

of 17s. 6d. a week. If he agrees, we can produce the needy unemployed, and Mr. Mather can give him the full facts.

It is very difficult for the State to carry on this good work without co-operation and assistance from the Commonwealth Social Services Department. If the Minister were to call for an inquiry by his department, he would be completely astounded to find that the State had to find the money for the rendering of this sustenance through the Child Welfare Department.

I have the permission of one of the people mentioned by me to quote his name; in fact, he wishes me to do so, but I do not think that his name should be given because he happens to be unemployed. I can supply it to the Minister privately.

For some time, this chap was out of work in Fremantle. He obtained a job on the Commonwealth Railways out in the never-never country and he stayed at this job for 18 months. Finally he was a leading ganger. He is rather a diminutive type of chap, about 5 ft. 5 in. or 5 ft. 4 in. tall. After being outback for 18 months he began to feel the strain and considered he was entitled to some sort of a break. Therefore, he returned to the city.

He was only back one day when he was knocked down by a motorcar. Because of that accident he was off from work for five months. When he went back to the Social Services Department to see if he could obtain employment he was told that he could go back to the job which he previously held. He pointed out to them that he had been there for 18 months and that there were other fellows who had never left Fremantle. He also told them that he was living at home with his mother who was 74 years of age, and he considered that he should be given a job in the metropolitan area or, failing that, obtain the social service benefit.

He was unable to get the social service benefit and the Labour Government assisted him with the payment of 17s. 6d. I point this out in order that the Government may know what is going on. I believe that we should be Christian enough not to make this a political matter.

We in the Labour movement believe the unions, in their own right, should keep their own cases away from politics altogether. However, what did this Government do? It made the situation a political one by placing it on its platform. Therefore, politics were brought into it. It is against the milk of human kindness to bring in politics to decide whether a man gets food or not. I support the amendment.

On motion by the Hon. F. D. Willmott, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 5.33 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 2nd July, 1959.

CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :	
Midland Junction workshops, idle machinery	81
Graham flats, change of name	81
South Perth Community Hospital, payments for construction	81
Spencer Park school—	
Electricity connection	82
Sewerage connection	82
Bananas, ban on sale in Eastern States	82
Transport of beans, freight subsidy	82
Railway Department revenue, segregated figures	82
Overhead pedestrian bridge, construction at West Northam	83
Electricity supplies, provision for Roebourne	83
State housing, Pilbara building programme	83
All-weather roads, construction in Pilbara electorate	83
Port Hedland harbour, soundings and action taken	83
Pilbara pastoral industry, recommendations of investigating committee	83
Marble Bar, provision of drilling plant	84
Point Samson, provision of potable water supply	84
Manganese and copper, tonnages shipped from Port Hedland	84
Child Welfare, remission of sentence on youth	84
Goldfields police boys' clubs, provision of assistance	85
Claremont Teachers' College, shortage of male staff	85
Third Teachers' college, location	85
State loan works, finance provided	85
Collusive tendering, application to public buildings	85
Bookmakers' turnover, weekly figures	85
Esperance land, Chase Agreement	86
Sewage treatment plant, effect on bathing beaches	86
Diphtheria, immunisation of South-West school children	86
Albany harbour, rock removal	86
Volunteer firemen, employment as fireguards	86
Consular representatives, invitations to opening of Parliament	87
State Housing Commission, drafting and architectural work	87
Workers' concession fares, abolition in metropolitan area	87
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE :	
North Kalgoorlie school, improvement to grounds	87
Talgarno rocket range, safeguarding of residents	87
Mr. John Alver, letter of goodwill	87
State Shipping Service—	
Approach to Commonwealth for financial assistance	87
Assurance of retention	88

CONTENTS—continued.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—continued

Aquatic centre—	
Establishment in King's Park	88
Introduction of Bill in Legislative Council	89
Guayule rubber, production in Western Australia	88
Cockburn Cement Co., source of proposed expenditure	88
Talgarno rocket range, safeguarding natives on Canning stock route	89
Beeloo, request for change of name	89
A.M.I. Hospital Benefits Fund, settlement of claims and report of operations	89

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY, SECOND DAY ;

Speaker on Address—	
Mr. Hawke	89
Speakers on Amendment—	
Mr Brand	102
Mr Tonkin	105

BILL :

Electoral Districts (Cancellation of Proclamation), returned	112
--	-----

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION—

Council's message	112
-------------------------	-----

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

MIDLAND JUNCTION WORKSHOPS.

Idle Machinery.

1. MR. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Is it a fact that many thousands of pounds' value in new machinery is lying idle in the Government Railway Workshops at Midland Junction?

(2) Is this machinery to be brought into early use?

(3) Who authorised the initial purchase of the machinery?

(4) For what purpose was the machinery purchased?

(5) Where was the machinery now idle purchased, and what was the approximate cost?

MR. COURT replied:

(1) No. Certain specialised machinery, however, is not always fully employed due to intermittent work, but these machines are essential for railway rolling stock requirements.

Absenteeism due to sickness, etc., and the training of apprentices at the Technical College are also causes of these specialised machines being used intermittently.

(2) to (5) Answered by No. (1).

GRAHAM FLATS.

Change of Name.

2. MR. HEAL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

(1) In view of the Government's standard practice in changing names of projects, is it intended that the name of the Colin and Hay-sts. flats be changed?

(2) If the answer is yes, why the change of brand?

(3) What name is proposed in the event of any change?

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) On the 17th January, 1958, the then Minister for Housing, the Hon. H. E. Graham, M.L.A., wrote to the Canning Road Board in connection with the naming of an area in the following words: "To select a person's name to cover this or any other area shows, in my opinion, a singular lack of imagination."

Mr. Graham accepted the proposal for the naming of the flats as a tribute to himself and the department concerned. No consideration has been given to changing the name.

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

SOUTH PERTH COMMUNITY HOSPITAL.

Payments for Construction.

3. MR. HAWKE asked the Minister for Health:

(1) What is the total amount of money paid in connection with the construction and running of the South Perth Community Hospital, including the recently completed maternity section, by—

(a) the State;

(b) Lotteries Commission?

(2) On what dates and in what amounts were the payments made by—

(a) the State;

(b) Lotteries Commission?

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

	£
(1) (a) General wing	55,611
Maternity wing (payments incomplete)	27,352
To date	£82,963
(b) General wing	£46,625
(2) (a) General wing—	£
1/6/1954	15,000
20/5/1955	15,000
20/12/1955	15,000
1/8/1957	3,340
30/10/1957	5,050
28/6/1959	2,221
	£55,611

	£
(b) General wing—	
3/2/1954	15,000
9/2/1955	15,000
2/11/1955	15,000
25/8/1956	1,125
29/3/1957	500
	<hr/>
	£46,625

With regard to the maternity wing, this was built by day labour and vouchers for payment by the Public Works Department have been spread over the full period of the job since August, 1958.

No subsidies towards the maintenance and running costs of the hospital have been paid by the State or Lotteries Commission.

In addition to the above amounts, £20,000 has been provided by the local community towards the capital cost of the general hospital section, as well as items of equipment, etc.

SPENCER PARK SCHOOL.

Electricity Connection.

4. **MR. HALL** asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Bearing in mind that there is no electricity connected to the Spencer Park school, Albany, will he undertake to press for same through the Minister for Works?

(2) If so, will he endeavour to get a definite date for this installation?

MR. WATTS replied:

The matter is under consideration by the State Electricity Commission and the Education Department.

Sewerage Connection.

5. **MR. HALL** asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Will he take up with the Minister for Works the matter of sewerage connection to Spencer Park school, Albany?

(2) If so, will he stress the urgency of such connection, owing to the unhygienic system now operating?

MR. WATTS replied:

Steps are being taken to plan for the provision of septic facilities at all schools where a satisfactory water supply is available. Spencer Park is included. The hon. member will be later informed when the work is likely to proceed.

BANANAS.

Ban on Sale in Eastern States.

6. **MR. NORTON** asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Will he ascertain what districts in the Eastern States have a complete ban on the sale of bananas within such districts?

(2) What is the reason for such ban?

MR. NALDER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) This will also be ascertained.

TRANSPORT OF BEANS.

Freight Subsidy.

7. **MR. NORTON** asked the Premier:

Will he give favourable consideration to the subsidising of the extra cost of transporting Carnarvon beans to Adelaide on Thursdays as, due to the cancellation of the Kalgoorlie express, large quantities have to be transported by road to Merredin?

MR. BRAND replied:

The position has already been fully examined. The railways, in a desire to ensure satisfactory and economical transport for this important outlet for Carnarvon beans, have kept charges to the minimum and no concession on existing rates can be approved.

RAILWAY DEPARTMENT REVENUE.

Segregated Figures.

8. **MR. EVANS** asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Would he please supply the segregated figures indicating the revenue drawn by the Railway Department from goods traffic hauled from—

(a) Perth and Fremantle to Kalgoorlie; and

(b) Esperance to Kalgoorlie, for the year ended the 30th June, 1959?

(2) If these figures are not yet available, similar figures for the year ended the 30th June, 1958?

MR. COURT replied:

(1) Figures for the year ended the 30th June, 1959, are not yet available.

(2) Figures for the year ended the 30th June, 1958:

	Ex Fremantle	Ex Perth	Ex North Fremantle	Ex Esperance
	£	£	£	£
Coal and coke	543	32	549
Timber	4	810
Grain	19	207
Grain Products	52	603	25
Fruit and vegetables	427	4,900	3
Oil in tankers	63,054	7,511
"A" Class	1,196	875	262	222
"B" Class	1,450	6,799	847	555
"C" Class	7,431	5,412	14,850	3,880
1st Class	8,412	7,508	3,385	2,488
2nd Class	7,260	33,297	403	626
All other goods	3,850	193	190
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	£30,053	£90,645	£83,625	£15,285

It is noted that the hon. member's question only asks for information indicating revenue drawn by the department from certain nominated points.

If he intended the question to include all revenue drawn from goods traffic in both directions, this additional information will be supplied if he so desires.

OVERHEAD PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE.*Construction at West Northam.*

9. **MR. HAWKE** asked the Minister for Railways:

Would he place upon the Table of the House the departmental file dealing with the construction of an overhead bridge for pedestrians at West Northam?

MR. COURT replied:

Yes; I will ask that railway files 1602/58 and 3516/38 be tabled herewith for one month.

The papers were tabled.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES.*Provision for Roebourne.*

10. **MR. BICKERTON** asked the Minister for Works:

What steps are being taken to provide Roebourne with electric power?

MR. WILD replied:

As yet no action has been taken by the Public Works Department, but the matter will be referred to the Minister for the North-West for consideration.

STATE HOUSING.*Pilbara Building Programme.*

11. **MR. BICKERTON** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

What is the State Housing building programme for the next 12 months, for the following towns:—

- (a) Port Hedland;
- (b) Marble Bar;
- (c) Roebourne;
- (d) Onslow;
- (e) Wittenoom?

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

The building programme is as follows:—

- (a) Port Hedland—12. All contracts let.
- (b) Marble Bar—Nil.
- (c) Roebourne—2. All contracts let.
- (d) Onslow—2. All contracts let.
- (e) Wittenoom—Initial programme of 10 being considered and a possible further 30 under consideration.

ALL-WEATHER ROADS.*Construction in Pilbara Electorate.*

12. **MR. BICKERTON** asked the Minister for the North-West:

What action is being taken to make all-weather roads between—

- (a) Port Hedland-Marble Bar;
- (b) Roebourne-Wittenoom Gorge;
- (c) turn-off from Coastal Highway into Onslow?

MR. COURT replied:

(a) In addition to increased funds for maintenance improvement throughout, it is proposed in the 1959-1960 programme to extend the existing bitumen road at the Port Hedland end by eight miles. Funds to the extent of £16,000 are proposed for improvement of crossing at the 12 mile, 22 mile and Shaw River.

(b) At the Wittenoom Gorge end of the road, it is proposed to extend the existing sealed road by three miles on the Fortescue River flats section. Improvement by stabilising 20 miles at a cost of £15,000 in the Pyramid Hill area is also proposed.

(c) It is not proposed at this stage to extend the surfaced road south from Onslow to the turn-off of the North-West coastal highway. Other sections of this latter road have been accorded a higher priority.

PORT HEDLAND HARBOUR.*Soundings and Action Taken.*

13. **MR. BICKERTON** asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Are detailed figures and drawings of the soundings and probings of the Port Hedland harbour available?

(2) Will he table this information?

(3) What action has been taken by him or his department as a result of the information obtained from the soundings and probings and from representations made to him by interested bodies at Port Hedland during his recent visit?

MR. WILD replied:

(1) Detailed plans of soundings and probings are not yet complete.

(2) When completed, plans can be viewed at the Director of Works' office.

(3) The problems involved in further development of the port are under consideration by the department.

PILBARA PASTORAL INDUSTRY.*Recommendations of Investigating Committee.*

14. **MR. BICKERTON** asked the Minister for the North-West:

(1) What action has been taken to implement recommendations made by the three-man committee created to investigate the pastoral industry in the Pilbara area?

(2) Will he table the report of this committee?

MR. COURT replied:

(1) As previously stated, the report released by the committee which examined the current problems of the Pilbara pastoral industry was in the nature of an interim report to permit early discussion with Pilbara pastoralists.

A lot of detailed work, most of which will be highly confidential because of its reference to specific properties, is still being collated. Until this information is completed, the Government cannot make a decision as to the extent to which the report can be adopted and implemented.

(2) Yes, in respect of the initial report referred to.

The papers were tabled.

MARBLE BAR.

Provision of Drilling Plant.

15. **MR. BICKERTON** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

(1) Will he advise what action, if any, has been taken to obtain a suitable drilling plant for operation in the Marble Bar area to assist to obtain water supplies for the mining industry, as outlined by a deputation the Minister for Mines received at Marble Bar?

(2) Is he in favour of a suitable drilling plant being obtained and operated by the Mines Department, as outlined by the deputation? If so, when can the plant be expected to arrive in the required locality?

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

The Minister's reply is as follows:—

(1) I had the department's technical officers further discuss the suggestion with Mr. Stubbs, of Marble Bar, when he was in Perth last week, and likely plants have since been inspected. A report is now being prepared.

(2) I am in favour of a suitable drilling plant being obtained for this area, and expect to make a decision after I have examined the report mentioned.

POINT SAMSON.

Provision of Potable Water Supply.

16. **MR. BICKERTON** asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Is he in favour of a potable water supply for Point Samson?

(2) Is it a fact that to pipe potable water from Roebourne to Point Samson would cost approximately £45,000?

(3) If so, is he prepared to cause this sum to be allotted for this project?

(4) If the figure of £45,000 is incorrect will he advise the total cost involved to enable potable water to be supplied to Point Samson from Roebourne or any other source closer to Point Samson?

(5) Is he aware of the inconvenience suffered by the people of Point Samson considering climate, isolation, etc., by not having a potable water supply?

