

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 7th July, 1959.

CONTENTS.

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :	
Italian marriages, tabling of Police Commissioner's report	123
Public Relations Officer, salary and duties of Mr. W. W. Mitchell	123
Midland Junction Workshops, number of employees	124
Public Service salaries, Government review	124
Public Works Department, number of men sacked, etc.	124
School bus services, additional cost to Treasury	124
Police officers, duty in metropolitan area	124
Lower King bridge, new construction	125
Technical school for Albany, discussions between Minister and department	125
Parliamentary services, transfer to private concerns	125
Sandalwood, royalty, freight, tonnage, etc.	125
War service land settlement, committee's appointment and report	126
Margaret-st., Midland Junction, flooding from Black Adder Creek	126
Midland Junction high school, adequate playgrounds	126
Onslow hospital, date of completion	126
Transport of beans, freight subsidy	126
Narrogin railway crossing and bridge, tabling of files re closure	126
Broome, provision of deep-water port	126
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE :	
Betting inquiry, election promises	127
Parliament House—	
Admission of public	127
Use of Speaker's gallery	127
Talgarno rocket range, safeguarding of residents	127
State trading concerns, sale and continuity of employment	127
Tramway Department—	
Retrenchments and retirements	128
Repairs, etc., of vehicles	128
Iron ore, Koolyanobbing deposits	129
Railway Department, retrenchments and retirements	129
Government employees, retrenchments and retirements	129
Perth-Darwin airline—	
Statement as to operation	129
Tabling of file	130
Prior notice of question	130
BILL :	
Electoral Districts (Cancellation of Proclamation), assent	123
ADDRESS-IN-REPLY, THIRD DAY:	130
Speakers on amendment—	
Mr. Wild	130
Mr. Andrew	136
Mr. Heal	141
Mr. May	143
Mr. Graham	145
Mr. I. W. Manning	151
Mr. Hall	152
Mr. Brady	154
Mr. Court	157

CONTENTS—continued

Address-in-Reply, Thrd Day—continued	Page
Mr. W. Hegney	162
Mr. Evans	166
Mr. Grayden	168
Mr. J. Hegney	171
Mr. Rowberry	173
Mr. Oldfield	176
Mr. Bickerton	178
Mr. Jameson	180
Mr. Perkins	185

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

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (CANCELLATION OF PROCLAMATION) BILL

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

ITALIAN MARRIAGES

Tabling of Police Commissioner's Report

1. Mr. HAWKE asked the Minister for Police:

(1) Has the Commissioner of Police yet received a report regarding the allegations made at a recent Liberal and Country League Conference by Mrs. G. Offer of Brunswick Junction regarding Italian marriages?

(2) If so, will he please lay the report on the Table of the House?

(3) If not yet completed, will he lay the report on the Table after it becomes available?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes.

(3) Answered by Nos. (2) and (3).

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER

Salary and Duties of Mr. W. W. Mitchell

2. Mr. HAWKE asked the Premier:

(1) What salary per week is the Government paying Mr. W. W. Mitchell?

(2) What salary per week was paid by West Australian Newspapers Ltd. to Mr. Mitchell?

(3) What other expenditure has the Government involved itself in as a result of the appointment of Mr. Mitchell?

(4) What method or procedure does he follow in carrying out the duties for the Government?

(5) Is each individual Minister entitled to make a public statement without referring it in any way to Mr. Mitchell or anybody else?

Mr. BRAND replied:

(1) I have already informed the House that Mr. Mitchell's salary is £2,500 per year.

(2) This information is private as between West Australian Newspapers Ltd. and Mr. Mitchell.

(3) The provision of a typist and a Government office.

(4) Mr. Mitchell's contract requires him to promote the advancement of Western Australia through the field of public relations. Detailed procedure is now being worked out.

(5) Yes.

MIDLAND JUNCTION WORKSHOPS

Number of Employees

3. Mr. HAWKE asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) How many employees are there at the present time at the Midland Junction Railway Workshops?

(2) How many men are expected to be employed there at the conclusion of the Government's proposed five-year plan of reorganisation of the workshops?

(3) At what rate per year during each of the next five years is the present number of employees likely to be reduced?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) Wages and salaried staff — 2,843.

(2) and (3) The proposed five-year plan is still under consideration. Finality will not be reached until the new Commissioner has had a reasonable opportunity to inspect the whole of the W.A. Government Railways system and installations, after which he will confer with the Government on important matters of long-term policy, including the workshops.

PUBLIC SERVICE SALARIES

Government Review

4. Mr. TONKIN asked the Premier:

As it is reasonable to assume that when Mr. Townsing, as Public Service Commissioner, issued the reclassification of the officers in the Public Service he, either directly or indirectly, necessarily related the salaries to be paid to the salary which he, as head of the Public Service, was receiving, viz., £3,470, will he now cause a review of the Public Service salaries to be undertaken in view of the very substantial increase which the Government has made in the classification of the Public Service Commissioner, who now receives £3,800?

Mr. BRAND replied:

No. The reclassification of the Public Service was not in any way related to the salary paid to the Public Service Commissioner.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Number of Men Sacked, etc.

5. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Works:

(1) How many men have been sacked by the Government from the Public Works Department since it assumed office?

(2) Of this number, how many were from branches of the department other than the architectural branch?

(3) What is the number of employees at present engaged in the day-labour organisation of the Public Works Department?

(4) To what number does the Government intend to reduce this labour force by the end of this year?

(5) How many of the employees sacked by the Government have found employment elsewhere?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) 251.

(2) 98.

(3) 1,368 in the day-labour construction organisation of the architectural division.

(4) To approximately 850, at the rate of 20 per week.

(5) Of the 153 men retrenched from the architectural division, 60 have been placed in private employment through the efforts of the department.

6. *This question was postponed.*

SCHOOL BUS SERVICES

Additional Cost to Treasury

7. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Education:

(1) What is the anticipated additional cost to the Treasury for the financial year 1959-60 of the new policy in relation to school bus services which has been announced, and under which spurs are to be added to the routes?

(2) What limit, if any, will be observed in the total mileage to be covered by a school bus on a single trip to or from school?

Mr. WATTS replied:

(1) Some matters are still being investigated so no estimate is yet available.

(2) It is not likely that existing limits will be changed.

POLICE OFFICERS

Duty in Metropolitan Area.

8. Mr. CROMMELIN asked the Minister for Police:

(1) How many detectives are on duty in the metropolitan area—

(a) on Saturdays;

(b) on Sundays?

(2) How many police cars are available on active duty at nights, in case of emergency for committed crimes in the metropolitan area?

(3) How many foot police were actually on night beat in the City of Perth area after 11 p.m. on the 1st, 6th, 11th, 16th, 20th, 25th and 30th June?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

(1)—

(a) Perth: an average of 23 officers.
Fremantle: an average of 5 officers.

(b) Perth: an average of 5 officers.
Fremantle: an average of 2 officers.

Details of the shifts can be made available, if desired.

The inspector in charge of the branch, or his deputy, is on call and available day and night on either day.

(2) Three police cars and two vans are on active duty each night, and in an emergency at least 12 other cars would be available immediately.

(3) The number of foot police on night duty at Central Station—

June	Sergeants	Constables
1st	5	9
6th	4	13
11th	5	8
16th	6	14
20th	5	16
25th	4	12
30th	7	30

The increase on the 30th was due to a school completing training.

LOWER KING BRIDGE

New Construction

9. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Have surveys been carried out by the Main Roads Department, and plans drafted for the building of the new Lower King bridge, Albany?

(2) If so, can he give an approximate date for the commencement of work on same?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) Preliminary surveys have been made and planning is only at an early stage.

(2) The department has been heavily engaged on the Lower Kalgan bridge and now on the Upper King bridge. It is not proposed to make provision for the Lower King bridge until the 1960-61 programme.

TECHNICAL SCHOOL FOR ALBANY

Discussions Between Minister and Department

10. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Have discussions taken place between him and administration staff of the Education Department in respect to the building of a technical school at Albany?

(2) If not, does he contemplate discussing the matter of building a technical school at Albany, with the department?

(3) Have similar discussions taken place between him and the department, relative to the erection of a technical school at Bunbury?

Mr. WATTS replied:

(1) No.

(2) This will be discussed in connection with the overall development plans for the technical division.

(3) No.

PARLIAMENTARY SERVICES

Transfer to Private Concerns

11. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Premier:

Is there any likelihood of his Government handing over to private concerns the catering rights of the bar and dining room, the cleaning of Parliament House, and the reporting of Parliamentary proceedings?

Mr. BRAND replied:

No consideration has been given by the Government to such action.

SANDALWOOD

Royalty, Freight, Tonnage, etc.

12. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Forests:

(1) Does the State Government receive a royalty from the sale of sandalwood?

(2) If so, how much per ton is the royalty, and by whom is it paid?

(3) Who pays the carting subsidy on sandalwood from the source of pulling to the nearest railhead?

(4) Is freight on sandalwood despatched overseas payable by the Australian Sandalwood Co. or by the overseas purchaser?

(5) What was the total tonnage of sandalwood sold during 1958, and what was the total value of same?

(6) What was the average price paid by overseas purchasers last year for W.A. sandalwood?

(7) Is there any company in this State that treats sandalwood for the extraction of oils from same?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) £9 per ton, paid by the Australian Sandalwood Co. Ltd., of 69 King-st., Perth.

(3) The Australian Sandalwood Co. Ltd.

(4) By the Australian Sandalwood Co. Ltd.

(5) and (6) 421 tons from the 1st July, 1957 to the 30th June, 1958; 428 tons from the 1st July, 1958 to the 30th June, 1959. Collection and marketing of sandalwood is controlled by the Sandalwood Export Committee, comprising representatives

of the Western Australian and South Australian Governments and the Australian Sandalwood Co. Ltd. The agreement under which the company operates is of a confidential nature, as advised to the member for Kalgoorlie by the previous Minister for Forests in reply to a similar question on the 21st August, 1958.

(7) Yes. Plaimar Ltd. of 169 Havelock-st., West Perth.

WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT

Committee's Appointment and Report

13. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Was the committee which recently partially examined some phases of war service land settlement appointed by the Government or by the Country Party?

(2) Were any members of the War Service Land Settlement Board invited to accompany the committee?

(3) Has the committee furnished a report; and if so, to whom was it presented?

(4) Will he obtain a copy and lay it on the Table of the House?

Mr. NALDER replied:

(1) By the parliamentary Country Party.

(2) No.

(3) and (4) Answered by No. (1).

MARGARET-ST., MIDLAND JUNCTION

Flooding from Black Adder Creek

14. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Works:

Is it intended by the Public Works Department to give attention to the area at Margaret-st., North Midland Junction, which is subject to flooding, caused by overflow from Black Adder creek?

Mr. WILD replied:

The Main Roads Department is investigating the matter of providing road access to the area which is isolated by the flooding of Black Adder Creek.

MIDLAND JUNCTION HIGH SCHOOL

Adequate Playgrounds

15. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Has the Education Department finalised arrangements for adequate playgrounds for the Midland Junction High School?

(2) If not, can he give an approximate date when the high school can get use of the required area of playground to properly cater for the 1,700-odd students?

Mr. WATTS replied:

(1) Yes; negotiations for the purchase of 20 acres near the high school are completed and transfer, etc., is now being arranged.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

ONSLOW HOSPITAL

Date of Completion

16. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for Health:

What is the estimated date for completion of the new Onslow hospital?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

Date of completion is not known, but the Principal Architect has been asked to prepare plans for a new hospital on the new site opposite the existing hospital. It is hoped to commence construction during 1959-60, depending on the amount of loan funds available.

TRANSPORT OF BEANS

Freight Subsidy.

17. Mr. NORTON asked the Premier:

In view of a recent letter to me in which he stated that road subsidies were paid where rail services had ceased, would he subsidise the extra cost of transporting beans between Perth and Kalgoorlie due to the cancellation of the Kalgoorlie express on Thursdays?

Mr. BRAND replied:

Rail services have not ceased on the Perth-Kalgoorlie line. In any case, beans are not freighted at "Miscellaneous Class," the only rate which is subsidised by the Transport Board.

NARROGIN RAILWAY CROSSING AND BRIDGE

Tabling of Files Re Closure

18. Mr. W. A. MANNING asked the Minister for Railways:

Will he place on the Table of the House the departmental files dealing with the Egerton-st. railway crossing and overhead traffic bridge at Narrogin; and in particular, the file dealing with negotiations relating to the closure about the year 1916?

Mr. COURT replied:

Yes. I will table the Railway files 2311/1958 and 10207/1941 for one month.

The files were tabled.

BROOME

Provision of Deep-Water Port

19. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Premier:

(1) As Broome is the nearest port to the new township of Talgarno, what action is being taken by the Government to provide adequate facilities, as requested by the Broome Road Board, for the lifting of heavy cargoes which are consigned to Talgarno?

- (2) Is it the intention of the Government to honour the promise of the Hawke Labour Government and provide Broome with a deep-water port?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) Until dimensions and weights of heavy packages are known, it is not possible to state if they can all be handled over the Broome jetty. Information is being sought. The Harbour and Light Department in conjunction with Public Works engineers examines each case involving heavy lifts outside of normal shipments on receipt of notification of special consignments.
- (2) The whole question of deep-water ports for the West Kimberleys is currently being examined. Important technical and other considerations are involved and it will be some time before a final decision can be made.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

BETTING INQUIRY

Election Promises

1. Mr. HEAL asked the Premier:

During the election campaign, the Premier and the Deputy Premier told the people that if they were returned to office they would make an inquiry into allegations of bribes in relation to S.P. betting licenses. Besides the inquiry now being set up by the Premier, did he have any inquiries made at all from the Sporting Editor of *The West Australian* who is, I think, a Mr. Colingwood?

Mr. BRAND replied:

The reply to the question is: No, certainly not. At the elections, we undertook to have the inquiry made. We have appointed a topline man, in the person of Sir George Ligertwood, as Royal Commissioner. His Commission starts on Monday, the 13th, and the inquiry will be carried on in accordance with the regulations and laws governing Royal Commissions.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE

Admission of Public

2. Mr. BRADY asked the Speaker:

Would you, Sir, review the Standing Orders, or the procedure, to allow the public to sit in the galleries before the House is opened? Today, and on most days, the public have to be kept outside while the members say prayers. By the time the doors are opened to the public, several important matters have been dealt with. I understand that in the Federal Parliament, the public are

allowed to be in the House while prayers are said. I wish to ask if you would be favourable to the public being in the gallery while prayers are said.

The SPEAKER replied:

The usage in the British House of Commons, I understand, is that the public are excluded; and that is the normal procedure for us to follow. I believe it is the procedure followed by most Parliaments in the British Empire. However, I will consider the matter. I point out that I can check up on the position in the Federal House and find out what it is. But I think that, unless a very good case can be put forward, it is not likely that we will interfere with the existing practice. I will be pleased to discuss the matter with the hon. member.

Use of Speaker's Gallery

3. Mr. BRADY asked the Speaker:

In the event of the public galleries overflowing tonight, would you, Sir, permit the overflow to go into the Speaker's Gallery, which is empty at the moment?

The SPEAKER replied:

I will deal with that situation when it arises.

Mr. Brand: Why not put us out?

TALGARNO ROCKET RANGE

Safeguarding of Residents

4. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Premier:

Further to a question I asked last week, appertaining to safety precautions at Talgaro Rocket Range, is the Premier, since having discussions with the Commonwealth Minister concerned with this area, now in a position to assure the House that there is no danger to life from rockets or missiles? Also, can he give reasons for the erection of the shelters?

Mr. BRAND replied:

I did make some inquiries about this matter and I had a reply typed; therefore, I will delay making a full answer until tomorrow. However, I can assure the House that I am quite satisfied, as was the previous Premier following his discussions with Mr. Townley in Melbourne, that there will be no danger to any citizens in the area affected by the range.

STATE TRADING CONCERNS

Sale, and Continuity of Employment

5. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Premier:

I would draw the Premier's attention to a report on page 10 of the *Daily News* of the 15th June, 1959, under the heading of "Premier Brand on Whispering Campaign." The Premier said—

The State Government has not sold its sawmills nor has it opened any negotiations to do so.

We stick to our policy speech. We have already taken action over the State hotels. The three principles which we have enumerated regarding the State enterprises are:—"A fair and reasonable price; the protection of existing employees; the continuation of the enterprise within the economy of the State."

Would the Premier be good enough to explain concisely what he means by "the protection of existing employees and the continuation of the enterprise within the economy of the State"?

Mr. BRAND replied:

I should say that the words are simple and mean exactly what they say. We will honour those undertakings, and we will give that protection to the employees. I have no further comment to make on it.

6. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Premier:

Following the Premier's reply I would like to ask him whether his condition or principle in regard to the protection of the employees means that in any agreement or contract for the sale of a State trading concern or instrumentality the employees will be guaranteed a continuity of employment?

Mr. BRAND replied:

Whenever we do sell these State-owned concerns we will, as I explained during the election campaign, have regard for the welfare of the employees; and the conditions applying will then be laid down.

7. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Premier:

The Premier has said that the principles set out in regard to the protection of employees are simple. I asked him a specific question as to whether the employment of the workers who are now employed by the State, in the event of a concern being disposed of, would be guaranteed? Also, will they have a continuity of employment? Will the Premier answer those specific questions?

Mr. Heal: Yes or no.

Mr. BRAND replied:

When we went to the people we made certain statements and gave certain undertakings in our election pledge.

Mr. Tonkin: We will fire nobody!

Mr. BRAND:

In those undertakings we said that we would give consideration to disposing of State-owned concerns. We were returned to Government and we have laid down the conditions under which these businesses will be disposed

of. If they are disposed of we will honour those undertakings; and I do not intend to bind myself or the Government, or anyone else, to any other conditions until an actual agreement is being signed.

TRAMWAY DEPARTMENT

Retrenchments and Retirements

8. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister for Transport:

- (1) How many employees have been retrenched from the Tramway Department since the 1st April?
- (2) How many of these were over 50 years of age?
- (3) How many have been compulsorily retired on superannuation between the ages of 60 and 65?
- (4) By what number has the washcrew been reduced?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) Twelve permanent employees. Eleven temporary employees. Of these seven have been directed to other employment in their trade and are now employed; one was offered alternative employment in the department.
- (2) Five temporary and four permanent.
- (3) Four—these are included in the answer to No. (1).
- (4) The car-washing staff has increased by one.

