

Legislative Council

Thursday, 11th August, 1955.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Judges and others, salaries	103
Redex car trial, damage to North-West Highway	103
Education, new primary school, Geraldton	103
Mental hospital, negotiations for new site	103
Chamberlain Industries Pty. Ltd., reports by accountant	104
Geraldton regional hospital, preparation of plans	104
Address-in-reply, second day	104
Speaker on Address— Hon. C. H. Simpson	104

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

QUESTIONS.

JUDGES AND OTHERS.

Salaries.

Hon. H. K. WATSON asked the Chief Secretary:

What is the present annual remuneration of—

(1) The Supreme Court judges of South Australia?

(2) The Supreme Court judges of Tasmania?

(3) The Supreme Court judges of Western Australia?

(4) The Crown Solicitor of Western Australia?

(5) The chairman of the W.A. Betting Control Board?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

The remuneration is as follows:—

Chief Justice	Judges
(1) £4,750	£4,000
(2) £4,000	£3,500
(3) £3,300	£2,900
(4) Crown Solicitor of Western Australia, £2,540.	
(5) Chairman, Betting Control Board £3,290.	

The salaries of judges and other salaries fixed by statute in Western Australia are now under consideration by the Government and legislation will be introduced later in the session.

REDEX CAR TRIAL.

Damage to North-West Highway.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER asked the Chief Secretary:

(1) Is he aware of the colossal damage caused to the North-West Highway by cars which took part in the Redex car trial last year?

(2) Is he aware also that a similar trial over this route, with 182 entries, is about to take place?

(3) As the state of our roads has improved out of all knowledge over the past three years, is the Government prepared to allow this wilful destruction of our road surfaces to continue in this manner, which brings no benefit to the public whatever but is merely a means of advertising the products of private companies?

(4) If the answer to No. (3) is in the negative, will the Government take immediate action to ensure that the route of this trial does not come through Western Australia this year?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

(1) The North-West Highway was damaged in some sections as a result of the Redex car trial last year.

(2) Yes.

(3) and (4) It has been decided to observe carefully the effect on the roads of this year's trial in order to assess any damage and enable appropriate action to be taken with regard to future proposed trials.

EDUCATION.

New Primary School, Geraldton.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN asked the Chief Secretary:

When is it anticipated that a commencement will be made on the new primary school in the Dampier-Elliott-st. area in Geraldton?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

The commencing date cannot be given until available loan funds are known and priorities arranged.

MENTAL HOSPITAL.

Negotiations for New Site.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER asked the Chief Secretary:

(1) Have any negotiations been entered into with owners of property at Guildford in relation to a new site for the mental asylum?

(2) Has any departmental officer entered a property to assess its value?

(3) Is the Minister aware that an article on the proposed new mental asylum site at Guildford appeared in the publication "The Week-End News" of the 6th August?

(4) Is he aware that the information contained in the article was purported to have come from the Premier?

(5) If the information contained in the article was what the Premier intimated, does the Minister think it was fair to the owners of the property to insinuate that they, the owners, have been holding out for a high price?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

(1) Initial approach has been made by correspondence.

(2) No.

(3) Yes.

(4) and (5) The article does not indicate a statement by the Premier.

CHAMBERLAIN INDUSTRIES PTY. LTD.

Reports by Accountant.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM asked the Chief Secretary:

Will he lay on the Table of the House the reports made by Sir Edwin Nixon, a Victorian chartered accountant, as a result of inquiries made into Chamberlain Industries Pty. Ltd., which reports were received by the Government about the end of 1952?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

No. Chamberlain Industries Pty. Ltd. is a private business undertaking and as such its affairs are not normally made public. However, the hon. member can peruse Sir Edwin Nixon's reports at the office of the Minister for Mines.

GERALDTON REGIONAL HOSPITAL.

Preparation of Plans.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN asked the Chief Secretary:

To what stage has the preparation of plans for the Geraldton regional hospital advanced?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

Preliminary sketch plans have been completed, but these will require some revision before the design is finalised.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Second Day.

Debate resumed from the 4th August.