MR. WILD replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) A provisional estimate for supplying Roebourne water to Point Samson is £50,000.

It is considered unlikely that such a supply would be potable water at all times.

(3) A supply of potable water to Point Samson will be considered on its merits in relation to other urgent works when the loan programme is being finalised.

(4) Further investigations for potable water supplies are necessary before any decision can be made.

(5) Yes.

MANGANESE AND COPPER.

Tonnages Shipped from Port Hedland.

17. **MR. BICKERTON** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

(1) What were the tonnages of—

(a) manganese;

(b) copper

shipped from Port Hedland over the last 12 months?

(2) What percentage of the manganese was exported and to what countries?

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) Tonnages shipped from Port Hedland during the 12 months ended the 30th March, 1959:

	Tons.
Manganese	24,583
Copper	3,455

(2) All manganese exported from the State:—

	Tons.
To New South Wales	6,473
To Japan	4,656
To France	9,854
To U.S.A.	3,600

Total 24,583

CHILD WELFARE.

Remission of Sentence on Youth.

18. **MR. EVANS** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Child Welfare:

With reference to a letter passed on to him by the Attorney-General from a Kalgoorlie legal practitioner concerning a case heard in the Kalgoorlie Children's Court on the 29th May last—

(1) Is the 17-year-old boy, sentenced on that occasion, still in detention?

(2) If not, where is the lad?

(3) Is he receiving the surgical attention to which he is entitled, and for which his past employer's insurance company, under the Workers' Compensation Act, is liable?

- (4) If so, is it the intention of the Minister himself, or the Attorney-General, to take executive intervention to amend the decision of the Kalgoorlie Children's Court?

MR. WATTS replied:

(1), (2), and (3) The lad concerned is at present in St. John of God Hospital as a patient of Mr. H. McComb, specialist.

(4) In these circumstances it is not considered in the lad's best interests for any remission of sentence to be recommended. The matter is essentially one for determination by the Minister for Child Welfare. (See section 47 of the Act).

GOLDFIELDS POLICE BOYS' CLUBS.

Provision of Assistance.

19. **MR. EVANS** asked the Premier:

(1) Has he received a letter from the hon. secretary of the Goldfields Advisory Council, Police Boys' Clubs, recently?

(2) Has he made a decision yet as to whether favourable consideration will be given to the assistance sought?

MR. BRAND replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) This matter is under consideration.

CLAREMONT TEACHERS' COLLEGE.

Shortage of Male Staff.

20. **MR. EVANS** asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Is there at present a shortage in the male staff at the Claremont Teachers' College?

(2) If so, when is the matter to be rectified?

MR. WATTS replied:

(1) A lecturer on the staff of the Claremont Teachers' College proceeded on leave on the 25th June.

(2) The question of a replacement is at present under consideration.

THIRD TEACHERS' COLLEGE.

Location.

21. **MR. EVANS** asked the Minister for Education:

Where is the proposed third Teachers' College, as mentioned in the Speech of His Excellency to Parliament on the 30th June, planned to be erected?

MR. WATTS replied:

Crawley.

STATE LOAN WORKS.

Finance Provided.

22. **MR. TONKIN** asked the Minister for Works:

(1) With reference to his statement published in *The West Australian* of Friday, the 17th April, 1959, under the

caption "State's Loan Works Revised," are the new works mentioned to be financed by additional provision by Treasury, or by a readjustment of sums already allotted?

(2) What was the amount of additional provision made available to him by the Treasurer?

(3) What items of the loan programme were reduced by him, and what was the amount of reduction in each instance?

MR. WILD replied:

(1) New works financed by an additional amount of £47,000 provided by the Treasury and also by readjustment of sums previously allotted.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

(3)—	£
Fremantle fishing boat	
harbour	34,000
Plant workshop	15,000

COLLUSIVE TENDERING.

Application to Public Buildings.

23. **MR. TONKIN** asked the Minister for Labour:

(1) In view of the decision of the Government drastically to reduce the volume of public buildings to be constructed by the work force of the Public Works Department and to have such buildings constructed under contract, does he intend to take any action in connection with the complaint made by the Principal Architect, contained in Part A of Public Works File 1208/50, that collusive tendering by members of the Fibrous Plasterers' Association was occurring, with the result that an increase in price of 4.7 per cent. over last year's prices had been imposed?

(2) If action is proposed, will he have proceedings commenced without delay so that the maximum benefit may result to the State?

MR. PERKINS replied:

(1) No further action other than that already taken. The report of the Honorary Royal Commission deals with collusive tendering, and legislation to be introduced to Parliament to replace the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Control Act, 1956-1959 will be based on the report of the Honorary Royal Commission.

(2) See answer to No. (1).

BOOKMAKERS' TURNOVER.

Weekly Figures.

24. **MR. TONKIN** asked the Treasurer:

(1) How many bookmakers operating in licensed premises, off course, had an average weekly turnover in 1956 of—

- (a) less than £1,000;
- (b) £1,000 or more, but not exceeding £2,000;
- (c) £2,000 or more, but not exceeding £3,000;
- (d) £3,000 or more, but not exceeding £4,000;

(e) £4,000 or more, but not exceeding £5,000;

(f) £5,000 and over?

(2) What are the comparable figures for 1959?

MR. BRAND replied:

- (1) (a) 98.
- (b) 71.
- (c) 28.
- (d) 12.
- (e) 5.
- (f) 6.

Total 220.

- (2) (a) 96.
- (b) 73.
- (c) 32.
- (d) 8.
- (e) 6.
- (f) 5.

Total 220.

ESPERANCE LAND.

Chase Agreement.

25. MR. KELLY asked the Premier:

Has the Government taken any steps to cancel the Chase Agreement?

MR. BRAND replied:

The Government has informed Mr. Chase that the Esperance Plains (Australia) Pty. Ltd., venture at Esperance has failed to achieve results envisaged in the 1956 Agreement, which Mr. Chase has acknowledged is correct.

As there appears no prospect of successful achievement by the company, Mr. Chase has been advised that the Government is prepared to negotiate fresh proposals to include an area of land which could be developed by the company within a specified period of time from financial and physical resources which he can demonstrate are available to him, and that development of land by his company should proceed under similar terms and conditions as apply to other settlers in the Esperance district.

SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT.

Effect on Bathing Beaches.

26. MR. ANDREW asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Could he give the reason why the menace to people's health and their enjoyment of the beaches, of the effluent from the Subiaco sewage treatment works flowing into the ocean, miraculously stopped on the 21st March, which was election day?

(2) Has the crack in the pipe, which has been there for over 20 years yet been repaired?

MR. WILD replied:

(1) No. The wiles of nature are beyond the wit of man.

(2) No. The outlet is corroded beyond repair.

DIPHTHERIA.

Immunisation of South-West School Children.

27. MR. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Health:

(1) How many cases of diphtheria have to date been reported from the various South-West towns?

(2) What percentage of school children and pre-school children have been immunised in such towns?

(3) Are arrangements to be made immediately for diphtheria clinics to be conducted in those towns?

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) The only South-West town where diphtheria has been reported this year is Bunbury (includes Picton) where six cases have been reported. Five of these cases were reported in the last week.

(2) Ninety per cent. estimated by the local medical officer of health.

(3) An immunisation clinic is commencing this afternoon at Bunbury.

ALBANY HARBOUR.

Rock Removal.

28. MR. HALL asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Will he give a definite date for the return of the dredge to Albany, to clean up rock blasted from the harbour bed adjacent to No. 1 berth, which is causing a restriction of draft from 34 ft. to 31 ft.?

(2) Can he advise where the £18,000 was spent, but not used for rock removal from the harbour bed, as passed for that purpose in last year's Estimates?

MR. WILD replied:

(1) As the situation is one created prior to my taking office, a definite date cannot be given, as the dredge is working on urgent work for the Fremantle Harbour Trust.

(2) Approximately £7,000 has been spent on rock removal at Albany. The remainder of the allocation has been absorbed on general loan works elsewhere.

VOLUNTEER FIREMEN.

Employment as Fire Guards.

29. MR. HALL asked the Chief Secretary:

(1) Have volunteer firemen been dispensed with as fire guards at theatres and concert halls?

(2) If so, on what date were their services terminated, and who issued the order?

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) All theatres and concert halls must employ a fire guard. Voluntary firemen may be employed for this purpose at the discretion of the management.

(2) Amendments to the regulations under the Health Act were published on the 30th June, 1959, and to the Fire Brigade Regulations on the 12th June, 1959.

CONSULAR REPRESENTATIVES.*Invitations to Opening of Parliament.*

30. **MR. GRAHAM** asked the Premier:

(1) Who was responsible for the decision to omit consular representatives from the list of officially invited guests to the opening of Parliament, and for what reasons?

(2) By whom were representations made in protest of this action?

(3) When was some corrective action taken?

(4) Representatives of which countries were—

(a) then invited;

(b) still ignored?

(5) Was one diplomatic representative (U.S.A.) allegedly representing those from other countries?

(6) Is such a course possible?

(7) Were the consular representatives of other countries—viz.: Great Britain, Italy and the Netherlands—consulted as to this arrangement?

(8) If so, did they concur?

(9) Will he take steps to ensure that in future there is no repetition of this discourteous treatment of consular representatives of other countries?

MR. BRAND replied:

(1) The Government does not control the issuing of invitations for the opening of Parliament.

(2) I am not aware of any protest by the representative of any country.

(3) to (8) The matter was brought to my notice on the day before the opening of Parliament. Two seats which then became available were allotted to the doyen of the consular corps, who at the moment happens to be the U.S.A. representative.

(9) The hon. member's suggestion will be conveyed to the appropriate quarter.

STATE HOUSING COMMISSION.*Drafting and Architectural Work.*

31. **MR. GRAHAM** asked the Premier:

Is there any likelihood of the Government handing over to private concerns the drafting and architectural work of the State Housing Commission?

MR. BRAND replied:

No consideration has been given to such action.

WORKERS' CONCESSION FARES.*Abolition in Metropolitan Area.*

32. **MR. HEAL** asked the Minister for Transport:

Is it his intention to abolish the early morning concession fares now enjoyed by the workers in the metropolitan area who board their transport before 8.45 a.m.?

MR. PERKINS replied:

A different system of workers' concession fares is under consideration.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.**NORTH KALGOORLIE SCHOOL.***Improvement to Grounds.*

1. **MR. EVANS** asked the Minister for Education:

Referring to the statement appearing in the *Kalgoorlie Miner* of the 1st July in which Mr. R. Burt, the member for Murchison, is quoted as saying in regard to the North Kalgoorlie school grounds, "I am very pleased that representations to the Government for improvements to the school grounds have borne fruit," what assurance was given to that hon. member to justify the statement, and when was it given?

MR. WATTS replied:

I do not know of the statement in the *Kalgoorlie Miner*. I have not seen the *Kalgoorlie Miner* for the last month or six weeks. The same assurance was given to the member for Murchison as was given to the member for Kalgoorlie in answer to a question, and it was given three days previously.

TALGARNO ROCKET RANGE.*Safeguarding of Residents.*

2. **MR. BICKERTON** asked the Premier:

In view of an announcement in *The West Australian* this morning regarding Talgarno Rocket Range area, will he give an assurance that he will do everything in his power to ensure that the safety of the people living in the area is fully safeguarded?

MR. BRAND replied:

Whilst I am certain the authorities concerned have already ensured the safety of everyone living in the area, I shall undertake to make further inquiries.

MR. JOHN ALVER.*Letter of Goodwill.*

3. **MR. BRAND:** Whilst I am on my feet I would like to lay on the Table of the House the letter given by the Premier's Department to Mr. John Alver, a copy of which I intended to show to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition privately.

The letter was tabled.

STATE SHIPPING SERVICE.*Approach to Commonwealth for Financial Assistance.*

4. **MR. W. HEGNEY** asked the Premier:

On the 30th June a report appeared in *The West Australian* on page 10 under the heading, "We May Seek Special Grants". The last paragraph reports Mr. Brand as saying, "A case would be put to the Commonwealth for special assistance to buy ships for the State Shipping Service which

played an important part in the development of North Australia." Is that report substantially correct?

MR. BRAND replied:

Yes; it is substantially correct. I was speaking in particular about the loan programme. The ship which was ordered by our predecessors in office will involve the Government in an outlay of well over £1,000,000. In view of the importance of the State Shipping Service to the North and its relationship to the whole national economy, I felt that a case could be built up to approach the Commonwealth for some financial assistance as a special consideration in regard to this facility.

Assurance of Retention.

5. **MR. W. HEGNEY** asked the Premier:

In view of the declared policy of the Government to dispose of State instrumentalities and trading concerns, will he give the people of this State an assurance that there will be no attempt made to dispose of the State Shipping Service?

MR. BRAND replied:

I do not propose to give any such assurance. I do not feel called upon to do so.

Mr. Tonkin: It would not make any difference if you did.

Mr. BRAND: If by any chance we get a very satisfactory offer, the Government will give such offer consideration. In the meantime we propose to carry on the service.

AQUATIC CENTRE.

Establishment in King's Park.

6. **MR. HEAL** asked the Premier:

In view of the statement appearing in the newspapers to the effect that the Minister for Lands stated definitely that he will not introduce a Bill to set up an aquatic centre in King's Park, will he, if and when local authorities make representations to him, give consideration to having the measure introduced in the Legislative Council? The reason for asking this question is that if the House of review decided to reject the Bill, this House would be saved many hours of debate. Such a move would give the Upper House something to do while the Address-in-reply motion is being considered here.

MR. BRAND replied:

In suggesting that one of the Ministers might, as against a private member, introduce the Bill, I had in mind that there might be technical difficulties. However, I am informed by the Deputy Premier it is not so. It is therefore open to any private member to introduce the Bill in this House. As for any arrangement for introducing the Bill in the Legislative Council, the member for West Perth, who is a member of the King's Park Board, has as much influence in the Upper House as I have in this regard. Any arrangement to save time would be welcome.

GUAYULE RUBBER.

Production in Western Australia.

7. **MR. OLDFIELD** asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) What assistance and/or encouragement, is being given to Mr. Hugh Anderson to establish guayule rubber production in this State?

(2) What progress has been made up to date in the establishment of such an industry?

MR. COURT replied:

(1) The Government has undertaken to conduct certain experiments which are an essential prerequisite of further considering the whole question of guayule rubber production in this State. If the hon. member has any specific phase of this project he would like me to comment on, I would be pleased to answer the questions if he would place them on the notice paper.

(2) Purely experimental phases have been embarked upon and no development beyond that has been attempted at this stage. This is by mutual arrangement between the Government and Mr. Anderson.

COCKBURN CEMENT COY.

Source of Proposed Expenditure.

8. **MR. OLDFIELD** asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

Is the expenditure of £100,000 by the Cockburn Cement Co., as reported in the Press, being made available by Sir Halford Reddish, the Treasury, some other Government agency or Government instrumentality, with or without Government guarantee?