Repairs, etc., of Vehicles

9. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Did Tramway employees previously carry out repairs, such as panel-beating and motor-trimming on Tramway Department and M.T.T. vehicles?
- (2) What firm now carries out these repairs?
- (3) What firm enjoys the spring-making orders from the Tramway Department and M.T.T.?
- (4) If the answer to No. (1) is in the affirmative—
 - (a) What has become of the employees thus engaged?
 - (b) If these employees have been transferred to other sections, have any other employees been retrenched to make way for the former?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) Tramway employees have carried out and still are carrying out repairs on Tramway Department vehicles. Certain repairs such as

motor-trimming and some electrical work were carried out on M.T.T. vehicles for a short period.

- (2) Tramway Department and M.T.T.
- (3) Various firms.
- (4) Still engaged in the same type of work in tramway workshops.

IRON ORE

Koolyanobbing Deposits

10. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Premier:
Is it a fact that the Commonwealth Government has now granted an export license for 1,000,000 tons of iron ore from Koolyanobbing?

Mr. BRAND replied:

No.

RAILWAY DEPARTMENT

Retrenchments and Retirements

11. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) How many employees have been retrenched from the Railway Department since the 1st April?
- (2) How many of these were over 50 years of age?
- (3) How many have been compulsorily retired on superannuation between the ages of 60 and 65 years?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) There has been no retrenchment of normal railway staff during this period. But due to seasonal suspension of relaying work and completion of other works which were carried out under Australian Workers' Union award conditions, and for which they were specifically engaged, the services of 26 men have been terminated.
- (2) Personal details of temporary workers on relaying and other reconstruction and construction work are not recorded and the information is therefore not available.
- (3) Nil.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Retrenchments and Retirements

12. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Premier:

- (1) How many employees have been retrenched by the Government from all departments other than the Tramway Department and Railway Department since the 1st April?
- (2) How many of these were over 50 years of age?
- (3) How many have been compulsorily retired on superannuation between the ages of 60 and 65 years?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) 286, including 14 casuals;
- (2) and (3) This information is being obtained; we did not have sufficient time to get it together.

PERTH-DARWIN AIRLINE

Statement as to Operation

13. Mr. GUTHRIE asked the Minister for Transport:

In view of the announcement in last Friday's *Daily News* concerning the possibility of a new airline operating between Perth and Darwin, and the comment that such announcement has raised in the community, would the Minister be prepared to make a statement to the House of the exact position?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

So far as I am aware the reporter of the *Daily News* did not receive any of his information from the State Government departments. I do not know from what source he received his information, but it was approximately accurate. As the member for Subiaco has indicated, since then there have been a good many questions asked, both by Press men and other people. An application was made by another airline for the right to operate an air transport service to the North-West and—withstanding the lecture which the member for Melville gave us last week, on the need for the Government to observe the law—on that particular occasion the then Government entirely ignored the law, and Cabinet overrode the Transport Board.

Mr. Graham: That is completely untrue!

Mr. PERKINS: It gave that particular concern the right to operate the service between here and Darwin, calling at intermediate points on the North-West coast. A letter appears on the files relating to this subject. It was written by that company and signed by one of its directors wishing the previous Government the best of luck at the elections.

Mr. Graham: There should be more of it.

Mr. PERKINS: The position now is that this Government has ascertained that the previous Government acted illegally; and, after advice from the Crown Law Department, another application was requested from the company in question to the Transport Board and that has now been considered by the

board. No decision has yet been made pending further information from the Federal Department of Civil Aviation.

Tabling of File

In order to avoid any further rumours in regard to this matter, I have brought the file with me, and I move—

That Transport Board file 199/59 be laid on the Table of the House for two sitting days.

Mr. HAWKE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to amend the motion just moved by the Minister for Transport. I move—

That the words "two sitting days" be deleted and the words "two weeks" substituted.

Mr. PERKINS: The only reason I moved for two days is that—

Mr. Hawke: You didn't want anybody to have a look!

Mr. PERKINS: That is not so. We did want everybody to have a look; that is the exact purpose. I desire everyone to have a look. The only complication is that the file will not be available to the department in the meantime, and it could be that the company, which has made application for the license will not be able to get a decision until after the file has gone back to the department.

Mr. Graham: The department can have a look at the file while it is lying on the Table of the House.

Mr. PERKINS: The member for East Perth knows full well the difficulties attendant on a matter of this nature.

Mr. Hawke: The Transport Board is less than a hundred yards away.

Mr. PERKINS: If the Leader of the Opposition feels that two weeks is more satisfactory, I am quite prepared to agree to it.

Amendment put and passed.

Motion, as amended, put and passed.

Prior Notice of Question

14. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Transport:

Usually, when questions are asked here without notice, the Minister indicates, when replying, whether he has received notice of the question. In view of the fulness of the Minister's answer to the previous question, I would like to know whether he had prior notice of this question.

Mr. PERKINS replied:

I did, early this afternoon, in time to enable me to obtain the file from the department.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

Third Day

Debate resumed from the 2nd July on the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply to which Mr. Hawke (Northam) had moved an amendment to add 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. WILD (Dale—Minister for Works—on amendment) [5.71: Last Thursday we listened to a further lecture from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition who, as we all know, in years gone by was a school teacher. He waved his arms around, and shed crocodile tears about the men who were thrown out of work by the Government's policy—which, incidentally, was given to the people of Western Australia on dozens of occasions by the leader and the deputy leader of the Government party. Everyone on this side of the House informed his electors that that would be the Government's policy, if the Liberal-Country Party was returned to office. The electors were informed that there would be a change-over from day labour to contract and tender in regard to the work being undertaken by the Government.

Points of Order

Mr. J. HEGNEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask you if you have given written authority for the photographers to take photographs of this sitting of Parliament.

The SPEAKER: I gave them authority to take one photograph of the people in the gallery.

Mr. MAY: On a further point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask you from where you got your information that there would be people in the gallery today.

The SPEAKER: I think the member for Collie has been in the House long enough to realise that points of order of that nature cannot be taken while an hon. member is speaking.

Debate Resumed.

Mr. WILD: As I was saying, when I was so rudely interrupted, the policy we are recommending—to the dissatisfaction, mainly, of members on the other side of the House—was put to the people of

Western Australia by every member of the Liberal-Country Party. The electors in the north, south, east, and west of the State were informed of this policy. So when a change of Government came, everybody in Western Australia knew full well that if we were men worthy of our salt we would do what we said we would do if we were returned to office.

We have no beg pardons to make and, as the one who is implementing that policy, I offer no apologies for doing so. All I am doing to the best of my ability is to honour the promise we gave to the thousands of electors in Western Australia who, in the interests of Western Australia, felt that there should be a change of Government.

During the course of his dissertation the other evening, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition made many statements, most of which were incorrect.

Mr. Tonkin: Prove that!

Mr. WILD: One by one I shall debunk them, for his edification, and for the edification of the people at the State Engineering Works whom he endeavoured to incite to hold, what he called, a constitutional protest.

The first is his statement that these men protested that I would not see them. We know that they protested at all sorts of meetings, some of which, if one were to believe the Press, were apparently not approved by the party to which members opposite belong. I understand that some 150 men did, one day, assemble outside the Public Works Department. That happened to be a day when a Cabinet meeting was held. At no stage have I refused to see anyone who has asked to see me.

I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, as he was a Cabinet Minister as recently as three months ago, whether it is standard practice for Cabinet Ministers to leave a Cabinet meeting, if a few riotous people are incited to assemble at one of the Government Departments, and hear what they have to say? I repeat that at no stage when a union representative or anybody else has requested to see me, have I refused.

The second point that was raised by the Leader of the Opposition was the question of the apprentices at the State Engineering Works being sacked. I wish to quote his exact words when he was referring to the State Engineering Works and the dismissal of 39 men in a matter of three or four weeks. He had this to say—

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.

The next passage is the one to which I would like to draw attention. It states—

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.

The hon. member knows better than I that it has not been standard practice in Western Australia for years and years past—whether it be in the Public Works Department or the railways—for apprentices to be carried on in their employment.

I shall now quote for the benefit of members a minute written by the Mechanical and Plant Engineer dated the 3rd July, 1959, in reply to my question as to whether it was standard practice for these apprentices to be kept on. This is what he had to say—

State Engineering Works, in common with most engineering workshops, normally pay off apprentices upon completion of apprenticeship, with the following exceptions:—

- (a) In the case of an exceptionally good apprentice where sufficient work is available to warrant retention.
- (b) In the case of acute shortage of tradesmen on the market for employment, a greater proportion of the apprentices would be retained after completion of apprenticeship.

So it was not standard practice at the time the hon. member was a Cabinet Minister.

Mr. Tonkin: Have you any figures to prove your argument?

Mr. WILD: I do not need any figures to prove my argument. When I receive a minute from the Mechanical and Plant Engineer I am prepared to accept it. I hope the hon. member did likewise when he was on this side of the House.

The next point is the reference by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to the State Engineering Works and the supply of school desks. He stated that the State Engineering Works was now being denied the right to make these school desks, a right which it had had for many years.

Mr. Tonkin: I said that your Government called for tenders.

Mr. WILD: I would like to read, for the benefit of this House, a circular which was sent out following an instruction—and I offer no apologies for this—that tenders were to be called for the supply of these desks. As a result the following circular, dated the 18th June, 1959, was sent out

by the Tender Board calling for tubular steel school desks and chairs. It was sent to the following firms:—

Cyclone.
Sheet Metal Workers.
Reliance Engineering.
State Engineering Works.
Altona Engineering.
Evans Agencies Ltd.
Supa Furn.
Jason Metal Furniture.
G.S.M. Sheet Metal.
Winters.
Bouchers Industries.
Joyce Bros.
Vawser & Sons.
Dunn Bros.
Chromecrafts.
Hanin Manufacturing Co.
N. Hoffman.
J. C. Pizey.
Alma Engineering.
Malloch Bros.
F. & P. Structural Engineering.
Rowe & Parks.

The tender schedule number is A4/28. The circular is in the following terms:—

I wish to advise that the board is now calling tenders for the supply of school desks and chairs under the above schedule and the requirements are as follows:—

5,000 single desks and 6,000 dual desks and 14,000 chairs.

If you are interested in tendering you may obtain copies of the drawings and specifications on application to the Tender Board Office, 74 Murray Street, Perth.

There was an opportunity for the State Engineering Works to submit tenders along with other firms. When the tenders close, then is the time for the Tender Board to determine whether the tender from the State Engineering Works is to be accepted, assuming its price is right.

It is fairly apparent that the previous Government, in its wisdom, did exactly the same thing in the first two years it was in office, because I have here a report on the manufacture of school furniture by the State Engineering Works. It is a report made by the Treasury Inspector to the Under Treasurer and states—

The manufacture of school desks and chairs at the present is carried out at the State Engineering Works. In December 1948 a contract was let under Tender Board Schedule 367A/1948 to the State Engineering Works for 5,500 desks. A contract for chairs was let at the same time to the Altona Engineering Works.

In August 1951 a further 6,000 desks were provided as an addition to the above contract and a further supply of chairs from the Altona Engineering Works.

In 1954, which was 12 months after the change of Government, the Minister directed that an order for the manufacture of 11,500 dual desks and 1,000 single units be placed at the State Engineering Works. Tenders were called for the supply of chairs and the contract was let to Altona Engineering Works. So it was pretty obvious at that stage that the Government thought the letting of a contract right and proper. In October, 1955, there was a change of front, because the Minister directed that desks and chairs for high schools were to be manufactured by the State Engineering Works without the calling of tenders. The circular states that the calling of tenders was discontinued under ministerial direction.

Mr. Brand: What happened to the employees of the private firms?

Mr. WILD: That is a very good interjection by the Premier. What happened to the employees of the private firms at the time when the change-over from contract to day labour took place? Were any crocodile tears shed?

Mr. Tonkin: The point I raised the other evening was that I would be watching if the Government accepted a contract price in excess of the price for which the State Engineering Works did the job.

Mr. WILD: The next point referred to by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition the other evening was that the Premier was endeavouring to convince this House that he would save money with his new policy. It is very interesting to see the result of the tenders that have been let by the Government since we took office.

Mr. Tonkin: It certainly is.

Mr. WILD: It is very interesting, and I want to inform the House that I have here all the tenders that have been let and accepted since the change of Government; and so far the result has been that the total estimate of the department was £1,334,276, and the tender price accepted is £1,258,056, making a net saving in two months to this State of £76,220. I have no doubt that many members want water services and additional schools, and that is where the money is coming from—a saving of 5.7 per cent.

Mr. Tonkin: Has the Minister, in that list, the equipment for the Government Printing Works?

Mr. WILD: I could not say without going right through the list. But I can assure the hon. member he can peruse the list if he desires; and if he can find any information of use to him, good luck to him!

Mr. Hawke: A contract was let to Tomlinsons but I very much doubt whether tenders were called.

Mr. WILD: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition also had something to say the other evening about the fibrous plasterers.

Mr. Hawke: Does the Minister propose to lay those papers on the Table of the House?

Mr. WILD: They can be.

Mr. Hawke: You have quoted from them so they have a right to be.

Mr. WILD: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition mentioned the fibrous plasterers. I would say that the facts are not disputed; because, strangely enough, the contracts among the firms which did tender for that type of work were for a job apparently approximating £25,000. But they were not all the same, as the hon. member implied. I have here picked out a case in which four tenders were received. These are as follows:—

	£
Perth Modelling Works	24,440
H. B. Brady	25,441
Ceilyd	25,841
Cowans	25,910

Therefore, if there was a bottleneck, it must have been broken. They are the tender prices in recent weeks.

Mr. Tonkin: On what date was that?

Mr. WILD: Only on the 12th March, 1959. I want to come now to this question of the apprentices in the day-labour organisation in the Public Works Department, and the fact that the hon. member implied that they are being sacked.

Mr. Tonkin: And aren't they?

Mr. WILD: It is as far from the truth as it is possible to be.

Mr. Tonkin: Aren't they?

[The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Roberts) took the Chair.]

Mr. WILD: No; because I issued an instruction at the very beginning that no apprentices were to be sacked; and as a result, when I heard that there were a certain number of apprentices in the first three months of the probationary period, in order that I could satisfy myself and settle down, knowing where I was going—. It is all right for members opposite to laugh; but the trouble with them is that they do not know where to hang their hats.

Mr. Hawke: We will hang you before long.

Mr. Jamieson: Not where you are.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Roberts): Order!

Mr. WILD: Not one apprentice has been sacked from the Public Works Department since the changeover and there is no necessity for one to be sacked at all because at the same time as making an application to the court to give us a further time to review the situation, I was informed that whilst the ratio of apprentices to tradesmen did apply when they were first employed, it did not apply when it came in reverse. When I found out, I gave instructions to the Principal Architect that no apprentice was to be sacked in this retrenchment period in the Public Works Department.

Mr. Tonkin: You woke up when the unions threatened to prosecute.

Mr. WILD: Let us have a look at what has actually happened to the employees at the Public Works Department. This was as at last Friday. Of those men, 153 have been retrenched. Of the 153, a total of 77 registered for employment with the Commonwealth Employment Service. The department found jobs for 60 of them, 72 resigned, and 76 did not register.

The report of the Director of Labour and National Service makes very interesting reading, bearing in mind the fact that 77 men of the 153 whose services were dispensed with registered at the employment service, and yet at the change-over of Governments, over the signature of the Regional Director, dated the 3rd July—as close to it as we can get, the 3rd July being last Friday—there were 538 building tradesmen out of work.

But last Friday that number had dropped to 450, so that we are 88 men better off, even though 77 of them had to register because they had their services terminated at the Public Works Department. Therefore, in effect, in round figures, 150 more building tradesmen are being employed than at the change-over of Government.

Mr. Hawke: It is more likely they have gone East.

Mr. Norton: Do all unemployed men register?

Mr. Toms: They left because of the insecurity.

Mr. Heal: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would the Minister for Works check his figures. His total figure—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Roberts): Order! There is no point of order.

Mr. WILD: I think it would be rather interesting to indicate to the House what was done at the Public Works Department to cushion the effect on any man whose services were to be dispensed with. The first thing done was to find a suitable officer to act as liaison to myself, and I had recommended to me the Chief Clerk of the Public Works Department, Mr. Ellis. I want to assure the House that that officer has given excellent service, and a better choice could not have been made.

This policy of change-over was to be carried out over a period of 18 months—which meant, in effect, that the services of approximately 20 men were dispensed with each week. I asked Mr. Ellis to notify the Master Builders' Association, the Builders' Guild, the painters' and plumbers' associations, and the Commonwealth Employment Service, of the names and trades of the men who were to be dismissed, 14 days prior to the actual dismissal.

The following letter, dated the 4th May, was sent to the Builders' Guild, and also to the Regional Director of Commonwealth Employment, and the Master Builders' Association:

Dear Mr. Mattiske,

It is the intention of the Government to implement its policy of predominantly letting contracts by tender and at the same time effect the changeover from day labour with as little disruption as possible.

It has been decided at the Public Works Department to effect this change as follows:—Mr. R. Ellis, telephone 218721, Chief Clerk in the Principal Architect's Branch, will act as liaison between the Public Works Department and outside building interests. When it becomes necessary to dispense with the services of certain building tradesmen, etc., he will 14 days before their dismissal forward to the Master Builders' Association, the Builders' Guild and the Commonwealth Employment Office, the names, addresses and trades of the men whose services are to be dispensed with. The Master Builders' Association and the Builders' Guild are requested to co-operate when requiring further building tradesmen by ascertaining from the liaison officer, P.W.D., if any building tradesmen are available due to the changeover. By this method it is hoped to disrupt as little as possible the employment of men in the Public Works Department and bring about a gradual changeover in regard to their employment.

My final paragraph was—

It is my intention to review this policy continually, as the Government is determined there is to be as little disruption as possible. If it is found that private building interests are not absorbing the major portion of the building trades employees from the P.W.D. further consideration will have to be given to the whole undertaking.