HON. C. H. SIMPSON (Midland) [4.41]: On our first business-day of sitting, we passed two motions of condolence which would be forwarded to the relatives of two very valued members of this House. One member has suffered a bereavement which could not be recognised in this House in the same way, but to that member our sympathies go out because of the loss of his partner of a lifetime. I refer to the death

of Lady Gibson and the loss sustained by Hon. Sir Frank Gibson. All of us who take part in public life recognise the debt we owe to our wives, because it is the womenfolk who stimulate and encourage us in the tasks we undertake. Lady Gibson was a great inspiration to her husband in his work, apart from which, in the capacity of Lady Mayoress of Fremantle, she met all obligations devolving upon her as a very kindly and gracious lady would. I feel it is due to the hon. member that I should voice a sentiment of sympathy with him in his loss.

I should like at this stage to offer my congratulations to those—and I think that you, Mr. President, were one of the prime movers—who have during the recess done a considerable amount of work towards making this Chamber more comfortable. A good deal of work has been done in the wiring and the installation of bell systems and so forth, besides which the upholstering of the seats has been very much improved and the better lighting is something from which we shall all derive considerable benefit. We should offer our thanks to those who have been responsible for having this work done, and I for one am hoping it is but the forerunner of some move towards the long-delayed completion of the Parliament House building.

In speaking to the Address-in-reply in the final session of the twenty-first Parliament, it is not my intention to detain members very long. As a matter of fact, I intend to confine my remarks to one or two salient points in His Excellency's Speech, and will leave to my colleagues, who are well able to undertake that task, the job of dealing with the other points, of which there are many, and in relation to which they can debate or criticise as they may desire.

The Speech contained many items inviting criticism. In general, it reflected the prosperous period through which the State has been passing for the last few years, and in many ways it reflected the continuity of operation of the work that had been carried on by the previous Government and which has been continued by the present Administration. That is not to say that the Government is entitled to unqualified praise for what it has done, or that it is immune from criticism. No Government is, and the task of the Opposition is to draw attention to what it considers shortcomings in the policy or performance of the Government, and to try, as far as it can in the interests of the country, to have the faults, if any, remedied or to furnish suggestions which might be adopted with advantage to the welfare of the State.

Some of the legislation which has been envisaged can be dealt with at the appropriate time; but it seemed to me, on hearing the Speech and re-reading it later,

that there were certain items that had been highlighted. On the front page, I think in paragraph 4, it says—

Bills will be placed before you to provide for price control and the automatic quarterly adjustment of the basic wage. Amending rents and tenancies legislation will also be introduced.

Whether that is a challenge to this Chamber, or whether it is something that the Government considers will be particularly appealing at election time, or whether it is a dying effort on the part of a Government which fears it will not be returned to office I do not know; but, as those items have been highlighted and referred to by the Government speaker in the first contribution to the debate, I take it that it can be accepted that the Government does stress those particular things, and that we will hear all about them in due course. But, because they have been specially mentioned, I wish today to make some reference to them in order to show that we are quite prepared to accept the challenge and to prove that there are two sides to every question, and that we think there are very good arguments against adopting all that the Government proposes to put forward.

I think members will recall that last year, 1954, a special session of Parliament was called to consider emergency legislation. I am not at present going into the pros and cons of that, but I think members will appreciate that it did have some effect on the campaign activities of those members who were seeking re-election; and, as a result, that election was responsible for the turnover of four seats as between parties and that, in turn, was hailed, throughout the length and breadth of Australia, as evidence that any attempt to do anything about rents was going to react on those who actually brought forward the legislation, if it was an attempt to correct a state of affairs which had developed under controls.

Now, as Mr. Teahan said—and I think all members will agree—the question of rents was not an issue, at least in three out of four of those provinces. I should say it had no effect on the issue in the South-East, North-East or North Provinces, and I doubt whether it had any great effect in the Metropolitan-Suburban Province. But in any case, that appeared to be the reaction; and I suppose that, from a campaigning point of view, one could not blame the Government if it thought, "This was a winner last time. We will try it again and see how we get on." I repeat that we are prepared to accept that challenge and, when the time arrives, to deal on their merits with any proposals brought forward.

Something which I notice was not mentioned in His Excellency's Speech was the Betting Control Board, and I will not comment on that. But before going ahead with

the question of price controls I will have something to say about the town planning report, after I have spoken in regard to the other matters to which I have referred.