MR. COURT replied:

I have no intimate knowledge of where the money is coming from. The only thing I can say with assurance is that it is not Western Australian Government money.

9. **MR. OLDFIELD** asked the Premier:

Is the money referred to in my previous question being loaned to the company by any Government instrumentality such as the Rural and Industries Bank, or some other agency?

MR. BRAND replied:

All I know is that the announcement was made by Sir Halford Reddish when he arrived here last night. I understand that the £100,000 expenditure will round off the first stage of the development of the cement industry in Western Australia. I know of no arrangements made for the Rural and Industries Bank or anyone else in Western Australia to advance the money. I assume that the advance is being provided by Sir Halford Reddish's company.

TALGARNO ROCKET RANGE.*Safeguarding Natives on Canning Stock Route.*

10. **MR. BRADY** asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

In view of projected weapons being fired from the Woomera Rocket Range over the Talgaro area, will the Minister take adequate steps to see that the lives of nomadic natives on the Canning Stock Route are not endangered?

MR. PERKINS replied:

I will undertake to have the position examined.

BEELOO.*Request for Change of Name.*

11. **MR. GRAHAM** asked the Premier: In view of the habit of the Government of changing the names of places and things, and even political parties, I ask whether he is aware—

(1) That one of his Ministers—to wit, the Minister for Housing—has virtually requested the Canning Road Board to make approaches to him for the purpose of changing the name of one of the State Housing Commission suburbs—I refer to “Beeloo”—and asked that local authority to submit a new name?

(2) That the present name of “Beeloo” was agreed to by the Nomenclature Committee, and that subsequently the Canning Road Board asked for the name of “Burton” because of the phobia of one member of that board in regard to a native name?

(3) That a submission either has been or is being made in respect of an entirely new name?

(4) Does he not consider it is disconcerting to the public generally, as well as disrupting public records, to have this uncertainty with regard to the names of places and things?

MR. BRAND replied:

I know nothing of the approaches by the Minister for Housing to the Canning Road Board.

Mr. Graham: You had better keep your eye on him.

Mr. BRAND: I do know, however, that the Canning Road Board made many approaches, many months before the change of Government, in respect of this matter. If the road board does decide to put up a proposition, it will receive the usual consideration.

AQUATIC CENTRE.*Introduction of Bill in Legislative Council.*

12. **MR. CORNELL** asked the Premier:

In regard to the question asked by the member for West Perth in regard to the establishment of an aquatic centre in

King's Park, is he aware that I favour such a course: namely, the introduction of this measure in the Legislative Council; because, if it does nothing else, it will give members in that august Chamber an opportunity to fall off the fence in regard to this matter?

MR. BRAND replied:

I will discuss this matter privately with the member for Mt. Marshall.

A.M.I. HOSPITAL BENEFITS FUND.*Settlement of Claims and Report of Operations.*

13. **MR. CORNELL** asked the Minister for Health:

(1) Has he received any complaint regarding the delays in settlement of claims by a hospital benefits fund known as A.M.I.?

(2) If not, will he inquire into the activities of this concern with particular reference to the point I have raised and into the question of a report as to whether this particular concern has in effect folded up?

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

No report has come to me as yet in regard to this particular organisation, but I will have inquiries made and, in due course, will let the hon. member know the result.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.*Second Day.*

Debate resumed from the 30th June.

MR. HAWKE (Northam) [3.56]: First of all, I would like to congratulate the mover of the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply, with which His Excellency the Governor was pleased to open Parliament, upon his contribution. I think those of us who have been here for a number of years will each remember his own ordeal in making what is picturesquely described as a maiden speech. If we do so remember that experience, we would all know it is not the easiest thing to do. Therefore, the member for Murchison is deserving of our appreciation of the fact that he steadily rowed his boat along and put forward what he considered to be some of the outstanding needs of the electorate he represents.

You, Mr. Speaker, I have already congratulated; and in that regard I hope I used a few well-chosen words. I intend, later this afternoon, to make some further reference to you, not so much as Speaker, but as a former prominent active—almost aggressive—member of the Liberal Party in this House.

I would like to offer my personal congratulations to the Premier and each of his fellow Ministers, as well as to the new members of the Assembly. In addition to offering my personal congratulations to all new members, I add to that,

my political congratulations to the new member for Fremantle. I am not able to offer political congratulations to the members of the new Ministry or to new members on the Government side. Nor would I think they expect me to do that.

The election was very largely decided, I think, by the active intervention of what is known as the Democratic Labour Party. The intervention of that party actively in the election had the effect of splitting the normal Labour vote in key electorates; and, as a result, sitting Labour members lost these electorates to the Liberal party members who were elected—I think, in almost every instance—on the second preference votes of the Democratic Labour Party candidates.

Much could be said about all that, but I wish for a few moments to discuss what I consider to be the most serious aspect of these developments. I think, after I have discussed that aspect, most members will agree with the point of view I shall put forward. There was a report in *The West Australian* newspaper on the 23rd March of this year, dealing with the post-election comment of the State President of the D.L.P. (Mr. W. R. Sawyer). Among other things, in speaking of the D.L.P., Mr. Sawyer said,—

We are now in the position to say which party is going to be the Government.

In other words, we now have in existence in Western Australia a political organisation which is, in fact, a very small minority group. I think that, at the recent election, the candidates of the D.L.P. polled about 6 per cent. of the total votes cast.

It is true that a D.L.P. candidate did not stand for every electorate in the State. As against that, it is also true that in some districts their candidates polled many more votes than they would have ordinarily polled because candidates of one or other of the major parties were not in the field. That was particularly so in the electorate of Fremantle. Is it a good thing for the political and parliamentary life of any State or country to have a small minority group deciding which party and which personnel shall be the Government of the State?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It is far better to have that state of affairs than to try to prevent them.

Mr. Jamieson: You tried to prevent the commos!

Mr. HAWKE: The question of trying to prevent anybody does not arise, because no-one is trying to prevent anyone from forming a political party or a new religion or trying to prevent any individual from standing for Parliament. The vital point I am discussing is whether it is, in fact, a good thing for the future politics of this

country—particularly for the future parliamentary government of this country—to have a small minority group deciding—not necessarily on any principle—which party or which group of personnel shall govern Western Australia. I submit very strongly that it is an extremely bad thing.

At the recent election, the D.L.P. strongly supported the Liberal Party and was, as Mr. Sawyer rightly claims, responsible for putting the Liberal Party, in coalition with the Country Party, into government. Knowing Mr. Sawyer as I do, and knowing some of the people associated with him as I do, I am sure they will be seeking some return from the Government for having put the Government into office. It could well be that some portion of the return which they will be seeking will be of such a type as to make it undesirable or impossible for the Government to give it.

Therefore, it could easily happen before the next election comes along, that the D.L.P. would decide to give its next-to-last preference, or its last preference, at the next State election to Liberal Party candidates, for the purpose of turning the Liberal Party Government out of office and of putting into office a party of our political complexion.

I submit that the existence of a small political party which will, according to circumstances, use its power in the way I have indicated, is a great danger to the future political and parliamentary stability of Western Australia. I put that claim forward for the calm and, I hope, logical consideration of members on both sides of the House. I think it would be a sorry day indeed for our politics, and especially for our parliamentary system of government and for the people of the State as a whole, to have the Government of the State decided periodically by less than 5 per cent. of the total voters, who have formed themselves into a small political organisation.

I said that a little later I would make some reference to the member for Blackwood, who happens now to be the Speaker of our House; and who, so far, has done a remarkably good job. I also, in this regard, want to mention the member for Avon Valley; not that there is any relationship between the two members.

When it was clear that our Government had lost the election, I marked down the member for Blackwood as a certainty for ministerial position. I thought he would be certain to be made a Minister; and would be sure to become the Minister for Railways. He had taken a great interest in railway affairs and in transport matters, generally. He had not taken a destructive interest, either. His interest had been keen and constructive and had, I know, been in some practical manner of

assistance to the Railway Department and to transport generally in the country districts of the State.

We know that when his party was in Opposition, prior to the last election, he was one of the most prominent members of his party in debate in this Chamber. When I was congratulating him the other day on his election to the Speakership, I referred to the fact that he did not slavishly follow any party line, but that he had the courage of his convictions and said what he thought should be said, and stood by his guns.

As a matter of fact, if I remember rightly, Mr. Speaker, your parliamentary colleagues, on at least one occasion last session, deserted you after having led you three-quarters of the way down the garden path in relation to a matter associated with railways and transport generally. So I was indeed surprised and disappointed to find, when the Liberal Party Ministers were announced, that your name was missing. I could understand the Premier leaving you out, Mr. Speaker. After all, no Leader of a Government, and I suppose no leader of any other organisation, wants a thorn in his side.

Mr. Brand: The member for Blackwood was no thorn in my side.

Mr. HAWKE: He wants about him—and this would apply particularly to a Liberal Party Premier—men who will more or less slavishly follow the party line. So it seems to me that it was thought advisable for you not to be put into the Ministry, and thereafter thought most advisable for you not to be upon the floor of the House as a private member. Those of us who were here last Parliament would not need to have much imagination to realise that if you remained a private member on the floor of the House you would, whenever you thought it necessary, criticise the Government, and take such action, drastic as it might prove to be, as you thought necessary to promote your particular point of view on any subject which might come before us for discussion and decision, irrespective of whether it was associated with railways, transport, or anything else.

Mr. I. W. Manning: I think the hon. member has special qualifications which fit him for the position he now holds.

Mr. Jamieson: He was too big to fit into the sausage machine.

Mr. Brand: You would fit into it but we would not put you through it.

Mr. HAWKE: Having said so much, Mr. Speaker, and having seen from you what I divine to be a half-nod of approval, I will leave the subject and turn to the member for Avon Valley. Here is a man—

Mr. Roberts: He can talk back.

Mr. HAWKE: —who was the founder of the Liberal Party or, as it is now known, the Liberal and Country League. The member for Avon Valley had to show tremendous initiative and courage to come forward and try to found a new party at the time he did—

Mr. Brand: Hear, hear!

Mr. HAWKE: —because he had previously been a member of the Country Party. His efforts in trying to found this new political organisation succeeded. He received a lot of abuse and condemnation from some quarters for his pains and trouble, but his efforts succeeded. He has been in this Parliament for a long time.

Mr. J. Hegney: Since 1930.

Mr. HAWKE: Longer than I have. I would like the Premier to say whether the member for Avon Valley was invited to join the Ministry.

Mr. Brand: He has asked me to keep that confidential.

Mr. HAWKE: Getting no reply to that question, I would like to ask the Premier whether he was considered for the Speakership.

Mr. Brand: Everybody was considered.

Mr. HAWKE: A case of everybody considered but only one chosen. I would ask him if the member for Avon Valley was considered for the post of Chairman of Committees.

Mr. Bovell: You will be losing your job as Leader of the Opposition if you don't stop that.

Mr. HAWKE: Getting no reply to that question, I can only conclude that these Johnny-Come-Latelys in the Liberal and Country League have forgotten the debt which they owe to the man who founded the organisation.

Since the new Government came into office we have read many ministerial announcements in the newspaper. As I read most of them I thought for a split second that I was reading announcements made before the election by my own colleagues, because all the announcements had a familiar ring about them—nearly all of them related to work which had been done by the Ministers of the previous Government. We have seen a great rush of new Ministers to the North-West where they have made an inspection from the windows of fast-moving motorcars, or from the portholes of State ships.

Mr. Rhatigan: And in the tourist season, too.

Mr. HAWKE: They have been there for five minutes, comparatively speaking, and they have suddenly blossomed forth as experts on the problems and needs of the North-West. People in the south who

read about these things are taken in by this sort of publicity; but people in the North-West are not taken in one scrap.

Mr. Brand: You hope!

Mr. HAWKE: Up there the people are tough; their eyes are wide open; they are practical; and they do not fall for this sort of nonsense.

Mr. Bovell: The strange thing is that the ministerial visits were made at the request of Ministers of your Government, and parliamentary representatives for the district.

Mr. HAWKE: What difference does that make?

Mr. Brand: It indicates that they did not get any ministerial visits before.

Mr. Bovell: It makes all the difference, because you said we were going up there and making a big noise, whereas the visits were made at the request of the parliamentary representatives for the North-West.

Mr. HAWKE: What difference does it make at whose request the Ministers went to the North-West?

Mr. Bovell: It would not make any difference had you not made the statement.

Mr. HAWKE: It makes no difference at all to the point I am making. Apparently the Minister for Lands is not very well today—he is not himself. He is impatient, whereas yesterday he was rude. I think the Minister for Health should take the Minister for Lands in hand and have him put into an appropriate institution, at least on a temporary basis. I am reminded of an incident which occurred at Northam some three or four years ago when I had much the same disease from which the Minister for Lands is at present suffering. One of my electors met me in the street and said, "How are you?" I said, "I am not too well; I have a dose of the 'flu.'" This fellow was a strong supporter of the Liberal Party and he said, "I do hope it proves fatal."

Mr. Bovell: I hope you are not saying that to me.

Mr. HAWKE: Apparently the Minister for Railways has gone to meet a train which is running late. He comes out and tells the public that he is going to bring about an improvement of £600,000 in the financial operations of the railways during the current financial year—that is, the financial year which started this week. That would impress some people; but I hope it does not impress the new members of the Liberal Party in this House, because all the Minister does is to pluck these figures from the blue air and say, "This is it."

Evidently when he gave this information to a newspaper reporter, the newspaper reporter, who would be a bit tough about this sort of thing, said, "How are you going to do this?" And the Minister said, "We are going to do it by two methods. Firstly, we are going to get increased revenue; and, secondly, we are going to keep a strict control over expenditure." So the new Minister for Railways has decided already that there is to be an improvement of £600,000 during the current financial year in the financial operations of the railways. It is as easy as that!

It will be most interesting, Mr. Speaker, and, hon. Mr. Treasurer, to have a look at this claim in, say, 14 months' time when the Budget is before us next year.

Mr. Court: We will not disappoint you.

Mr. HAWKE: I have no doubt that when that time arrives, and when we find that the financial position of the Railways instead of having been improved has become worse, the Minister for Railways will not be short of words to explain why things went wrong.

Mr. May: The basic wage will be one excuse.

Mr. HAWKE: Since the Minister for Railways made this claim he evidently has had a bit more practical experience of the Railway Department, and of its administration, because he addressed a meeting in Perth recently—I think the meeting was one of accountants of some description or another.

Mr. Court: Cottesloe.

Mr. HAWKE: After the Minister had talked about railways, the railways finance, and railways administration, towards the end of his speech he made a remarkable confession—I am sure it was true—namely that he was already a little worried at trying to buck the system.

Mr. Court: It had nothing to do with the deficit we were trying to reduce.

Mr. HAWKE: What was it about?

Mr. Court: You know what Government systems are like when you try to alter them quickly.

