposes should be approached with the greatest caution and with considerable thought. We should not dispose of our great assets in this State unwittingly, or without careful and proper consideration.

In the matter of timber production, I am reminded of the great advantage which the timber industry has proved to be to that part of the South-West represented by me. The establishment of State sawmills in various towns and districts has been instrumental not only in developing the population of the villages and towns, but also in developing the agricultural part of the community. These establishments have provided social meeting places, shopping centres, and the ordinary and everyday facilities required by the people; and, above all, they have provided sufficient population to bring about the raising of the status of schools in some of the centres—especially in Pemberton, where the status of the school is that of a junior high school. The State sawmills have been the means of providing the people of the outback with an opportunity to educate their children.

Before the Government thinks of disposing of these State undertakings to private enterprise, it should give thought to what I have just said. In some quarters it might be thought there should be no State enterprises, and that all State instrumentalities should be taken over by private enterprise. I would remind people holding such ideas that the opportunity for private enterprise to establish similar undertakings existed for over a hundred years, but private enterprise has not availed itself of the opportunity.

Recently I read in an ancient copy of *Hansard*, of the 3rd August, 1878, a debate as to where the railway line should be routed—whether north or south of the river. It was mentioned during the debate that there were three major timber companies operating in the State. The Wright and Bell Timber Co. offered to load 4,000 loads of timber at 15s. per load on the railways if the line went south of the river. There was the Rockingham Lumber and Timber Co., and also the W.A. Timber Co. operating here. In point of fact, timber was the first cargo to be exported from the port of Fremantle and from Western Australia.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired.

#### *Extension of Time*

MR. FLETCHER: I move—

That the honourable member's time be extended.

Motion put and passed.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Mr. ROWBERRY: This cargo of timber was consigned to the English Admiralty. It was exported in the year 1831, which was 16 years after the Battle of Trafalgar. So it can be said that this State, by its timber resources and exports, has assisted England to build up the English Navy after the terrific naval battle with the French at Trafalgar. The private timber companies were in existence and they had the opportunity to exploit our timber resources in the South-West.

Mr. Graham: And did they exploit them! They cost the State millions of pounds in wastage.

Mr. ROWBERRY: The very existence of the State sawmills in these centres proves that private enterprise did not avail itself to the full of the opportunity for expansion. The Governments of this State which took the opportunity to build up these mills and the communities around them are to be commended greatly. Any Government which proposes to dispose of these State instrumentalities will not be acting in the best interests of the community. In the disposal of the State sawmills the Government will be betraying its own friends.

Mr. May: It has none.

Mr. ROWBERRY: That is quite commonly said about this Government. I well remember getting a telephone call on the 27th March, 1959, from a prominent executive of the State Saw Mills who congratulated me on being re-elected to Parliament. I told him that I was really disappointed with the over-all result of the elections. He said, "Why? You have nothing to worry about." I said, "The people of Pemberton have, and it is on their behalf that I am concerned." He said, "Why are you concerned?" I said, "Your political friends have sworn to, and told the populace that they will, dispose of these mills. We fully expect them to do so." He said, "That is the last thing they will do." I said, "You are not too sure about that?" He said, "Yes, I am sure. That is the last thing they will do." Personally, I hope that, if that person's political friends try to dispose of them, that will be the last thing they will do.

I went on and said, "Do you not think they will sell these undertakings?" He said, "No. They will try to run them more efficiently." I said, "That is very nice coming from you, a senior executive of the organisation." He said, "They will try to run these undertakings more efficiently." I said, "That is just as bad." Here was a prominent member of the Liberal Party who did not believe that this Government would dispose of the State trading concerns. I say advisedly that if the Government does dispose of the State trading concerns it will be betraying its own friends. It intrigues me greatly that

people who do not subscribe to State enterprises and socialism, are quite willing to earn their living from them. How can they reconcile their conscience with what they practise? It is beyond my understanding.

Mr. Hawke: Members opposite eat socialised meals, at a socialised price, in a socialised dining room in Parliament House.

Mr. ROWBERRY: I conclude by pronouncing a pious hope that the Government will find it impossible to dispose of our State instrumentalities. If it does, the present situation of the State will become much worse. The Minister for Railways, in answer to a question, indicated there could be a continuation of the interest bill on State instrumentalities which have already been disposed of. How are we to reconcile that fact with the Government's belief that it is acting in the best financial interests of the State by disposing of the State enterprises?

MR. MOIR (Boulder) [7.57]: The other evening I heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition voice objection to the discourtesy meted out by the Government to private members. I, too, would like to voice my objections to the procedure of Ministers of this Government in their dealings with private members. One incident which I consider to be highly discourteous occurred last year, and it concerned the Minister for Police.

I approached him on behalf of the Police Boys' Club of Boulder in regard to a certain matter, to which he finally gave his approval. He notified me on a Thursday in this House, and requested me to inform the officials of the club concerned, that he had agreed to the proposal. On arrival at Kalgoorlie the next morning, I rang the secretary of the club and conveyed to him the Minister's decision. To my unbounded astonishment he told me that he had already been informed—a couple of days previously—of the decision by no less a person than the Federal member for Kalgoorlie. What the Federal member for Kalgoorlie had to do with purely a State matter, I do not know.

Mr. Graham: Politics at its lowest.

Mr. MOIR: That was far from courteous, as the Minister well knew that he had given prior information to a member of another Parliament—who could not, by the widest stretch of the imagination, be said to have anything to do with a purely State matter. The Minister knew he would put me in the position of being a conveyor of very late news.

This also applies to other Ministers. We find that Ministers journey to Kalgoorlie without giving any notification to the members concerned, as has always been the practice in the past. When I came into Parliament some nine years ago, I was impressed by the courtesy of the

Ministers of the then Government, which is of the same political nature as the Government of today. They invariably notified the member concerned when journeying into his district, and that was courtesy indeed. Of course, I quite recognise that we had in the Premier of the day a very courteous gentleman himself; but we find that that has changed.

I hasten to add that there are some Ministers today who do observe the courtesies; and I wish to publicly record my thanks to those Ministers; namely, the Minister for Education and the Minister for Health. Early in his career as a Minister, the Minister for Mines also showed this courtesy, but of late he has omitted to do so. There have been occasions when the Minister for Works has visited Kalgoorlie, and the first time the members have known about it has been when they have read in the local paper an item reporting that the Minister had been there but had since departed.

Mr. Graham: How is your halo, Ross?

Mr. May: They don't stay long, do they?

Mr. MOIR: If these Ministers go to a member's electorate for a special purpose, surely it is not too much to ask that they notify those members! Often we get approaches from people who want to place certain matters before the Ministers, and they still have the old-fashioned belief that the member is the right person through whom to make such approaches. I say "old-fashioned" because we find that this Government has introduced a procedure that to my knowledge has been foreign to previous Governments. I am referring to the practice of receiving deputations direct from organisations or people without any reference to the members concerned at all. It was only by chance the other day that, in answer to a question asked by me, the Minister for Railways informed the House that he was receiving a deputation from the mining people in regard to the increase in freights. Freights are a matter which concerns everyone.

Mr. Court: They made a direct approach to the Minister to see the Premier, primarily.

Mr. MOIR: That is all very well. There have been other Ministers apart from the Minister for Railways. Ministers on this side of the House and Ministers of preceding Governments invariably received deputations with the members for the district in attendance.

Mr. Roberts: That was not always the practice of the previous Government, you know.

Mr. MOIR: That may have been so on an odd occasion when there were certain circumstances surrounding a matter; but I can speak for myself. When I was a Minister and received a direct approach from an organisation on any matter, I

used to refer them to the member for the district; and it mattered not to me whether he was a Country Party, Liberal Party, or Labor Party member. I referred the organisation to the member and had arrangements made through him. It is only common courtesy; but apparently this Government likes to play politics right down as low as it can possibly get.

Mr. Graham: That is typical!

Mr. MOIR: I do not know whether Ministers treat their own party members in the same discourteous fashion as they treat members on this side of the House, but presumably they do not. To me it appears to be designed as a slight to members who are not of the same political beliefs as they are themselves.

Mr. Graham: I cannot even get replies to letters.

Mr. MOIR: I want to say something about the attitude of this Government towards various matters which affect the public very deeply. The attitude of the Government to rising costs has been mentioned before in this House, as has also the Premier's attitude to imminent increases in the basic wage.

After the Federal arbitration tribunal had decided that there had been increases in the cost of living in the various capital cities, and it appeared that an increase in the State basic wage was warranted, the Premier, by his public utterances, did everything he possibly could to persuade the Arbitration Court in this State not to grant an increase. If the Premier and this Government were consistent in this matter they could perhaps be forgiven. But we know what their attitude is to other highly increasing costs which affect the people and the cost spiral. After all, when we talk of wages, we know that that is one commodity that is fixed.

We have wage fixation operating in this State and in the other States, but we do not have price fixation operating. The price of a person's labour is fixed by tribunal, but we find that when it appears that it should be increased, no less a person than the Premier of the State rushes to the Press with utterances forecasting dire results if the tribunal should see fit to grant an increase.

There are numerous instances of very high profits being made by various concerns, and it is indicated by the size of the profits that these concerns are charging more for the products they produce than they are entitled to do. But we do not hear any protest from this Government on that score.