The Government has expressed concern about rising prices, and I say that members on this side of the House are just as much concerned with that issue. We know the effect of inflation or rising prices on the economy of the country, and its effect on primary production, which cannot pass on its costs, together with its impact on the pensioners. I do not think any sane man is anxious that there should be any disturbance of the stability of the country, or that everything should not be done to try to keep prices, in particular, stable; but we want to tackle this thing at the source and to try, if we can, to correct those causes which are bringing about this inflationary trend.

We want to let everybody know, as far as we can, what those causes are, so that they will be prepared to accept legislation which is honestly brought down to deal with these things, even if in some degree it might mean certain restrictions of opportunity. There is sometimes a tendency for Governments and others, instead of dealing with causes—which might be a little difficult to explain—to point to some section of the community and say, "There is the villain of the piece."

During the last day or two, business people have been referred to as profiteers who batten on the people of the country. I have here an extract from a lecture by Earl Russell, and will read it to the House, as it will show that this tendency to feature some thing or person as the villain of the piece is as old as sin and as wide as humanity. The extract is taken from a series of lectures by Bertrand Russell entitled, "Authority and the Individual," and the passage to which I refer is as follows:—

In every misfortune it is a natural impulse to look for an enemy upon whom to lay the blame; savages attribute all illness to hostile magic. Whenever the causes of our troubles are too difficult to be understood, we tend to fall back upon this primitive kind of explanation. A newspaper which offers us a villain to hate is much more appealing than one which goes into all the intricacies of dollar shortages. When the Germans suffered after the first World War, many of them were easily persuaded that the Jews were to blame. The appeal to hatred of a supposed enemy as the explanation of whatever is painful in our lives is usually destructive and disastrous; it stimulates primitive instinctive energy, but in ways the effects of which are catastrophic. There are various ways of diminishing the potency of appeals to hatred. The best way, where it is possible, is to

cure the evils which cause us to look out for an enemy. Where this cannot be achieved, it may sometimes be possible to disseminate widely a true understanding of the causes that are producing our misfortunes. But this is difficult so long as there are powerful forces in politics and in the Press which flourish by the encouragement of hysteria.

If we look at the pros and cons of the question of controls in wartime, we realise that we submitted to such controls as those over prices, rationing, materials, manpower and wages; and all those controls, it is admitted, worked together. If we try to impose one without the rest, it is never satisfactory. But the reaction now is that the war has been over for ten years, and people are becoming restive under controls. They ask, "Why cannot we get back to prewar conditions, under which we knew exactly where we stood and there was no Government restriction or interference and things always sorted themselves out"? Because, when men are faced with the necessity to solve their own problems, they can always make an attempt to do it. Price control did not control prices but only recorded price movements.

My second point is that, under price freedom, prices have risen less than they rose under controls. Since December, 1953, when price controls in Western Australia were removed, the annual increase for food, clothing and miscellaneous in Western Australia was 3.6 per cent. In South Australia, for the same period and with the same items under controls, the rise was 3 per cent. per annum. There we have a slight difference, for which there is an explanation. In Western Australia, we had a wage advantage of 10s. 6d. over the Eastern States—it is now 16s. 5d.—and higher wages do tend to produce higher costs; and that means inevitably that they have some effect on the prices that people have to pay. Western Australia had the greatest population increase—27 per cent.—between 1947 and 1954. The work force was up 25 per cent., and every machine was in production. There was a shortage of manpower and the demand still exceeds sales. The investment of outside capital and the accelerated development relatively have been greater in this State, in proportion to population, than in any other. All those factors did exercise pressure and were recognised to a certain extent in the grants made by the Grants Commission when considering the special disabilities of this State.

But in any case, the way of remedying these troubles is not by controlling prices and restricting initiative. It is to attack inflation at the roots, and follow the lead of those other countries where controls have been relaxed. I refer to Britain, Canada, America, Scandinavia and Germany, all of which have thrown their controls overboard; and all of which without

exception, have made amazing recoveries, by harder work, greater production and surplus budgeting, tight money and above all, by educating the public mind. In every case, they have left business enterprise free to find its own price levels, as it has always done. Unfettered business competition benefits the consuming public and produces maximum efficiency. The buyer is the controller, and today we have a buyer's market. The buyer has the initiative, but price control would tend to take it away.