Yours faithfully,

G. P. Wild,
Minister for Works.

That was an indication to the employers that they would be advised, 14 days previously, of who was to have his services dispensed with; and, as members have already been told, that policy has borne fruit, because, of the 153 men whose services have been dispensed with, employment has already been found for 60. I heard, as other hon. members did, that there was some talk of a stoppage, and so I wrote the following letter to the secretary of the Building Trades Association

of Unions of Western Australia, Mr. R. W. Clohessy, Room 6, 102 Beaufort-st., Perth:—

I have been advised unofficially that there is a possibility of a number of stop work meetings on building projects now being undertaken by the Public Works Department being held tomorrow, to be followed by a mass meeting of building trades employees on Saturday week. While it is your inherent right to ventilate a protest against any eventuality to your members in regard to their employment, etc., I would like to point out that the steps being taken by the present Government are only in keeping with the policy upon which it was elected to be the Government of this State in March last. As indicated to you in my letter of the 6th of May, you can assure your members that I am personally going to watch the position very closely and if it is found that the building tradesmen being displaced from the P.W.D. are not in the main being taken up by outside builders, then the whole matter will have to receive further consideration. The policy to be followed is a gradual changeover from day labour to contract and as yet there is no indication of any job already started by the P.W.D. not being completed, with the exception of the R. & I. Bank building.

It is anticipated that the work force at the Public Works Department will be slowly dissipated over a period of from 12 to 18 months, with the exception of the maintenance section, which will be permanently retained. Tenders have already been called for several outside projects and whilst there may be a small period of time during the changeover when some men could be out of employment, it is hoped that the change of place of employment of employees from the P.W.D. to outside contractors will be effected with as little disruption as possible.

In order to minimise the effect of the change arrangements have been made to notify the Master Builders' Association, the Builders' Guild and the Commonwealth Employment Office of the names, addresses and trades of the men whose services are to be dispensed with, 14 days prior to their dismissal. In addition, a liaison officer has been appointed at the Public Works Department to assist in the change-over and to give any information to the outside employing interests regarding men who will shortly be available for private employment.

Furthermore the men, on dismissal, are to be advised to report immediately to the nearest Commonwealth

employment agency, with a view to their being able to obtain employment benefits immediately they are dismissed, and the policy of dismissals will be last on first off, except in exceptional circumstances which I shall personally review. All of the foregoing action is being taken, I feel sure you will appreciate, in the interests of those who are to be displaced and for the purpose of minimising the effect of any change in venue of employment. The Government feels confident that the change in policy in regard to day labour employees will in the long run be not only to their benefit but to the benefit of those in the building industry generally as it is considered there will be more jobs completed for the same amount of money which is made available by the Government year by year. I trust that you will see that this information is passed on to the men who, it is understood, are going to hold these stop work meetings and I feel certain that, on reflection, sane counsel will prevail.

Mr. Tonkin: What is the date of that?
[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Mr. WILD: It is the 13th of May. I have great regard for the average working man—members opposite may laugh, but I say it does not cast great credit on the Deputy Leader of the Opposition when he goes down to the State Engineering Works as he did today at lunchtime, with Mr. Clohessy, and tries to stir the men up to come here and cause trouble—

Mr. Tonkin: I ask for an unqualified withdrawal of the Minister's statement that I went down there to cause trouble. For his edification, Mr. Speaker, I can tell him that I went down there to stop trouble. The words are offensive to me, because they are totally untrue, and I ask for an unqualified withdrawal.

Mr. WILD: In deference to the hon. member, who was at the State Engineering works, talking to the men there, I withdraw. If there is any man who should stop preaching class hatred to the workers, and who is always talking about peace in industry and the desirability of bringing money and industry to this country, it is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, whom the State recently sent overseas—I have no objection to that—to try to bring industry to this State. He should be the last man to go among the workers and in any way cause dissatisfaction among them in regard to the policy that is being implemented by the Government today.

Mr. Rowberry: If you have regard for the working man, why did you state in that letter that there would be more work done by private enterprise for the same amount of money?

Mr. WILD: In reply to the hon. member, I say that the figures I have given show that in the hon. member's electorate there will probably be a few extra classrooms built with the money being saved.

Mr. Tonkin: Let us see what an examination of your figures will show.

Mr. Hawke: We would want a close examination of your figures. They would be cooked, I imagine.

Mr. WILD: At the present time we are being subjected to criticism and abuse by a certain section of the community; and that abuse is being fanned by a few people because of the fact that we are implementing our policy. It is interesting to look back, in the little volume which I have here, and which contains copies of reports from *The West Australian* and other leading papers in this State, to see what is going on within the union movement and the hierarchy in Beaufort-st., in regard to this change-over.

Here we have Mr. Chamberlain, Dr. Evatt's offside, for the first time saying that the Communists are coming into this; and he sent a circular around to all the trade union secretaries warning them that the Communists were interfering in this dispute. To my way of thinking the best thing which could have happened in this dispute was when Mr. Troy, Mr. Cahill, and Mr. Mutton came as a deputation to me, because that showed the whole thing in its true perspective.

Look at members opposite shuddering, because they know what I say is true! It was the best thing that could have happened in this dispute, when the Communists allied themselves with some of the men at the Trades Hall, who are now trying to shake them off. I have here the Press cuttings, if anyone wants to see them. In effect, Mr. Chamberlain says, "Now boys, when the Communists are in this, keep out." It is very difficult for the hierarchy in Beaufort-st. to know where to hang their hats in this dispute; because without a doubt the Government has proved conclusively that its policy was right, and has found more employment for building tradesmen than was available when the previous Government was in office.

During the three months prior to Christmas last year one did not hear anything about protest meetings; or about 200 or 300 people coming to Parliament House, when my predecessor sacked 250 men—

Mr. Tonkin: Yes one did!

Mr. WILD: We did not have the galleries of this Chamber full—

Mr. Tonkin: Stick to the truth!

Mr. WILD: The 250 men were put off in a short space of time, but we did not see crocodile tears from the then Minister for Works. When one looks through the files

it is apparent that the previous Government was going to sack 450 men; and had it not been for the good offices of the then Premier and Treasurer, 450 men would have been put off. It is all there on the files; when they got the extra money, the number was brought back to 250.

I repeat that there was not then this agitation all over the place, and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was not talking to the employees of the State Engineering Works. However, I wish to assure the House that we will stick to our guns, and I assure every worker in the Public Works Department that he will be looked after to the best of our ability. Members opposite may laugh—

Uproar.

The SPEAKER: We do not usually have such demonstrations in this House, and it is evident why we are having them today. I expect members to conduct themselves today as they normally conduct themselves during the sittings of this House. The Minister may continue.

Mr. WILD: The trouble is that the truth hurts. It has been disappointing to members opposite to find that the programme which we mapped out is working so well. They cannot refute the figures as quoted by the Deputy Director of the Commonwealth Employment Service in this State. Those figures show that there are 88 fewer building tradesmen out of work than there were when the present Government took office and began to implement the change-over from day labour to contract. There is not an atom of truth in the statement by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that this Government is throwing men to the wolves.

We are implementing the policy enunciated on the public platform before the election in March last; and I can assure members we will carry that policy through. I venture to say that in a few months' time it will be difficult to get building tradesmen in Western Australia.

Several members interjected.

Mr. WILD: One can already see the results of the confidence that has already been instilled among those engaged in industry in this State. That is proved by the figures. Already more men are being employed in the building industry of Western Australia than during the past year or so.

Mr. W. Hegney: How many men do you propose to dismiss over a period of 18 months?

Mr. WILD: We intend to dismiss the Public Works Department men at the rate of approximately 20 a week. That will apply to the remainder of the Public Works Department work force, with the exception of the maintenance gang, which will be retained. At that rate it will take approximately 15 to 18 months for all the men to be assimilated in private employment. I am certain that by that time all

those men will be happily engaged building for contractors outside the Public Works Department with the knowledge that they have secure employment, which is more than they have today.

Mr. W. Hegney: You will dismiss 1,500 men.

Mr. WILD: One has only to look at the records to see the ups and downs in the employment graph. Much has been said about permanent employment in the Public Works Department, but these men were no more permanent than we are. The employment graph went up and down every day.

Mr. Tonkin: It will be all down from now on.

Mr. WILD: It will be up in every industry; and, with the confidence the people have shown in the Government, and with the confidence that has been instilled into those people who are willing to invest their capital in this State, I am sure that money will begin to flow into Western Australia in the not too distant future. And, when that time comes, there will not be sufficient tradesmen for building purposes. I oppose the amendment.

The SPEAKER: Does the Leader of the Opposition wish to reply?

Mr. HAWKE: I have no right of reply, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker. If you offer me one, I will gladly take it.

MR. ANDREW (Victoria Park—on amendment) [5.47]: I support the amendment to the Address-in-reply—moved by the Leader of the Opposition—protesting against the sacking of many employees in the Public Works Department and also against the action of the Government in depriving many unemployed single persons of the benefit of supplementary assistance.

The Minister for Works made many statements to some of which I want to reply. He spoke of Government policy in saving large sums of money. By depriving single unemployed persons of the allowance of 17s. 6d. a week granted to them by the previous Administration, the Government is saving nearly £50,000 a year. This action has caused a great deal of hardship. In answer to many questions asked on this subject, the Premier has replied that the payment of 17s. 6d. a week would be paid to all those persons who were suffering hardship. However, when he was asked to supply the figures regarding those persons who are now being paid 17s. 6d. a week by the Government, he could not say that even one person was receiving such benefit.

Single unemployed persons, and those classified as such, are undoubtedly suffering great hardship. Several people in Victoria Park have approached me since this payment has been stopped, and I suggest that the Government should reconsider its decision in regard to these

unfortunate cases. One woman who interviewed me was receiving £1 for working one day a week, and 15s. for working another half-day a fortnight. She was also receiving 17s. 6d. a week paid to her by the Hawke Government. How she lived on that allowance, I do not know.

However, despite her small income, payment of 17s. 6d. a week was refused her. She had expected to receive that money on the Thursday, and she did not have a shilling in the house. As a result she had to wait for money until the following Tuesday when she was paid the £1 for the day on which she worked. In spite of this, the Government stated that assistance would be granted to necessitous cases.

By withdrawing this assistance to those deserving people the Government is saving £50,000 a year. I have learned of another woman who was classified as a single person who had to cease work for some particular reason. She had three or four children, and her income was supplemented by the payment of 17s. 6d. a week which she received whilst the Hawke Government was in office. Of course, she has now been deprived of that amount every week, and she is in dire straits. There are several other cases that I know of; but those two will illustrate to the House that the Government, in acting the way it has done, without making any inquiries into the merits of each case, has been harsh and indifferent to the welfare of the people who were receiving that allowance.

If it is the policy of the Government to save £48,000 a year by withdrawing this assistance from those people who are badly in need of it, it is welcome to it; but I am certain that the Hawke Government would not follow such a policy. Of course, that is the difference between the policies of the two parties. The Hawke Government tried to alleviate the lot of these people. The Minister also stated that there would not be any apprentices dismissed from the P.W.D. If he intends to dismiss the tradesmen in that department, who will teach the apprentices?

Mr. Hawke: The Minister!

Mr. ANDREW: When the Minister was speaking I interjected by asking that same question, and the Leader of the Opposition gave the same reply as he has now. However, to be quite frank, I do not think he would be competent. He would show the same competence in that direction as I surmise he will show in running his department. Another unpleasant remark made by the Minister was in regard to Troy being a member of a deputation who waited upon him; and in linking Troy—to use his own words—with the Beaufort-st. hierarchy. I wish to tell the Minister that Troy has nothing to do with the Labour Party; and I can assure him that

no Communist can take part in any meeting held under the auspices of the A.L.P. or any of its branches. That has been pointed out many times in the past.

I do not suppose anyone would say that Harold Holt, the Commonwealth Minister, is mixed up with Communism; nevertheless, he has had many conferences with Jim Healy, General Secretary of the Waterside Workers' Federation. When Harold Holt goes to see Jim Healy he greets him with, "How are you Jim?"; and Jim Healy generally says, "How are you Harold?" I am not trying to imply—as the Minister did—that Harold Holt is contaminated with Communism, but the Minister apparently can make nasty inferences and nothing is said about it.

Mr. Perkins: I have never heard of Harold Holt taking a Communist along as a member of a deputation to wait upon anybody.

Mr. ANDREW: That has nothing to do with the Labour Party. If the Minister cannot differentiate between the A.L.P. and certain unions, I cannot help him, unfortunately.

Mr. Hawke: Nobody can!

Mr. ANDREW: The Minister stated that dissatisfaction had been whipped up among those men who are now in the public gallery, and who have held many meetings protesting against this threat to their livelihood. Surely the Minister has the commonsense to realise that men will fight when their livelihood is at stake, as it is now. Their dissatisfaction has not been whipped up. In fact, we have tried to direct their activities into quieter channels than those they wished to follow. We have tried to direct their efforts in a proper direction. However, again that is only an assertion on the part of the Minister; and as he did not back his statement with facts and figures, it cannot be substantiated.

The Premier stated that the Government had a mandate to implement this part of its policy. If we cast our minds back to the days prior to the general election, we will recall that the so-called conservatives—the Liberal Party, which has never had a positive policy—endeavoured to instil fear into the hearts of the people by the same old methods they have always used. Someone was instrumental in having a barrel of bitumen tossed into the Swan River, and shortly afterwards headlines appeared in the Press over a report about pollution in the river.

Another instance concerned a happening which has been going on for 20 years—namely, effluent appearing in the ocean near the outlet pipe from the sewage works. Because of certain reports of effluent in that area large headlines appeared in the Press. We heard also, through the Press, of a beach inspector

called Alver. I do not know what privileges that gentleman received from the Liberal Party.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member must confine his remarks to the amendment before the Chair.

Mr. ANDREW: I think I am speaking to the amendment, Mr. Speaker, because the Government has stated that it has a mandate to act as it has done. There were other factors which influenced the election result; it was not this policy that influenced the people to vote for the Liberal-Country Party Government. That is the point I am trying to make.

As I was saying, any slight occurrence that might embarrass the Government then in office was always headlined in the Press so that the people might gain the impression that the previous Government was not doing its job. It was those factors and the attention given to them in the Press—which far outweighed their importance—that were influential in swaying many people to vote for the Liberal-Country Party candidates; and, unfortunately, they are now suffering as a result.

I do not think the policy of introducing the contract system in place of the day-labour system had anything to do with the general election and the Government being returned to office. The Liberal and Country Parties have always been indifferent to the welfare of the ordinary people.

Sir Ross McLarty: That is not true!

Mr. Lawrence: Of course it's true!

Mr. ANDREW: The interjection by the member for Murray brings a story to mind. There was once a woman whose husband was a heavy drinker. Before continuing with this story I would point out that I am not implying, in any way, that the member for Murray is a heavy drinker. This man kept his wife short of money. However, he did most of his drinking at home. On the Monday, when the bottle-o came for the bottles, the woman next door said to his wife, when she saw all these bottles being sold, "My word! It's a pity your husband drinks so much!" The woman said, "That's all right. The more he drinks the more money I get for the bottles."

That is just about how much the Liberal Party considers the workers. Its primary and major concern is with big business interests. Any crumbs which fall from the table—like the bottles from the drinker—are for the workers.

Mr. Brand: Is that your story in support of the restoration of the 17s. 6d. a week sustenance?

Mr. ANDREW: I am certainly in support of the restoration.

Mr. Brand: Did you tell that story in support of it?

Mr. ANDREW: That is just about what one can expect from the mind of the Premier! He is putting his neck out when he says that these people are hard up through drinking, because that is far from the truth.

The building trades have always been very hard for the workers engaged therein. They have to work in all weather—rain, hail, or shine. In the past they have received intermittent work. There is no continuity and there is no security in the ordinary course of events, except on a few private jobs and in Government jobs. The workers might receive a job lasting a week, a month, six months, or longer if they are extremely lucky. Normally these men lose quite a lot of time in the course of their work.

Another factor in regard to their work is that it is an active occupation. If one were to watch building tradesmen working one would see that they have to climb up ladders and over obstacles. When the worker reaches 50 years of age he finds it very hard to obtain employment. Even the few private contractors—and these are the people the Government supports so keenly—often will not engage building trades workers if they are over 40 years of age. So, quite often, they have a pretty difficult time getting a job.

Not only do they face the difficulties I have outlined but also other factors, such as contract labour—that is, piecework being carried on in the industry. This piecework undermines the conditions and standards of the workers in the building industry. For instance, if a contractor wants a job done, and there are unemployed workers around, he can say to them, "What price will you do that job for?" If there is competition for the job, the worker will give a price, quite often below ordinary wages, and he has to work long overtime during week-ends and holidays in order to obtain a decent wage return. This factor has caused the Carpenters' Union—one of the unions in this State—a great deal of concern. It tried to overcome the position.

In 1938, Mr. Justice Wolff, in a case before him, expressed the opinion that the introduction of the principle of preference to unionists would enable the unions to exercise some discipline over the operatives in the trade, and the preference clause was brought in as an experiment. Examining this position in the light of our present-day knowledge, the unions' fears have been realised. Persons wishing to go subcontracting have resigned from the unions; and assuming that there are 800 carpenters operating as subcontractors, they are destroying conditions in the industry.

Whilst the preference clause has proved of great value in preventing subcontracting from becoming the universal practice in the industry, it has not proved a sufficient deterrent because subcontracting is being carried on in the main by

non-unionists. In other words, if unionists begin to subcontract, they can be penalised by the unions; but if they resign from the unions, they can carry on subcontracting. The union has enforced penalties on members for engaging in subcontract work, and in a great number of cases the member has tendered his resignation.

Mr. Justice Jackson, the President of the Arbitration Court, expressed the opinion that in the post-war period, abnormal conditions continued to operate in the industry until 1957, and were existent extensively in 1953 when the case was heard in the court. The court accepted this and, with some doubts, decided to leave the clause in the award. Mr. Justice Jackson, however, warned the unions that unless they took proper steps to implement the original intention of the clause—that is, to abolish subcontracting—he would have it deleted.

Following that case in 1954, the Carpenters' Union decided to test the clause in court. The unions sued two members—one named Byrne and one named Higginbotham—because they undertook subcontract work for the Forrestdale Company. This decision became very important and was often quoted. The defendants admitted having worked on a subcontract basis. They were convicted of a breach of the award, because they had not given notice of resignation to the union. The onus was on the defendants to give notice of resignation. Had they done so, they would not have been convicted.