Mr. HAWKE: Indeed I do! So we will watch with tremendous interest, and with a great deal of sympathy for the Minister for Railways, the practical results which will flow from the continued administration of the Railway Department. I am inclined to make the prophecy that at the end of 12 months or so from now the Minister for Railways particularly—and the Premier also—will regret very much Sir, that they did not put you into the Ministry and make you Minister for Railways. The Minister for Railways has

also talked about a five-year plan in connection with the railway workshops at Midland Junction—the Government-owned and Government-operated workshops.

This five-year plan business, unless one knows about it, could be very misleading, because it is a plan to reduce and to destroy, to a very large extent. I am not sure how many men are employed there at the present time in manufacturing, and maintenance and repair activity, but I should think that by the time this five-year plan is put into operation—if it is ever fully put into operation—the number employed will be reduced tremendously, and the Railway Department will find itself in tremendous mechanical and other difficulties; and, instead of the financial result in regard to the operation of the railways improving by £600,000, I should think they would be more likely to go to the bad by £6,000,000.

We have also had the Premier saying a few things. First of all somebody nudged him, and he said that land at Rottnest would be made available for private ownership. Then somebody nudged him from the other side, and he came out a few days later and said that land at Rottnest would not be made available for private ownership. Then again somebody nudged him in the back, and after a few days he said that land would not be made available for private ownership yet. I hope I am right in saying this: that no land can be made available for private ownership at Rottnest unless Parliament is first consulted.

Mr. Heal: The Minister for Lands would not agree with that.

Mr. HAWKE: In that situation I would say that there is no likelihood of any land at Rottnest Island being made available for private ownership. I want to say a few words now about the Narrows Bridge; because the Government, since it came into office, has decided that the name of this bridge should be the "Narrows Bridge."

Mr. J. Hegney: A narrow subject.

Mr. Evans: Narrow-minded.

Mr. HAWKE: It is most unfortunate that a bridge of this importance and magnitude should have such a commonplace name. I understand it is the first bridge of its kind built anywhere in the world. It certainly is a wonderful structure. When all the improvement work adjacent to the bridge is completed the whole set-up will be magnificent, I am sure, and one in which we can all take great pride.

Accordingly, I am extremely disappointed to think that when the Government decided to change the name which had previously been decided upon for the bridge, it did not get something a bit better than "Narrows". After all is said and done, when people in other States and other countries read about the Narrows Bridge in Perth, they will think it is a bridge over a creek, instead of being a wonderful bridge over a beautiful river.

Mr. Brand: What did they think the Narrows was in the first place? It has been a well-established name, associated with the Swan River.

Mr. HAWKE: We know that. But it is nevertheless a commonplace name; there is nothing to it. I suggest to the Premier, and to his colleagues, that at this stage they should give further consideration to the matter and see if they cannot choose a name which will be worth while and appropriate to a structure of this nature, to the river, and to the surroundings.

Mr. Perkins: Surely it is better than linking it with the name of aerated waters.

Mr. HAWKE: If that is the only objection that the Minister for Transport had to the previous name, I should have thought that legislation could be introduced to preserve the right of this name for the bridge. It would have been a simple procedure, and we could have given the company concerned an adequate period of notice of the change. But to say that the bridge should not have a proper name, a reasonable name, or a worth-while name, because some maker of soda water uses that particular name, is not very convincing.

I am not here to throw suggested new names at the Government, but I should have thought that something like "The Mill Park Bridge" or the "Mill Swan Bridge", or something of that kind, would have been far more appropriate than the word "Narrows". I know one of the arguments against any name other than the Narrows was that the place where the bridge was built has always been known as the Narrows, and everybody would continue to call it the Narrows, irrespective of what the bridge is called.

Why should we surrender to that lazy, slothful type of thinking? We all know from practical experience, whenever anything new is suggested, there is always opposition to it. We all know that. We know it is difficult to get people to change their thinking habits and their mental outlook, particularly after they have reached the age of 14 years.

But that is no reason why we should surrender to conservatism and say, "Because the people have done this they will continue to do it, irrespective of whether it is the best thing or not". I am extremely disappointed to think that when the Government decided to change the name which our Government had given to the bridge, it did not find something more adequate than the word "Narrows" with which to describe and name the bridge.

On the basis of the Government's outlook in attaching the name "Narrows" to the new bridge I would not be surprised if, in the near future, the Government decided to change the name of St. George's Terrace to "Brand Parade"; or the name of Mounts Bay-road to "Court Highway", or the name of Stirling Highway to "Hutchin-

son Highway"; or the name of the main road which runs down to Busselton to "The Bovell Boulevard"!

Mr. Bovell: That would be quite appropriate seeing that people of that name have been traversing it for 100 years.

Mr. HAWKE: I was very interested to read in the papers recently of the proceedings of the Liberal Party State conference. The first thing which impressed me unfavourably about this conference was that it was of only two days' duration. Fundamentally, the rank and file members of the party were not going to be given much opportunity, if any at all, of having their say. But at least one female member of the party from Brunswick Junction had a say. I am not supposing she was given all the time she wished to have, but at any rate she made a rather sensational allegation in regard to the marriage of some Italian single men and some Italian single women in this State.

Since then, I have read in the newspaper where the Commissioner of Police has ordered an inquiry into the allegations, and I have questions coming up on the notice paper for Tuesday next, the essence of which is that a copy of this report, when available, shall be laid upon the Table of the House in order that all members of the House might know the facts of the situation, and in order that the public might know them also.

Another subject brought up at the conference had to do with the practice of the previous Government in selling motorcars, on a time-payment basis, to civil servants and to members of Parliament who wished to obtain motorcars under the system. The previous Government was criticised very strongly for the practice. If I remember rightly, a motion condemning the practice was carried unanimously, so the newspaper reported.

I am not sure whether at the conference any member of the Liberal Party was present who at that time had taken advantage of the system to get a motorcar. If such a person was present, then I think it was a pretty poor show that he did not stand up and explain why the scheme operated and make a move to prevent the motion being passed unanimously. The basic fact about this practice or policy is that it was introduced by the McLarty-Watts Government, and was introduced because it was considered to be a system which would financially benefit the Government and financially benefit the State. I think that in operation that has been the main result of it. I would think that the present Government would not wipe out the policy.

Mr. Brand: No.

Mr. HAWKE: I am very glad to have an assurance from the Premier that the present Government will continue the policy, as I was very sure it would do

despite the fact that poorly-informed people at a Liberal Party conference unanimously carried a motion condemning the policy. I know enough about this sort of conference to believe that the motion was put up in such a way as to give it a very deep party bias against Labour, and I suppose it was upon that basis that all the delegates were taken in by the half-truths which were given to the conference by the proposer of the motion—a Mr. Withers, I understand, from Bunbury.

Recently the Trade Unions of Australia, through the Australian Council of Trade Unions, presented a case to the Commonwealth Arbitration Commissioners in relation to basic wage matters. In the first place, they applied for an increase in the Federal basic wage of approximately 22s. a week, and applied also for a restoration of quarterly cost-of-living adjustments to the Federal basic wage.

The hearing was quite a long one. Very considerable evidence was given on behalf of the trade unions—and also, of course, on behalf of the employers' organisations. The judges, or the Arbitration Court Commissioners, took the shortest time on record in regard to arriving at a decision, ever known in the history of Federal arbitration in Australia. They decided to grant an increase of 15s. per week to adult males; a quite substantial increase per week to adult females; and of course, appropriate increases to those who were not adult either in the female or male sections. I thought it was quite a pity that the Premier of Western Australia felt it necessary to grizzle about the decision.

He publicly said that this decision of the Federal Arbitration Court would certainly lead to inflation and could do a great deal of harm throughout Australia. It is remarkable, is it not, that whenever any decision of this kind is made in favour of the workers of Australia, some people—usually the Leaders of the Liberal Party or leaders of the employers' group—prophecy all kinds of difficulties and all kinds of problems. Yet, when employers' profits hit the sky, they give the public to understand that that is a wonderful achievement; a marvellous thing for the country; and not likely, of course, to cause any inflation at all. Obviously, such an approach is one-eyed beyond adequate description.

Mr. Heal: What did they say about Holdens?

Mr. HAWKE: Our workers in Australia, operating under Federal awards, have had a terribly rough deal in regard to wage adjustments during the last several years. Not only have they been deprived of quarterly cost-of-living adjustments to the basic wage, but also they have lagged badly behind in normal adjustments to the basic wage to keep pace with the rising prosperity of the nation, and to keep pace also with the rising cost of living which has followed from inflation.

That inflation has not been brought about by wages or salaries, but partly by excessive profits; and mainly, I think, because we, as a nation, have to pay and keep on paying for the tremendous cost which this country incurred in its participation in the last world war. I would therefore ask the Premier to lay off this business of grizzling whenever the workers get an increase in their wages or salaries; or, alternatively, to grizzle and complain also when company profits hit the sky, as many of them have since the war, and as some of them have very recently.

I think I mentioned yesterday a leading article which appeared in *The West Australian* recently—on the 15th May last. It advocated a substantial increase in salary for judges and Ministers of the Crown, and for the Leader of the Opposition. It then went on to state that private members of Parliament should have to prove a case before they should be considered in any way for any increase in salary. I mention this again today only to underline what I said yesterday, which was that the Government need not expect any support from me for any Bill that it might bring down this session for increases in anybody's salary, unless it first declares its policy on the vital question of quarterly adjustments to the State basic wage.

Should the Government's policy be to introduce legislation to wipe out quarterly adjustments, then of course it could expect no support at all from me for any increase-of-salaries Bill which it might bring down, even though it might include me in the measure as a bait to try to get my support.

Mr. Brand: You have offered enough bait in the past. Our policy has always been that the Arbitration Court should make its own decisions, as it does at present.

Mr. HAWKE: I think there is more than that to it. If the Premier will think back to last session, and perhaps the session before that, he will know that members of the Liberal Party, when in opposition—some of them—criticised and condemned the practice of quarterly cost-of-living adjustments to the State basic wage.

Mr. Brand: They were not prepared to make it compulsory, but to leave it to the court.

Mr. HAWKE: I know also that employers' organisations in Western Australia are most anxious that no quarterly adjustments to the basic wage should be made. Their argument is—and there is at least something in it on the surface—that the wage should be stabilised over a period of at least 12 months, from time to time.

Mr. Brand: Isn't the Arbitration Court set up for the purpose of studying the problems involved and making decisions accordingly? We believe that, at all events.

Mr. HAWKE: I do not think the Premier has comprehended clearly the point that I am trying to establish.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4 p.m.

Mr. HAWKE: I now wish to discuss the legislation which, for the purpose of easy description, we call the unfair trading legislation. Fairly recently the President of the Farmers' Union in Western Australia—I think, by name, a Mr. Grant McDonald—had something to say about this legislation. He emphasised its importance; and, in effect, expressed the opinion that the legislation had been of considerable value and had protected the people of Western Australia and, in some instances, farmers in particular.

When opinions of that nature emanate from a leading official of the Farmers' Union, we naturally have to sit up and take notice; because the Farmers' Union, by any stretch of imagination, cannot be described, in the political sense, as having communistic, socialistic, or even Labour tendencies. I think the Farmers' Union can fairly be described as an organisation which is not party political officially, but the majority of its members would support candidates other than Labour Party candidates.

So when the President of the Farmers' Union praises unfair trading legislation, that is something we should remember when the Government tries, later in the session, to abolish the existing legislation, and I feel sure that it will be something which at least two members of the Country Party will keep to the fore in their minds.

A few days after the views of the President of the Farmers' Union had been published, an anonymous spokesman for the superphosphate companies made a Press statement criticising the views expressed—that is, the views of the official of the Farmers' Union in question. I suppose the spokesman for the superphosphate interests and all those associated with him would have thought that a statement of this kind from the companies concerned would push right out of the ring for all time a farmer or a farmer's representative.

On the contrary, however, the President of the Farmers' Union was not pushed out of the ring, but stayed in it; and he used a Johansson right uppercut to the jaw of the spokesman of the superphosphate companies with the result that it was the spokesman in question who left the ring. The other day we were graced—or otherwise—by a visit to this State by the Minister for Transport in the State of Victoria; one, Sir Arthur Warner, who, by the way, is a millionaire company man in Victoria.

Mr. Jamieson: He is the Victorian equivalent of our Western Australian Johnston.

Mr. HAWKE: He came here to transact some private business on behalf of his company; to negotiate the taking-over of a long-established Western Australian trading concern. Even though he was here on private business, he could not resist the opportunity to get over some Liberal Party propaganda, and so he criticised the unfair trading legislation that we have in Western Australia.

I do not think one would expect Sir Arthur Warner to praise the legislation. I have no doubt that the legislation we have in this State has prevented, or brought to an end, the operation of unfair trading practices which are being operated by Sir Arthur's companies in the State of Victoria, and from which Sir Arthur and his colleagues associated with him in the conduct of those companies are receiving much more profit than they would ordinarily receive, and much more profit than they should fairly receive.

So we could understand quite well the personal motives which would prompt a person such as Sir Arthur Warner to make a statement of the kind he did. I would not have minded so much his making this statement had he been visiting Western Australia on Government business on behalf of the State of Victoria, or on political business for the Liberal Party; but he was over here on his own private business. I suppose it might be interesting to find out whether during the time he was here he was drawing expenses from the Government of Victoria.

Mr. Andrew: I bet he would be!

Mr. HAWKE: On the 15th May of this year I wrote to the Minister for Labour on this question of unfair trading legislation as follows:—

Dear Mr. Perkins:

You were reported recently in *The West Australian* newspaper as having said, in effect, that the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act was no longer being operated; also that all inquiries which were being made currently at that time by the appropriate officials had ceased.

I am anxious to know from what source you obtain the power to order the non-enforcement of a law which has been passed by Parliament.

Mr. Tonkin: What, again!

Mr. HAWKE: To continue with the letter—

In this instance the law in question was passed fairly recently and on a permanent basis.

Thanking you to advise me.

On the 21st May, 1959, the Minister replied as follows:—

Dear Mr. Hawke:

Replying to yours dated 15th instant, I may say that soon after taking office I met the Commissioner and the Advisory Committee appointed under the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act and also the staff employed and informed them all that as they were appointed under an Act of Parliament it was not for me to direct them. I told them that the policy of the incoming Government was to implement the majority recommendation of the Honorary Royal Commission and repeal this Act as soon as possible and substitute other legislation.

Few, if any, requests have been made for action under the Act since the change of Government.

I am sure all members will agree that that is grim sort of humour. The Minister's reply continues—

I have issued no orders for the non-operation of this Act, but legislation will be brought before Parliament as soon as possible for its repeal and the enactment of substitute legislation.

In the meantime, the Advisory Committee continues to meet regularly and the office and some staff is retained.

I hope this makes the position clear for you.

On the 26th May I again wrote to the Minister in the following terms:—

Dear Mr. Perkins,

Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act.

I desire to thank you for the information set out in your letter to me of the 21st inst. in connection with this legislation.