Three years ago, I was in Canberra, and I travelled from there to Melbourne in a plane with a gentleman who was then No. 2 officer in the Federal Treasury and who is now secretary of the Olympic Games Committee. I asked him, "How is this fiscal policy going to turn out?" and he said it was difficult to say, but he could give me one illustration of the way things work. He said that in Victoria there was a small textile establishment employing 26 men, and the textile market was becoming pretty well filled. There was really fierce competition. The owner of the establishment found that he could not make ends meet; and he approached his staff and said, "You know how things are going."—which they did. He continued, "I have to reduce hands. I propose to reduce the staff from 26 to 20, but I will adopt the good labour rule of 'last on, first off.'" They agreed. They knew that if they did not agree, the whole business would close down. The extraordinary part was that with the diminution of staff from 26 to 20 he obtained 40 per cent. extra output. I think that the men who remained on his staff responded because they knew the condition of things, and that if they did not all pull their weight the business would collapse and their jobs would be no more. Under the spur of that pressure they apparently responded and that was the result.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It would not be that he tightened up the efficiency of his management as well, would it?

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I think that in a small business such as that a great deal of management is not required; and, in any case, there was the closest possible relationship between the employer and the employees. It was more like a big family than a big concern. However, that man was able to weather the storm and meet the competition of his rivals; and, in time, the position remedied itself. So much for prices.

As I said earlier, these questions, when they are brought forward later on, can receive attention on the merits of the legislation placed before us. But it is foreshadowed that an amendment to the Arbitration Act will be introduced in which we will be asked to agree to quarterly basic wage adjustments and to a direction being given to the Arbitration Court to make them from quarter to quarter. The Arbitration Court already has the power to

make those adjustments whenever they are reviewed; and if it thinks it is necessary, it alters the basic wage accordingly. In fact, the court has made an adjustment only this week. I think it can be trusted, with its long experience of these things, and with its knowledge of the system of arbitration both here and in the other States, to make those decisions on its own, if and when necessary. However, once we start interfering with the powers of a court, whether it be the Arbitration Court or any other court, we can be heading for serious trouble.

As a result of past experience, we have found that when the court did make this variation each quarter as a component of the basic wage, we had a long string of inflationary tendencies. I think the people as a whole were becoming very alarmed at this constant rising of prices, followed by a rise in wages, and they were wondering if the see-saw would ever end. I am satisfied that most of them were pleased when the Arbitration Court took steps to remedy this state of affairs.

What people forgot was that when the prosperity loading was added to the basic wage, the court entered upon an experiment which was very difficult to check and which, on the whole, has been disastrous. Not only was it a big factor in the inflationary trend, but the real effect of it was to destroy the relativity of margins, because that prosperity loading was given to the office boy as well as to the skilled worker. Each time a variation was made in the basic wage it was added to the wage of the office boy as well as to that of the skilled worker.

So when the basic wage more than doubled itself, the margin for skill remained practically the same and the relativity of the margins was destroyed. In the last few years the object of the Court has been to try to check that trend; and although the basic wage is claimed as being very low for the man who is actually on the basic wage, it is still a good deal higher than the needs wage as measured by the original components used to make up a living wage.

As to the attitude of the court, this is an extract from the statement made by the president of the W.A. Employers' Federation, Mr. C. R. Bunning, on the Arbitration Court's decision in the March quarter of this year—

Any suggestion that the basic-wage worker is receiving a wage less than is necessary to provide a reasonable standard of living is not substantiated by the facts. The basic wage still incorporates loadings that total £1 16s. per week above the basis fixed by the Court as sufficient for the reasonable comfort of a worker and his family.

The State Arbitration Court's decision to withhold the quarterly adjustments, in November, 1953, contained points that are still pertinent:

For many years Commonwealth basic wage trends have been followed in W.A. when increases have been granted.

Consistency demands that the State Court should now refuse adjustments.

The State basic wage for Perth is already 10s. 6d. higher than the Federal base and this difference should not be increased.

As I said a moment ago, the further adjustment made this week means that the difference is now 16s. 5d.