The opinions of Mr. Justice Wolff and Mr. Justice Jackson were indicative of the fact that conditions were very difficult in the building trades in the State. Therefore, when the Hawke Government was returned to office, it endeavoured to do something for the building trades.

That was particularly so in regard to Government work. It built up a work force of some 1,700 or 1,800 workers who had reasonable security of employment. They were able to look forward to the future with some confidence; and, with their wives and families, they were able to plan for the future—something which they could not have done had they been working for private contractors.

These people did an excellent job. We hear a lot about contractors doing a cheaper job; but I would like to point out to the Government which is always speaking about socialised enterprises being inefficient, that the private contractor is not so efficient. The Governments of Western Australia, in conjunction with the Commonwealth Government, entered into an agreement to build Commonwealth rental homes. At the present moment these homes are let at a rental of about £2 9s. to £4 4s. per week. Those figures may be a shilling or two out either way, but they represent the rents being charged for these well-built new homes.

Private enterprise has not been able, and is not able to build homes comparable with these excepting for a rental of about £2 2s. or £2 more per week. Therefore, private enterprise has failed in that direction. I know of a place in Victoria Park which comprises two semi-detached houses. The particular houses are at 18 and 20 Mackie-st., Victoria Park. They are very old and in a bad state of repair. They were not furnished, yet were let at £7 per week each. That is private enterprise!

There is no house to let in Victoria Park under a rental of £4 a week, except a shanty that should be condemned. Most houses bring in about £5 5s. or more per week by way of rental. Therefore, the State Housing Commission, which is a Government institution, can beat private enterprise hands down in providing houses for the people at a low rental.

The Government of that day built up an efficient work force, which did a good job. However, the present Government is reversing the position, because big business is its master. The Government is told to do something, and it has to do it. This Government is catering for a few, while we try to cater for the many. A Labour Government endeavours to cater for the well-being of the greatest number of people; and that is what it endeavoured to do.

I would say to the Government: What is the difference in actual practice between a Government employing a lot of people and paying money out direct to those people, and a Government giving a few people the job to do? In other words, what the Hawke Government did for a lot of people, this Government is doing for a few. However, there is no difference in principle whatsoever.

If it is socialism to help the many, that is what the Labour Government did. What do we call it when a Government helps a few, as this Government is doing? It is giving contract work to its friends. That is its primary objective. Any good that may accrue to the workers will be purely incidental. This policy will result in a lot of harm, because a great deal of insecurity is experienced by workers employed by private contractors.

It has been mentioned that a far superior job is done by day labour as against contract labour. Speak to any tradesman who works either for the Government or a private employer, and he will state that the job is much better when the Government employs its own men. I attended a function on Saturday evening; and a chap said to me, "They can have specifications on the jobs, but the private contractor is always doing his best to beat the specifications, and an inspection does not reveal the fact that specifications have not been adhered to."

For instance, I think it is usual practice on Government jobs for four coats of paint to be provided in accordance with the specifications. However, on a private job, although the specifications may stipulate four coats of paint, they give only two coats.

Mr. Roberts: Have you any proof of that?

Mr. Court: Are you blaming the Principal Architect for a dereliction of duty?

Mr. ANDREW: Ask any man in the gallery and he will state that what I have said is correct. My father, who is a truthful man, told me something in regard to contract labour and the way an attempt is made to beat the specifications.

Mr. Roberts: Where were they?

Mr. ANDREW: It was work done on a concrete board. It was a Government job being done by contract; and so much sand, metal, and cement was required. A Government inspector was watching that particular board; and while the foreman spoke to the inspector, the workers did not empty the bag of cement; half a bag was swished away.

Mr. Roberts: They must have been quick.

Mr. ANDREW: That sort of thing happens in many directions in regard to contract work. I have only given one example which was witnessed by my father. Not so long ago we read in the Press of a building in America which collapsed through inferior workmanship; and many people were hurt and some were killed.

Mr. Roberts: How many buildings have collapsed in St. George's Terrace?

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. ANDREW: Prior to dinner I was giving a few illustrations regarding contractors who endeavoured to save on jobs by dishonest methods. The temptation is there; and as they are out to make a profit, they will naturally take the opportunity to do so if they can. The more they can skimp on a job and cover up so the inspectors cannot see, the more profit they will make. Therefore, I think I have proved my point in that direction.

I want to speak now regarding the conservative Liberals. They do not believe in full employment. At present they are sacking a number of individuals, and we consider this should not be done. The so-called Liberal Party has never, although it claims differently, been in favour of full employment and it was a Labour Government in the Federal House that achieved this for the first time.

The Lytton report stated that it was good for the economy of a country if up to 7 per cent. were unemployed. I am wondering whether this particular Government is endeavouring to bring about that situation here.

Mr. Court: Nonsense! The highest degree of employment was achieved in—

Mr. ANDREW: The Minister for Railways will have an opportunity to speak later; and I suggest that when he does so he should prove what he says. We can bring reports about certain Liberals having subscribed to that report.

Mr. Court: Who are they?

Mr. ANDREW: I would like to say that the so-called Liberal Party in Australia is worse than the Conservative Party in Britain, the members of which do call themselves Conservatives.

Mr. Crommelin: Why this "so-called"?

Mr. ANDREW: There are policies and actions to which the Conservative Party subscribes, to which this Liberal Party does not subscribe. The Liberal Party in Australia is right out of step with modern trends throughout the world. The object of good government is to endeavour to give security to the people governed.

Mr. Court: Australia has never had such a high degree of security as now.

Mr. ANDREW: The Minister for Railways spoke about four times as much as anybody else last session—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Court: You stick to the facts!

Mr. ANDREW: I wish the Minister for Railways would give someone else a chance to speak. He is too verbose and does not give anybody else a go.

Mr. Hawke: In a few weeks he will be sacking people himself.

Mr. ANDREW: I was saying, when I was so rudely interrupted by the Minister for Railways, that the modern trend is to give security to the people. The Hawke Labour Government endeavoured to do that by building up a labour force which had decent conditions; and the trend today is even observed by the Liberal Party sometimes because it cannot help doing so. We have pensions for the aged, maternity benefits, unemployment benefits, child endowment and many other measures to give security to the people, but the actions of the Liberal Party today are breaking down the security of nearly 2,000 men, and it is a retrograde step and contrary to what should be done. People's well-being should be built up, and they should be given something in life to make them feel secure.

There is a last point I want to make and it is this: The action in breaking down the work force of the Public Works Department will leave quite a lot of superfluous machinery. I am wondering whether the Government is going to sell that machinery for half its value to some private contractor. If the Government is going to carry on as is suggested, continuity of government in this State will be upset. When the Liberal-Country Party was last

in office, the work force was continued to some degree; but on this occasion it has been broken down, and it will not be very long before a Labour Government goes into office again.

It is all very well for members opposite to laugh. I did not say when we would be in office again, but one day for sure we will be. What is going to be the result if, when one Government gets in, it introduces one policy; and then, when the other party is elected, the policy is reversed; and reversed again when the former Government returns to power? It will end in chaos.

Mr. Court: You want socialism all the time.

Mr. ANDREW: Summing up my remarks, I firstly make the point that building trades employees have a very difficult row to hoe in regard to the peculiarities of their particular industry, and they deserve every consideration. Secondly, by the action of the present Government in throwing these employees to the private contractors—some say to the wolves—their security is being taken from them, and they are being deprived of the measure of happiness they previously enjoyed. Thirdly, the Government is going in the opposite direction to world trends and is out of step. Fourthly, it is bad for the people in Western Australia to have violent changes in policy when one Government is defeated and another elected. For these reasons, I am very strongly in support of the amendment to the Address-in-reply.

MR. HEAL (West Perth—on amendment) [7.40]: I rise to support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition; but I wish first to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on having been appointed to the position of Speaker of this Chamber, and I hope you will have a successful term of office. To the Premier and his Ministers I say, for the sake of the State of Western Australia and the people therein, that I hope that in their short term of office they will be able to bring some good to this State.

Is it not an amazing thing that the present Government was first formed on the 1st April? As members know, that is April Fools' Day. After many hours of bickering and talk upstairs, eventually the parties concerned were able to allocate the portfolios to the various Ministers; but I believe the people of this State would be right in saying that this is an April Fool Government, because it has certainly fooled them since the day of the election. In this Chamber today we have heard the Minister for Works talking a lot of hot air and telling a lot of untruths, as I hope to be able to prove during my speech. When in Opposition, he delivered some good speeches here, on occasions; but since becoming a Minister of the Crown, he has gone downhill very fast.

During the election campaign the Premier and other members on that side of the House stated that they would fire nobody if returned as the Government of Western Australia. But what do we see at the present time? We have heard the Minister for Works state that, over the next 15 or 18 months, 20 men will be given notice of dismissal each week at the Public Works Department. That is not a good thing for the employees of that department to have to go home and tell their wives and families; and there we have the first untruth told by the Premier and his colleagues, and the first injustice to the people of this State.

During his remarks, the Minister for Works said that 153 people had been sacked from the Public Works Department up to date; and that, of that number, 77 had registered at the Commonwealth Employment Bureau. When the men approached the person on the counter, the first question fired at them was, "Are you prepared to take work in the country?" When they replied in the negative, they were immediately wiped off and had no chance of receiving the unemployment benefits.

I think the treatment of the men was most unjust. First of all they should have been registered; and then, if they were offered work in the country and refused it, the benefits could have been withdrawn. The Minister further said that 60 men had been found jobs by the department, and I think that is the only hope that some of these unfortunate people have to look forward to when they receive their dismissal notices.

The Minister then said that 72 men had resigned. No doubt they did not do that because they wanted to, but simply because they felt they had to take some other employment when it offered, knowing that the department did not intend to employ them much longer. The Minister said that another 76 men did not register at the Commonwealth Employment Office.

Let us examine the figures given by the Minister. He stated that 153 people had been dismissed from the Public Works Department; but if we total up the figures we find that they come to 285, which proves that the Minister just plucked out of the hat the figures he gave the House today. That is another complete untruth that he has placed before the people of the State today. He further said that the last on would be the first off, and I sincerely hope that that is the policy to be followed.

Let us now examine the position at the Tramways Department, where I believe 39 men have been given dismissal notices. Unfortunately one of those is a man who has been employed by that department for the past 39 years. He is now 63 years of

age, and he had only 18 months to go before retiring and receiving his superannuation; and I hope the Minister for Transport will see fit to do something about his case. To my way of thinking, any person who has given the State of Western Australia 39 years' good service should be allowed to continue another 18 months in order to receive his superannuation—

Mr. Perkins: It was your Government that stopped the trams running, and that is why this man has become surplus.

Mr. HEAL: I do not know that that is the reason for it—

Mr. Perkins: It is; because I handled that case personally, and tried to keep him on and give him other work.

Mr. HEAL: The Minister may have offered him a job as a conductor on the trams. How could a man of that age learn a new job after being in employment for 39 years?

Mr. Perkins: I could not give him a job on the trams, because there are none running.

Mr. HEAL: I do not think the Minister can be very proud of what happened, and I do not think that members of the Government can be happy to think of the people in the gallery tonight who will be sacked in the next 15 months. Let us now examine the question of the wiping off of the 17s. 6d. unemployment benefit. The Premier said that that payment had cost the Government £48,000 up to date; but I maintain that was money well spent, because it helped people, who could not find employment, to live. The day that announcement appeared in the press a person visited my home at 7.30 p.m., asking could I do something for him; but all I could say was that he should appeal to the Minister concerned, and that if the Minister thought that his case was one of sufficient hardship the payment might be reinstated.

Any unemployed person who is receiving the social service payments must be living under extreme hardship, if that is all he has to live on; and for that reason I say that if the Premier reinstated the 17s. 6d. payment it would be a worthwhile thing for the people to whom it would be paid. In the *Daily News* on Friday, the 22nd May, there appeared, on the front page, the story of the sacked Public Works Department carpenter. I will not read it out, as no doubt most members have read it; but what a position to be in for these men to have to go home and tell their wives and families that after seven or 14 days they will have to go on social service payments unless they can find other employment!

At a social evening at which I was present the other night a carpenter from the Public Works Department said that,

although he has not received a dismissal notice yet, he had made application to enter the Police Force, as he expected to be dismissed soon. Unfortunately he was half an inch too short for the Police Force. That is the sort of thing that must be running through the minds of many of the workers who are expecting to be dismissed.

I hope that, when this debate is concluded, the Premier and his colleagues will give further thought to the question of decreasing the day-labour force of the Public Works Department; because I am sure that in the long run the Minister for Works will find that the work now being done by the day-labour force will be superior to that done by most private builders—and also a lot cheaper.

Another interesting statement by the Minister for Works was that there has never been so much employment in the building trades in Western Australia as there is at present. Is it not marvellous that in this morning's issue of *The West Australian*—which I hope is an honest paper—Mr. Holt, in relation to his Budget plan said, in regard to unemployment—

Balancing this bright budget picture, Mr. Holt finds that total unemployment is embarrassingly high in a few industries; that the export market estimates for 1959-60 still hesitate around next season's wool prices; and that there is no guarantee of a sustained flow of investment capital from overseas.

Let us look at that statement and compare it with the statement made by the Minister for Works. I think the people of Western Australia would take what Mr. Holt said as being correct; and I am sure that the Minister for Works is talking with his tongue in his cheek regarding the unemployment in this State, because, as member for West Perth, I have people visiting me at Parliament House, and ringing me up to see if I can find employment for them. Members know as well as I do that, unfortunately, it is particularly hard at present to find employment, even for tradesmen in the building industry.

Mr. Roberts: How many supply teachers approached you when the previous Minister for Education gave them dismissal notices?

Mr. HEAL: I do not think that has much to do with the question. However, as the hon. member has asked me, I will tell him that no supply teachers approached me, because they were married women who had husbands in employment who were receiving a fair income, so that they could look after their families. The then Premier, in his wisdom, reinstated those teachers. I strongly support the amendment, and I sincerely hope that it will be carried.

MR. MAY (Collie—on amendment) [7.52]: I rise to support the amendment. But, firstly, I would like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, upon your re-election to this House at the last State elections, and on your election to the Chair. I see by the returns that you had a sweeping majority of 71. There are only three parties in this State; and as the Labour Party did not oppose you, some of your friends on the other side must have done so. Evidently they must have desired to liquidate you.

Mr. J. Hegney: They didn't do that, did they?

Mr. MAY: I do not think you, Mr. Speaker, could feel well disposed towards those who tried to deprive you of your seat. It would have been a terrible thing if, on the night of the election, you had had to go home and tell your wife and family that you were out of employment and therefore would not have any income. The following morning you would have had to go to Donnybrook to register for unemployment benefits, the same as the Government is making the people do at present. I wonder what the feeling of the families of the Premier and the Deputy Leader of the Conservative Party would be if they had to tell them that they were out of employment, the same as many people are having to do today.

Mr. Roberts: What is this Conservative Party you are talking about?

Mr. MAY: Sometimes I think it is nice to put oneself in Gallagher's place. The Minister for Works very bravely, or very glaringly, published in the paper in the week-end that he did not care if 10,000 men came up to listen in to the debate. He would not care if 10,000 men were put out of employment.

Labour Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Roberts: What a lot of rot!

Mr. Hawke: Where there is no sense there is no feeling.

Mr. MAY: So long as the present Government is prepared to follow the dictates of the Employers' Federation, and those associated with it, this sort of thing will happen. We all know where this move comes from. I know men on the other side of the Chamber who would not be a party to this sort of thing if they could avoid it; but they know what will happen if they do not carry out the instructions given to them.

Mr. Roberts: What utter rot!

Mr. MAY: It is the perfect truth, whatever the hon. member might say.

Mr. Brand: It is better than going through the inquisition machine.

Mr. MAY: I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, of what happened before the election in regard to the two parties on the other side of the Chamber. Nobody

can tell me that members of the Country Party have any good feelings towards the Liberals; of course they have not!

Mr. Heal: If they had any sense they wouldn't.

Mr. MAY: They know very well that if the Liberal Party of this State had its way it would liquidate members of the Country Party the same as this Government is trying to do to the workers.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must relate his remarks to the amendment before the Chair.

Mr. MAY: I understood, Mr. Speaker, that we had to talk to you and not to individual members of the Chamber. This evening the Minister for Works said that the Government intended progressively to lessen the working force of the Public Works Department. He also said that it would not make one scrap of difference so far as apprentices were concerned. We are going to finish up with no work force in the Public Works Department, and that will leave only the apprentices. The Minister knows, as well as I do, that under the awards of the Arbitration Court he cannot do that; there have to be so many journeymen to each apprentice. Yet he is trying to put that sort of stuff over us in this Chamber; and I, for one, will not swallow it.

Furthermore, the other evening when the Premier spoke he laughed to scorn when it was suggested that there were many families in Western Australia who, as a result of the activities of this Government, were going through an anxiety state.

Mr. Brand: I did not laugh to scorn at all. That is a lie.

Mr. MAY: I want that withdrawn, please, because it is not a lie. That is what the Premier said.

Mr. Brand: I did not laugh to scorn, and I do not intend to withdraw unless you withdraw your remarks.

Mr. Tonkin: Make him withdraw.

Mr. MAY: In reply to the Premier, who suggested—

The SPEAKER: The hon. member must address his remarks to the Chair, the same as the Premier did.

Mr. MAY: I maintain the Premier said it.

Mr. Tonkin: Make him withdraw it!

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Collie has asked for a withdrawal.

Mr. Brand: The hon. member said that I laughed to scorn the fact that there was unemployment in this State. Until he withdraws that, I have no intention of withdrawing my remarks.

Mr. Tonkin: Haven't you?

Mr. MAY: I did not say that the Premier laughed to scorn the fact that there was unemployment. He laughed to scorn when the Leader of the Opposition said that the actions of this Government were causing great concern and great anxiety among the families of those who had been retrenched.

Mr. Hawke: That is correct.

Mr. MAY: That is exactly what the Premier said.

Points of Order.

Mr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the member for Collie has objected to the Premier's remarks; and, acting within his rights under the Standing Orders, he has asked for a withdrawal. I submit to you, Sir, that if you are to uphold the Standing Orders you will require the Premier to withdraw. If he desires to take any subsequent action, that is his business and yours; but he is not entitled at this stage to add any qualification to the withdrawal.

Mr. J. Hegney: And defy the Chair.