Recently I have had occasion to notice the tremendous cost of drugs and various medicines. It is quite fantastic to see the varying charges for some of these articles. A short time ago I was asked to purchase a particular medicine for someone. I

found that in one establishment the price was 37s. 6d. for 100 tablets; in another place a few doors removed, it was 34s. 6d.; while in yet another shop, within a few hundred yards, I made the purchase at 25s. That is rather extraordinary, because I believe the people selling the tablets at 25s. were not doing so at a loss. Therefore it is quite apparent that those who were charging more than that, up to 37s. 6d., were indeed making a huge profit on the transaction.

And so it applies to other articles; and one does not wonder when one discovers, on reading the daily Press, that companies have been progressing. It is reported in the trade and finance column of *The West Australian* of Thursday, the 11th August, that Rumbles Ltd. is marking its silver jubilee with a bonus. The article reads as follows:—

Rumbles Ltd., a member of the Associated Drug Companies of Australia, which is celebrating its silver jubilee, has added a special bonus of 2½ per cent. to the year's 10 per cent. ordinary dividend.

There is nothing wrong with that. I suppose, according to the business practice of today, that 12½ per cent. would be looked on as quite a normal dividend. The article continues—

The company has shown steady expansion since its incorporation.

Sales which were £66,589 in the five-year period to 1940, reached £4,210,102 in the latest five-year period.

And this is the part that is rather astounding—

Shareholders' funds since 1940 have grown from £2,838 to £198,984.

Mr. Roberts: What is astounding about that?

Mr. MOIR: I know the member for Bunbury would not see anything extraordinary about it; but I think the average person would. To continue the article—

In that period, total assets have gone from £7,035 to £339,538.

Mr. May: The member for Bunbury would not see anything wrong in that either, would he?

Mr. MOIR: The member for Bunbury would not see anything wrong with it except that he would wish he was in it himself.

Mr. Graham: Probably is.

Mr. MOIR: But we find that the ordinary subscriber in the share market cannot participate in this very close preserve. The article continues further—

The company was formed in 1935 by Mr. Rumble, who realised that it would be an advantage to chemists in this State to have a co-operative wholesale warehouse.

In 1947 the articles of association were altered to allow only persons actively engaged as retail pharmacists in W.A. to be admitted as shareholders. In 1953 the company acquired its own warehouse in Aberdeen Street.

So it will be seen that it is a very close preserve indeed. But we have not heard any comment from the members of the Government on that phase of business activities. We have seen that within the last twelve months action has been taken in America to curb the drug houses which were making extortionate profits; but, fundamentally, the sky is the limit here when it comes to making profits—even profits out of the ill-health of the people.

This attitude is in marked contrast to the Premier's concern when the worker is given an increase of a few shillings a week. He is not given an increase in his actual wages, but only an increase to enable him to keep up somewhere with the cost of living and to try to keep value in his pay envelope.

We have had the experience of seeing wages pegged when no quarterly adjustments were made to the basic wage and we know perfectly well that that did not stop the cost spiral. One has only to study the relevant graphs to realise that. Therefore, the old story about costs following wages does not hold water.

It is very evident that this Government has a tender regard for big business and that it could not care less for the people. That is illustrated by the very generous assistance offered to wealthy companies to establish business in this State, in contrast to the Government's attitude to the people. We have heard it quoted here—and it is general knowledge—that the Australian Paper Manufacturers have been promised a loan of £2,500,000 by this Government on very liberal terms—the company does not have to make repayments until 1980. There is no justification for anything like that to be done by a State such as ours which, we are told, is all the time struggling for funds. Members know that when they press for urgent works to be carried out in their electorates, they are told that funds are not available. Yet we find the Government taxes the people heavily; we have only to remember the Town Planning Bill which was introduced last year, and which imposed substantial taxes on the people in the metropolitan area. Again this year we have only to think of the exorbitant water rates that the people are called on to pay; and there are now heavy increases in rail freights.

Many years ago there was a legendary figure—I do not know whether such a person really existed—called Robin Hood who was popularly supposed to rob the rich in order to give to the poor. But I am afraid this Government is more in the category of Ned Kelly who just robbed people.

Only recently we have been confronted with substantial increases in rail freights and fares. It is remarkable that although all the people are concerned about this, particularly the people in the country, we have not heard one word on the subject from members on the Government side of the House. The debate on the Address-in-Reply provides an opportunity for members to rise and air their views and grievances, but we have not heard one word about rail freights from the private members sitting on the Government side.

Mr. May: You know why, don't you?

Mr. MOIR: I can imagine that when they return to their electorates, if they are game enough to do so, they will be bombarded with questions and protests from various people and organisations. It must be very embarrassing for members opposite and for members of the Government—and for you too, Mr. Speaker, although you are not altogether responsible for the acts of this Government—to return to their electorates and face up to the barrage that they will encounter from the people who elected them to this Parliament.

Mr. Court: It would have been a bigger one if it had gone up as much as your Government wanted to put it up in 1953—£2,000,000; 35 per cent. on miscellaneous.

Mr. Tonkin: I imagine there is a barrage in Nedlands about the rates at the moment.

Mr. Court: I haven't noticed it.

A member: Not to mention the median strip.

Mr. MOIR: The Country Party members must be particularly embarrassed in view of the fact that at the last election they gave an emphatic assurance to their electors that, if they were returned and became the Government, they would not in any circumstances increase rail freights. As they pointed out, the people in the country bear 90 per cent. of any increases, and therefore they would not, under any consideration, increase rail freights. I can easily see that it must be most embarrassing for the private members on the Government side—particularly the Country Party members—to face up to broken promises.

Mr. May: Someone will have to do some somersaulting!

Mr. MOIR: Unfortunately, since this session of Parliament opened, we know that assurances given from the other side of the House have been hardly worth the breath they were spoken with. But the general public are probably still naive enough to believe that when these solemn assurances are given they will be kept.

It would appear that the Country Party representatives have bowed to the pressure that has been placed upon them. I cannot imagine that they would agree to

these increases without serious objection. I can go further and well imagine that it would only be after several stormy meetings of Cabinet that the Country Party Ministers would agree to increase the rail freights. We can imagine the Minister for Lands, the Minister for Agriculture, and the Deputy Premier, himself, voicing strong objections when the proposal was first mooted.

But we see that even although they might have strong objections—and it is reasonable to assume that they had strong objections in view of the assurances they had given on the hustings—they were finally overruled. Evidently the Country Party section of this coalition Government has not the courage to stand up and say, "We have given certain promises; we are not going back on them." We know that strong objections have been made by people in the country; and they will continue to be made while people realise what these freight increases mean to them.

The Premier's concern about spiralling costs does not ring very true when one considers what the increases will actually mean. The increases in freights will apply not only to various items of produce, building material, and commodities used in various undertakings in the country, but also to foodstuffs; and when we consider that the business people who pay the freights pass the freight cost on to the customers—and indeed more than the freight because it is invariably the practice to arrive at the cost of the goods into store and then to put the retailer's percentage on to that cost—we realise that the ultimate price to the consumer will be considerable. So we can look forward to seeing more increases in the cost of living in the very near future.

Some of these increases are rather extraordinary when one goes through them. One of the increases that rather intrigued me was that which applied to road metal. It would appear that the Government is endeavouring to receive a higher amount from the petrol tax because we know that, in the main, road metal in the country is transported for the Main Roads Department, so that any increase in cost to that department increases the cost of roads; and by the railways increasing the freight on road metal, the Government will be getting a bigger percentage from the moneys that the Main Roads Department receives from the Commonwealth petrol tax.

The farming organisations have not been slow to approach this Government on the question of increased freights; and the Government was warned, before it made its announcement on the subject, by deputations which approached the Premier and pointed out to him how seriously the farming community would be affected by any increase in freights. I have here an article

which appeared in *The West Australian* of Saturday, the 30th July. The heading of this article is "Brand Holds out No Hopes on Rail Freights," and it states—

Premier Brand told a Farmers' Union deputation yesterday that he could not hold out hope that transport costs would not be increased in both the metropolitan area and the country.

The report goes on to say—

The deputation told the Premier that steeply rising costs would have to be arrested quickly if agricultural and industrial expansion were to continue.

Farmers' Union general president Grant McDonald said that net incomes for primary producers had fallen sharply compared with increases enjoyed by secondary industry and workers.

Wheat section president D. W. Maisey said that 90 per cent. of the State's wheat was sold on the export market, which was becoming more competitive. This was being reflected in lower prices, particularly for flour.

The wheat stabilisation fund was now almost exhausted, and a liability of astronomical proportions could be created.

Barley and oats section president Mr. H. L. Kelsall said that coarse grain growers were probably in a worse position than wheat growers because they produced a higher percentage for export and were not protected by a stabilisation fund.

The deputation submitted that an increase in rail freights would also be a serious matter for the wool industry.

So we can see that these organisations representing the producers in this State made emphatic representations to the Government stressing the seriousness of any increase in freights. Notwithstanding these representations, the Government went ahead, with the result that the freights have now been put up considerably.

Further, on the 10th August, after the increase in railway freights had been announced, there appeared in *The West Australian* of that date an article headed, "Maisey: Rail Rise Hits Wheat Hard." It reads as follows:—

Rises in rail freights in Western Australia were a serious blow to wheat-growers, and increased costs would weaken their position when the next wheat stabilisation plan was negotiated, Mr. D. W. Maisey said today.

Mr. Maisey, who is a W.A. grower-representative on the Australian Wheat Board, is in Melbourne for meetings of the board.