It is rather interesting to realise that only 9.3 per cent. of the total number of wage-earners are actually on the basic wage. That is taken from the latest available figures. Using as a basis for calculation the Taxation Department's statistics for the income-tax assessment year 1951-52—which is the latest year completely recorded and available—it is estimated with reasonable accuracy that today, out of Western Australia's work force in secondary industry and commerce—which is 174,800 strong—only 16,313, or 9.3 per cent., received income in the basic-wage bracket; that is, from £625 to £650 per annum. Most of these persons would, of course, be juniors and females. The number of employees on the basic wage in Western Australia during 1951-52 was as follows:—

Male	9,194
Female	6,535
		<u>15,729</u>

If it is assumed that since then the number of basic-wage earners has increased at the same rate as that at which the work force in secondary industry and commerce has increased, and if the Commonwealth Statistician's June, 1954, employment figures are used as a basis, the estimate of the current basic-wage earners today becomes, in detail—

Males:	9,700 out of a total 132,000
Females:	6,613 out of a total 42,800
Total	<u>16,313 out of a total 174,800</u>

On these figures a total of 7.3 per cent. of males, a total of 15.7 per cent. of females; and an aggregate total of 9.3 per cent. of all workers are on the basic wage.

The question we have to ask ourselves is: What is the public attitude towards the problem of basic-wage adjustment? I have here a survey which was taken by a private organisation on similar lines to the Gallup Poll survey, and the results

are rather interesting. The survey employed the mathematical principle of such analyses, and on this occasion a sample of the occupants of 300 Perth homes was taken. This sample was calculated and proportioned in accordance with the various income groups and the proportion of population in each. A margin of error of less than two per cent. is claimed for the answers. The questions and the answers to them are as follows:—

Question No. 1.—Do you think that working people are better off today than they were in 1939?

49.6 per cent. answered yes.

40.8 per cent. answered no.

9.6 per cent. no opinion.

Question No. 2.—Would you rather have applying for the basic wage—

- (a) Compulsory changes each quarter equal to changes measured in the cost of living, or
- (b) Changes only when it can be proved to the Arbitration Court that a change is justly needed and that industry can afford the increase?

Answers:—

(a) Forty-four per cent. favoured quarterly adjustment.

(b) Forty-nine point six per cent. favoured adjustments at the discretion of the Arbitration Court.

Six point four per cent.—No opinion.

I think those figures are illuminating in indicating that the public has formed an opinion of its own on what it considers is some solution to this big question. I say again that if they were given a strong lead they might be prepared to respond to a Government's call to do the things which I have already indicated are necessary to bring about a measure of stability.

Whether we like it or not, there are certain facts we must recognise. One of them is that the high prices that we have been enjoying for commodities such as wool, wheat and meat during past years have disappeared. We have been priced out of export markets for our manufactured goods. Directly after the war there were people hungry for anything we could produce and sell to them, because of the shortages in their own countries; but now they have restored their manufacturing plants to a point where they can come into production themselves. These people have now re-erected their own factories and not only produce for their own requirements, but are under-cutting our markets.

Our prosperity has depended on high export prices, investment of overseas capital and on the demand for our

manufactures. We know that the future of those is uncertain. No one can foresee the amount of capital that will be invested in Australia. We hope that it will be invested in ever-increasing volume, but no one can say with any degree of certainty that it will be so. We do know that we are now facing increasingly strong competition in the goods that we are exporting overseas and synthetics are becoming an increasing menace insofar as they relate to the high prices that we are obtaining for our export wool.

The answer to those questions does not lie in quarterly adjustments, nor in price control. Controls stifle progress and hamper private enterprise; and from past experience we see that their tendencies are towards inflation. The real answer to the whole question is increased production. America can be cited as an example; and it can be quoted to prove that if we can improve our output per capita and produce the manufactured goods at a reasonable price, we can still raise our standards.

But there are many industries in Australia in which the tendency is to do as little as possible and to get as much money as possible in return. This results in a relatively poor showing in the matter of output per unit as compared with what other countries have done, and when we measure the 1949 results with those that other countries are obtaining today, I am of the opinion that the Australian worker is equal to any worker in the world, and in many respects possibly better. If he can be educated to a truer appraisal of the position, I am quite sure that he will rise to the occasion, because no man is more conscious of what it will mean to his own standard of living or to that of the following generation.