The SPEAKER: I think I must uphold the view of the member for Melville and ask the Premier to withdraw.

Mr. BRAND: I will withdraw. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask the member for Collie to withdraw the remarks that I laughed to scorn anything associated with unemployment, or the policy of the Government creating unemployment.

Mr. Hawke: The member for Collie did not say that.

Mr. BRAND: I did not laugh with scorn at any stage.

The SPEAKER: The Premier has asked for a withdrawal.

Mr. MAY: I did not say that, and I am not going to withdraw something I did not say.

The SPEAKER: I understood the member for Collie to say that; that was the impression I gained, and I must ask him to withdraw.

Mr. TONKIN: On a further point of Order, Mr. Speaker, we have a *Hansard* reporter whose duty it is to make an accurate report of what has been said. If the member for Collie did not say something he should not be asked to withdraw it. What he said can easily be proved from the *Hansard* record of what was said. I think the member for Collie is entitled to have that explained to him.

The SPEAKER: I have called for a *Hansard* report of the hon. member's speech in that regard. The relevant portion of the *Hansard* transcript reads as follows:—

Furthermore, the other evening, when the Premier spoke, he laughed to scorn when it was suggested that

there were many families in the State who, as a result of the action of his Government, were going through an anxiety state.

My understanding of that is that they are the words about which the Premier objects, and I must ask the member for Collie to withdraw.

Mr. MAY: I do not wish to quarrel with you, Mr. Speaker; and in deference to your knowledge of shorthand, I will withdraw anything I have said that is objectionable to the Premier.

Debate Resumed.

Mr. MAY: The Minister for Works, during his remarks, had something to say about the Trades Hall; and I want to make this observation: that had it not been for the Trades Hall officials, much stronger objection would have been made against the implementation of this part of the Government's policy. Those officials have done much to alleviate what could have become a nasty situation, and what could have reached serious proportions; and therefore I think that the members of the Government owe a debt of gratitude to them.

The Minister also said that, in dealing with this matter, we were associated with Communists. He knows full well the Labour Party is not associated with any body. When the members of my party were in office they did not make up any shandygaff Government. They stood on their own feet. We do not fight with our neighbours and then kow-tow to them to gain Treasury benches. In my opinion, the Liberal Party of this State, by the will of the people, has no right to be sitting on the front benches.

Mr. Graham: Its members tried to exterminate the Country Party.

Mr. Roberts: There is a party in your movement that you would like to exterminate, too.

Mr. MAY: In dismissing the Public Works Department men in a progressive manner, is it possible for members of the Government to understand the anxiety that is being suffered by the wives and the families of those men who are still employed, inasmuch as they do not know, from week to week, whether they will be next?

Mr. Crommelin: What has happened to the families of the men that your Government sacked?

Mr. MAY: What men?

Mr. Crommelin: The men that were sacked before Christmas.

Mr. MAY: The hon. member would not understand even if I told him.

The SPEAKER: There must be no noise whatsoever from the gallery. Should there be any further noise from the gallery, I will have to take appropriate steps to prevent it.

Mr. MAY: I completely disapprove of the manner in which the Government is handling the employment question in this State. I know that for many years it has been the policy of a Liberal Party conservative Government in this State to try to maintain a pool of unemployed.

Sir Ross McLarty: That is utter rot!

Mr. MAY: The member for Murray can call it what he likes, but it is a fact.

Mr. W. Hegney: The members on the other side of the House want from 10 to 12 per cent. of the work force unemployed.

Mr. Bovell: The member for Collie should be the last one to talk about unemployment.

Mr. MAY: When I was a lad of 11 years of age—

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: My word! You have a good memory!

Mr. MAY: —my job was to milk cows in a dairy.

Mr. Brand: Milk them where?

Mr. MAY: In the winter time, when it was frosty and snow was lying on the ground at 6 a.m., I was unable to milk the cows dry; and, as a result, because I was unable to drain those cows, they went dry, and naturally I got the cane from my employer. To the Minister for Works I want to say that my story is applicable to him at the present time, because I think he is completely drained of any milk of human kindness so far as the workers in this State are concerned.

MR. GRAHAM (East Perth—on amendment) [8.8]: Needless to say, I wholeheartedly support the amendment to the Address-in-reply moved by the Leader of the Opposition, although I regret the circumstances that have necessitated such a move. First of all, I want to say that those of us who have had experience, over the years, of the policy and the attitude of anti-Labour political forces—particularly the political force of the so-called Liberal Party—are by no means surprised that this Government is embarking upon a policy of deliberately putting men out of work; of deciding, as one of its first steps as a Government, that the unemployed should have 17s. 6d. a week snatched away from them.

Mr. Andrew: Shame!

Mr. GRAHAM: This action on the part of an anti-Labour Government merely reveals, in its true colours, the thinking by anti-Labour forces, and conforms completely with the attitude those forces have adopted throughout the years on various matters. You, Mr. Speaker, are aware of the people who have consistently denied the right of adults to vote for both Houses of Parliament in Western Australia. You know who it is that opposed the move of a Labour Government to make basic wage

adjustments automatic. You are aware, too, that when Labour Governments have sought to broaden the terms of workers' compensation legislation, opposition has always come from one source.

You know who inserted—and who insists that they should be retained—the savage penal clauses in the Industrial Arbitration Act. You are aware, Sir, who it was that removed prices control, which gave some measure of protection to the workers, their womenfolk, and their families; and who abandoned rent control, and put the landlords in charge of a luckless people who were compelled to rent premises.

Mr. Roberts: It sounds like a policy speech.

Mr. GRAHAM: It sounds as though it is a recital of history; and if it is a little embarrassing to the member for Bunbury, I am afraid he must take it. A few weeks ago we had this Tommy-rot about guilty men. I venture to suggest that practically everything undemocratic, everything that has been directed against the ordinary people of the community, has been initiated by those who are our political opponents.

Mr. Andrew: Hear, hear!

Mr. GRAHAM: I have mentioned a number of points, and many more will suggest themselves. These are the people who support the case of the non-unionists against the unionists.

Sir Ross McLarty: They do nothing of the sort!

Mr. GRAHAM: The member for Murray has apparently slipped since he was Premier of the State—during which time the State slipped. I well remember from this side of the House the performance that he and his gang put on in connection with the fact that there were a couple of gentlemen from the other side of the world who were working at the State Brickworks; and who, whilst they were prepared to enjoy the benefits gained for them by their industrial organisation, were not prepared to support that organisation.

Sir Ross McLarty: I know they had religious convictions.

Mr. GRAHAM: We are now coming to excuses. I am stating the bald facts, and they are available for anyone who wishes to peruse them.

Mr. Hawke: The member for Murray should appreciate bald facts!

Mr. GRAHAM: Having said that, and without going further—and believe me there is a long and impressive list—is it any wonder that a Minister in Her Majesty's Government can stand here in this Chamber, as the Minister for Works did this evening, and coldly and brazenly proclaim the fact that the Government, by deliberate decision and policy is, in respect of one department alone, going to give a walking ticket to 20 men every week for the next 15 to 18 months.

Mr. Wild: What about the 250 walking tickets that my predecessor gave before Christmas?

Mr. GRAHAM: And this coming from a Minister of a Government which, eight days before the election was held, said through its leader—the Hon. Mr. Brand—that “nobody will be fired”; I repeat, “nobody will be fired.” Yet we find it is part and parcel of their plan and procedure that, in the Public Works Department alone, 20 shall be sacked every week for the next 15 to 18 months.

Mr. Tonkin: Six hundred by Christmas.

Mr. GRAHAM: These poor beggars—single men amongst them—will be receiving 17s. 6d. a week less than would have been the case if a Labour Government had given effect to such an inhuman policy—which, of course, it would not.

Mr. Wild: You have a look at the file from the Premier where he suggested and asked if they would be prepared to go to the country.

Mr. GRAHAM: We can have these bright asides; and if the Minister for Works can draw any consolation from the files, he is entitled to it. Whilst these solemn pronouncements are given by the Minister to 10,000 workers with death sentence hanging over their heads, we have this Government deciding that next week Parliament shall not meet. Why? Because some professional people are having a conference in Western Australia. I wonder whether, if there were to be a conference of the building trade workers held in Perth, the Liberals would be so ready to close up the institution of Parliament for a week!

What the deliberations of the Law Society have to do with the deliberations of Parliament, and the business of the country, I know not. But I mention that to show the utter irresponsibility of this Government during a time of crisis. When so many hundreds—indeed several thousands—of men are expecting next week, or next month, or in several months' time, to receive the order of the boot from this Government, we find that, because people from a high and distinguished social strata are having a pow-wow in the City of Perth, the business of the State must cease.

Mr. Hawke: Wicked!

Mr. GRAHAM: The Premier, and his official organ—*The West Australian* newspaper—

Mr. Andrew: Hear, hear!

Mr. GRAHAM: —have said on many occasions that they have a mandate to do these certain things. A mandate! The Premier of this day does not know for certain but that tomorrow he will be bundled out.

Mr. Brand: You hope!

Mr. Roberts: Neither does the member for East Perth.

Mr. GRAHAM: The people of East Perth would welcome an opportunity to pass judgment on this Government.

Mr. Bovell: They nearly did the right thing.

Mr. Brand: Would you like to afford them another opportunity?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would welcome it. They say they have a mandate, Sir, when you can see with your own eyes that a minority of members sits on the other side of the House. They have a mandate when they have two members to rely on—members on whom they have no call or claim, and whom the Liberal Party fought bitterly to defeat at the last election. Yet they come back with 24 on the floor of the House and consider they have a mandate for this, that, and the other. It is as baseless and irresponsible as the great majority of utterances that come from the other side of the House.

Mr. Brand: What about the Labour Premier of Tasmania?

Mr. May: What has he to do with W.A.?

Mr. Roberts: Nothing, thank God!

Mr. GRAHAM: See how anxious they are to get away from local questions! I am not aware what the Premier of Tasmania is claiming; but I know what the Government of Western Australia is claiming, without any warrant. I know that the Liberal Party is pretending that it believes in private enterprise; and that anything performed by the State is an instalment of socialism. Of course, that is far-fetched and fantastic, and I do not think they believe it themselves. It is surprising on how many occasions even Liberal Governments are prepared to extend the hand of socialism—let us call it that—when their private enterprise friends are in a little spot of bother. They do not mind raiding the Treasury funds in such cases.

But this Government has, in my view, gone completely berserk. We have had Liberal Governments in Western Australia before, and they have not sought to go to these excesses, and desire to completely abandon anything and everything that belongs to the State. There are Liberal Governments in other States of the Commonwealth, as indeed in the Commonwealth itself, and nothing along these lines has ever been attempted.

Mr. May: They have not got a Mr. Johnson.

Mr. GRAHAM: That has been the case, not because of any political philosophy, but because those Liberal Governments in other parts of Australia—and in the past in Western Australia—realise the necessity for certain State instrumentalities, work forces, and the rest. I wonder what this Government is seeking to do!

Mr. Tonkin: Commit suicide.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is doing that, I should say.

Mr. Hawke: I thought it was being butchered by the member for Nedlands.

Mr. GRAHAM: Does it feel that it has an obligation to certain interests; to certain companies; to certain powerful groups; and that somehow a pay-off is necessary; and therefore no work shall be undertaken by the State, or on behalf of the State, unless some of the Liberal Party's political friends first of all get their percentage of the loan moneys or of the State's revenues; and, secondly, have all the activities pass through their hands? Why is there this frenzy in the year 1959, when, throughout the entire period from 1947 to 1953 when there was a Liberal-Country Party Government, nothing of the sort was attempted? Where did this brainstorm come from?

Mr. Heal: From Nedlands.

Mr. GRAHAM: What are the reasons and purpose of it? Apparently this Government feels that all that is necessary for it to do is to make its own friends and its own interests happy, then all is well in the State. Do the humanitarian aspects, the welfare and happiness of ordinary people, count for nothing? Whilst this sort of thing is going on, we find the Government's friend, which after all was responsible for putting it in office—namely *The West Australian*—drooling and slobbering all over the Liberal-Country Party Government. All that newspaper has to do is to take a trip around the State, and discover some gigantic work commenced by the Labour Government, and there is a greater prominence given to an inspection by the Liberal Party Ministers than was given to the conception and inauguration of that work by the previous Government.

As the member for Victoria Park has said—and it is true—somehow mysteriously, yet certainly, on the 21st March, which was polling day, all the effluent from the metropolitan sewerage system which was emptying itself on the metropolitan beaches miraculously ceased, and there has been no trouble since.

Mr. Brand: Because of the change of Government.

Mr. GRAHAM: I said something about a pay-off. In this regard, we find that one of the employees of *The West Australian*, which was giving vent to political poison and spleen almost daily, has now been offered a job—indeed signed up under a contract for a job—by the Liberal-Country Party Government, at a salary greater than that paid to elected representatives of the people, amounting to £2,500 a year; supplied with an office to himself, which no member of Parliament has; and supplied with a typist, which no member of Parliament has.

I would like to get some idea whether certain other considerations are to be given to him—a person who was a paid employee of a newspaper which played party politics, and a person now employed at the taxpayer's expense—for the purpose of concocting articles to prop up the present Government. He certainly has a full-time job ahead of him! We find that as part of this pay-off, by direction of certain Ministers, the advertisements of the Government must be taken away from the Sunday newspaper and given to *The West Australian*, even if those cost the taxpayers more.

The SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member is relating these remarks to the motion before the Chair.

Mr. GRAHAM: Very definitely. As I have already indicated, it has been the policy throughout the years—and it has not been varied—for the major public works, throughout the Commonwealth of Australia at any rate, to be undertaken by the public works organisation, if that work was within its capacity.

Everybody has accepted that situation, and everybody has been reasonably satisfied with it. As a consequence the quality of work turned out is not matched by anything done by all those engaged in private enterprise. This is not an airy something which is being said: it is something which can be established and proved.

The fact is that the Government was using its own instrumentalities. Is there anything wrong with that procedure? After all, if *The West Australian* requires some forms for the people who advertise in that newspaper, does it call for tenders outside, or does it set about doing the job itself? If Bunning Bros. wants to make extensions to one of the firm's sawmills, does it call for tenders for the supply of timber for the erection of the sheds and buildings, or does it use the timber it produces?

Mr. I. W. Manning: That firm has not made any extensions for quite a while.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes it has; The hon. member would not know the first thing about it. If the firm of Bouchers desires to extend its shelves for records and other purposes, naturally it performs that work itself. It does not go outside. Therefore, is there anything wrong with the action of the previous Government, in conformity with the procedure of preceding Governments, in using its own instrumentalities for the supply of goods and for the construction of new works? That was precisely what had been going on.

Many of the people who are employed in these Government undertakings did not merely have a job or trade; they embarked upon a career. They had every right to expect that, so long as they performed a reasonable day's work for a fair day's

pay, until the retiring age of 65 years—if work were available—they would be so employed to that retiring age.

They have probably—and indeed I know of several cases myself; not that a single swallow makes a summer—refused employment elsewhere, preferring the security of the job under the employer by whom they were engaged.

Of these people I am particularly sorry for those who are upwards of 50 years of age—I am sorrier still for those who are in excess of 60 years of age—and for their plans, their hopes, and their security for the years to come in their declining years being suddenly swept aside by an irresponsible and heartless Government—a Government which, only this evening, proclaimed proudly that it intends to go on with its rotten policy, month after month, until a couple of thousand men have been thrown on the economic scrap heap.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: How about the 200 men which your Government sacked?

Mr. GRAHAM: Every Government is required and has throughout the years been compelled, because of the shortages of funds from time to time, to reduce those who are on its payrolls; but no previous Government, as a result of pressure from somewhere—which in this instance is not hard to guess—has by deliberate decision and policy thrown these people out on the dust heap, as this Government has done. Never before has it happened in the history of the Commonwealth of Australia, or in any of the States of this country of ours.

Mr. Hawke: It did not happen under the McLarty Government.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You used the same methods with private enterprise.

Mr. GRAHAM: Have these people earned or do they warrant this inhuman treatment which is being meted out to them?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Your Government's policy was the same in reverse with private enterprise firms.

Mr. GRAHAM: No!

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It was.

Mr. Roberts: You did not shed any crocodile tears then.

Mr. I. W. Manning: That is why the Government changed.

Mr. GRAHAM: Representatives of the workers, elected to this Parliament, had no need to shed crocodile tears about anything. Those members on the other side of the House are so far removed from ordinary people that they would not have a clue as to what is going on. They are more concerned with the social aspects of political life; certain prominence in certain newspapers and photographs at social gatherings with their own kith and kin; and being the object of flattery there, and prominence somewhere else. But we who spring from the workers are selected by the rank-and-file workers, and can be summarily dismissed through the selection

ballots. Therefore, we have a keen sensitivity to the problems that beset the workers. We are in a position to speak on their behalf.

Mr. Roberts: A lot of our members were elected by the workers.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GRAHAM: The building trades unions—I refer particularly to them—have shown themselves to be reasonable and responsible to the nth degree. They have been co-operative, and they have done an excellent job for the State of Western Australia. I think, therefore, their views and their wishes are worth something; that some regard should be had for their viewpoint in connection with this extraordinary action being taken by this Government.

Members are, or should be, aware that the building trades unions agreed to a considerable dilution of labour; that they facilitated workers from overseas being absorbed in the various building trades; and that they accepted many men with doubtful qualifications because of the need for a job to be done in their own State of Western Australia. They accepted under protest—I know something of this from my experience as a Minister—the labour only contracts for the construction of houses. Notwithstanding their objections, the matter was not pressed to the extent it well might have been; because these people, whilst having a sense of responsibility to their union members, at the same time had a sense of responsibility to the community and the thousands of families who were clamouring for homes.

At that particular time there were clerks, shop assistants, and the rest working from early in the morning until late at night, and on week-ends, who were posing as and individually performing the work of building contractors; breaking every rule in the book; and observing none of the standards which had been won by building trades workers as a result of the efforts over a couple of generations. The people who allowed these things, or closed the eye, or partly closed the eye, to what was going on, are the people who are now being booted where it hurts most by this Liberal-Country Party Government.