He said the higher rail charges would be reflected in the overall cost structure of Australia's wheat harvest, a big percentage of which was grown in W.A.

There would be no possibility of growers recovering increased rail costs on the 20,000,000 bushels of wheat from their last harvest. This was now in country silos.

W.A. growers would bear about two-thirds of the increased freights. The remainder would be recovered from an increase in the guaranteed price of the next harvest, which was calculated on a f.o.r. natural terminal port basis.

Mr. Speaker, you can readily appreciate why we on this side of the House wonder why Country Party members, and back-benchers on the Government side do not stand up in their places and have something to say on this vital matter, for it is a matter vital to the people of Western Australia, and in particular the people that country members represent.

As members know, the goldfields depend on an industry which cannot pass on its costs. That industry has to absorb any increased costs; and it has been doing this successfully for some years past. But we know that there are some large mines on the goldfields which are not in the same fortunate position as some of the stronger companies, and they are having a tough time indeed; so much so that the previous Labor Government had to advance large sums of money to two mines in particular to enable them to keep going—I refer to the Sons of Gwalia Mine at Leonora, and the Western Mining Corporation Mine at Bullfinch, upon which hundreds of people are dependent for their livelihood.

Increases in freights such as have been announced must have a serious effect on these people, and I mention them because of the burden that will bear down on them and will, undoubtedly, in at least one of these instances, be almost impossible for the mine to bear. It will also be hard for the wage-earners on the goldfields—the family men—to pay increased charges for commodities they use on their tables every day of the week, and the clothes they and their families wear. One could go on enumerating the various items involved.

I know the Minister for Railways gave an assurance in this House that, as far as freights were concerned, he would give consideration to industry on the goldfields; but he could not give any assurance as far as foodstuffs were concerned. Regarding that part of the question, he replied as follows:—

Regarding the question relating to foodstuffs and so on being transported to the goldfields, I do not think any

special concession can be given there, because the goldfields already enjoy a very considerable advantage in their freights because of the heavily telescoped system of freighting we use in this State.

In view of the sympathetic way he has received approaches on behalf of the mining industry, his attitude with respect to giving consideration to reducing the freights on foodstuffs is in sharp contrast. Apparently they do not come in the same category. However, it is in keeping with this Government's attitude where capital is concerned, and where people are concerned. I do not know how the Country Party members in the Government can justify the Government's action to the people who returned them to this House, presumably to look after their welfare, as far as it goes, within the ambit of government.

We find that those members do not attempt in any way to justify the impositions that have been put upon the country people. I am of the opinion that by its actions this Government is forfeiting the respect and the confidence of those misguided people who elected it to office. I feel, too, that this should be emphasised so that the people will know that there are some members in this Parliament who are concerned for their welfare, and who are critical of the actions of this Government. Therefore, I move the following amendment to the Address-in-Reply:—

We wish to protest strongly against the burdens of additional cost which increased railway freights will soon place upon those country people and rural industries not able reasonably to bear such burdens, and also against increased railway fares in the metropolitan area.

We deeply regret the breaking by Country Party Ministers of the promise given by and on behalf of the Country Party to the people of the State during the last election campaign, the promise being:—

The Country Party will not agree to any further increases in rail freights, about 90 per cent. of which are paid by country residents.

We regret also the breaking of the assurance given at that time by the present Premier to the effect that the whole of the Liberal Party's policy would be directed against rising costs.

**MR. COURT** (Nedlands—Minister for Railways—on amendment) [8.40]: This amendment which has been moved by the member for Boulder takes on a very hollow ring; in fact it could be described as nothing more than a political sham of the first order.

Mr. Heal: Fancy you talking about that!

Mr. COURT: For some extraordinary reason a freight increase, made after the most careful deliberations by this Government, and designed to achieve from the increases approximately £1,100,000 per annum, becomes something sinister and something unjustified; yet the action of the Hawke Government in October 1953 of increasing freights on a basis to produce over £2,000,000 per annum is apparently justified!

Mr. Jamieson: They didn't make the promises you people made.

Mr. COURT: Not much! Let us have a look at some of the adjustments that have been made now as against the adjustments made by the Hawke Government. In 1953 we find that miscellaneous freights went up by no less than 35 per cent. We find an item like livestock, which has been very much discussed during the Address-in-Reply debate, went up by 25 per cent. In the case of the present increases, the rise in miscellaneous freights was 20 per cent., and an exception was made in the case of superphosphate, so that the increase was only 10 per cent. The increase on livestock is only 12½ per cent. compared with a 25 per cent. increase imposed by the Hawke Administration.

Therefore I think that if one pauses for a minute to examine the relative merits of the case, one will see the hollow sham—the political sham—in the criticism that has been voiced in connection with these freight increases. What are the facts regarding freight increases?

Mr. W. Hegney: You promised not to increase them.

Mr. COURT: That is not so.

Mr. Hawke: Yes it is!

Mr. COURT: That is not so.

Mr. W. Hegney: It is!

Mr. COURT: What are the facts regarding the freight increases?

Mr. W. Hegney: You promised not to increase them.

Mr. COURT: Since the last increase in October, 1953, the railways have had to absorb wage cost increases which aggregate £2,700,000 per annum—and that is without the last basic wage increase. Yet the increase sought is only £1,100,000 per annum. Part of the Government's policy in connection with freight increases was to make sure that, as far as was humanly possible, action would be taken to bring about a reorganisation and greater efficiency in the system to absorb as much of the costs as was possible; and that has been done; because the deficit last year alone, in spite of cost increases of over £500,000, came down by £500,000, in round figures, on a cash accounting basis, and by more if it is taken on a true commercial basis.

Mr. Tonkin: This wonderful cash accounting basis!

Mr. COURT: I am not going to bother to go into detail on that—

Mr. Tonkin: I should think not.

Mr. COURT: When we have the railways report before us the Deputy Leader of the Opposition might be convinced of the merit of what I said.

Mr. Tonkin: The Treasury had to find the extra money.

Mr. COURT: If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition only stopped to think for a minute, he would realise that the improved performance on a commercial basis will be felt in subsequent years. Eventually the Treasury gets the benefit of the improved performance. Anyhow I am not here to discuss the merits of accounting systems at the moment; I am here to expose the hypocrisy of this amendment we have before us tonight—I suppose it is one of a series of amendments we can expect before the Address-in-Reply wends its way to a weary close.

Mr. Tonkin: No hypocrisy attached to the promises.

Mr. COURT: My understanding of what the Country Party said was that there would be no freight increases until there had been a thorough examination of all ways and means of reducing the costs on the railways.

Mr. Hawke: That is not true.

Mr. COURT: Any supporter of the Government can with a clear conscience go to the people of this country and say that this Government made every effort to keep down the costs of its railways, and to improve the deficit; otherwise how was it possible to achieve this £500,000 reduction in the cash deficit?

Mr. Tonkin interjected.

Mr. COURT: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is again getting on to his hobby-horse of spare parts. The fact remains that even if things were done that should not have been done, the deficit was reduced by that amount, in spite of the heavy costs of basic wage increases and marginal increases.

Mr. Hawke: There was a fair amount of wheat about.

Mr. COURT: So there was. There was also a fair amount of super, but it still had to be transported. We still had to have the men and equipment to do this, and this deficit reduction was achieved in spite of those costs which the Leader of the Opposition knows are inescapable—costs such as basic wage increases and marginal increases, which automatically apply to the whole rail force. We could not go on

absorbing these costs indefinitely. Let us look at the last part of this amendment which says—

We regret also the breaking of an assurance given at that time by the present Premier to the effect that the whole of the Liberal Party's policy would be directed against rising costs.

It is.

Mr. Tonkin: By paying private architects to design schools.

Mr. COURT: Did not the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's Government pay private architects to design the block of flats at Subiaco, or did they do it for fun? It would be interesting to know what the fees were; though I am sure they were not excessive.

Mr. Tonkin: It would be interesting to draw a comparison between the amount paid by the Hawke Government and that paid by this Government.

Mr. COURT: I think the member for Melville's Government also paid some private architects to build the State Insurance Office; they would not have done that for love and affection.

Mr. Hawke: But your Government is doing it as regular policy.

Mr. COURT: If it is right in one case, it is right in the other.

Mr. Watts: Public Works Department architects have as much as they can handle from the point of view of the Education Department.

Mr. COURT: In framing freight and fare increases, every consideration was given by the Government to the impact of these on the people of the country. No Government of any colour cheerfully makes charge increases; this sort of thing is never popular, either with one's opponents or with one's supporters.

Mr. Andrew: I am glad to hear you say that, because you were one of the greatest critics when anything went up under the previous Government.

Mr. COURT: The whole of the cost structure was carefully considered. Let us look at the situation and the timing of it. This Government was in office for 16 months before the freight and fare adjustments were made. On the figures we inherited from the previous Government the freight and fare adjustments were justified at the time we took over; but we worked on them for 12 months to try to demonstrate where savings could be achieved; and they were achieved.

Mr. Hawke: And you waited until the Legislative Council elections were out of the road.

Mr. COURT: That does not happen to be the reason.

Mr. Toms: That is only a coincidence.

Mr. COURT: It is not even a coincidence; and I can look at the honourable member right in the face and say so; because the whole objective in considering railway finance was to do all that was humanly possible to keep that deficit down, and to demonstrate to the people, particularly in the country, that the deficit could be reduced. Having done that—having made these savings and effected these economies; and made adjustments, like getting more economic cartage of freight in the South-West with fewer freight trains—it was only then that those figures could be disclosed to demonstrate our action to the people of the country; and it was then that the freight and fare adjustments were announced. That was fair and reasonable.