I shall not attempt to say much about the rent legislation. I do not know what the Government has in mind. It would be premature to deal with something of which we have no knowledge. But if it is proposed to tie up the question of rents with the basic wage, I think we shall be treading on uncertain and dangerous ground. It has been calculated that only 7.1 per cent. of the wage-earners are directly affected. Over 56 per cent. occupy their own homes—and that applies to wage-earners as well as others—and about four per cent. have homes provided for them. They comprise caretakers, people living in railway houses, or people working for institutions which provide some houses for their employees. Of the balance, quite a number are provided for in Commonwealth-State rental homes, or in homes of which the rentals have been fixed in the last three years. In any case, it is most inequitable and out of balance to give a flat rate of adjustment to the basic-wage earners if we are to give 93 per cent. of those a bonus when, in fact, only 7

per cent. are affected. We can deal with the question of rentals when the legislation comes before us.

As members are aware, the town planning report has not been generally distributed, and none of us who are interested can gain a full idea of the implications. Not having seen the report, I cannot offer any detailed comment. I have seen some of the Press extracts. A portion of these has caused me some misgiving. I am prepared to admit that a plan of some kind is very desirable, and I say in advance that I believe the two men mainly responsible for that plan are very able.

When I read in the newspapers that this plan visualised a vast growth over a fairly short period of years with 80 per cent. of the population of Western Australia in the metropolitan area and only 20 per cent. in the country, I was horrified. I have always been a believer in trying to induce people to go to the country by every means possible so as to develop this State. This plan is going to create a top-heavy State with all head and no body. I would like to study the report in detail to see how those calculations are arrived at; and whether we, as men entrusted with making the laws of Western Australia, can correct something which I think leads to a bad trend for the development of this State.

My next query concerns the Narrows bridge. Why was it tackled in its initial stages without some reference to Parliament? It is a major work. I do not argue that it may not be wholly justified, because I do not know. But with a work of that nature, which will occupy some years in its implementation and will cost a terrific amount of money, Parliament should have a say on whether such a project should have been started before it was consulted. According to the Press, there is to be a causeway which will come from the Narrows bridge to Malcolm-st. and Mount-st.; this will entail very costly resumptions and a good deal of disturbance. I question why it is necessary for people who wish to travel beyond Perth to have to go through the centre of the city. Why can the planners not select some way around it, which will avoid this disturbance? I have not seen the plan in detail, and I am only citing the reactions of people like myself.

The Minister for the North-West: That is the Stephenson plan.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I notice that in the report there is a proposal to site new marshalling yards at Welshpool. This question received intensive study when I was Minister for Railways. I agree that it is a top-priority job. If the railway marshalling yards can be removed from the centre of Perth to some convenient point outside, then much use can be made in a number of ways of the very valuable land so released.

In this week's newspapers there was a proposal to build an overhead railway from West Perth to East Perth; I am in favour of that. I have been told it would be costly; but offsetting that, very valuable land would be released by such a move. There has been some talk about the noise of an overhead railway; but today, people living alongside of suburban lines get used to the siren of and the noise created by the diesel engines. In any case, with city traffic there is always a certain volume of noise, and people do get used to it. Therefore the argument on the ground of the noise created has no substance.

If the Government can resume a lot of the land not occupied by the marshalling yards in the city, then Wellington-st. and Roe-st. can be widened and turned into major traffic lanes and so relieve the congestion through Perth. There could be an uninterrupted north-south flow of traffic and the area north of the line could come into its own. Much of that land, which is as yet hardly developed, is a lot closer to the centre of the city than areas in East Perth and West Perth which are now being developed more rapidly. Again such land can be used for parking areas or for bus stations.

Railwaymen are in favour of this suggestion concerning the marshalling yards. The land has all been resumed, compensation has been paid in full, and it will not disturb anyone. I know the views held by the railwaymen when the Bill was brought forward a few years ago. They considered the alternative scheme, and proved quite conclusively that it was much more costly, both in initial expense and afterwards. It would take a much longer period to implement, and time is the essence of the contract.

When I see such proposed schemes, and when I am disturbed by what might happen, I am consoled to some extent by looking around and seeing what the experience has been in regard to other major projects which have been under construction in Western Australia. We have had four plans for the development of Fremantle harbour. Up to the present not one of them has been adopted in its entirety. Coming nearer home, we have Parliament House, which was conceived and planned around the turn of the century. It was started 53 years ago, and 50 years ago it was completed as far as it went; and that is the stage at which it stands today. Fifty years have gone by, and the building has not yet been completed. I am hoping that we will at least have time to consider these far more costly projects envisaged by the town planners and to get public reaction before we embark on them. I support the motion.

On motion by Hon. F. R. H. Lavery, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 5.27 p.m.