The same thing applies to their ignoring, for a period, week-end work; and, true to form, I was asked some caustic questions by representatives of the Liberal Party as to why I had, as Minister for Housing, then taken action to make a condition of contracts that work should not be performed on week-ends. It was done at that stage for the simple reason that there was a shortage of work; and it did appear ludicrous that some people who had a full day's work should work at the week-end while others were walking the streets looking for employment. Again I say that the Liberal Party showed itself in its true colours. What does it care for conditions, and the welfare of the workers, or their security, or the rest of it?

Mr. May: Nothing.

Mr. GRAHAM: I now refer to State Housing Commission matters. Homes built by the Public Works Department day-labour organisation are the hallmark of quality. I am not using idle words. I can take members of the Liberal Party and the Country Party to homes in Nollamara where persons who are purchasing them, upon being introduced, will proudly proclaim that theirs is a decent house, because it was built by the Public Works Department. I ask the new Minister for Housing, and the Minister who represents him in this Chamber, to call for the files of the people who have complained about shoddy work, poor materials, and the generally low standard of housing; and I wager that in every single case these homes have been built by private contract.

Mr. Andrew: That has been my experience, too.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is no gainsaying the fact.

Mr. Roberts: You are saying that homes built in country areas are not of the same quality as those in the metropolitan area.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not saying that at all.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GRAHAM: I hope I will be allotted a little extra time for that, Mr. Speaker. The quality of the work by day labour is immeasurably superior to the work performed by private contractors. There are, of course, exceptions; but, generally speaking, that is definitely the position. The difference in cost has not been so great. I remember how Sir Ross McDonald, when he was Minister for Housing, would not disband the day-labour organisation, because of the results it was achieving. Let me anticipate some cooked-up figures by pointing out to members immediately that where there is any difficult work to be done—that is to say, houses built where roads are not constructed, where there are no water supplies, where the slope of the ground is particularly steep, or any other such difficulties—the work is given to the Public Works Department to do, and not to the private contractor.

Mr. Roberts: Not in country areas.

Mr. GRAHAM: Therefore, some of the figures a biased Minister for Housing may care to produce, should take into account those factors and considerations that I have mentioned. Surely, apart from a quality angle and a price angle, there is some sort of obligation from a responsible Government to set an example as an employer!

Mr. May: Hear, hear!

Mr. GRAHAM: Many industrial reforms in Western Australia have been pioneered by Government decision; here, let me hasten to add, by Labour Government decision. These conditions and amenities

enjoyed by the workers surely become the lot of those employed by private operators. Is there anything wrong with that course of action? Even if it does cost a little more, surely it is better than trying to extract every single penny or save every single penny on a certain venture! Surely the rights of ordinary human beings have a place in the scheme of things somewhere!

If a certain job costs a few thousand pounds more; and if on the other side of the account there are several hundreds of our own people enjoying slightly better conditions than would otherwise be the case, is there anything basically wrong with that? Have we completely sacrificed human values; and is all that matters; material things, ledger accounts and things of that nature at the bidding of St. George's Terrace? I am somewhat astounded that this Government has pledged additional support to the racing clubs. That is no trouble at all!

It will give a cut to the architects for the building of the Empire Games village. The fact that the homes will cost workers and others from £100 to £250 more, does not mean a thing to this Government, because some of its professional friends, the architects, will be there in the carving up of the goose.

Mr. Brand: Who wrote to the Perth City Council and said the Government would give an open cheque for the games?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is not strictly correct, but is approximately right; and as with many brave things done in this State, it was done by a Labour Government. By the same token, nobody is suggesting that a Labour Government would have allowed itself to be a party to a racket—if I might use that term—to enable certain political friends of the Government, in the main, to draw something unto themselves. It is a burden which will have to be borne by the workers: £100 minimum if they do the architectural work only, and up to £250 if they do the plans and supervision as well; and for what? As I say, playing up to a certain section of the community. So easy for this Government to do those sorts of things for that sort of people; and yet simultaneously it takes away from the pensioners some of their travel concessions. These things surely stand out.

Mr. Brand: We gave them concessions. You could not make a decision on giving them—

Mr. GRAHAM: I think we should have the facts right.

Mr. Brand: A decision was not made.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think this has anything to do with the matter under discussion.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think you might be perfectly right, too, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Brand: Put the file on the Table of the House.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would like to illustrate how the Government is doing certain things for friends on one side, and has a complete and utter hostility to the ordinary people of the community on the other. What cares it that the meat prices have risen to a record level; that boot and shoe prices are the highest ever; that egg prices are soaring; that timber has gone up 10s. per 100 super feet; and that General Motors-Holden have made a £15,000,000 profit—a profit borne by ordinary people and business concerns. And yet there is a complete silence about that, and a desire to abandon legislation which might give some measure of protection; while, at the same time, those opposite express some concern that the workers, after a full inquiry by the Commonwealth, were granted a lousy 15s. a week! There is a matter for concern; but a business set-up ripping £15,000,000 off the people does not mean a thing! There is plenty of money for the race-courses, all these spivs, and social butterflies, and lounge lizards. Plenty for them but they take—

Mr. Brand: We'll take a few bob off your S.P. friends!

Mr. GRAHAM: —but they take 17s. 6d. from a poor unemployed man.

Mr. Brand: These people—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GRAHAM: If the Premier must take something from the S.P. bookmaker, let him go to it. But let him give some of the proceeds to the hungry unemployed instead of to the people in mind. Crocodile tears! We have heard all about solicitude for the pensioners. A single pensioner receives £4 7s. 6d. a week in social services. He receives travel concessions; he receives medical benefits, and is able to have his payment of rates deferred; and so on. But the single unemployed man does not receive £4 7s. 6d. in all this consideration; he receives £3 5s. a week. And the Labour Government felt that that was not enough, and so gave him an extra 17s. 6d. a week; and this has been snatched away from him by the Liberal-Country Party Government.

Mr. Andrew: Without any inquiry whatever.

Mr. Brand: The Labour Government in New South Wales does not give 17s. 6d. additional payment.

Mr. GRAHAM: As one of my colleagues behind says, without any inquiry whatever; and on the pretext that some of them were drawing unemployment benefit, and then supplementing the allowance by not playing the game and taking occasional outside work without notifying the department.

There was a Royal Commissioner appointed to investigate the position of road subsidies. Within a few hours, almost,

of this Government becoming a Government, it decided that irrespective of whether a farmer had an income of £2,500, £3,000, £5,000, or anything else, the State taxpayers, the unemployed, and everybody should contribute so that 100 per cent. subsidies could be restored and paid to these people. The fact that many of these people did not deserve it or need it—

Mr. Brand: Who didn't need it?

Mr. GRAHAM: —did not mean a single, solitary thing to this Government. Here we have the auction market, the Liberal Party and the Country Party competing for the—

The SPEAKER: The hon. member has five minutes left.

Mr. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope you have taken time off for interjections.

Mr. Brand: Who does not need it?

Mr. GRAHAM: This amount is being paid to them irrespective of their financial circumstances. Some may need assistance and no doubt do; but some would not. And yet, without any inquiry—as a matter of fact the Royal Commissioner was dismissed. The Government did not wait to receive his report.

Mr. Brand: He had two years. We thought that was enough.

Mr. GRAHAM: Can anyone tell me that a person—young, old, short or tall—on £3 5s. a week does not require or need additional assistance? This is the type of Government that considers it has a mandate to do things—inhuman things—to people who are in distress. This, coming from a Government which, eight days prior to polling day, stated that nobody would be fired if a Liberal Government were returned.

Mr. Hawke: We will fire nobody!

Mr. GRAHAM: And only this afternoon I heard an interjection by the Premier that the Government would honour the promises made. We have some example of that. An unemployed man is deprived of 17s. 6d. without any inquiry or investigation; but in order to help some of our professional colleagues—some, indeed, who might be political colleagues—with a stroke of the pen, the salary of the Public Service Commissioner is raised by £330, so that he receives £3,800 a year, more than any Minister of the Crown. This was done, as members are well aware, in order to oblige a friend.

There is money aplenty—whether it be for subsidised transport; whether it be for racecourses; whether it be for certain highly paid public officials—but apparently there is a dire shortage of money when it comes to a little food for a hungry

man put out of employment by the deliberate policy of this Government, which hoodwinked the public a few short weeks ago.

I mentioned this business about the sewerage which has apparently stopped running; and the resumption of land for a hundred and one different purposes—necessary, of course—but whereas in 1954 there was dissatisfaction when land was resumed by a Labour Government, people are apparently quite happy and contented when their land is taken over from them by a Liberal Government; and so on, and so on. The present Government can do no wrong in the eyes of the Press; and so criticism is stifled and everything the Government says or does is given a boom. The Minister for Railways can even stick his boot through a glass door, which is public property, and that action receives prominence of considerable dimensions.

I wonder if we should ask some questions as to the extent of the damage done on the occasion of the Minister putting his boot through the glass door, and as to who was responsible to make good the damage, and whether the funds so employed could have been more usefully employed in giving succour to the unfortunate people who are at present on the scrap heap owing to the activities of the Minister for Railways and others who sit with him. To cap it all, as if this business of the Public Service Commissioner was not bad enough, we have the statement from the Minister for Works to the effect that there must be a considerable lift in the grading of senior officers and professional men in the Public Service. If the Public Service Commissioner was not prepared to act, the matter would have to be tackled at ministerial level.

This is a Government which is prepared to hand out to people in the higher positions, but which at the same time puts the boots into the unfortunate folk who are in dire distress because of its deliberate actions and activities. I require no extension of time. Surely the facts speak for themselves! This is a cruel, heartless Government; a Government which has no care or concern for the ordinary people. Because of moneyed interests and the protection afforded it by the Press—the monopoly Press—the Government has been able to create a facade of make-believe and make the people believe it will really do something for the State of Western Australia. Prior to the election it was able to make the electors believe that it was a friend of the ordinary people, but in its first few weeks of office this Government has revealed itself to the public as the anti-social element which it really is.

As we have seen in respect of the matters outlined in my earlier remarks in regard to the activities, approach, and outlook of the Government on so many

matters, we know that it occupies office and has been returned to office merely because it was able to hoodwink and blind a sufficient number of the people into believing it was a friend of the people and would do something for them; whereas in fact its actions have shown that its prime concern is making certain interests happy and stuffing money into the pockets of its supporters and ensuring that, whatever may be the fate of Western Australia, its friends in St. George's Terrace and around about shall get their corner, while the public of the State comes second. As long as its friends are happy, long live the Liberal Party; but the sooner the next election comes the better. There have been a few jibes at my majority at the last election, because instead of being tens of thousands it was down to some hundreds—obviously because some thousands of people, through the activities of the Labour Government, were moved to new Housing Commission homes elsewhere. Let us have a redistribution, and all that will be settled. But redistribution or not, on the issues that have been mentioned tonight, I would have no fear in facing the people of Western Australia tomorrow, next week, or next month, or any time that the Government cares to choose, if it feels so cocksure of itself.

Believe me, it will require more than the protection of West Australian Newspapers Ltd., with its broadcasting station and its new television service, to save the Government from the wrath of the people of Western Australia.

(Clapping and noise from the gallery).

The SPEAKER: I have mentioned previously today the question of demonstrations from the gallery, and I do not intend to mention it again. It may be that many of the people in the gallery are not used to the procedure at Parliament House. It has always been the practice for people in the gallery to remain quiet and to refrain from making any noise. I do not propose to speak on this matter again.

MR. I. W. MANNING (Harvey—on amendment) [8.55]: There are always two sides to every question; but if the member for East Perth had come to Yarloop and told the workers there the story that he has put over here tonight, he would have been thrown into the biggest hole in Logue Brook, and left there; because the position of the workers in the country deteriorated from the time that the then Premier, the member for Northam, issued a minute to all Government departments, to the effect that they were to channel all work through Government instrumentalities, which, of course, included State Building Supplies.

Mr. Graham: You do not mind what goes through your water channels, at half price, to irrigate your property.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: Certainly not; but the hon. member could not have put his story over at Mornington Mills, where the people were dependent on private enterprise for their living, and where the slackening off of orders due to the policy of the previous Government created considerable unemployment, as it did in all the mill towns that I represent. We protested, on behalf of those people, to the then Government, but it wiped us off. It was not concerned about the workers in the country. What is this story about concern for the workers of Western Australia today, when the previous Government, by its policy of socialisation, created widespread unemployment among employees of private industry?

What I say is factual; so much so that the Government, in building up its socialist State, ran out of money and before Christmas sacked 250 of its Government workers. This State was doing no good under Labour—

Mr. Graham: No good for your mob.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I am certain that is what brought about the change. We had a taste of socialism and the policy that was bringing concern and distress in industry. Had the previous Government been able to continue with its policy it would eventually have been the only employer in Western Australia, and it was well on the way to achieving that position; but that was no good to the State or to the workers in electorates such as mine, who are dependent on private industry for their livelihood. Their livelihood was being taken away from them by the action of the socialist Government. Why all this hostility to private industry and the employers? They are the taxpayers of the country, on whom the Government depends for its income—

Mr. May: Don't you pay any tax?

Mr. I. W. MANNING: Too right I do! The previous Government, by its policy, created widespread unemployment, and under it we made no progress; so it was time for a change. The present Government is trying a new approach and is letting the work be done by private industry, which will provide employment for the workers. Of course the work has to be done, and employment is offering for the people who need it—

Mr. May: You have started at the wrong end.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: If the work has to be done, let it be done by private industry. It is not for the Government to own industry, but to make the laws; and the time has come for us to try a new way, because by this means we will create employment and restore confidence throughout the country districts.

Mr. Rowberry: Did you say, "Restore confidence"?

Mr. I. W. MANNING: Certainly! The story of the member for East Perth leaves me cold, especially when he talks about the concern among the people who have lost their employment.

Mr. Graham: You are right when you talk about cheap socialistic water!

Mr. I. W. MANNING: He did not turn a hair, and showed no interest whatever in the needs of the people who lost their employment through the policy of his Government. I oppose the amendment.

MR. HALL (Albany—on amendment) [9.1]: I should like to digress for a moment, Sir, and congratulate you upon your appointment as Speaker of the House. The action of the Liberal-Country Party Government in closing down the day-labour work force has amazed me, because, in the long run, the industrialists, whom they represent, and the Chamber of Commerce, must be affected by their actions; and fall-off in trade will have a repercussion in the business community.

I believe there are three components which make up sound, sensible government; they are land, labour and capital. If those three components are out of alignment or balance things will become difficult. The first component is land, and we know that the return from land today is lucrative. That return has been assured by the Federal Government which tells us that everything in the garden will be rosy provided our wool prices next year are good. The next component is that of labour, and today we find this Government is endeavouring to deplete the income of our working force. That policy will eventually have a repercussion on the industrialists whom this Government represents.

Mr. Brand: Do you agree with the member for East Perth that we should not pay a subsidy on transport for country people?

Mr. Graham: I did not say that; I said first things first.

Mr. Brand: Do you agree with him?

Mr. Graham: The unemployment position should come first.

Mr. HALL: I think that is getting away from the subject. These men who are becoming unemployed are willing to work but they are finding difficulty in obtaining employment. Many of them are paying off homes and motorcars, and so on; and if the Government continues with this policy of creating turmoil by the closing down of the day-labour force, it will reap a reward it does not at present anticipate. If this work force is unable to obtain employment the men will naturally be forced to take social service benefits and, accordingly, their spending power will be reduced. If that policy is followed, the sufferers will be, firstly, the workers in industry because of a consequent falling off in orders. The second people to suffer will be those engaged in commerce.

By its actions this Government will deplete the number engaged in industry; and finally those engaged in commerce will be affected. It will have a snowballing effect such as the action of the Menzies Government had some years ago. If this Government persists with its present policy it will be giving the snowball a further kick along. That policy will also have an effect on the Housing Commission, and there will be a greater turnover in houses. At one time in my electorate we had a turnover of a hundred houses a year; but as soon as there was a stability of employment, because of the introduction of the public works programme, the drift in population stopped. This was made possible by the co-operation of the Minister for Works and the Premier.

On many occasions they diverted finance from other channels and we were able to transfer men from harbour work to work on drainage schemes, housing programmes and the like, and from there to the building of the hospital. I might also add that because of the public works that were being undertaken in my electorate contracts were let for the building of houses in the district.

Mr. Nalder: You mean the Premier of the McLarty-Watts Government?

Mr. HALL: No, the Premier of the Labour Government. As regards the 17s. 6d. which has been mentioned on several occasions, it was used to the best advantage in trying to assist these people, who were out of work.

Mr. Nalder: Albany was put on to the map when the McLarty-Watts Government came into power.

Mr. Brand: That is a fact.

Mr. HALL: It is obvious that the turnover in houses will be seriously affected by the employment position. When we get instability of employment we get a shifting population. When that happens civic pride disappears, maintenance charges increase and there is a loss of confidence among working people. Because of this the Government, instead of decreasing its expenditure, will find that all these charges will increase. As I have already stated, civic pride will go by the board and pride in electorates will be lost. The Government, if it pursues its present policy, must take the responsibility if that happens.

A public works programme provides a stability of employment, and this applies particularly in some of our provincial towns; they need some sort of stability until they are able to fend for themselves. If the Government cannot adapt itself to that idea, and institute a public works programme, I am afraid we will never develop the State. The plight of the North-West is obvious, and if we do not develop and populate that part of the State we will eventually pay for it with lives and not £ s. d. We should use our assets in other parts of the State to develop our

North-West; if we do not do that we will be in serious trouble, and either we or our children will pay for it.

In *The West Australian* of the 12th June, 1959, there was an article headed, "A Foolish Stoppage." This article claims that the Government has been given a mandate to close down the public works programmes. I hope to prove that no such mandate exists. This article also states that this is not an industrial issue. If a recession of employment takes place as a result of the contemplated action by the present Government, its effects will be felt, as I have already said, by the industrialists and the people employed in industry, and later on by those engaged in commerce. I am sure that members opposite have read this article, portion of which reads—

Building workers should not make the mistake of trying to force the Government to reverse its policy of substituting contract building for day labour except for a maintenance force in the Public Works Department.

It goes on—

If it led to a strike by Government workers it would merely do at one stroke what the Government intends to carry out progressively over 18 months

We have heard it said that some men are leaving the work of their own accord. I think you, Mr. Speaker, will agree that we would both leave if we were under pressure as these men are. We would be like rats leaving a sinking ship because we would have to find some livelihood so that we could care for our families. This article states that it is not an industrial issue. I have already covered that ground. It is an industrial issue, because any recession in employment affects industry and, in the long run, commerce. In the final analysis, it affects everyone in the State.