There has been no outcry such as some members opposite would like to make out there has been. There are some people who have brains to work out what was a fair and reasonable thing. Had we set out to get the whole of the £2,700,000 increase there would have been some justification for an outcry, but the Government seeks only to get £1,100,000 from revenue to assist in the problem of railway finance against known costs which cannot be avoided. People say that is a fair go. At least a *bona fide* effort was made to secure improvement and efficiency; to keep costs down; and to ease the burden so far as it was humanly possible to do it.

The final point is the significance of this freight adjustment in our Commonwealth-State financial relations. Former Ministers of the Hawke Government know that the Grants Commission has the obligation to examine our charges, and our expenditure under certain headings, in relation to the standard States. This State was expecting a penalty of about £600,000 because its freight charges were not comparable with those of other States; and it was made very clear that that penalty would rise to something like £1,000,000 this year, because the other States were making their freight adjustments; and, after all, our grant from the Commonwealth Grants Commission comes out of the Commonwealth pool of money, and the other States take exception to the claimant States not playing their part in getting their State revenue up, or their expenses down, as the case may be.

Had we continued at the old rate of freights, at least £1,000,000 penalty would have been imposed against this State, and therefore the amount we have sought to recover approximately offsets the penalty we would have suffered, and removes the justification for the penalty. If we suffer a penalty from the Grants Commission—and I am indebted to the Leader of the Opposition for an explanation of this on one occasion when I was on the other side of the House—we suffer it two ways: We not only lose revenue that we should have collected according to their calculations, but we also suffer the penalty as well.

Could this State justify such a situation any longer? Therefore, the Government had no alternative but to make a freight and fare adjustment; and in doing so, it did it on the most moderate basis on which it could possibly be done.

Mr. Evans: Have you considered the Grants Commission's reaction to your Government's paying excess for goods that could be produced at Midland Junction?

Mr. COURT: The Grants Commission fortunately has a more sound approach to this problem than some members on the other side of the House, who will pick the eyes out of something in a great big organisation, and give no credit for the important things that have been achieved. After all, it is the big and important things that matter in considering the State's finances, and the results achieved by the railways.

Let us examine the situation of some important freight rates in Western Australia today as compared with those in other States. Here we have the situation that Western Australia, on a 150-mile haul—this is normally taken in assessing Western Australia in relation to other States—for miscellaneous freights has a cost of 46s. 6d. against 56s. 6d. in South Australia; 57s. in Queensland; 65s. 9d. in Victoria; and 77s. 6d. in New South Wales. I stress New South Wales, because it has a Labor Government, and I should imagine that in the eyes of the Opposition it can do no wrong.

For "A" class freights, Western Australia's figure is 74s.; South Australia's, 65s. 3d.; Queensland's, 74s.; Victoria's, 79s.; and that of New South Wales, 84s. For "B" class freights, it is 90s. 6d. for Western Australia; 85s. for South Australia; 123s. 3d. for Queensland; 100s. for Victoria; and 117s. for New South Wales. So the story goes on for "C" class freights and for first-class and second-class freights; in each case Western Australia is the lowest, without exception.

If we follow the story through to the 400-mile haul, which is important to some of the goldfields people, again we are a long way below the other States in every class of freight—that is, in miscellaneous freights, "A," "B," and "C," and first-class and second-class freights. For all those our figures are still the lowest in the Commonwealth. Surely that means something in a State which is a claimant State! Surely that means this Government is responsible in its attitude, and has had proper regard for the disabilities suffered by rural areas and industries, such as the mining industry of this State which, in respect of gold, in particular, is pegged to a fixed world price!

Their problem is not much different from that of the primary products today, which are fixed to world prices. I ask members of this Chamber to realise that the

majority of the members of this Government and its supporters are country members; they would have a sense of responsibility in this matter in respect of the impact of this, both on the mining industry and on the primary-producing industry.

Mr. W. Hegney: The Ministers have sandbagged them.

Mr. COURT: That is so much nonsense! The honourable member knows the Deputy Premier and some of the country Ministers well enough to know that it is not possible to bulldoze them.

Mr. W. Hegney: You cannot bulldust us!

Mr. COURT: The House can be assured that the rise in fares and freights was arrived at after full consideration of the impact it will have on the economy, and the impact it will have on the country people. I oppose this amendment, which I consider to be a political sham.

MR. MAY (Collie—on amendment) [8.59]: I rise to support the amendment moved by the member for Boulder. I do so not for political reasons.

Mr. Roberts: Much!

Mr. MAY: I do so for reasons which concern the very existence of the people I represent. Let the member for Bunbury jibe at that one. I can assure the member for Bunbury that his people will suffer also as a result of these increased freight charges. I am quite serious when I say that. I would implore the member for Bunbury to take heed of what I say, because the interests of Collie and Bunbury are intertwined; what affects Collie will affect Bunbury in no uncertain manner. These increased freights have come at a most psychological moment. At the time we are trying to arrive at some conclusion in connection with the Government's desire to lower the production costs of coal, along comes this statement.

There is to be an increase of 20 per cent. in the freight on coal. Is it any wonder that the people have taken the stand they have? I want to say this also: This increase in freight had been decided on before the new tenders for coal had been concluded. Does the Government realise—I wonder if it does!—that the proposed increase in connection with the freight on coal is going to cost the State Electricity Commission something like £140,000 a year?

Mr. Court: I am afraid you are in for a complete shock, because it will not cost the State Electricity Commission anything of the sort.

Mr. MAY: The only way the Government can get out of it is to talk about coal and turn to oil. I think this Government has that in mind.

Mr. Court: It is going to cost the State Electricity Commission precisely nothing extra for coal so far as freight is concerned.

Mr. MAY: I cannot swallow that.

Mr. Court: It is factual.

Mr. MAY: I know the Minister is a marvellous mathematician; and he should realise that if the State Electricity Commission takes the same quantity of coal this coming year as it did last year, the increase in cost, because of freight, will be £143,000.

Mr. Watts: If the 20 per cent. applied, it would.

Mr. MAY: The Press says so.

Mr. Court: It is not going to apply to the S.E.C.

Mr. MAY: The Press says it will.

Mr. Watts: Now you are being challenged by the Minister.

Mr. Hawke: He is not looking at us straight in the eyes.

Mr. Court: Which eye?

Mr. MAY: The Government has not made that statement to the general public; and until it does, as far as I am concerned, the 20 per cent. applies.

Mr. Court: You have been told.

Mr. MAY: Make an announcement to the Press.

Mr. Watts: The announcement is made here; surely that is public enough.

Mr. W. Hegney: You made a public announcement regarding a proclamation and turned a somersault.

Mr. MAY: The price will be increased by 7s. 7d. a ton on 900,000 tons per year. This means that the industry at Collie is going to carry at least 25 per cent. of the total of the increased freights.

Mr. Court: I think you have been disabused on that point.

Mr. MAY: It is nice to hear the Minister say that, but I would rather have something in writing so that I could quote him.

Sir Ross McLarty: You have it in print.

Mr. MAY: I have seen 20 per cent. in cold print; if the honourable member does not believe it, I will show it to him.

Mr. Roberts: It will be in *Hansard* tomorrow.

Sir Ross McLarty: Two Ministers have given an assurance.

Mr. Hawke: They did that before in connection with the proclamation.

Mr. MAY: We will have something to say about assurances later on.

Mr. Tonkin: The same Ministers!

Mr. Court: There will be no increase to the S.E.C.

Mr. MAY: Why not make an announcement? It will be in the Press now I have drawn attention to it. If there were a midnight edition, it would appear in it. I want it in writing or published in the Press that freight on Collie coal has not increased 20 per cent.

Mr. Court: Who do you want to sign this letter?

Mr. MAY: I prefer the Premier.

Mr. Court: Right!

Mr. MAY: I prefer the Premier.

Mr. Court: Would the Acting Premier do?

Mr. Hawke: Not on your life!

Mr. Bickerton: We don't want it in Latin, either.

Mr. MAY: Unless it is published otherwise in the Press or given to me in writing, I shall accept that this increase is going to cost the consumers of Collie something like £300,000 a year.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MAY: What chance has Collie when the increase on coal will be 20 per cent. while the farmers will only pay 10 per cent. increase?

Mr. Court: What does one have to do to be saved?

Mr. MAY: That is what the Government is doing for the farmers.

Mr. Heal: The Minister is a St. George's Terrace farmer.

Mr. MAY: The farmers will be 10 per cent. better off than people at Collie and the farmers do not work as hard as the coalminers.

Mr. Wild: You are a farmer.

Mr. MAY: I manage a farm for a member of my family; and, up to date, I have made a fairly good job of it. With this extra freight, is it any wonder that the goldmining companies in this State are turning to oil? I wonder if the member for Murray has had a look at the freights. I think he would be interested to know that the increased freight on oil is going to be only 7½ per cent. This Government, by its policy at the present time, is endeavouring to put the coalmining industry into extinction. Over the last three years up to next September the coal tenders will have saved the State £1,500,000; and yet the present Government wants to reduce the price again by 10s. a ton. That is the objective of the Government. On top of that, it proposes to increase the freight on Collie coal by 20 per cent.