The following was published in *The West Australian* newspaper on Friday, 1st inst.:—

"Labour Minister Perkins said yesterday that W. J. Robinson, director of investigation under the Act, was now completing some final office work brought about by the operation of the Act.

He was being helped by one of the three other officers employed in the department.

The Government has arranged with the Public Service Commissioner for the other two officers to be employed elsewhere in the service.

Mr. Robinson was also doing some work for the Government in connection with hire-purchase.

W. J. Wallwork, the commissioner under the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, was carrying on his duties as a magistrate."

I would be pleased to have your comments regarding this newspaper report.

I would also like to know whether any action has been taken by the Commissioner, Mr. Wallwork, to investigate the activities of the Association in Perth which is attempting to maintain a set retail price for Television Sets and is reported to have suspended from membership of the Association, W. J. Lucas, because he has insisted on sticking to a plan which will make Television Sets available to the public at a price less than the one fixed by the Association.

Yours faithfully,
Leader of the Opposition.

I sent this letter to the Minister for Labour on the 26th May, but up to this moment I have received no acknowledgment or reply to it. I need say no more in regard to that correspondence at this stage.

However, I shall have much more to say about it unless I receive a reply in the very near future. It is interesting to note that Sir Arthur Warner's company in Victoria is one of the biggest manufacturers of television sets. I would not be a bit surprised, if the matter could be thoroughly investigated, to find that Sir Arthur Warner and his colleagues in Melbourne are behind the dictation which has been sent over to this State to the effect that television sets shall not be sold retail at a lesser price than is dictated by the manufacturers of these sets.

At any rate, there appears to be quite a tie-up there; and we may be able to have much more information upon it by the time this Government introduces the legislation which it proposes to introduce to repeal the unfair trading legislation now operating in this State. I would say in advance that the legislation which the Government will substitute, should its move to repeal the existing legislation succeed, would be absolutely worthless and useless.

We debated the recommendations of the Honorary Royal Commission soon after the report and recommendations were presented. It was then proved beyond any shadow of doubt that the proposals which were recommended by the Honorary Royal Commission did not have one tooth in them—not even a decayed hollow tooth. They were absolutely useless and valueless; they were just a bit of political window-dressing on the part of the majority of the commission. Basically the majority recommendations were made in the form in which they were made in an attempt to patch, as far as possible, the serious difficulties which then existed politically between the Liberal Party on the one side, and the Country Party on the other.

I want to say a few words about the Government's wholesale sacking policy in regard to the construction of Government buildings by the Government's own building construction organisation, and also in regard to State trading concerns. A day labour building organisation has been operated by Government after Government in Western Australia for a great many years. The organisation was in operation throughout the whole six years of office of the McLarty-Watts Government; it was operated by the Mitchell Government many years ago; and it has always been found to be a necessary safeguard to the Government, the State, and the taxpayers generally.

It is a safeguard, if on no other point, in regard to the quality of the work which shall be performed. From the point of view of any Government, and of members of Parliament generally, I should think that is tremendously important. When Government buildings are constructed they should be constructed faithfully, on a quality basis rather than on a speed and cheapness basis.

This afternoon I asked of the Minister for Railways a question on notice as to whether he could lay upon the Table of the House the file in connection with the construction of an overhead bridge for pedestrians at West Northam. I did this because some of my constituents in Northam told me that this job was fairly shabby in some respects. It is a job which has been carried out by contract. The contractor in turn has let portions of the contract to sub-contractors.

I have been given to understand by these railway electors of mine that there is quite a battle going on between the Railway Department and the contractor, and the contractor and the sub-contractors to try to have this job put into first-class order. The job was only completed the other day. I have not had time to study the file, so I cannot say with certainty that the information given to me is correct.

However, I shall have an opportunity of studying the file tomorrow. I feel fairly confident in advance that the information with which I have been supplied is reliable. If such a thing were to happen in the construction of a comparatively small job—a bridge for pedestrians over a set of railway lines—goodness knows what might happen in some other direction. I would warn the Government to be extremely careful in smashing down an organisation which has served Government after Government, irrespective of political colour, faithfully and well over a long period of years. Once this organisation is destroyed the Government will be in the hands of private builders and companies.

Mr. Graham: What does this Government care?

Mr. HAWKE: The Government will have no safeguard against them. Some members may say there will be plans, specifications, penalties, and this, that and the rest of it.

Mr. Bovell: That is fair competition.

Mr. HAWKE: The Government and—worse still—the taxpayers of the State as a whole, will have nowhere near the safeguard which they have at present under the existing system. In regard to this policy of the Government in destroying, or proposing to destroy, the day labour construction organisation, I was interested the other day to hear the comments of two building tradesmen employed on a Government job. They were having a bit of a chat as I was going past during their lunch hour. The young fellow said to the old chap on the job, "The Liberal Party of this Government are bashing their brains out." The old fellow said, "Bashing their what out?" The young fellow said, "Bashing their brains out." The old fellow said, "You mean bashing their heads to pulp."

In connection with the State trading concerns, we know it is the declared policy of the Government to give these away at the first reasonable opportunity. I think it was yesterday when the Minister for Railways, in answer to some questions on this matter, poured out some wonderful soothing syrup. If one did not know him—or, alternatively, if one did not have some hard commonsense—one would be taken back completely by what the Minister said. One of the things he said was that a condition in any agreement for sale of a State trading concern to a private company would be to safeguard the employment of the men in the State trading concern when it came under private ownership. Can one imagine any greater or more treacherous soothing syrup than that?

Mr. Andrew: Just can't be done!

Mr. HAWKE: Would the member for Avon Valley swallow that? I am sorry that the member for Mt. Marshall does not appear to be here at this moment. I know he will be back shortly. I am glad to see that he has seen the light completely and has come over to our side of the House! I am sure he will not swallow the idea that men who are now employed in a State trading concern will have their employment safeguarded following the sale of such State trading concern to a private company. How could that be done?

I suppose the Minister for Railways would say, "We will provide for certain penalties in the agreement." How can that be done, and how can that be enforced? It is misleading to the greatest degree. It is preposterous for the Minister to put forward that sort of nonsense. He knows as well as, or better than we that it cannot be done.

Mr. Court: It was done by the Commonwealth when it disposed of its concerns on exactly the same three principles.

Mr. HAWKE: I ask the Minister for Railways what would happen in the case of, say, an existing timber mill owned by a private company taking over a State timber mill and things slackening down in the industry?

Mr. Court: The situation would be no different than under Government enterprise at the present time.

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister quickly shifts his ground.

Mr. Court: Nothing of the sort!

Mr. HAWKE: Yesterday, men employed in any State trading concern sold to a private company were to have their future employment safeguarded. Now they are not to have it safeguarded at all. The Minister now admits, under pressure on questioning, that the future employment and welfare of the men concerned will be absolutely at the discretion of the private company to whom the State concern is sold.

Mr. Court: Plain nonsense!

Mr. HAWKE: Why?

Mr. Court: When you were Premier of this State you got rid of 200 men in the Public Works in a short period.

Mr. HAWKE: What has that to do with the point with which I am dealing? I am saying that the Minister for Railways, yesterday, in this House, told members in no uncertain words—words which could not be misunderstood—that any men employed in a State trading concern when it was sold to a private company would have their future employment safeguarded.

Mr. Court: I repeat, that that is the policy of the Government.

Mr. HAWKE: I repeat that it cannot be done. What I am saying is that the future employment of these men and their future welfare will be absolutely in the hands of the private company which purchases the concern. The Minister for Railways knows it too; but he is out, not so much to mislead us, as to mislead the men who are in employment in these concerns, and to mislead the trade unions who represent them industrially.

Mr. Court: They know they will get a fair go from our Government.

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister is to be strongly condemned for having tried to mislead members of this House and for having tried to mislead everybody else in Western Australia who is concerned in the matter.

Mr. Heal: Snide tactics!

Mr. Evans: That includes the Minister for Lands too.

Mr. HAWKE: I was interested to read of a telegram being sent by the Premier from Canberra to Graham Farmer, captain of our State football team which

toured the Eastern States recently. The telegram congratulated the team on its great win at Hobart, and I think it went on to state that the Premier hoped to see the team play in Adelaide against South Australia. It is one thing to congratulate these men and to wish them well; and another to be, at the same time, sacking their mates back here in Western Australia.

Mr. Evans: Jekyll and Hyde.

Mr. Jamieson: They have the hide anyway.

Mr. HAWKE: This Government claims it has a mandate to destroy a long-established Government building construction organisation—the day labour organisation—and a mandate to sell State trading concerns and to do other things. Has it?

Mr. Bovell: Yes.

Mr. Brand: As much as any other Government in Australia.

Mr. HAWKE: If we look at the make-up of this Chamber we find that the two Government parties together have in total 25 members out of 50. They have appointed one of their 25 to the Speaker's Chair, which leaves them with 24 on the floor of the House. If anyone can torture a mandate out of that situation he should be travelling with Wirth's circus, or perhaps as manager for Sabrina.

Mr. Heal: You have a point there.

Mr. HAWKE: Obviously the Government has no mandate at all.

Mr. Bovell: You were in a worse position after the Bunbury by-election in 1956.

Mr. HAWKE: Why?

Mr. Bovell: You did not have a majority and went into recess.

Mr. HAWKE: Why were we able to carry on in this House?

Mr. Bovell: You got out of the House as quickly as you could, and prolonged an election until the following April, after promising it in February.

Mr. HAWKE: If the Minister for Lands were not suffering from the disease that is afflicting him—

Mr. Bovell: It is not a disease.

Mr. HAWKE: It is a drastic complaint.

Mr. Brand: Like socialism.

Mr. HAWKE: I do not hope that it will prove fatal. If he were not suffering from this disease, he would know that our Government was able to meet the House at that time and continue in session because there were two members of the official Liberal Party who were not prepared to be whipped into line to vote us out of office. If the Minister for Lands cares to press the matter, I will name the two Liberal Party official members to whom I have referred.

Mr. Bovell: If you named them, it would not be correct, necessarily.

Mr. HAWKE: What sort of milk-and-water attitude is that? He says "It would not be correct"; and then as an after-thought—knowing it would be correct—he says, "necessarily".

Mr. Bovell: Everything you say is not correct.

Mr. Court: Fair comment!

Mr. HAWKE: I could reply by saying that hardly anything the Minister for Lands has said has ever been correct.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Bovell: Another inaccurate statement on your part.

Mr. HAWKE: Let us not waste words with the Minister for Lands. All those who were here at the time—and especially the member for Murray, who was Leader of the Opposition at the time—would know that our Government, after the Bunbury by-election, was able to meet the House and successfully complete the session because two official members of the Parliamentary Liberal Party were not prepared to vote us out of office.

Mr. W. Hegney: Didn't his blood pressure go up?

Mr. HAWKE: It has been up to some extent ever since. As I have said, the Government, on the floor of the House, after one of its members having been made available for the Speaker's Chair, has only 24 members in a house of 50; on this side there are 25 members. It is true only 23 of them are members of the official Opposition. The other two are Independent Liberal members. But does anyone on the Government side suggest for a second that an offer of the Government party was in any way responsible for the return to this House of the member for South Perth; and of the return to this House of the member for Mt. Lawley? Does anyone suggest that? No-one, as you can see, Mr. Speaker, from the Government side of the House is prepared to suggest that; yet we know some members on the Government side have hides twice the thickness and toughness of a rhinoceros.

True, no-one on the Government side lifted a finger to try to have the member for South Perth re-elected, or the member for Mt. Lawley re-elected. But did anyone on the Government side of the House lift a finger to prevent them from being elected? Did the Premier use his writing finger and the thumb of his writing hand to prevent the member from South Perth being elected on the 21st March? Did he send out hundreds of personal letters to electors in South Perth to try to undermine the present member for South Perth in an endeavour to have someone else elected in his stead? Did the Liberal Party spend thousands of pounds in the South Perth electorate and in the electorate of Mt. Lawley trying to defeat the sitting members of that time?

Sir Ross McLarty: Did you say thousands of pounds?

Mr. HAWKE: I did. I know that the mind of the member for Murray always runs in millions of pounds, and I can quite understand his total inability to comprehend a small amount like thousands of pounds. Thousands of pounds were so expended in each electorate by the Liberal Party trying to destroy the member for South Perth; and trying to destroy the member for Mt. Lawley. I think I need not go much further to talk about the offensive propaganda directed against each individual by the Liberal Party.

Mr. J. Hegney: Or against the member for Mt. Lawley.

Mr. HAWKE: So surely no-one on the Government side—not even the mentally-acrobatic Minister for Lands—would claim that the Government has the right to total with the Government's own members the two Independent Liberal members to whom I have referred.

Mr. Bovell: Why did you hand in your resignation to the Governor?

Mr. HAWKE: One reply to that could be to enable the then member for Vasse to become a Minister of the Crown so that members of this House and the public generally can realise what a hopeless proposition he is. Therefore, I say the Government has no mandate—none whatsoever—because it has not the numbers to put a mandate into operation.

Mr. Bovell: I like that!

Mr. HAWKE: Therefore, this proposition to destroy the day labour building organisation and to give away State trading concerns is a proposition which the Government is entitled to bring to Parliament, or to put into operation administratively, to the extent the Government is able to do it. But neither proposition is one for which the Government can claim a mandate. No Government has a really true mandate unless it has a majority of its supporters elected by the people at the preceding election.

Mr. Brand: Didn't Joe Chamberlain say we had a mandate?

Mr. HAWKE: I was hoping strongly that someone on the Government side would say that. For the last five minutes I have been trying to get someone in on it.

Mr. Brand: Yes, you were!

Mr. HAWKE: Finally the Premier came in on it. Did Joe Chamberlain say that the Government had a mandate on the question of the destruction of the day labour organisation?

Mr. Brand: Didn't he?

Mr. HAWKE: I do not know whether he said it.

Mr. Brand: I thought that was what you might say.

Mr. HAWKE: But surely if he did say it, the Government is not bringing that forward in support of any claim it might make to possess a mandate?

Mr. Brand: I simply asked the question.

Mr. HAWKE: Yes. It is amazing how the Premier whizzes around the mulberry bush on an issue like this.

Mr. Brand: I thought what Joe Chamberlain said might have carried as much weight as—

Mr. HAWKE: No; I do my own thinking, and I hope some day the Premier will do his own.

Mr. Jamieson: That will be calamitous!

Mr. HAWKE: It could be, too. Recently I received from South Australia what is described as a souvenir publication in connection with the official opening of a State sawmill at Mt. Gambier, in the south-east of that State. This was the official opening of the Mt. Gambier State mill.

Mr. J. Hegney: It is Government-owned!

Mr. HAWKE: This official opening was performed by Sir Thomas Playford, the Liberal Party Premier of South Australia. This was a £2,500,000 sawmill.

Mr. Brand: And without a mandate.

Mr. HAWKE: This, I understand, is one of the biggest sawmills in Australia.