I should now like to quote from *The West Australian* of the 28th October, 1958. Then it was a different story because the heading reads, "P.W.D. Plays Big Part in Development." The paper cannot give us big enough headlines in 1958; but in 1959 it cannot be sufficiently critical—a reversal of form. The article states—

The Public Works Department plays a vital role in the development of the State and, at the moment, is providing employment for 4,667 men

That speaks for itself. The Hawke Government was doing a good job in 1958, and employed many men, but the Government now in office is endeavouring to reduce that figure to zero and to prove that we did not do a good job.

I will now deal with another phase of the position. In *The West Australian* of the 16th June, 1959, there appeared an item of news under big headlines. Those headlines were—

Slight Rise in Number of Jobless.

I reiterate that if the Government persists with its attitude, the number of unemployed in this State will snowball. Management and workers in industry should get together because I do not agree with the striking down of a solid working force because if this is done it will undoubtedly result in a recession in this State.

The time is not far distant when the workers will have to face up to their masters and ask them to answer why they have brought about a recession. Labour and management both have a job to do that is essential to the welfare of the community. Industrial efficiency and our standard of living depend on the way we use the powers of productivity and the resources at our disposal. If we do not follow that course but, instead, do away with the day labour scheme in favour of the contract system, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that there will be an industrial recession and the work force of this State will be condemned to idleness. In other words, it will be a policy of progress with poverty.

MR. BRADY (Guildford-Midland—on amendment) [9.12]: I support the amendment to the Address-in-reply moved by the Leader of the Opposition last Thursday evening. For the benefit of the House I will read the amendment, which is as follows:—

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 wide-spread 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.

The Premier has no mandate to continue with the policy he has embarked upon. As Premier of this State, all that he is entitled to do, if he is desirous of ridding himself of Government employees, is to dismiss these men as each job concludes. He should not set out deliberately to sack them as he is now doing. When a protest was made against the action of the Government the other evening, the Premier tried to suggest that this move by the Government had been mentioned in his policy speech. I have checked various newspapers and the policy speech outlined by the Premier, and I cannot find any reference to this matter of sacking men in Government employ; nor did the Premier make any reference to it when he supported Mr. Throssel in Geraldton.

The Premier referred to oranges in Northampton and something about the installation of harbour works and a few other matters, but whilst he was making his policy speech he made no mention of sacking men in Government employment. In my opinion, contrary to the view held by the Government, the present Administration has no mandate to sack these men because it has not the numbers in this House. In actual fact, there are 24 Liberal and Country Party members. The other two members who are keeping the Government in office are sitting on this side of the House, as anyone who is in this Chamber can observe.

Mr. Roberts: Isn't that always the position in regard to the independents?

Mr. BRADY: Those two members can show their hand at any time in regard to the problem confronting the Government at the moment. Secondly, the Government has not a sufficient number of electors to support it. Only recently a booklet on the result of the last general election was prepared by Dr. Crowley, a lecturer at the University of Western Australia. In this booklet, Dr. Crowley states that Labour got 43.8 per cent. of the votes cast and 53.85 per cent. of all contested seats. The actual voting strength of the Labour Party and non-Labour parties was practically the same overall; that is, 42.8 per cent. and 41.68 per cent. respectively. The division gave Labour 21 seats and non-Labour 16 seats.

Therefore, how can the Government maintain that it has a mandate from the people to implement this part of its policy? First of all, it was never mentioned in the Premier's policy speech; secondly, the Government has not the numbers in the House to ensure that its policy will be carried out; and, thirdly, it has not the support of the public to justify its action. It is a shocking state of affairs that the Government has endeavoured to implement this part of its policy right at the beginning of its assuming office. If the Government is short of money, and should it be anxious to give support to its political friends, the best it could do would be to reduce the number of men employed in this Public Works Department as each job finishes. Instead of doing that, it is setting out to destroy an employment programme that was commenced by the Labour Party.

There is nothing so upsetting to a working man as to know that he has to go through a period of casual employment. I know that as a result of my experience with the Labour movement during the years from 1929 to 1939, until the outbreak of the second world war. I know how harassing it is to realise that one is not in permanent employment. Yet that is the position in which the Government is now placing many men who were employed by the Public Works Department.

It is not very pleasant for any employee of the Public Works Department to attend this House after performing a hard day's work and with the prospect of rising early in the morning to commence his work the following day. But the men who are now in the public gallery have attended in order to listen to our arguments against the Government's action. I hope that the workers and the unions will see the writing on the wall, because this is only the start of a movement among the Commonwealth and the State Liberal Governments. I realise that the workers will suffer great hardships as a result of Government policy on hire-purchase, insurance, increased prices, contract work and the calling of tenders for Government work in general.

I sincerely trust that the rank and file of the various unions will band together in an endeavour to stop the rot that has set in, because there is no doubt that the policy on which the Government has embarked will expand. Those people who paid the piper to finance the election campaign for the non-Labour parties and who banded together to attack the Labour Government have to get their reward. The only ones that will suffer will be the workers. Therefore, the workers must close their ranks. I hope they will attend here more often than they have in the past to listen to our deliberations. I hope they will urge their union secretaries and organisers to listen to the debates in this Chamber. If they do, I think that the debacle they are now facing will not continue. Vested interests' secretaries and organisers frequent the House. Why should not unionists do likewise?

Many of our workers felt that, with the Government taking office, they were in for a good time and were entering a golden age. A golden age is open to those who want it. We on this side of the House can only work to a limited extent. The balance of the responsibility is upon the workers themselves. Hundreds of youths who normally would be apprenticed to journeymen employed in Government departments this year, will not be indentured; and, as a result, they will lose, for the rest of their lives, an opportunity to be apprenticed to good trades.

This is so because, as somebody here said earlier, private contractors who are in casual employment here, and casual work there, are not going to accept apprentices for five years, as did the Public Works Department. As a consequence of this policy which the Government is putting into operation, our apprentices will lose their opportunity of learning a trade. That is another most unfortunate aspect of this decision with which we in this State are confronted. I align myself with those members on this side of the House who have said that the Government

will not get value for the money it proposes to spend on private contractors in the future, as it did through the Public Works Department in the past.

Members opposite can laugh and sneer, and say, "The private contractors will do us." I have no hesitation in saying that the contract system is open to abuse from half a dozen different angles. It has been abused in the past, and it will be abused in the future. We all know that the private contractor has to provide for profit for himself, taxation for the Commonwealth, and for a host of other contingencies which are not applicable to the work done by the Public Works Department. In the latter case the State would get the benefit of a better job, and the employees would receive stability in regular employment. The State Departments which are carrying on as trading concerns are providing the Government with a profit, to enable the State to build the much-needed hospitals, schools, water supplies, and other essential requirements.

This policy of the present Government is being carried out for the benefit of the contractors. They are the people who are backing this Government in its approach to the problem; it is they who came out on the eve of the elections with certain propaganda in an endeavour to defeat the Government. This Government led the people to believe that there was going to be continuous employment in public works. The Premier is alleged to have said that there would be no sacking, and I believe he stands by that. But now he says he has a mandate to do it, and he strives to justify his mandate by saying that Joe Chamberlain said he had a mandate. Joe Chamberlain denies he said that. That is the usual sort of talk we get from day to day to boost the efforts of this Government.

Whilst we are on this matter, I would like to point out that I envisage a most difficult position for the working man, unless he starts to think for himself, and to read between the lines and create his own propaganda machine. Here, in Western Australia, the Government has open to it two definite avenues of propaganda in the daily Press.

Point of Order

Mr. BRAND: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask you what bearing this has on the amendment to the Address-in-reply? The hon. member is making a political speech, appealing to the unions to develop their system of propaganda.

The SPEAKER: I hope the member for Guildford-Midland will relate his remarks to the amendment before the Chair, which was read out earlier.

Debate Resumed

Mr. BRADY: With all due deference to yourself, Sir, I will not continue along those lines, except to say that with all the propaganda machines now in the hands of certain people, and with the advent of television, the working man's outlook for the future is very poor indeed, unless he does something about it.

Another matter which relates to the building trades dispute, is the fact that this Government has admitted through the Minister for Education, and other members, that it is unable to cope with the requirements of the Education Department in regard to classrooms. The very organisation which was set up to cope with that shortage is now being dragged apart, and allowed to go into a decline because of the action of this Government. The Government's action is making our economic position very difficult. Because of our public works we have been provided with sufficient capital to enable the Government to catch up with the shortage of classrooms; but now the contractors will be encouraged to build up the necessary capital to do the work which should be done by the Public Works Department. Instead of helping the economy of the State, the Government is making it most difficult by sacking men employed in the building trade.

We have a shortage of hospitals throughout Western Australia, and the Public Works Department and building trades unions were doing a magnificent job in coping with that shortage. But here again they are not able to go on with it. There is also money which was available for certain other avenues, but this Government is not going to accept it. Recently there was an article in the papers which said—

**GOVERNMENT NOT TO ACCEPT
BUILDING AID.**

Cabinet decided yesterday to discontinue the practice of accepting contributions from local associations and road boards towards the capital cost of building hospitals in country districts.

These people were ready and willing to find money for these essential requirements, but the present Government says that it does not want that money; that it would sooner put men off from the Public Works Department than accept that money and do the jobs for which the State is crying out. The sacking of the building tradesmen is a shocking thing. The Government seems to be realising that the private capital it expected will not be here in the quantity it envisaged. I would like to read some of the remarks made by the Premier, which appeared in

The West Australian of the 5th March. They were written by "David Brand for the Liberal Party" and are as follows—

In Western Australia the unemployment situation is much worse than the average for Australia, which enjoys generally an unemployment level unsurpassed in the free world.

Deterioration in world trade has caused a slight degree of unemployment throughout Australia.

Positive action taken by the Commonwealth Government has been successful in keeping the overall level of unemployment low.

It took this Government's policy to build it up. To continue—

Why, then, do Western Australian figures compare so unfavourably with other States?

The answer lies in the policies pursued by the Hawke Government, which has failed to attract capital, and has actively hampered the expansion of established local industries.

Apparently this Government is not encouraging private capital into the State to the same extent as other Governments are encouraging capital from overseas into their States. It is this policy which secured for the Commonwealth Government certain finance in the past few months. This State Government of ours is setting out to take money away from the Public Works Department, and it has already said it is going to sell the State enterprises to private concerns if it can secure a satisfactory price. I believe the total profits built up in the State building concerns are in the vicinity of £750,000. The Government is apparently going to turn this money over to private firms, and to people who will ultimately be induced to build for those firms. Just as profit has been made by the State building concerns so has it been made in other avenues of State trading concerns such as the State Engineering Works.

It is a shocking thing for this Government to hand over those profits to people who have done nothing for the State, but who, to a large degree, have taken all they can from the State and put very little back.

There is another aspect about the Public Works Department and the sacking of the men which is true; that is, during the pressure period when houses could not be built for love nor money, because of the shortage of building tradesmen, hundreds of the men were loyal to the Government and to the Public Works Department. They stood by the department. As a consequence the Government was able to get its essential work done in the construction of buildings and houses.

Many of these men have passed their prime in the building trades, and they will not be employed by outside contractors. The latter want young men, not the

old ones. So it would appear that for their loyalty to the Government, and for their valuable contribution to the progress of this State, and for their efforts in building Government structures and houses, they are to be thrown on to the pool of unemployed, and left to make the best they can of the position.

There are people who will say that the Government has taken this action because the men will not do a fair day's work. I say that is a deliberate lie. As one who has been brought into the question of retaining these men in the service of the Public Works Department I can say this: Very often if they did not carry out their jobs they were sacked. Any man who did not do his job would be watched by the foreman, and he was expected to do a fair day's work. If he did not, he was transferred to another foreman; and he might pass through three or four foremen. If the three or four foremen were unanimous that the worker was not doing his job, he would be sacked, the same as the worker would be sacked under a private contractor.

People who put out the story that the Government departments retained the workers, willy-nilly, without the latter doing a fair day's work, are telling an untruth. They did a fair day's work, and that is all we can ask of them. In their employment they should not have to exert themselves like a bulldozer from 6 a.m. to 5 p.m. each day, as some who receive less than the basic wage when the figures in the contract are worked out, have to do under private contractors. Apparently that is the system which this Government wants to bring into operation.

Only the other day I saw in *The West Australian* a picture depicting two men working on a public works building on the riverfront, and the men were holding an umbrella while they did a certain amount of work. That is apparently the standard of work which the Liberal-Country Party wants to see in this State.

There are a dozen avenues through which this Government can proceed, if it wants to do the right thing by the people, instead of upsetting the status quo in the building trades. One of the things it can do is to tackle the increased shipping freight imposed by the interstate and overseas shipping companies. Those are the factors bringing about stagnation in this State.

Mr. Brand: What did your Government do about this matter when it was in office?

Mr. BRADY: Plenty. If the Premier were to look up the files he would see that the Labour Government did its utmost in putting up arguments for increased tariffs and in advocating the lowering of freight charges.

Mr. Brand: Where can I find that mentioned?

Mr. BRADY: Seeing that the Premier has brought up this question, he should do something about the matter of encouraging local industry in his own electorate. I believe that Fuller's earth is being imported from Japan and England, yet there are some deposits in his electorate which could be used to bring about employment. If he were to look around his electorate he would see that he could do something to relieve the unemployment brought about by the sacking of Public Works Department tradesmen.

There are other activities which this Government can undertake to create wealth in this State, instead of bringing about despair and misery in the homes of people by sacking men who have housing, hire-purchase, and other commitments to meet. The Government has done a most inhumane thing—something not done by the McLarty-Watts Government in its six years, nor by the Labour Government in its term of office. It took the Brand-Watts Government to set this new standard.

I say to the public in general and to members here that the conditions of these workers will be lowered by the Government, and that lower standard will become the common standard unless the workers unite behind the Labour Party and bring about the defeat of the Liberal-Country Party Government in the Federal as well as the State sphere. I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development—on amendment) [9.35]: Tonight we have heard from the Opposition a series of speeches which, even to be kind towards them, should be branded as politically insincere. If we go back to the genesis of all this hullabaloo going on at the present time we will find that the whole matter is politically inspired.

Mr. Evans: Exactly; from Beaufort-st.

Mr. COURT: The hon. member said that.

Mr. Evans: You said it and I agreed with you.

Mr. COURT: We find that on the 12th June, Mr. Chamberlain (the A.L.P. State Secretary and the Campaign Organiser for the Labour Party, and the Federal President) is reported in the following terms—

"This is a political dispute with the Liberal Government as an employer and as a Government," he said. He told the men that this stop work protest meeting was the first step in an overall drive to unseat the Liberal Government.

Point of Order

Mr. LAWRENCE: To what does the hon. member refer?

The **SPEAKER**: The hon. member is entitled to ask that anything quoted shall be tabled. I do not think that at this stage he can ask for the source from which it comes.

Mr. **LAWRENCE**: I ask that the quotation be tabled.

The **SPEAKER**: The Minister may proceed.

Debate Resumed

Mr. **COURT**: I hope I will receive some tolerance from the Opposition if I want more time, because I remember a similar thing happening to me once before on an important motion. The second point is this: The speakers on the Opposition side have tried to convey the impression that this Government has no mandate. Try as hard as they will, with all the acrobatics of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in his speech the other evening, they still cannot get away from the fact that this Government—the Liberal-Country Party Government in Western Australia—has been elected by the people of the State.

Mr. **Tonkin**: It has a minority on the floor of the House.

Mr. **COURT**: It was elected by the people of Western Australia. If not, why did the hon. member's Government resign; because the hon. member would be the last to resign from the ministry if he did not have to?

Mr. **Tonkin**: But you are in the minority on the floor of the House. Laugh that one off!

Mr. **COURT**: Despite what the member for Guildford-Midland has said, the State Secretary of the Labour Party (Mr. Chamberlain) has admitted publicly that the Government has a mandate. He also said that the Government had a majority in Parliament, and therefore a mandate. That was a statement from him. It was not a political writer saying that.

Mr. **Tonkin**: You promised the people that you would not sack anybody. That was why you got a mandate.

Mr. **COURT**: I shall come to that later.

Mr. **Tonkin**: We will come to it later on all right.

Mr. **COURT**: This is purely a political racket.

Mr. **Tonkin**: We agree it is a political racket.

Mr. **COURT**: This is purely a political racket started under the direction of the State Secretary of the Australian Labour Party, who is also the Federal President, and now being carried on by members opposite in this Parliament.

Mr. **Jamieson**: You are miles out.

Mr. **COURT**: We heard the amendment being introduced by the Leader of the Opposition, and the Leader of the Opposition shed tears about the mental turmoil

going on. He reiterated that statement. It was a figment of his own imagination; it was a figment of the imagination of the Opposition. It is a state they would like to bring about; it is something which they will do their utmost to create in this community for a political end. This approach of the Labour Party is not new; it is purely an attempt to create unrest, class hatred and class distinction. That is the thing the Labour Party tries to prosper on for its political life, but it has brought about that party's own destruction. The public is not the least bit fooled by the antics of the Opposition.

Mr. **Evans**: They were fooled on March 21st.

Mr. **COURT**: The atmosphere in Western Australia is one of confidence, the like of which has not been here since 1947-53.

Several members: Hear! hear!

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

Mr. **COURT**: What happened during the years 1953-59 was that this State had a full-blooded experiment in socialism, but the people of the State really saw behind the curtain for the first time.

Mr. **May**: What curtain?

Mr. **COURT**: The socialist curtain. They saw the full impact of what could happen to the State and to individual people in the State if a Labour Government continued in power in Western Australia. Having felt the effects of socialism upon them, they made a change on the 21st March.

Mr. **Tonkin**: They will get rid of you.

Mr. **COURT**: The members of the Opposition are trying to make out that the people are a lot of nincompoops —

Mr. **Tonkin**: The Government is.

Mr. **COURT**: — the people who voted on the 21st March. If the people had not voted in favour of the change of Government, there would not have been a change.

Mr. **May**: You called them nincompoops.

Mr. **COURT**: The Opposition is trying to imply that they are a lot of nincompoops. Do not try to put into my mouth words which I do not want to use.

Mr. **May**: I know what I would like to put into your mouth.