Mr. Court: Collie coal is suffering no increase whatsoever.

Mr. MAY: I told the Minister earlier that he should either make a public announcement or else supply me with a written statement.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think there is too much of this repetition.

Mr. MAY: I agree; but the Minister for Railways—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member should take no notice of interjections.

Mr. MAY: I have proved by a statement which the Premier made to *The West Australian* dated the 9th August that the freight on Collie coal is to be increased by 20 per cent.; the freight on wheat by 10 per cent; and the freight on foreign oil by 7½ per cent. Is that justice, Mr. Speaker? Of course it is not!

Mr. Hawke: Under pressure, the Ministers have retreated on the freight on coal issue.

Mr. Court: No, no!

Mr. MAY: I am prepared to accept it provided it is given me in black and white; then there will be no argument. Let us have a look and see what the farmers have to say about the 10 per cent. increase. I will quote from *The Farmers' Weekly*.

Mr. Roberts: I thought you were quoting from the—

Mr. MAY: The honourable member always comes in with some funny quip, but this is not funny. I intend to quote from *The Farmers' Weekly*, dated the 11th August, two days after the announcement by the Government in regard to increased freights. The article under the heading of "Severe Blow to Development", reads as follows:—

"The Farmers' Union has been a keen advocate of increased and expanded production but it is going to have a difficult time justifying this to farmers now that rail freights have taken the jump they have," said Farmers' Union general president (Mr. Grant McDonald) yesterday.

"Consistent calls have been made by both Federal and State Governments for greater production and more exports, but the higher freights announced will do nothing to encourage farmers to meet this request.

"In fact, it is obvious that any proposed expansion must be retarded simply because the volume of finance would not be available.

"It seems that one of the most important features which induced the State Government to increase freights is what almost amounts to a fear of the attitude of the Commonwealth Loan Council.

"Either that or the Loan Council's views have been used as an excuse. In either case, it is most regrettable that this Federal body can have such a marked effect on the progress and potential development of a claimant State," Mr. McDonald said.

Sir Ross McLarty: What has the Loan Council to do with it?

Mr. MAY: The Minister mentioned the Loan Council last night. He said that if the Government did not put the freights up the Loan Council would have to cut the State grants.

Sir Ross McLarty: He said the Grants Commission.

Mr. MAY: I am only quoting Mr. McDonald.

Sir Ross McLarty: It is the Grants Commission.

Mr. MAY: That does not make it any easier for the Government. To continue—

At the present time if a State was prepared to offer encouragement, by way of lower charges, to its populace to promote greater progressive activity, then it was penalised by the Loan Council.

That reference should be to the Commonwealth Grants Commission. To continue—

One would think that the Loan Council would be anxious to assist any State towards greater development but the obvious effect at the present time was to the contrary.

I am convinced that the State and Federal Governments need to give consideration to formulating other ways of allocating Loan funds.

There is the aspect also that Western Australia's prosperity depends entirely on the prosperity of its primary industry and if restriction is placed on farmers' activities the whole State must suffer.

This includes the coalmining industry. To continue—

The increases were high and in application would be felt twice by farmers—by adding to the cost of transporting their production away from the farm and by bringing essential goods to it.

A jump of 20 per cent. on wheat was much too big an increase and rises of 7½ per cent. and 12½ per cent. for wool and livestock respectively were out of proportion for products already paying fairly high freight rates.

Farmers would no doubt make as extensive use of road transport as possible because road operators were able to provide service at reasonable rates whereas the railways were reaching the stage where they were pricing themselves out of the transport business.

This would be regrettable because there was an obvious need and place for the railways.

The higher freights would affect country people generally because they would mitigate against the establishment of secondary industries in rural centres, Mr. McDonald said.

Not only will it militate against secondary industries, but, as I have said before, it will militate against the coalmining industry in this State. It will go into complete oblivion. I do not intend to say very much more. I have stated the position as it will affect one of the biggest industries in this State should the rise in freights be put into effect.

I hope that the assurance given both by the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Railways tonight will be carried out. I do want to see some announcement made on behalf of the Government in that connection, or else something in writing addressed to me in order that I may inform the public at Collie that the suggested increases in coal rates are a mistake and are not going to be put into effect. I support the amendment.

**MR. BRADY** (Guildford-Midland—on amendment) [9.16]: I wish to support the amendment. In my opinion, as member for Guildford-Midland, it appears to be another blow directed at the railways. The increase in freights is going to drive people away from the railways, and increasing fares are going to do likewise—with the result that there will be less work for the railways, and for the workshops, and fewer employees engaged in the workshops. Later on, I will enlarge on this theme.

At the moment I am concerned for the primary producer; because although I am a Labor man, I am quite mindful of the fact that we are all dependent upon the primary producer. When the primary producer's costs go up, he has difficulty in selling his commodities overseas. Unfortunately, I feel we have already priced ourselves out of some of the overseas markets, and it would appear that for some people this could be the last straw that broke the camel's back. It has already been anticipated that we might be heading into another depression period in the Commonwealth and more particularly, I feel, here in Western Australia; because economists tell us that our overseas surpluses will be down some hundreds of thousands of pounds in the next twelve months or so. Commodity prices are going up, and I feel that many of our overseas sales will be lost to us.

Instead of concentrating on the railways, the Government should attempt to effect economies in Government departments in order to raise the £1,000,000 revenue required. The member for Beeloo asked a question last week and was told that no less a sum than £34,000 a year was being paid in rentals to private property-owners. The Government should concern itself with bringing down this type of costs.

I am not too sure that the railways are on the ball in regard to retaining the traffic to which they are entitled. I asked

the Minister for Railways a question regarding truck hauliers hauling goods from Nungarin. I believe that if the Transport Board and the railways had worked along the lines that they should have, the railways would have had another 1,000 tons of freight arising out of the disposals sale at Nungarin. I have been told within the last 24 hours certain metals have been carried from Norseman to Esperance. If it is correct, that revenue should have gone to the railways. I understand that other materials have also gone to Esperance by road from Salmon Gums.

The railways are suffering badly as a consequence of the activities of road hauliers, and I hope that the Minister for Railways will instruct his departmental officers to report daily to him on these activities. The president of the Farmers' Union (Mr. Grant McDonald) says, in effect, that the farmers will have to resort to road transport in order to reduce their costs. He wrote in *The Farmers' Weekly* of the 11th August as follows:—

A jump of 20 per cent. on wheat was much too big an increase and rises of 7½ per cent. and 12½ per cent. for wool and livestock respectively were out of proportion for products already paying fairly high freight rates.

Farmers would no doubt make as extensive use of road transport as possible because road operators were able to provide service at reasonable rates where the railways were reaching the stage where they were pricing themselves out of the transport business.

As a member representing a constituency having a large number of railway workers depending upon the railway workshops for their livelihood, I feel I must draw the attention of the House to this letting out to road transport systems, haulage which should be handled by the railways. Here we have the president of the Farmers' Union echoing the very thoughts that I have in regard to this matter. I wish to protest that there is not more activity on the part of the railways to see that railway work is retained for the railways.

I also want to protest against these increased charges, on behalf of the fixed income people in our community. There are thousands of such people; and if they have to pay these increased metropolitan fares to the Metropolitan Transport Trust and the railway suburban services, their money value will decrease daily. Superannuated employees are also feeling the burden and feeling it badly. Pensioners are looking to the Commonwealth Government for relief; I understand they are now to receive the sum of 5s. a week extra, which is a mere bagatelle. I wonder the Commonwealth Government had the temerity to offer them 5s.

These people are carrying the burden of increased transport charges. Quite recently I made representations to the Minister for Railways on behalf of the pensioners in Midland Junction who find that if they leave Midland Junction before 9.30 a.m. they have to pay full passenger fares; but after that hour they obtain a reduction. I assume they will have to pay these increased charges the same as other people; if so, I wish to protest long and loud in regard to the matter.

As I have mentioned, I am concerned mainly with the fact that the railway employees are gradually losing the possibility of regular employment and the transport side of the railways is gradually losing both freights and fares which are its normal prerogative by virtue of the fact that they were operating many years before the introduction of road transport systems. Road hauliers today are operating under shocking industrial conditions. Some transport workers are working around the clock, and I doubt whether many of them are earning more than the basic wage.

I recently read to the House a newspaper article in which the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics released figures for the March quarter of this year, showing that Western Australia paid the lowest wages in the Commonwealth. According to statistics, the average wage for the March quarter was £18 16s. Road transport operators, who are not receiving the margin over the basic wage, will be competing unfairly against recognised transport systems whose employees are receiving wages granted by the Arbitration Court. Unless this situation improves, there will be little hope for the workers in the railway workshops.

I wish to protest against these increases; and while I know the Minister for Railways will tell me it is not a great deal to be concerned about and I know he can quote slightly higher freight rates in some of the Eastern States, I am mindful that various concerns in those States are taking millions of pounds from Western Australia in a half a dozen different ways. This State Government should be trying to see that that money remains in Western Australia. The finance companies, the banking concerns, the insurance companies, the commercial houses, and industrial concerns are all dragging millions of pounds out of this State. Also there is the unbalance with respect to imports and exports interstate. All that is working against Western Australia, which is suffering many disadvantages as a primary producing State compared with the highly industrialised and commercialised States.