Mr. Brand: Has Sir Thomas Playford two independents to give him a majority?

Mr. Jamieson: It is the biggest sawmill.

Mr. HAWKE: Reading through this official publication, I find that the South Australian Government proposes, in the not distant future, to establish another mill of a somewhat similar kind. So we find that the only progressive Liberal Party Premier in Australia—the only one who has ever existed as far as I know—is going ahead to establish, wherever he considers it reasonable and justified, State-owned concerns.

But, of course, we know from previous experience that Sir Thomas Playford still operates price control for the protection of the people of South Australia. We know of many other things that he did over there, which no Liberal Party member of the present Government in Western Australia would dare to do, even though he might think it would really be the right and best thing to do for the benefit and advantage of the people in this State.

Not so long ago I came into possession of a copy of the State platform of the W.A. Division of the Liberal Party of Australia. I was interested in the section which comes under the heading, "Industrial Charter." Reading through some of the sections of this platform, I could hear the soothing syrupy talk of the member for Nedlands all the way; you

know that chloroform talk which he indulges in. When he gets the would-be victim chloroformed, then it is sudden death for the victim.

Mr. Brand: You speak as though you know something about chloroform talk.

Mr. HAWKE: This document says—

The industrial aims of the Liberal and Country League are—

To maintain full employment at good wages and progressively improve the standard of living.

Sir Ross McLarty: Read on; read on.

Mr. HAWKE: Yes, indeed. The member for Murray reminds me, by his interjection, of a story he told me this week about something which a comedian said in His Majesty's theatre. Before the session is over, I hope the hon. member will give other members in the Chamber the benefit of the story here, and not outside in the corridor where he told it to me. Another paragraph under the section headed, "Industrial Charter" states—

To achieve peace in industry and to establish harmonious industrial relationships through joint consultation, conciliation and where necessary arbitration.

Mr. Brand: What is wrong with that?

Mr. HAWKE: Every now and then through these pages I find there is a policy or a slogan. Further down on this page, the slogan reads, "Always Full Employment." Under the heading, "Industrial Welfare and Security" there is a paragraph which reads—

Removing from the minds of the people the fear of insecurity and want.

Further over, under the section dealing with Peace in Industry, there is a heading, "Teamwork not Turmoil."

Mr. Brand: That is very desirable.

Mr. HAWKE: Further down we find a slogan—"Justice and Fair Play." As you would know, Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of insecurity and fear established in this community in recent weeks by the actions of the Government. A considerable number of men—some of them married and with families—have already been sacked.

Mr. Bovell: Rubbish!

Mr. HAWKE: I am not sure whether the Minister for Lands said, "rubbish," but it would be an appropriate interjection from him, and it would show how hopelessly out of touch he is with realities. It could also show what little thought or concern he has for the men and families placed in the situation to which I have referred.

There is turmoil—mental turmoil—and there is a great possibility, to put it mildly, of industrial trouble. So this Government, because it has been persuaded to embrace certain lines of policy; and because it has not had enough commonsense, carefully

and at length, to study the probable or certain effects of putting the policy into operation, has barged in and developed a situation which is full of hardship for those who have already suffered from the policy, and which is full of insecurity for tens of thousands of others who could easily suffer from the policy; and which is charged, if not super-charged, with all the possibilities of industrial dislocation.

Mr. Court: Where is the turmoil you talk about? The only turmoil I know about is the dilemma at Trades Hall.

Mr. HAWKE: There is no dilemma. If the Minister for Industrial Development had more experience; more commonsense; and more knowledge of how a situation like this develops, he would know that there would have been industrial trouble already except for the stand taken by what he calls Trades Hall. In reality, the members of this Government owe some thanks—even though they do not express them—to the men of Trades Hall who have so far prevented any industrial stoppages from taking place.

The Minister for Industrial Development, instead of sniggering and being self-satisfied because there is disputation at the Trades Hall on this issue, ought to be disturbed about that fact, because the disputation which has occurred there has been over the official policy of the State executive of the A.L.P., which has been a policy of no industrial stoppages. But the feeling of the men concerned—the rank-and-file men concerned—has been so strong that they have been able to win to their support practically 50 per cent. of the delegates who would decide this issue.

I am sure the Minister for Agriculture would find no satisfaction in that; and I hope the Premier would find none in it either. I am certain the Attorney-General, if he were present, would find no cause for sniggering or satisfaction; rather, on the other hand, he would find cause for considerable concern and worry. If the Minister for Industrial Development wants to encourage further disputation at the Trades Hall, and if he wants to feed those who want industrial stoppages, then the way he is going on this afternoon is the way to do it.

Mr. Court: Nonsense!

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister says, "Nonsense," now that the realities of the situation have been put in front of him; but two or three moments ago he was getting tremendous political satisfaction out of the fact that there was a strong difference of opinion at the Trades Hall. It was a great thing; he wanted more of it; he wanted the disputation at the Trades Hall to continue to grow wider.

Mr. Court: That is the only turmoil I know of that is going on, industrially, in Western Australia.

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister for Industrial Development exposes the shallowness of his thinking. Has the Minister ever heard about the mental turmoil that exists in the minds of worried men and worried women?

Mr. Court: Of course I have.

Mr. HAWKE: Does he think there is no mental turmoil in the minds of the men who have been sacked and who have not been able to gain other employment? Does he think there is no mental turmoil in the minds of their wives? Does he think there is no mental turmoil in the minds of those men employed here on the additions to Parliament House, and who know for certain that some time in the future they will get the sack?

Does he think there is no mental turmoil in the minds of thousands of other men employed in the day labour organisation at the present time, and the thousands more men employed in State trading concerns when they learn what this Government will do to them? Of course there is great turmoil—great mental turmoil—in the minds of those people. It is very real and it is very cruel.

So I ask the Minister for Industrial Development to try to get hold of this situation and realise how serious and dangerous it is; and not to sit back sniggering and laughing in self-satisfaction because at the Trades Hall there is a disputation as to whether or not there should be industrial stoppages in protest against the policy which this Government is putting into operation.

I have dealt with the question of the Government's sackings, and that of the far greater number of sackings which it proposes to carry out in the future. Therefore, in conclusion, I propose to move to add to the Address-in-reply, the following words:—

We wish to protest strongly against the Government's policy of deliberately sacking many of its employees, and against the Government's expressed intention to sack additional large numbers in the future, as this policy is creating unemployment and hardship and a widespread feeling of insecurity and unrest.

We wish also to protest strongly against the action of the Government in depriving many deserving single unemployed persons of supplementary help.

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier—on amendment) [4.59]: This move by the Leader of the Opposition was anticipated, because those of us who have been following closely the various actions taken in regard to the implementation of the Government's policy of changing over from day labour construction to, in the main,

the letting of contracts, would have appreciated that ultimately the matter would find its way to the House and, in fact, become a political issue rather than an industrial one. All those who, in the first place, ran in with their heads down in regard to what they called threats of stoppages and strikes, had to find some way of face-saving. As a result, the actual dispute was passed along.

I should like to pay a tribute to the hundreds of men—unionists—who were not prepared to join in an irresponsible strike over a matter which—at least at this stage—they consider to be unjustified. It was as a result of their determination to keep out of the strike, thus giving an indication to their union leaders that they were not prepared to strike or join in one-day stoppages, marches on Parliament House, and that sort of irresponsible action, that the matter finally landed in the lap of the leader of the Labour Party in this State, who has now brought the matter to this chamber. We have no opposition to that; we consider that that is quite a justifiable action.

Today, in speaking to the Address-in-reply to the Governor's Speech, the Leader of the Opposition has travelled a long journey, and has mentioned many subjects. However, it is my intention to deal only with the subject matter of the amendment he has moved, and to oppose it. Members will recall that on previous occasions, when amendments have been moved to the Address-in-reply, the Government of the day—that is, in the time of the previous Government—took action to amend the amendments. I believe that that sort of action is not in order, and that the address as moved should be presented to His Excellency. Therefore, I do not intend to move any amendment to this amendment; I shall simply attempt to defeat it.

Mr. Bovell: Hear, hear!

Mr. BRAND: I intend to deal firstly with the latter portion of the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, which reads—

We wish also to protest strongly against the action of the Government in depriving many single unemployed persons of supplementary help.

Mr. Hawke: I think you left a word out.

Mr. BRAND: I did not intend to do so. The latter portion of the amendment reads—

We wish also to protest strongly against the action of the Government in depriving many deserving single unemployed persons of supplementary help.

Mr. Hawke: That is better.

Mr. BRAND: I did not intend to leave out any words.

Mr. Hawke: You left one out.

Mr. BRAND: The Leader of the Opposition, I am sure, would have been courteous enough to give *Hansard* a copy of the amendment, and it will appear correctly in *Hansard*. The fact is that our Government decided that as some £48,000 was being paid out annually to single unemployed persons in this State, by way of supplementary grants of 17s. 6d. a week, and as all the other States of Australia, including the Labour-governed States, paid no such extra subsidy—

Mr. Graham: So what?

Mr. BRAND: The member for East Perth says "So what"? I simply say that as a claimant State we are not justified in paying that extra 17s. 6d. a week when the standard States of Australia—the Labour-led standard States—cannot feel justified in supplementing the sustenance paid to single unemployed persons in their States. As the Minister responsible for the administration of the Child Welfare Department has pointed out, when the original check was made after the change of Government, it clearly showed that many of these single unemployed persons drawing cheques were actually in employment. Altogether it was a most unsatisfactory situation.

Mr. Graham: How many men?

Mr. BRAND: As a result of the then Government's decision to pay this £1,000 a week to single unemployed persons, it was found necessary for the then Premier, or the Minister for Railways, to issue a direction to the effect that men required for work in the Railway Department should be drawn from that pool. As the policy of paying 17s. 6d. a week extra to these people was a direct cost to the State, the decision made in that regard was a wise one; and the railways, when they wanted men, drew them from that pool.

But it was found—and the files reveal it—that the railway commissioners were opposed to the idea, because many of the single unemployed men who were drawing this 17s. 6d. a week were not the most satisfactory workers; and, as a result of having to employ them, the railway commissioners were not able to employ suitable men who were offering, but had to draw them from the pool.

The file will also indicate that a most unsatisfactory situation developed at either Cue or Mt. Magnet as a result of these men having to be employed. All in all, the present Government decided that the right and justifiable thing to do was not to pay this 17s. 6d. a week but to allow the Minister for Child Welfare discretion in dealing with hardship cases and, if he felt that any persons required assistance, the 17s. 6d. a week would be paid.

As one would expect, the Leader of the Opposition has strongly protested about the Government's policy in changing over

from the Public Works day labour system to the letting of contracts. He was quite justified in his opposition to it because it is the policy of his party to use the day labour system; but the letting of contracts and the encouragement of competition is our policy. In spite of what the Leader of the Opposition has said, at present we do have a mandate, and we have a mandate until such time as we are defeated on the floor of the House.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Hear, hear!

Mr. BRAND: The Leader of the Labour Party has pointed out that in South Australia, Sir Thomas Playford, a Liberal Premier, has just set up a State-owned timber mill. But if we have no mandate to do certain things, then Sir Thomas Playford has no mandate. He relies on two Independents for his majority. The situation is the same as it is in this State; and, might I add, exactly the same, or even a worse situation exists in the State of Tasmania. So to talk about our not having a mandate is so much eye-wash. We have a mandate, and we intend to remain here and govern the State in accordance with our policy so long as we have a majority on the floor of the House—

Mr. W. Hegney: Which policy—Liberal Party policy or Country Party policy?

Mr. BRAND: —and we have the support of members. We stated quite clearly—nothing could be clearer—during the election campaign that if returned to power we would gradually implement a policy of carrying out Government work by the letting of contracts. We stated also that we intended to have a maintenance gang to carry out work associated with the Government's responsibilities.

Mr. Tonkin: Did you not also state that the Public Works Department would be given the opportunity to tender?

Mr. BRAND: As far as I know it has been given the opportunity to tender.

Mr. Tonkin: How can it tender if it has no men to do the work?

Mr. BRAND: I could not say that. But the department has been given the opportunity to tender; and, presumably, if it were successful it could employ men the same as anyone else.

Mr. Graham: It has not tendered.

Mr. BRAND: Therefore we feel that we are in no way open to censure for going forward with the implementation of our policy and calling tenders for the work we have to do both now and in the future. As a result of that policy we have found that a large number of men in the Public Works Department have no work to do. The figures released recently indicate, however, that we still have in the vicinity of 1,400 or 1,500 men employed by the Public Works Department. In 1955

there were approximately 1,069 men employed by the department—that was right in the middle of the Labour regime—and after that there was a gradual build-up to approximately 1,850 men. So members will see that about 800 men—the difference between 1,069 and 1,800—have been put on since 1955.

As was pointed out today by way of interjection, the sackings, as the Leader of the Opposition is pleased to term them, went on while he was Premier of the State. In fact, he did not sack the men in groups of 20 but in groups of 200.

Mr. Graham: Not because of policy but because of necessity.

Mr. BRAND: I am sure that no-one would quarrel with the implementation of our policy; the only quarrel the people of Western Australia would have with this Government would be if it were not implementing its policy. Therefore I believe that it is a matter for this Government to handle carefully, and in such a way as not to create unemployment. We do not desire to create unemployment any more than anyone else desires it; and we have as much feeling for people who are unemployed as has the Leader of the Opposition or anyone sitting on that side—and well they know it.

Mr. Evans: Yet you cut out the 17s. 6d.

Mr. BRAND: The Leader of the Opposition talks about mental turmoil and insecurity. Did his Government worry about people who were employed by private enterprise when the Government of that day was refusing to let contracts? Those men and women were in exactly the same position; but was there any talk about mental turmoil then? Of course there was not!

Mr. I. W. Manning: Not by the then Premier.

Mr. BRAND: There were no threats of one-day stoppages or strikes; but that was because the boot was on the other foot. As a matter of fact, I believe we on this side have a greater sense of responsibility in regard to this matter, because we appreciate that as a result of the change of policy some of these men are facing a degree of insecurity, and some realise that ultimately they will lose their jobs with the Government and have to find employment elsewhere. We realise that; but the position is merely the reverse of what took place when the previous Government changed over from private contracting to the day labour system.

Mr. Tonkin: What are you doing about them if you realise it?

Mr. BRAND: We are letting contracts in greater numbers than have ever been let before; there are already indications that capital is beginning to flow to this State; and so there will be more work available. While the Leader of the Opposition talks about unemployment I would remind him that this Government took over a legacy

of 500 unemployed in the building industry. But nothing was said about that. There was no strike action or no talk of censure motions about that.

Mr. Hawke: They developed under your control, did they?

Mr. BRAND: They did not; they developed under the control of the Hawke Government. Five hundred men in the building trade were unemployed when this Government took over.

Mr. Hawke: You expressed it wrongly on the first occasion.

Mr. BRAND: I am making it quite clear now.