In my view the State Government should be pressing the Commonwealth Government for more assistance by way of special grants, or through the Loan Council, so that we can do the job we as a State are

supposed to be doing in developing our economy. I can only repeat that I strongly protest against rail and passenger charges being increased, mainly for the reason that it is driving revenue away from the railways. The natural business of the railways is being driven into the hands of road hauliers, and the road transport system generally. I support the amendment.

**MR. HAWKE** (Northam—on amendment [9.27]): I support the amendment. The Minister for Railways tried to wipe out the amendment as being nothing but a sham. I suppose in some of the circles in which he moves, and in which he delivers addresses, that sort of illogical bull-headed approach might have some effect. However, such an approach could have no effect in this place, particularly in relation to a matter as vital to the economy of Western Australia as the subject of rail freight increases are and must be.

I suppose we could not expect the Minister for Railways to know of the tremendously important part which the primary industries play in maintaining wealth production, and in sustaining a great number of other activities which are carried on within the State, mostly within the metropolitan area. For instance, we have living in the metropolitan area more than half of the total population of the State; and it would be agreed by most people in this House that the continued active operation of the primary industries, and the wealth which they produce, together make it possible for a great deal of industry and commerce to be carried on successfully in the metropolitan area which otherwise could not be carried on to the same degree.

Therefore any substantial increase in charges upon rural industries is a vital matter, whether one agrees with the proposed heavily increased new charges or not. One must, if one has any sort of appreciation at all of the value of industries operating in country districts, realise how tremendously important a substantial increase in the costs of production in those industries will be to the total economy of the State. So clearly any motion or amendment, or piece of legislation brought forward in this Parliament dealing with a subject of that nature, is not a sham—it could not be by any stretch of the imagination, except by the Minister for Railways, be described as a sham.

I should like to quote for the information of all members, and particularly for the information of the Minister for Railways, a statement made by his own leader in connection with costs, this statement having been made as part of the Liberal Party's policy speech at the last Legislative Assembly general elections. When dealing with the financial situation at that time, the present Premier made very critical reference—naturally—to the financial

administration of what was then the Hawke Government. Among other things he said—

Total deficits for the six years are £7,500,000 or more. It all boils down to financial mismanagement.

In other words, the thing to do to get over these financial difficulties and problems was to defeat the Hawke Government, and put into office a Government led by the then Leader of the Opposition, and made up of Liberal Party and Country Party people. We know the people of the State, in a majority of electorates, took this advice. They defeated the then existing Government and put the new Government into office to overcome all this financial mismanagement, alleged or real.

The Leader of the Liberal Party during that election campaign did not say, "The finances of the Railway Department are difficult, quite apart from any real or imaginary mismanagement by the Hawke Government. Therefore in the course of time, if we become the Government we will have to increase rail freights." He did not say that at all; he said that the financial problems of the State as a whole, including those of the Railways Department, were due to the financial mismanagement of the then existing Government. However, he went on further to say—

Taxes and charges have been pressed to breaking point.

Mr. Brady: That's a beauty!

Mr. HAWKE: Clearly the present Premier, when electioneering at that time, either believed rail freights and other charges and State taxes were so high as to be at breaking point, or he did not believe it and was simply indulging in that type of propaganda for the purpose of trying to scare enough people to vote against the then existing Government. However, we must take what he said at its face value, particularly now that he is the Premier and Treasurer of the State and the Leader of the Government. Not only did he say that State charges and taxes had been raised to breaking point; but also, immediately in the speech, he went on to promise reduced charges, in effect. This is what he said, immediately following the quotation I made a moment ago—

The prospect of reducing the impact of taxes and charges through economy and efficiency seems foreign to the Hawke Government's thinking.

So, undoubtedly, there was, in those few words I have quoted, an implied promise to the people of Western Australia that these charges and taxes which had reached breaking point would be reduced in the event of the Liberal Party and the Country Party winning the last elections; and they would be reduced through economy and efficiency which, allegedly, was foreign to the thinking of the Hawke

Government, but which would be the natural corollary of a new coalition Government.

Mr. Court: Can you explain why you did not think £2,000,000 was excessive in 1953?

Mr. HAWKE: I am coming to what the Minister for Railways had to say a while ago.

Mr. Court: I would like to know about that.

Mr. HAWKE: At the moment, I would like to know, from the Minister for Railways—seeing he is as talkative as ever—why his Government is now increasing charges and taxes upon the people and upon the industries of our State beyond breaking point.

Mr. Court: Your reasoning just does not add up. The sum of £2,000,000 from you does not mean anything, apparently; but £1,000,000 from someone else is excessive.

Mr. HAWKE: I did not say that. I have asked the Minister for Railways a plain straight-out question; and, as usual, he looks me straight in the eyes and dodges the question I asked and says something which is not relevant to it.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition must address the Chair.

Mr. HAWKE: I am concerned about your attitude in this matter, Mr. Speaker; because, at the last election, despite the straight-out promise and what was implied by the Leader of the Government to the people in your electorate, you only just scraped in by a few votes. Now, this present increase in rail freights could have serious consequences on some of the present supporters of the Government; and, out of respect to your feelings, I will not individualise. I am asking the Minister for Railways again: Why does he—and I think he is more to blame than any other Minister for the increase in rail freights—and why do his colleagues increase, beyond breaking point, the charges and the taxes upon the people of Western Australia?

Mr. Court: This is not increasing the charges beyond breaking point. It is little compared to what you would have done.

Mr. HAWKE: I am not a bit surprised, really. It is more than interesting to find the Minister for Railways rattling on what his Leader had to say on this matter to the electors during the last election.

Mr. Court: It is not rattling at all! It is a statement of fact!

Mr. HAWKE: Rattling on what his Leader had to say during the last election.

Mr. Court: You drop all these charges around the place; it is a favourite hobby of yours.

Mr. HAWKE: So it becomes very clear, from the quotations I have made from the present Premier's policy speech, that

he said taxes and charges were at breaking point more than 18 months ago. He presumably believed that then. Yet, since that time, this Government has loaded, very substantially, increased charges upon the people; and in this present instance is increasing a charge—that is, rail freights—which bears very heavily on the vital industries of our State.

I am not here this evening to say that any particular industry can or cannot bear this burden. I say that, generally, this £1,000,000 increased charges will become part and parcel of the production costs of industries and other activities which are carried on in the country. We all know that the costs of production have been increased almost continually since 1945, and particularly since the end of 1949. Hardly a day goes by but we hear from some source or other, or we read in some newspaper, of the problems of inflation; of the serious effects which the continued growth of that problem is having upon industry. When the present members of the Country Party were in opposition they frequently told us of the difficulties of primary industries, of how costs were mounting in almost every direction; of how the situation of individual farmers in many areas was becoming more and more difficult. We have had information given to us tonight in regard to much of the goldmining industry activities.

The Minister for Railways knows something about goldmining. I think it can be said quite safely that some goldmining activities in Western Australia cannot possibly bear any increase in production costs. So the increased freights which are to be imposed upon this industry must have the effect of reducing the activity of that industry and of reducing the volume of employment which it provides. There is a rumour abroad that all farmers are prosperous. I think it is fair to say that most farmers are in a fairly good position. However, anyone who cared to travel through the dairying industries in the far South-West and the area around about Denmark would find many dairy farmers who are struggling along; would probably find some who are heavily in debt, not only in respect of their properties, but also in respect of their dealings with storekeepers, machinery firms, and so on.

Unfortunately, rail freights, as a factor in the cost of production, bear most heavily upon those farmers who are the greatest distance removed from the ports; mostly on those the greatest distance removed from the City of Perth and the port of Fremantle. The Minister would smoothly overcome this aspect of the problem by leading us to believe that the telescopic system of adjusting railway freights would safeguard the position of those farmers. I ask: Does it?

Clearly the farmers who are the greatest distance removed from the ports—particularly from the port of Fremantle and from Perth—have not only to meet higher railway freights; they also have to meet higher costs in regard to everything they buy, whether it is a plough, a tractor, or a harvester; whether it is a pair of trousers, a hat, or a coat; because no matter how the system of railway freights is telescoped, the man who is to have his goods brought the greatest mileage over the railways pays more freight than anybody in between.

So clearly this increase in railway freights will bear most heavily upon farmers the greatest distance removed from the ports—and particularly on those the greatest distance removed from Perth and Fremantle. On the question of railway freights, the present Premier, when he was electioneering some 18 months ago, gave at least an implied, if not a direct promise, that freights would be reduced. I will quote again from his policy speech. He is discussing the railways, Mr. Speaker, as you will readily understand, as soon as I make the quote. He says—

We will secure additional patronage—

that is, for the railways—

—through improved, cheaper services, and a virile publicity campaign.

So here the present Premier, during the last election campaign, in his policy speech, promises cheaper freights on the railways. He also promises cheaper services. How one can provide a cheaper service on the railways without providing cheaper freights, I would not know. So here again we have an assurance or an undertaking from the present Premier to the people of Western Australia, which has been broken.

Mr. Court: We are getting a cheaper service, and we are employing commercial methods as advocated by the leader of the Opposition at the time.

Mr. HAWKE: Here we have the smooth Minister for Railways again.

Mr. Court: That is not smooth; it is factual.

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister for Railways leaves out the most vital of the three factors in the quotation I have just made from the policy speech made by the present Premier. He says nothing about cheaper services which were promised; he says we are indulging in a virile publicity campaign and getting more efficiency.

Mr. Court: In some cases we are getting a cheaper service.

Mr. HAWKE: Of course we are; in some cases we are getting a cheaper service. However, to get to the stomach of the situation—if I might use that term—we find the Government is proposing to increase railway freight charges by approximately £1,000,000 a year. Perhaps the

Minister for Railways could give us the figure which would be involved in twelve months in these cheaper services. Would it be £1,000,000? Would it be £500,000? Would it be £250,000? Of course it would not!

The Minister for Railways comes here with his pettifoggish talk, only for the purpose of trying to fool and mislead; for the purpose of trying to smother the total and actual effects—the net effects—of Government policy in this and other similar matters.

Mr. Court: The fact is that there are some cheaper services.

Mr. HAWKE: Clearly, promises and undertakings given by the present Premier on behalf of the Liberal Party in the last election campaign have been scrapped, and very badly scrapped indeed. Charges are now being pushed up by this Government beyond the breaking point. The cheaper service promised is not being provided; rail freights are to be increased by approximately £1,000,000 a year.

Mr. Court: The then Leader of the Opposition did not say there would be a general reduction in freights. He said there would be cheaper services; and there are cheaper services; there is a commercial approach. What more do you want?

Mr. HAWKE: If someone undertook to give you a cheaper service in regard to the transport of your goods, Mr. Speaker, and he reduced the transport cost 1d. a cwt. on three items, and increased it 1s. a cwt. on 97 other items, I am sure you would not be fool enough to be taken in by that sort of chicanery! I am sure the Minister for Railways would not be taken in by it, either, if he were on the receiving end.

Mr. Tonkin: He is using that commercial accounting method to get that result.

Mr. HAWKE: Unfortunately, the Minister for Railways is not on the receiving end in connection with the increased railway freights; he will not pay one farthing of them.

Mr. Court: That is what you think.

Mr. HAWKE: The people who will pay are those who are in the district of the member for Moore; those in the districts of the member for Narrogin, the member for Toodyay, the Minister for Agriculture, and so on. They are the people who will pay. They will be on the receiving end.

The Minister for Railways also tells us in his speech that there has been no outcry in regard to these increased freights. They have not been imposed yet. Nobody has had to pay them yet. They are around the corner. As soon as they are applied, and as soon as people find they have to pay more freight on this, on that, and on everything else, there will be plenty of complaints, protests, and outcries then.

Mr. W. Hegney: Another fortnight.

Mr. HAWKE: There was no outcry, if I may use the illustration for a moment, when the first announcement was made in the newspapers about the increase in water rates in the metropolitan area; but today, after the people have received their increases in their rating notices, there is plenty of complaint, protest, and outcry—there is plenty of it; and it is growing in volume every day.

Mr. W. Hegney: Seventy per cent. increase.

Mr. Court: I think they are surprised at the moderate nature of the railway charges.

Mr. HAWKE: Well!

Mr. Court: I think they expected it to be much more.

Mr. HAWKE: I can almost see the Minister for Agriculture having an apoplectic fit at the thought of having as a brother Minister one who is so politically hypocritical as to make an explanation of that kind.

Mr. Court: We are waiting for that 64-dollar explanation you are going to give us.

Mr. HAWKE: I am coming to that. The Minister for Railways also talked about the Grants Commission and the State's finances. In all my experience with the Grants Commission it never, on any occasion, sought to determine or dictate the lines of financial policy which any State should follow in regard to imposing taxes or charges.

Mr. Watts: They say you can do what you like if you take the consequences.

Mr. Court: You can do as you wish if you are prepared to accept the consequences.

Mr. HAWKE: Exactly! That is perfectly right. There was no pressure by the Grants Commission on the Government to increase railway freights.

Mr. Court: Except financial pressure.

Mr. HAWKE: Even if there was, the Ministers of both sections of this Government are bound by their election promises, assurances, and undertakings not to increase railway freights. It is amazing how the Minister for Railways will smooth over the question of increased railway freights, as if it was something which did not matter, and something of little importance and of little concern to the people on the receiving end.

I remember that when we were in office he used to kick up Hell's delight at any proposed increase, no matter how small or how few were the people affected. I remember his putting on a show one night when he was in the Opposition, when some water charges in the Nedlands district were increased as a result of revaluation of land. There were tears in his voice and in his eyes; he told us his telephone

did not cease ringing day or night, and said what a wicked thing it was the Government did.

Mr. Court: Because of the method by which the Minister put it over.

Mr. HAWKE: Yet we have him coming along on this occasion not only justifying the savage increase in railway freights, for which there is no adequate justification, but also pouring out soothing syrup by the gallon to the farmers of this State, telling them that this is not much of an increase; that the Hawke Government or some other Government seven years ago imposed bigger increases; and trying to persuade us to believe that those who have to bear these increased railway freights do not mind paying, and that they realise the justice of the situation. When he was speaking I almost thought he was going on to say, "They will give three cheers for me, as Minister for Railways, for having initiated these increased railway freights."

Mr. Court: I would not expect that.

Mr. HAWKE: That was nearly the point the Minister reached in depreciating almost to a vanishing point the likely serious effect of the £1,000,000 increase in railway freights. The Minister appeared to be more proud than usual, if that were possible, of a comparison which he put forward between the railway freight increases imposed in 1953 and those which are to take place in the near future. What is the point of that comparison?

Mr. Court: If £1,000,000 is vicious in 1960, surely £2,000,000 was more vicious in the value of money in 1953.

Mr. HAWKE: That is some logic! The Minister has not heard the saying, "The last straw which breaks the camel's back." If somebody put a burden of a half cwt. on a person's back seven or 10 years ago, it is all right to come along five or seven years afterwards and put on another quarter cwt.

Mr. Court: Did you not think that the charges which you imposed on the last occasion were vicious?

Mr. HAWKE: "Vicious" is the word the Minister used. I have not used it in this debate.

Mr. Court: "Savage" was the term you used.

Mr. HAWKE: I am simply saying that the railway charges which were put upon the people were described by the Leader of the Government, in his election speech 18 months ago, as being charges which had reached the breaking point. I have no doubt the Minister for Railways had a lot to do with the writing of that policy speech which his leader delivered. So the Minister for Railways and Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party, when the last election campaign took place told the people that railway freights had reached the breaking point, as far as those paying them

were concerned. Now he comes along, after he has been able to persuade his fellow Ministers to agree to increases of approximately £1,000,000 in these freights, and tells us, "Our action is justified, because some other Government seven years ago increased the freights more than we are doing on this occasion."

Mr. Court: The previous Government doubled the present increase.

Mr. HAWKE: What sort of reasoning is that? On the basis of that lack of reasoning the Minister would be justified in coming along next year and saying, "The Hawke Government in 1953 increased railway freights by so much. Our Government increased them by so much. This year we are justified in increasing them by so much, because these latest increases will only be 33 per cent. as high as the increases imposed by the Hawke Government".

Mr. Court: You are still romancing. You still have not answered why your increase of £2,000,000 was not vicious—33 per cent. on miscellaneous goods, and 25 per cent. on livestock.

Mr. HAWKE: I am saying that the more charges and taxation are increased, the less capable become those who have to carry the increased taxes and charges of carrying them. I know that will not sink into the stubborn, political outlook of the Minister for Railways, because once he makes up his mind not to absorb something which does not suit his political outlook, nothing on earth will cause him to absorb it; nothing on earth will cause him to admit its correctness. However, I am sure other Ministers in the Government—some of them at least, but I shall not name them so as not to offend any—and the Country Party members on the crossbenches, who have practical knowledge of this situation, understand there is a breaking point. No one will understand that better than my neighbouring electorate's representative, the member for Avon Valley, because he has been through the mill as a farmer.

Mr. Court: I wonder what the Premier of New South Wales feels about his increases in rates if they are so excessive and so much higher than ours.

Mr. HAWKE: Now we have been able to peg the Minister for Railways down to some degree in regard to this issue in Western Australia, he wants to get on a jet plane and clear off to Sydney.

Mr. Court: We have to be compared with that State for Grants Commission purposes.

Mr. HAWKE: I know what the Grants Commission does. I say the Grants Commission would not dictate to Western Australia that it should increase railway freights. It would not do that. Even if it tried, the Ministers of both sections of this Government gave clear-cut promises,

assurances, and undertakings at the last elections that railway freights would not be increased. As a matter of fact, the Liberal Party section of the Government promised that freights would be reduced. The Minister should not try to hide behind the Grants Commission. He should not push the commission into the firing line in connection with this issue.

Mr. Court: It is not a question of pushing the commission. It is a statement of fact.

Mr. HAWKE: He knows what I am saying. He should stand up to it.

Mr. Wild: He is standing up to it.

Mr. HAWKE: He is sitting down now.

Mr. Wild: He is accepting his responsibility.

Mr. Court: Do you know that the Grants Commission can dictate to the States financially?

Mr. HAWKE: These proposed increased railway freights will certainly bring about increases in costs in country areas. There cannot be any other result in that direction but the one I have just indicated. The cost of living will be increased. The cost of living in the country will rise through constant pressure; the constant attraction towards a bigger percentage of the increasing population coming to the city will be intensified; and wages and salaries in country areas will increase as subsequent quarterly adjustments to the basic wage are made. Therefore, these proposed increases in railway freights will push up other costs in the country. It will not only be an increase in railway freights; this action of the Government will set in train a circle of events all of which will combine together to increase costs in all directions in country areas. There cannot be any shadow of doubt about that.