Mr. Tonkin: What is the unemployed figure now?

Mr. BRAND: I could not say.

Mr. Tonkin: No; because you are not interested.

Mr. BRAND: At this time every year there is an increase in unemployment; but statistics show—and the figures can be laid on the Table of the House at the next sitting if members would like to see them—that the increase in unemployment started a month later this year than last year.

Mr. Lawrence: Therefore you believe in unemployment.

Mr. BRAND: I did not hear the hon. member for South Fremantle. In any case, I feel I have said enough, in that regard, to indicate that we are simply implementing a policy—a policy of letting our work by contract. We believe, too, that in letting contracts based on firm estimates, and under a signed contract, we will save the country a considerable amount of money. The Leader of the Opposition has indicated that we would raise this very point—the point of talking about starting buildings without an estimate.

There is an indication on the file that a number of buildings have been started without a firm estimate, and without detailed plans first having been prepared. The tendency in that regard is for some changes to be made in the process of the building, with the result that there is no end to the incidental and miscellaneous expenditure on these buildings.

Mr. Graham: Did not the University deliberately ask for that procedure?

Mr. BRAND: The University asked that we finish the buildings—the Engineering School—by day labour, because there was insufficient time to have plans drawn up and tenders let; it would have meant a delay of six months. We had a close look at that matter before we agreed to the request of the University that we finish off this project by day labour.

Mr. Graham: Would that not apply equally in any other job?

Mr. BRAND: We made it clear that in future we would call tenders for any of the University buildings.

Mr. Graham: And hang the expense!

Mr. BRAND: That is a strange utterance coming from the member for East Perth; because right up to the point of letting the work by contract it was a case of hang the expense, as the files will indicate. I hope the House will toss out this amendment. The members on this side of the House were elected on a policy.

Mr. Graham: There are more members on this side of the House.

Mr. BRAND: When we were in Opposition there was a motion moved for the sale of the State-owned concerns, and there were many expressions during the election campaign that we would let our work by contract, and call tenders for our requirements. That is what we are doing, and I hope we are doing it in a business-like and responsible way, inasmuch as we hope to minimise the hardship and inconvenience brought about by the change.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—on amendment) [5.19]: I am glad the Premier reiterated that he was elected on a policy, because it indicates that he is prepared to carry out the policy which he announced to the people, and in connection with which he gained support. But he has forgotten some of that policy, and I feel sure it will be only necessary to remind him of it for him to live up to the assurance that he has given, or be stamped as a person who says one thing and means another. What I am about to read must be taken as the policy, because it was printed in *The West Australian*, which some people regard as Holy Writ.

Mr. Brand: You did while it was telling the story of the overseas trade mission.

Mr. TONKIN: We know very well—if I might interpolate here—that *The West Australian* did not go out of its way to give us any praise on the mission.

Mr. Brand: It gave you marvellous publicity.

Mr. TONKIN: On the contrary, it did its best to damn it.

Mr. Hawke: It damned it before the mission started.

Mr. Brand: You damned it.

Mr. Hawke: I will damn you if you are not careful!

Mr. TONKIN: This is what appeared in *The West Australian* on industrial relations—

By David Brand for the Liberal Party.

Our policy in industrial relations is to recognise that people are the most important factor in industry.

People are the most important factor in industry! I would ask hon. members to note that.

Mr. Rowberry: During the elections.

Mr. TONKIN: He says that people are the most important factor in industry; not profits. To continue with the extract from *The West Australian*—

Industry is for people and industrial relations should be based for the general good.

We intend to create conditions in which people and industry will all prosper together. Our principles are: Full employment; conciliation and arbitration; employer-employee consultation at all levels;

That is why the Minister for Works refused to see a deputation from the men concerned.

Mr. Brand: Having already seen them.

Mr. TONKIN: Oh no! To continue—fairness to all unions whether affiliated with the A.L.P. or not;

I take it that means Communist-led unions.

Mr. Brand: Any unions that wish to see us.

Mr. TONKIN: To continue—

freedom of belief, no victimisation because of political, religious or ethical principles; voluntary political levies; adequate workers' compensation; safety in industry; equal pay for work of equal value decided by the arbitration authorities. The Hawke Government is making absurd charges that Liberal intentions are to close all State trading concerns, fire their employees, reduce wages and lengthen working hours. We will fire nobody.

Mr. Brand: We have had that once.

Mr. Roberts: We would be grateful if you were instrumental in having that printed in *The West Australian*.

Mr. TONKIN: That occasioned quite a lot of talk from the other side; and so it should. Anybody reading that, and not knowing the Government, and the ways of the Government, would assume that his employment with the State trading concerns was secure. One could not come to any other conclusion. The present Premier said, "We will fire nobody; nor close any concerns down." But what is the Government doing? It is slowly strangling the State concerns. The complaint is that there is no work for them to do, and the Government has not instructed that the men be sacked; that it is done at the discretion of the management.

But what is the Government doing? It is taking away from the State concerns work it has done for years, and which has enabled the works to keep the men employed. It is giving those contracts to its friends, so that there is no longer sufficient work in places like the State Engineering Works to keep the men employed.

Accordingly, we get a situation where the management finds it necessary to sack eight apprentices; and the Premier stands

up there and sheds crocodile tears over the plight of men and women. There are eight young lads who were encouraged to seek apprenticeships in the State Works in the belief that, in accordance with the policy followed in this State over the years, they would have the opportunity of gaining employment in those works when they had completed their time.

But as a result of this Government's policy, and for no other reason, eight apprentices have already been sacked—not by the Government, the Premier said, but by the management; that is whom he puts it on to.

Mr. Brand: He does not put it on to the management at all.

Mr. TONKIN: Oh yes he does!

Mr. Evans: Whom do you put it on to?

Mr. Brand: The management uses its discretion.

Mr. Hawke: What drivell!

Mr. TONKIN: They are expected to show a profit in these works—and they have been showing a profit for many years—when the work is taken away from them. How is it possible for them to show a profit when they have the same number of men with no work to do? So they are obliged to sack men for whom there is no work. I understand that already, on top of the dismissals that have taken place, the Government has caused inquiries to be made with regard to the manufacture of desks and seats for our schools. This is work for which the State Engineering Works has been properly and completely fitted up. They make these desks and seats—

Mr. Brand: What about Tomlinson's?

Mr. TONKIN: The State Works make them at a price which is completely satisfactory; it enables the works to make a profit, which of course goes into the Treasury. I am told that already the works have been instructed to send a sample of their desk and seat to the Tender Board, in order that this work for our own Government schools can be let out to private tenderers.

Mr. Brand: That is what we said we would do.

Mr. TONKIN: I tell the Premier here and now, that if his Government lets a tender at a price which exceeds that for which the State works have been manufacturing these desks, I will stomp the country from one end to the other telling the people that this is the way the Government saves money.

Mr. Brand: Do you think your stumping the country at any time would impress the people?

Mr. TONKIN: It would impress the people; and I repeat the challenge to the Premier. I know the price at which those desks and seats have been constructed; and if the Government lets a tender at a

price exceeding that for which they are made by the State Engineering Works—and which makes provision for a profit—I will see the country knows about it. The Premier has endeavoured to convince the House he will save money with his new policy.

Mr. Brand: We will.

Mr. TONKIN: This is how he will save it: Last year the fibrous plaster manufacturers in this State all tendered the same price for fibrous plaster work for the Government.

Mr. Hawke: And how!

Mr. TONKIN: They all tendered the same price. From memory, I think eight of them tendered, and their price was precisely the same. It was an increase of 4.7 per cent. on the price for which the work had been done previously. The Principal Architect was so concerned about this situation, because it is just like plundering the public purse, that he brought the matter under my notice by a minute on the file, drawing my attention to the fact that the Fibrous Plasterers' Association had ganged up. His words were that "the Government was in the hands of the Fibrous Plasterers' Association." I sent that information on to the Prices Commissioner, requesting that action be taken to deal with this collusive tendering which was going on, and the use of public funds in a way that was not justified.

I received a reply stating that the matter had been gone into and that the papers were with the Crown Law Department. That is just where the matter has stopped. A change of Government took place; and the present Minister, in accordance with the policy of this Government, just ignored the law: the act does not mean a thing to the Government. The Minister ignores the law and proposes to do precisely nothing about this matter.

I asked this question today—

(1) In view of the decision of the Government drastically to reduce the volume of public buildings to be constructed by the work force of the P.W.D.; and to have such buildings constructed under contract, does he intend to take any action in connection with the complaint made by the Principal Architect, contained in Part A of Public Works File 1208/50, that collusive tendering by members of the Fibrous Plasterers' Association was occurring with the result that an increase in price of 4.7 per cent. over last year's prices had been imposed?

(2) If action is proposed, will he have proceedings commenced without delay so that the maximum benefit may result to the State?

And this was his answer to No. (1)—

(1) No further action other than that already taken.

That is, no action beyond what was taken under the previous Government. So it stops there. Then, in the answers to my questions, there is a lot of flappedoodle about what the Government proposes to do in the future in regard to legislation.

Mr. Hawke: I did not get a reply to mine.

Mr. TONKIN: So we have to accept the situation that although it is known that the fibrous plaster manufacturers have ganged up and all submitted the same price for fibrous plaster work; and the Principal Architect has stated that his department is completely in the hands of the Fibrous Plasterers' Association, the Government will do nothing, and proposes to let this work to tender.

It is just a shame what these contractors are going to do to the country and how they are going to use this money! The Government has a great chance of getting these jobs done more cheaply than before, I don't think!

Mr. Hawke: The suppliers of electrical goods shot prices up recently.

Mr. TONKIN: It is a lot of wishful thinking on the Government's part. With regard to the Premier's statement that some jobs were commenced before complete plans were made, that is a terrible thing, isn't it? As a matter of fact, he is not game to state categorically what has been wrong with the practice in the Public Works Department so far as the architectural division is concerned. I challenge the Premier or the Minister for Works to state wherein the Principal Architect has shown a dereliction of duty in the construction of public buildings—

Mr. Bovell: It was the instructions he received from his then Minister which we criticise.

Mr. TONKIN: Oh, is it?

Mr. Bovell: Yes.

Mr. TONKIN: Here is the oracle from Vasse again.

Mr. Bovell: That is funny, isn't it? Very funny!

Mr. Graham: Not funny, just peculiar.

Mr. Bovell: You are that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TONKIN: The Government will make these statements about jobs being commenced without proper plans and specifications, with no regard for the damage it does for the reputation of the men concerned in that department. It is hoping that in some way it will act detrimentally to the previous Government. This is the policy which was going on in the Public Works Department when the present Premier was Minister for Works. It is no different. As a matter of fact, unless the construction of public buildings in this State is to be considerably slowed up, it will continue to go on.

It is an established fact that although advertisements are made, draftsmen are not available in Western Australia because there are not enough training for the position to meet the demand. So difficult has been the situation that I had the experience last year that, when one of my draftsmen, who is an outstanding cricketer in this State, applied for leave to proceed to the Eastern States to play with the State team, the Principal Architect refused to grant permission. An appeal was made to me, and I asked the Principal Architect to discuss the matter with me, because I felt that if a man was good enough to win State recognition in sport, then every effort ought to be made to allow him to participate. So far as I was concerned, I would grant permission for him to go.

The Principal Architect reported to me that if I did that, I would slow up the construction of one of our major schools in Western Australia because he just could not get a draftsman to replace the sportsman and the work would have to stop. Therefore, I had a very serious decision to make—whether I ought to risk the slowing up of this work, or try to get through somehow and let this man go, or say that he could not go.

In view of the fact that it had been the practice over the years to allow outstanding sportsmen and women to participate when they were good enough to win recognition, and because it meant, through this sport, recognition for the State, I gave authority for the man to go. I mention the matter to illustrate the existing great shortage of skilled labour for this department.

If this Government is going to wait until all plans and specifications are drawn up by the department before these works commence, it is inevitable that there will be a slowing up in the rate of construction. As the rate of construction was more important to us to enable the schools and hospitals to be built when money was available, we authorised them to proceed, even though all plans and specifications were not in the condition that would be required if tenders were to be called for.

But I will say this: There is nobody who could say that because work was commenced in that way the workmanship suffered. I am prepared to stand by the jobs which the Public Works Department has done and compare them with any job done anywhere by private builders.

Mr. Hawke: They would win hands down.

Mr. TONKIN: The quality of the workmanship is unquestioned, and the State gets good value for its money in this regard. I say it is a shocking thing for the Government to blame the Principal Architect and his staff for commencing public buildings before the specifications, as would be required for tenders, were available.

Mr. Court: The Government is not blaming the Principal Architect.

Mr. TONKIN: Oh, yes!

Mr. Brand: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. Court: Oh no we didn't! We blamed the Administration which told them to do it.

Mr. TONKIN: If the Government thought it blamed the Administration which told them to do it, it backed the wrong horse because the Administration at no stage told the Principal Architect and his staff what they were to do.

Mr. Court: You have turned about face and are now saying he is to blame.

Mr. TONKIN: I am not saying that.

Mr. Hawke: We say he is to be given the credit.

Mr. TONKIN: We are not blaming him.

Mr. Hawke: That is the difference.

Mr. TONKIN: The Premier well knows that the policy about which he complains is precisely the same policy which obtained when he was Minister for Works.

Mr. Hawke: Exactly the same.

Mr. TONKIN: Exactly the same.

Mr. Hawke: But he would not know.

Mr. TONKIN: So it ill becomes him to criticise under these circumstances. One point that the Government entirely overlooks, when it claims that it is just as much concerned over the working man as we are, is that it will not be possible for a large number of these men to obtain employment with private employers. The private employer will not look at a man over 40 years of age. Many of them will not look at a man over 35—they pass him by because they know there will be plenty of men under the age of 35 available.

We have men who have been with the Public Works Department for more than 20 years and who have given of their best. We employed them from the time when they were apprentices. They have given this State the best years of their lives and they had no reason to believe that a Government would come along and deprive them of their employment at an age when they would have little likelihood of getting other jobs.

Mr. Brand: The policy was made quite clear.

Mr. TONKIN: You cannot have it both ways. If you say that what you are doing is in accordance with policy, you have to acknowledge that you are putting out of employment men who will find it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to obtain other jobs. A further bad feature of this policy has reference to apprentices. Dozens of lads, over the years, have taken apprenticeships with the various branches of the Public Works Department, believing that it gave them an opportunity of securing a job with continuity of employment.

I have no doubt that a lot of members on the Government side of the House—in common with members on this side—have endeavoured to gain apprenticeships in the department for lads. Now this Government comes along and is in the position that it will not be able to find work for these apprentices, who will have to be sacked, one after another. The Minister for Works found it necessary to make a special application to the Arbitration Court to enable him to evade the requirements of the law. These apprentices had been started and had completed their probationary period; and ordinarily they would have had to be told, "You are unsuitable and therefore you will not be apprenticed," or the Minister would have had to apprentice them.