Almost everything which people buy in the way of food, things to be worn, or things to be used in 101 directions, will become more costly to secure. Of course, as upward adjustments of the basic wage are made in country districts, the cost of living will further increase the cost of running the railways, and the pressure upon the Liberal Party members of this Government to abolish quarterly cost-of-living adjustments will become ever so much heavier than it is at the present moment. However, that is their problem—they are responsible for creating it.

I am sure they have not the answer to it; but, as usual, I have no doubt they will make the section of the community least able to bear the burden bear most of it. There is never a suggestion from any Minister in this Government that prices should be put in restraint to keep down the cost of living; to keep down railway freights—quite the opposite. They say they are opposed to any restraint over

prices; opposed to any restraint over profits. The only thing they want restraint over is the wage of the mass of working people in this State.

They very strongly favour restraint over that; and they favour more restraint over it than they dare to admit. We have had the Minister for Railways, who happens to be the Minister for Industrial Development also, sending out written appeals, I understand, to local government authorities in country districts, appealing to them to set up local committees at, say, Beverley, Narrogin, and similar places, to consider possible ways and means of establishing manufacturing industries in country towns. Some local authorities, taking the Minister at his face value—

Mr. Rowberry: Which face?

Mr. HAWKE:—which was foolish on their part, have set up these committees; and the first thing that hits them in the face after setting up these committees is a terrific blow against any possibility which might have existed of having manufacturing industries established in country towns—a substantial increase in railway freights. Obviously the effect of increased railway freights will be more and more to centralise manufacturing industries in the Perth metropolitan area and to make it more and more difficult for them to have any possible chance of being established at, say, Beverley, Geraldton, or wherever else in the country it might be.

So the Minister for Railways has reduced to a farce the appeal which he has made to these country local authorities in this matter by increasing railway freights and thereby substantially increasing, straightaway, costs of production which manufacturers would have to meet should they decide to establish their industries in country towns. Undoubtedly, another effect of these increases in railway freights will be to cause farmers to transport in their own motor vehicles greater quantities of their own goods.

I travel quite a lot on the roads between Perth and Northam, as members know; and the number of farmers' vehicles bringing goods to Perth and taking goods out of Perth is increasing—increasing quite substantially from time to time. One would not require to have much imagination to know how the volume of that traffic will increase when these higher railway freights come into force. So the Minister for Railways and his advisers who have worked out this estimated increase of £1,000,000 or so, approximately, in regard to railway freights, might find that the £1,000,000 per year will not be any more than £500,000.

Then we might have the situation which we talked about a few moments ago of a Minister coming along next year and trying to justify further increases in railway freights at that time, although I guess that would be too close to the 1962 elections

for the Minister to even dare to do it at that time. I want to quote from the policy speech of the Leader of the Country Party.

Mr. Watts: You are not quoting from the policy speech because you haven't got it. You are quoting from *The West Australian* report.

Mr. HAWKE: I was going to say that.

Mr. Watts: There is a considerable difference between the two statements.

Mr. HAWKE: I do not think that the Attorney-General can sneak out of it that way.

Mr. Watts: I am not trying to sneak out of it at all.

Mr. HAWKE: I have no recollection of the Attorney-General correcting or adding to this report of his policy speech as made at Mt. Barker.

Mr. Watts: If one had to correct all the omissions in newspaper reports, one would be very busy.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has three minutes.

Mr. HAWKE: In this case, the Attorney-General cannot put over the proclamation-no proclamation stunt. We will not fall for that again. This is what the Leader of the Country Party (Mr. Watts) said at Mt. Barker on Friday, the 27th February, 1959, as reported in *The West Australian* newspaper of the 28th February:—

The Country Party will not agree to any further increases in rail freights, about 90% of which are paid by country residents.

When I questioned him the other day about this in the House he said there is a qualification. The only qualification in this report is that—

Losses must be reduced to a minimum by efficient management.

As the Government has now been in office for eighteen months, presumably this efficient management has been put into effect.

Mr. Court: The losses have been reduced substantially.

Mr. HAWKE: So the promise of the Leader of the Country Party stands; and that promise was that there would be no increase in railway freights during this current three years. Yet, at this stage, we have a very substantial increase in railway freights about to take place. When I questioned the Attorney-General about this policy the other day in this House he said, in effect, the recent conference of the Country & Democratic League had given him and his ministerial colleagues a green light on the matter.

What a take-down of the public that would be if it were allowed. In other words, they can make whatever promises they like during an election campaign. Then if they are elected as the Government

and find that some of the promises are awkward or have to be broken, they can call a conference of their friends and get them to say they can break those promises.

I say those promises were not made to delegates of the Country and Democratic League. They were made to the public of Western Australia as a whole, and there is no justification of any kind for breaking them.

MR. WATTS (Deputy Premier—Stirling—on amendment) [10.16]: I move—

That the amendment be amended by deleting all words after the word "wish" in line 1 and substituting the following words:—

to assure Your Excellency that this House appreciates the reasons which rendered it necessary for the Government to make a very moderate increase in railway freights, such increase being considerably less than one-half that needed to compensate for increased railway wages and salary costs of approximately £2,700,000; and also being essential to prevent this State from being further penalised through the Grants Commission. And this House further assures Your Excellency that freight rates will be very considerably lower than those in the standard States after the approved increase has been made.

I moved that amendment immediately on rising for two reasons: Firstly, because I think it will be a very appropriate amendment for this House to carry; and, secondly, because I feel that members should have notice of it in order that they might be in a better position to debate it tomorrow; because, taking advantage of the ruling you gave this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I now move—

That I be given leave to continue my speech at the next sitting of the House.

#### Point of Order

Mr. HAWKE: On a point of order, Sir, is the motion in order?

The SPEAKER: The motion that the Minister be allowed to continue at the next sitting of the House?

Mr. HAWKE: Yes.

The SPEAKER: I think so.

Mr. HAWKE: Can you quote a Standing Order?

The SPEAKER: Yes. I think it comes under Standing Order No. 157.

Mr. HAWKE: Would you mind reading it out for our benefit, please?

The SPEAKER: It is as follows:—

A debate may be adjourned on motion and without discussion or by leave being granted to a member then

speaking to continue his remarks at a future time either to a later hour of the same day, or to any other day.

Mr. HAWKE: How can leave be granted? No-one has moved that leave be granted.

The SPEAKER: I think that is the substance of the motion.

Mr. HAWKE: Yes; but the Deputy Premier is addressing himself to clear-cut business before the House. He is addressing himself to an amendment which I moved, in connection with which he has moved another amendment. How can he, when he is addressing the House on clear-cut business of this kind, suddenly somehow wind up, or break in by moving that he be given leave to continue his remarks at the next sitting? How could that possibly be approved?

The SPEAKER: The point is that it is consistent with the ruling I gave this afternoon. The Standing Order requires that leave be granted, and the Deputy Premier has now moved that he be granted leave to continue his speech tomorrow; and I think that is consistent with the ruling I gave this afternoon on that particular point.

The thought behind my ruling was that I felt the member who has the floor is the one who should decide whether or not he wishes to continue his speech at some later date, and that it should not be the prerogative of the House to decide whether he shall finish his speech on that particular occasion.

Mr. HAWKE: I would hope that you would give this ruling further consideration. I do not desire at this stage to move to disagree with it; but it seems to me rather weird that in the proceedings of Parliament—or any other organisation for that matter—someone who is on his feet addressing himself to a motion or amendment should suddenly be able to move that he be given leave to continue his own remarks at some future time. That appears to me to be hopelessly illogical, with all due respect to you. However, I would be satisfied if you would undertake to give the ruling further consideration and report back to the House at a later date to suit your own convenience.

The SPEAKER: I am prepared to do that.

Mr. TONKIN: There is an aspect which concerns me considerably, and I would like your direction in connection with it. Do you rule that the Deputy Premier has moved an amendment? If that is your ruling, will the Deputy Premier only be permitted to speak next to the amendment; or is your ruling to the effect that he has not moved the amendment and that it will not therefore appear in the *Votes and Proceedings*?

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier has moved his amendment, and he proposes to speak to it at the next sitting of the House. That is my understanding of the matter.

Mr. Watts: And mine.

Motion put and passed.

## ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

MR. WATTS (Stirling—Deputy Premier) [10.21]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

### Ayes—23.

Mr. Bovell	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Court	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Owen
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Perkins
Dr. Henn	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Watts
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Wild
Mr. Mann	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. W. A. Manning	(Teller.)

### Noes—22.

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Curran	Mr. Norton
Mr. Evans	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Heal	Mr. Sewell
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. May

(Teller.)

### Pairs.

### Noes.

Mr. Brand	Mr. Graham
Mr. Crommellin	Mr. Andrew

Majority for—1.

Question thus passed.

House adjourned at 10.26 p.m.

## Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 17th August, 1960

### CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Fremantle Lot 1850 : Transfer to Fremantle City Council	444
Fremantle Railway Station : Inward and outward passengers	444
Katanning High School : Completion	444
Lockyer Housing Area : Investigation of damage	444
Motor Vehicle Drivers' Licenses : Number for 1959 and 1960	444
Motor Vehicle Licenses : Number for 1959 and 1960	444
Railways Goods Traffic : Tonnage handled by Harbour Trust	444
Rainmaking : Kalgoorlie investigation	444
Traffic Accidents : Statistics	444
War Service Land Settlement : Improvements to Perillup property	444