Because of the policy which the present Government has introduced, the Minister was not in a position to apprentice these lads, and so he applied to the court for an extension of time hoping, I suppose, that the lads would see the writing on the wall and get out, thus relieving him of the responsibility of trying to find jobs for them elsewhere. We may discover later on how many such lads have left on that account; but the fact remains that the Government will not be able to employ them, because it will not have any work for them to do, as it is going to give all the work out on tenders.

The position is that these lads, who have started off in apprenticeships, have little chance of getting into the trades which they desire to take up, because private builders do not take on a sufficient number of apprentices to give continuity of employment. So far as private enterprise is concerned, the building trade is a casual trade. The private builder is in a position to engage men when he wants them and put them off when he no longer requires their services, because there is always a pool of labour upon which to draw; and so he is not in a position to carry the number of apprentices which the Public Works Department would ordinarily carry. Therefore, in introducing this new policy, the Government is taking away the opportunity of these apprentices and, what is far worse, it says to these lads, who have made a start and who had reasonable expectations of employment, "We cannot sign you up. There is no job for you. Do your best somewhere else."

The Premier and other of his Ministers, including the Minister for Lands, have kept on harping on the fact that the Hawke Government dispensed with the services of 200 men from its day labour organisation, but that is not comparable with the present situation. As a matter of fact, when the present Government came into office there were actually more men in the day-labour organisation than there were at the time when the services of the 200 men were dispensed with.

I suppose it is reasonable to assume that the bulk of those 200 men were re-employed by the department, and what happened was that the amount of work which the Public Works Department could carry out was determined by the amount of money made available to it by the Treasurer. If there were need to expedite the work the money might be expended much more quickly than it would be if it were left to the department to determine that the money would be expended regularly over the full 12 months.

As a matter of fact, prior to the dismissal of these men, I put this question to the representatives of the unions, who were anxious that I should speed up a number of jobs in order to provide employment. I told all their representatives that, if I further expanded the day labour organisation, I would use up my money all the faster and they would be faced with the certainty that, before the end of the financial year, it would be necessary to dispense with the services of a number of men; and they accepted that situation. They said they preferred that, rather than that I should keep in employment the number of men I then had employed all the way through, I should provide additional employment for men then out of work, knowing full well that it would result in quite a number of them having their services dispensed with before the end of the financial year. That is precisely what happened.

As I had said would be the case, the funds of the department were expended earlier than they otherwise would have been, and some 200 men lost their employment. But in the next financial year more money was available and the work was to be done and men offering for employment were re-employed. In that way we reached a situation where actually, at the time when we went out of office, there were more men in employment than there were when the services of the 200 were dispensed with. Therefore, the situation is in no way analogous to that in which we find ourselves today. This Government is going to sack the lot and is going to do it progressively, until all that remains will be a skeleton maintenance staff.

It is stupid to try to explain the situation away by referring to the fact that the previous Government, at one stage, sacked 200 men. That was not an isolated instance; and if one goes back over the six years one finds that the level of employment in the department fluctuated in accordance with the work to be done and the money available. It must always be so; but there is no future in the present Government's policy, because the reduction in the manpower of the department is being made with the expressed intention of sacking all except a maintenance

force, which the Government proposes to retain in order to carry out some maintenance work.

I have little doubt that pressure will be put on the Government shortly to allow outside firms to undertake this maintenance work, too, and we will find that less than 250 men will be employed by the department on maintenance work. It will all go to private enterprise, and it will not cost less but will finish up costing more.

We let a contract for the erection of a school in one of the northern suburbs. We called tenders for the school and we let it to a private contractor. Some time after he got started with the job, he discovered that he had made a serious error in his computation; he had forgotten to include the joinery—some £20,000 worth.

Mr. Hawke: An elector of the Minister for Railways.

Mr. TONKIN: He found himself in a serious jam.

Mr. Brand: Don't we all at times?

Mr. Hawke: You do at present.

Mr. TONKIN: This contractor got the job against other contractors; and started with the work; and, after he was well under way, discovered that he had made this serious error. I had a perfect right to hold him to his contract; but it would have bankrupted him.

Mr. J. Hegney: And he was out trying to defeat me at the election.

Mr. TONKIN: I had to determine what would be fair and equitable under the circumstances. We got out of the difficulty this way: We fined him, I think, £1,000.

Mr. Graham: It was £500.

Mr. TONKIN: Was it? We fined him for his mistake, and then did the job by day labour; because it would not have been fair, under the circumstances, to give it to any other tenderer, and the calling of fresh tenders would have caused too much delay; and it would have been unfair because the figures which had been lodged were already known.

Mr. W. Hegney: And it is a beautiful job.

Mr. TONKIN: The department did the job itself by day labour. This is a question that I would like to pose. In connection with the Rural and Industries Bank, the firm that has been successful in getting the contract is the same firm that was engaged on the Chest Hospital, which took such a long time to build.

I think upon examination it will be found that this contractor was paid substantially more for the job than his contract price. I want to know what the situation will be if he finds himself in similar difficulties with regard to the Rural and Industries Bank. Is he to be held to

the contract price, or will he be paid whatever extras are involved because he strikes some extraordinary difficulty? If that is to be the situation it is more than likely that this job will end up costing the Rural and Industries Bank a lot more money than it would have cost if completed by day labour.

Mr. Hawke: I think you are convincing the Minister for Works. I have never seen him look so worried.

Mr. TONKIN: There is another aspect of this which requires watching.

Mr. Brand: Is that the situation which applies to all contracts let?

Mr. TONKIN: No.

Mr. Brand: Then it would not apply to this one.

Mr. TONKIN: This man is a very influential person on your side of the House; and I have little doubt that if he runs into trouble he will be seeking this way out of it.

Mr. Oldfield: He must have some influence with you, too. You got him out of his trouble.

Mr. Brand: That is a point well taken.

Mr. TONKIN: It is not so well taken, because it was a Commonwealth job.

Mr. Brand: I was not talking about that job.

Mr. Hawke: He was talking about the Chest Hospital job.

Mr. TONKIN: Before the contract for the Rural and Industries Bank was let, it was freely rumoured that a certain man made approaches to some men on the Parliament House job and offered them the job of works foremen on the Rural and Industries Bank job—this is before the tenders were decided. It is further stated that this particular person works in association with the tenderer who ultimately got the contract. That suggested somebody had some inside information about what was likely to happen; and it remains to be seen how this contract finally pans out, and whether the contractor gets paid the amount for which he tendered, or whether he gets some substantial additional sums.

It is worthy of note because this is not an easy job to do. The circumstances under which the tenders are called are different from the ordinary because quite a lot of work was done in the first instance by the Public Works day labour organisation. Also, because some contracts were let in connection with the job, it was necessary to make allowances for the prices already decided as a result of those sub-contracts. It is my firm belief that instead of saving the country money, we are going to get less work than we used to get for the same sum; and ultimately we will get fewer schools and fewer hospitals for the same expenditure.

Mr. Graham: And a much poorer standard.

Mr. Court: Why?

Mr. TONKIN: But it remains to be seen, because this is one case where the proof of the pudding will be in the eating. It will be possible to ascertain what these various jobs cost, and to make a comparison; but the Government does not want to fool itself by believing that this type of work will be so much cheaper, especially as we have these people who gang up, like the fibrous plasterers, and who put their heads together and decide upon an increase in price and then all tender the same price. If they do that the Government, as the Principal Architect informed me, will be in the hands of the association.

Mr. May: They are now.

Mr. TONKIN: It will have to pay whatever price is asked by these people. I should now like to say a few words regarding the decision of the Government to deprive these deserving young single men of the 17s. 6d. a week which the State Government used to give them.

Mr. Andrew: And the single women.

Mr. TONKIN: I say quite frankly that had it been possible for the Hawke Government to grant more than 17s. 6d. a week, without reducing the amount of Commonwealth assistance, the Government would have given it, because it considered that the single person is in a very difficult position if he is out of work. The small sum which he is paid is insufficient to enable a person to pay for accommodation, keep himself decent, and get sufficient food upon which to live. The amount available will just not allow it to be done.

Recognising that, our Government decided that it was the responsibility of Government, and should not be thrown upon individuals; because, if members will throw their minds back, they will recall that the situation which obtained before this sum was granted was one in which there was an organisation at the Perth Trades Hall, and the business people in the community made donations of money and food to that organisation, while the Child Welfare Department was used to distribute the money and goods, proving that the need for assistance was there. Our view was that we should not expect the business community to do this sort of thing. If the need was there, and the men and women concerned were not getting sufficient assistance, the Government ought to do it.

We do not believe that 17s. 6d. was sufficient; but the situation was such that if we had given them more the Commonwealth would have reduced its allowance. Therefore, by consultation with the Commonwealth, it was decided that we could give 17s. 6d. without the Commonwealth

allowance being reduced. Although a small amount, it was of very real assistance to those unfortunate people.

What did the Government do as soon as it took office? One of its first acts was to take away, without any reasonable explanation or excuse, the small amount which was made available to those deserving people, on the pretext that because Western Australia is not a claimant State, and no other State is making this allowance, this State Government should not do it.

That does not prevent the Government from paying out money in other directions, although it is not done elsewhere. That did not stop the Government from restoring the road subsidies because it is not done in any other State. That did not enter into the question at all! The Government considered that there was a need to restore the road subsidies and it granted them irrespective of any other consideration.

There is a need for this assistance to be given to these people; but the puerile excuse for its not being given is that Western Australia is a claimant State and it is not done anywhere else. We are also told that the Minister will consider each case on its merits. In view of that, I would like to know—and I will put a question on the notice paper next week to find out—how many men and women have been granted this special assistance after the Minister has considered each case on its merits. I very much doubt if there are half-a-dozen, and I would be surprised if there are any.

Mr. Roberts: How many men or women, residing in country districts, received this assistance under your administration?

Mr. TONKIN: I cannot answer that question because it was not my department, but I would say the decision of Cabinet did not restrict the payment of the assistance to any particular place.

Mr. Roberts: In other words, there were not any single unemployed men and women in country districts at that time?

Mr. TONKIN: The member for Bunbury is making his own deduction from my statement. I did not say that. If applications for assistance had been made from single persons in country districts, I believe—and I will continue to believe until the contrary is proved—assistance would have been granted to the people in those places, because no decision had been made that this assistance would be limited to single persons in any particular place. There is a vital principle involved in this question. There is no doubt that the plight of the single unemployed person is a very difficult and serious one.

Mr. HAWKE: I move—

That the hon. member's time be extended.

Motion put and passed.

Mr. TONKIN: I had hoped that I would be able to conclude without requiring an extension of time, because I will take only another minute or two to finish my speech. As I was saying, there is a vital principle involved in this question; namely, there is an obligation upon the State to ensure that a person is not forced into crime through poverty and want. The plight of a single person is, quite often, much more serious than the plight of a married person. Usually a married person has his own accommodation; and with the assistance that he gets by way of child endowment and social service benefits, he can manage. However, the single person is generally one without accommodation, and he has to pay a high price for it wherever he goes. Further, he gets assistance which is not commensurate with the obligations he has to meet.

Mr. Brand: Is there not something in the contention that a bachelor or a single person can chase work more easily than a married person because he has no family ties?

Mr. TONKIN: One can chase work, but it does not bring in a wage.

Mr. Brand: But a single person is in a much better position to chase work.

Mr. TONKIN: Maybe. But surely the Premier is not going to say that the situation in this State today is that any man who looks for work can get it.

Mr. Brand: That is true; and it was also true before the 31st March.

Mr. TONKIN: Last week I had a visit from a man—I am not saying that he is entitled to assistance, because he did not ask for it—who owns a motor vehicle. He told me he had been driving his car about for the last three months looking for a job. He said he would go anywhere and do anything; but he could not get a job. So he asked me if I could find one for him. I asked him what work he usually followed, and he replied that he was a shop assistant, and added that the Social Services Department could not do anything for shop assistants.

He said that he had been to find a job for himself but suspected that the trouble was that he was only on a small amount of relief, whereas the Social Services Department have people on their books who are drawing larger sums from them and, accordingly, they are more interested in finding work for the man for whom they pay large sums of money rather than for people like himself. He said, "I am afraid my chance of getting a job through the department is practically nil."

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 7th July, 1959

CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :	
Licensing Act, parliamentary committee's report	112
Government employees, dismissals	112
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE :	
State Government Insurance Office building, cost	113
Beeloo, renaming of suburb	113
BILL :	
Electoral Districts (Cancellation of Proclamation)—	
Assent	112
Personal explanation	113
ADDRESS-IN-REPLY, FOURTH DAY	113
Speakers on amendment—	
The Hon. F. D. Willmott	113
The Hon. R. F. Hutchison	115
The Hon. J. D. Teahan	118
The Hon. R. Thompson	119

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

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (CANCELLATION OF PROCLAMATION) BILL

Assent

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read notifying assent to the Bill.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

LICENSING ACT

Parliamentary Committee's Report

1. The Hon. E. M. HEENAN asked the Minister for Mines:

In view of the Government's expressed intention to introduce a Bill this session proposing important amendments to the Licensing Act, 1911-1958, will the Government make early arrangements to have the 1958 report of the parliamentary committee on licensing, printed, in order that members may have an adequate opportunity of studying same?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

It is estimated to cost approximately £150 to print the report referred to. Inquiries as to whether this expenditure can be justified are at present being made.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Dismissals

2. The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH (Minister for Mines): Last Thursday, Mr. Strickland asked the following questions:—

(1) What is the total number of Government employees dismissed since the Liberal-Country Party coalition Government took office?

I spoke to a number of my friends who are in business—I had an opportunity to do so the same night as I saw him. They, however, could not do anything at all for him. This man came to see me yesterday, after giving me one week to look about for a job for him, and I had to tell him that I had no prospects whatever of finding employment for him.

I only mention that to show that even though a man looks for work today, and is prepared to go anywhere and take anything, he may still remain unemployed. If this man were in such circumstances that he did not have his own home, how could he possibly live on the amount of money made available by the Social Services Department for a single person? That is where this policy of the Government is heartless—

Mr. May: Hear, hear!

Mr. TONKIN: —Inconsiderate and bad. It is no justification to say that, because we are a claimant State the policy should be cut out. This is a matter which the Government should reconsider.

Mr. Brand: It will not.

Mr. TONKIN: I do not want to be fobbed off by statements that the Minister will consider each case on its merits, because that means nothing.

Mr. Brand: That is the decision of the Government.

Mr. TONKIN: Does the Premier know if anybody has been assisted under that decision?

Mr. Brand: I cannot say.

Mr. TONKIN: The Premier cannot say; and what is more, he does not care.

Mr. Brand: That is not true.

Mr. TONKIN: I hope the amendment will be carried.

On motion by Mr. Wild, debate adjourned.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION.

Council's Message.

Message from the Council received and read notifying the personnel of sessional committees appointed by that House.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (CANCELLATION OF PROCLAMATION) BILL.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 6.12 p.m.