Mr. **COURT**: There is no doubt in my mind that the public of Western Australia understood thoroughly what was the policy of the Leader of the Liberal Party, and what was the policy of the Leader of the Country Party. They declared themselves in the plainest of language in respect of the policy now being implemented by the present Government of this State. If one listened to the speeches from the other side of the House one would gain the impression that the public was being hoodwinked.

Mr. **Evans**: That is it.

Mr. COURT: The Opposition is implying that we were elected on a policy which we are now dishonouring.

Mr. Evans: So you are.

Mr. COURT: We are honouring the promises on which we were elected. The member for East Perth gave the impression that we have gone berserk and do not know what we are doing.

Mr. Graham: You always have.

Mr. COURT: We are implementing the policy on which we were elected.

Mr. Lawrence: That is why you tramped these people.

Mr. COURT: It is interesting to note this concern about the worker today: I cannot remember any motions of no-confidence coming from the back benches of the Labour Party when there was chaos in the building industry caused by the over-spending of the then Minister for Housing, the member for East Perth.

Mr. Graham: Tommy-rot!

Mr. COURT: It threw the housing industry into absolute and complete chaos, and no-one shed any tears on the Government side, as it was then, in respect to the people who were thrown into insecurity.

Mr. Graham: You reckon we built too many houses?

Mr. COURT: It was not a question of building too many houses; it was a question of throwing the industry into chaos and of causing unemployment and insecurity. There was mental turmoil in the community when your Government tried to extricate itself from its financial embarrassment.

Mr. Evans: By building houses for the people?

Mr. Graham: Do you suggest they should have waited another year or two for their homes?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will address the Chair.

Mr. COURT: The member for East Perth, in his tirade against the Liberal Party and the Country Party, referred to the Industrial Arbitration Act; and he referred to the penalty clauses in that Act. If he wants to put his head out in respect of this matter, I would point out that the penalty clauses in our Industrial Arbitration Act are only a part of the penalties that are in the Commonwealth Act by virtue of the amendments moved by Dr. Evatt when Attorney-General in the Federal Parliament.

Mr. Graham: There was a chap by the name of Abbott who tried to say that in this place, and he had to apologise because it was not true. He is out of Parliament now.

Mr. Andrew: You ought to be.

Mr. COURT: The amendments in our particular Act, moved by the then Attorney-General in Western Australia, are not as severe as the amendments put in the Commonwealth Act by the then Attorney-General, Dr. Evatt.

Mr. Graham: Because the Leader of the Opposition moved to reduce them by half.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COURT: Let us examine the situation. We would gain the impression, if we believed all that is told to us by the Opposition, that there is mass-unemployment of an unprecedented amount in Western Australia—the like of which we have never seen—and that this is a ruthless, heartless Government.

The SPEAKER: There are too many interjections, and I will have to take further action. I am endeavouring to give all speakers on both sides of the House the hearing to which they are entitled. I propose to see that they get it.

Mr. COURT: I predict that early in the New Year, as was foreshadowed by the Minister for Works, with the projects this Government has afoot, there will be a shortage of building tradesmen in this State. This is the most difficult period in the Government's history. It is by far the most difficult period, because, first of all, of seasonal unemployment, and because of the transition period in going from day labour to the tender and contract system. However, we find that there has been an improvement, not a deterioration, at a time when one would expect a deterioration. There is an improvement in the employment factor in respect of the building trade.

Mr. Graham: Ask the unemployed!

Mr. COURT: At the end of June, there were 88 fewer unemployed in the building trade in Western Australia than when the previous Government went out of office. One cannot get away from this fact.

Mr. Toms: What is the total unemployed now, compared with what it was?

Mr. COURT: Those registered for unemployment benefits—

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COURT: I will state what I want to state.

Mr. Tonkin: That won't be unusual.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will address the Chair.

Mr. COURT: At the end of March, the total number of applicants in respect of the building trades, as shown by the Commonwealth Labour and National Service Department, was 538. In June, it was 450. That has happened during a most difficult period when this Government has been switching from day labour to the tender and contract system. There has to be a

transitory period while getting out plans and specifications. I realise that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition made a lot of the question in regard to plans and specifications, but I submit that the great breakdown under the day-labour system was the failure to get plans and specifications.

Mr. Tonkin: You are the only one who is saying that.

Mr. COURT: Is the hon. member happy about the figures for the University?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will address the Chair.

Mr. Tonkin: Much happier than I am about the Chest Hospital.

Mr. COURT: If the hon. member is happy about the University figures, I am amazed. I should imagine he would be distressed about the situation; about the embarrassment it has caused the State and the University in respect of finance because of the extra costs.

Mr. Graham: That is why the University asked for further additions under the day-labour system.

Mr. COURT: They are in the morass of having to go on and get it finished.

Mr. Graham: Like the Rural and Industries Bank.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COURT: It is being finished by tender.

Mr. Graham: And the University is being built by day labour.

Mr. Tonkin: A bigger morass.

Mr. COURT: All of a sudden, we find that senior members of the Opposition have switched from the question of the difference in cost between work carried out by day labour and tender to the question of the quality of work; and there is a very good reason why they have had to seize on another issue, because there is no denying that the work will be done cheaper by tender and by contract—

Mr. Tonkin: Oh yes there is! What about the Tuart Hill high school?

Mr. COURT: — and within controlled figures. This is what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said the other day in the course of his speech. He reflected very seriously on the capacity of the professional officers in the Public Works Department.

Mr. Tonkin: Oh no he didn't! I thought you would come at that.

Mr. Bovell: How many speeches are you going to make?

Point of Order.

Mr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Minister is saying something which is untrue, and I ask for a withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: Will the hon. member say to what particular part he objects, so I can ask the Minister to withdraw it?

Mr. TONKIN: To his last statement that I reflected on the professional officers of the department. As a matter of fact, the boot is on the other foot. I ask for a withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has asked for a withdrawal of the words about which he has complained.

Mr. COURT: If he is so thin-skinned that he cannot take it, I must withdraw.

Debate Resumed.

Mr. COURT: You are so terribly thin-skinned when in Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Railways must address the Chair and not members across the Chamber.

Mr. COURT: I will approach the matter in another way, and leave the name of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition out of it, as he seems a little touchy tonight. If one says—and "one" could be anybody—that the quality of work done under the tender and contract system cannot be guaranteed, it is tantamount to saying that the plans and specifications are not correct; or that the supervisors are incapable or, if not incapable, are negligent; and, if neither, that they are dishonest.

Mr. Graham: Do you want a supervisor watching over every workman?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COURT: Therefore, it follows that if the tender and contract system does not produce the quality of work, it is the fault of those who have the responsibility to supervise the work concerned.

Mr. Graham: You would not know the first thing about building construction.

Mr. COURT: There have been millions and millions of pounds' worth of buildings constructed throughout the world by the tender and contract system, and the people who have paid for those buildings are not fools. They want value for money.

Mr. Bovell: And they get it.

Mr. COURT: They also want it at the time they specify, the way they stipulate, and the price they offer. It is more or less being intimated that quality is gained only by the day-labour system, and the people who have the job of supervising and drawing up the plans and specifications are either incapable, negligent, or dishonest.

Mr. Graham: If that makes you happy, run away with it.

Mr. COURT: It is an amazing thing to find all this solicitude for certain sections of the work force in this State when it is not long ago that workers were leaving Western Australia.

Mr. Heal: They still are.

Mr. COURT: They were leaving because of the then Labour Government, and because of its attitude towards private enterprise. One has to look further than the question of the immediate present day-labour wrangle. The Government has the responsibility of gearing up the economy to bigger and better things, and that is what this Government is trying to do.

One of the great deterrents in regard to persuading private enterprise to come here and bring capital and know-how from other places was the policy of the previous Government. It was clearly understood by people in other parts of Australia, and the world, that the then Government was a socialist Government intent on expanding the day-labour system. It was opposed to tender and contracts. All the time that Government was in power in Western Australia and had that attitude, the degree of progress that could have been made in Western Australia was automatically restricted.

Mr. Lawrence: Rubbish!

Mr. COURT: It is not. It is a statement of real fact.

Mr. Lawrence: You put out plenty of people on this—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for South Fremantle will refrain from interjecting; and, furthermore, when the Speaker is speaking he will keep quiet.

Mr. COURT: There were no tears at the time the Labour Government caused distress to these people when men in private enterprise were thrown out of employment.

Mr. Graham: By private contractors; not by the Government.

Mr. COURT: The people who work in private enterprise should realise the treatment they got from the previous Labour Government and not be dragged along by the heels by those members we have heard in this present dispute.

Mr. Graham: Private enterprise failed its workers.

Mr. COURT: Rubbish!

Mr. Graham: They did.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COURT: There has been a lot of comment on the debate on this particular amendment regarding State trading concerns. The Opposition seems to think it is impossible to handle the transition of the State trading concerns from Government to private ownership, using the formula, declared by the Government both during

and after the election, of a fair and reasonable price, protection for employees and the preservation of industry within Western Australia.

Mr. W. Hegney: What do you mean by "protection for employees"?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Graham: Airy nothings!

Mr. COURT: I will gladly oblige the member for Mt. Hawthorn. Protection of the employees means that in any transaction there is proper protection for the employees, so that the individual owner does not, willy-nilly, throw a lot of people out of work.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COURT: You are just guessing.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would stress that the Minister for Railways must address the Chair and not indulge in cross-fire. He is to disregard interjections, and the interjectors will have to be careful, too! I am not standing any more.

Mr. Graham: The safest thing for me to do is to leave the Chamber, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COURT: This Government has demonstrated during its period in office that it has a responsible approach in connection with the economy and employment factor in this State. If it did not, it would have handled this transition period by an entirely different system. No one can deny that the Minister for Works has gone out of his way, and gone to extremes, to ensure that the transfer from day labour to the tender or contract system is handled in a humane, sensible manner. I think he has gone to extreme limits and is doing a first-class job. Of course, he has disappointed the Opposition because they were hoping that he would throw people out by the hundreds.

Mr. Tonkin: He has said there will be 600 sacked by Christmas.

Mr. Bovell: He has sacked nobody.

Mr. COURT: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is apparently completely oblivious of the facts stated to him. The programme and method of handling this situation have been clearly demonstrated by the Minister for Works, and previously by the Premier.

Before I commence on the second part of this amendment, I want to deal with references made about the apprentices. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition made certain sweeping statements which have been debunked—

Mr. Tonkin: Oh yes?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COURT: — by the Minister for Works. The situation in the Railway Department where there are a very large number of employees in a great number of

trades, is traditionally that the department only contracts to teach the young man his trade. It enters into no contract and gives no undertaking at all about future employment after serving the period.

That is not peculiar to this Government, or to the Hawke Government, or to the McLarty-Watts Government. It is an established traditional situation. It does happen that when one of the cadres has a vacancy and a young man is just concluding his time and shows aptitude, he might get the job. But that is the exception and not the rule. Sometimes it might happen on several occasions, and at other times not at all.

But it is the general practice to acknowledge that the period of indenture is the only contractual commitment that the department has; and that is a large Government instrumentality which handles a terrific number of apprentices and which has a clearly defined practice in respect of them—a practice that is thoroughly understood by the parents of the young men, by the unions, and by the lads themselves.

I shall now refer briefly to the 17s. 6d. It has been suggested that when the Government removed that supplementary payment to single unemployed, it did so without examination. It is said that we peremptorily withdrew the payment; but I can assure members that the Minister in charge of that portfolio gave the question a most thorough examination in the light of the experience of the previous Government, and in the light of our own experience during the short time we were in office before the decision was made. I am speaking with some knowledge of the facts, as I do not wish to give the impression that this was one of the so-called ruthless, heartless actions which members opposite say this Government takes.

Mr. Evans: Are you carrying out policy in this regard?

Mr. COURT: It was found that it was an intolerable situation for the State to be in; and the whole matter had got completely out of hand. The only way in which to handle the situation was to cancel the supplementary payment and introduce a new system. It is interesting to note that after the new system was introduced on the 1st May—

Mr. Tonkin: What was that?

Mr. COURT: —cases of hardship could apply for payment—

Mr. Tonkin: And how many of them are getting it?

Mr. COURT: I am coming to that. Why not do what the Speaker told you to do, and I will do the same? From the 1st May only 20 people have applied. Their

cases have been examined by officers skilled in this work, and hardship has not been established.

Some payments have been made—I think about five in all—to men who have come out of prison and who have been more or less penniless until they could get registered for unemployment benefits. They have received a lump sum to tide them over. It is part of the policy of the department to administer the matter in that way, but the point is that these cases are all capable of being examined. Every person has the publicly-announced right to make a submission for his case to be considered; and if there was any hardship I am certain that most of them would want their cases considered. For that reason I think the Government has acted humanely in this regard. It has not adopted a hole-and-corner method, but has considered all the facts; and, after due regard to all the circumstances, has decided to withdraw the supplementary amount.

I hope this House will reject the amendment, which is against the interests and economy of the State and against the interests of the people it professes to help. I oppose the amendment.

MR. W. HEGNEY (Mt. Hawthorn—on amendment) [10.41: I naturally propose to support the amendment; but, before dealing specifically with its subject matter, I will reply briefly to a few of the statements made by the Minister for Railways, the Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party. He adopted the old theme of ours being a socialistic Government, but I do not think that cuts much ice anywhere.

The Labour Government was in office from 1953 to 1959 and carried out its policy without fear or favour. Incidentally, the Minister implied that tradesmen and residents of this State were leaving Western Australia because of Labour policy; but if there is any section of this community which did its utmost to damn Western Australia from 1953 to 1959, it was the members of the Liberal Party.

The Labour Government, in carrying out its policy, introduced legislation in an endeavour to protect small traders against monopolistic tendencies; and when the proposed trade delegation was going overseas with representatives of the Chamber of Commerce and the Deputy Leader of the Labour Government, members of the Liberal Party did their utmost to decry the mission and to destroy its objectives, and in that way did a great deal of damage to the State of Western Australia. Yet this Government says that because of the attitude of the Labour Government from 1953 to 1959, there was chaos in this State.

The Minister for Railways made reference to the chaos that was alleged to have existed in connection with housing during a certain period of the Labour Government's administration. If that Government made any mistake, it was made in

the interests of the people of the community, when we were badly in need of houses and used every penny that the Government could lay its hands on, for the purpose of relieving the shortage. The Minister also referred to the question of contracts, and implied that work done by contract was always cheaper than that done under the day labour system.

I will not go into detail on the question of contract prices versus day-labour costs, but in one instance—I happened to be accused of political dishonesty in regard to this big project in my own electorate; and here I refer to the Tuart Hill High School, which is one of the most beautiful educational buildings in the State—the work was let to contractors, and it was in January or February, 1956 that they started work. But they were obliged to relinquish the contract because of a mistake mentioned by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition a few evenings ago. The balance of the building was carried out by departmental construction, and it was erected in stages and is now almost finished. I am given to understand—I am open to correction on this—that the cost of that work to the Public Works Department was less than the original contract price.

I will now deal with the subject matter of the amendment, which states—

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.

Anyone who studies the wording of that amendment, having regard to the existing position, must realise that it is factual. The Government has sacked a number of men already. Prior to the election the present Premier indicated that no employees would be fired, but members of the day-labour organisation of the Public Works Department have been fired. To reiterate what the member for East Perth has already said, the Minister for Works has indicated, in no uncertain terms, that 20 men from the public works organisation will be dismissed each week for the next 65 weeks, at least.

That is the position. There are approximately 1,500 men—now employed by the Public Works Department—who will lose their employment in the Government service; and, as has been indicated, there are numbers of men over 50 years of age, and up to 60 years of age, who will find it difficult to obtain appropriate employment outside, although they are an acquisition to the State and to the public works organisation. That organisation was built up over a period, and much has been said about the previous Government sacking a number of the employees of that department.

A number of men were employed on a temporary basis for the express purpose of trying to get the Scarborough High School and additional rooms for the Modern School ready for the opening of the school year. When these projects had reached a certain stage a number of men were put off because the Government of the day did not have enough money to keep them employed. But the organisation is there; and it is doing, and has done, and if left alone will continue to do, a good job in the interests of the State.

Now I come to another aspect of the position which the Government has created, and will continue to accentuate as the months go by. In the course of his speech, one of our members earlier in the evening indicated that it was the policy of the Liberal Party to create a pool of unemployment. I say unequivocally, with all due respect to your background, Mr. Speaker, that that is a policy of this Government.

Mr. Court: Nonsense!

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Its policy is to endeavour to create a pool of unemployment, not of seven per cent. but, if it possibly can, in the vicinity of 10 per cent.

Mr. Brand: Why not make it 50 per cent?

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Its policy is to have a pool on tap and the tendency will be to reduce the standard of the industrial conditions in this State.

Mr. Nalder: What rot!

Mr. W. HEGNEY: That is your opinion.

Mr. Nalder: What rot!

Mr. W. HEGNEY: This is the first link in the chain of movement upon which this Government will engage for the purpose of creating that industrial pool. The Minister for Railways made reference to the Industrial Arbitration Act. I can recollect vividly—I think it was last session—introducing an amendment to the Industrial Arbitration Act for the purpose of clothing the Arbitration Court with the requisite power to determine in a particular case whether a worker was a contractor or an employee.

Mr. Brand: Why not?

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Why not! See how even the Premier can stick his neck out. He voted against the proposition. The proposition briefly was that as the sub-contracting system had been introduced and extended in the building industry—in the carpentry, plastering, and bricklaying sections—there was a very strong protest by the members of the Building Trades Union who held the view, and rightly so in my opinion, that certain tactics were being adopted by various employers for the purpose of sidestepping the appropriate industrial award.

Mr. Graham: That is quite right.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Instead of engaging men under the terms of the award which would provide for the basic wage, the margin, and other conditions, the men were put on what is called a sub-contract basis, or a contract basis. Yet to all intents and purposes they were employees. The Carpenters' Union took the case to court and the court indicated that it was powerless to do anything in that particular instance. It suggested that an appropriate amendment might be introduced into Parliament, and it was as a result of that that the then Government introduced the amending Bill. But members opposite, who were then in Opposition, voted, as far as I know, in toto against the proposition.

Mr. Court: That is right.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The Government of that day was not asking for the union secretary to be the interpreter as to whether the award should be carried out or not; all that the Government of the day asked was that the Arbitration Court should be given the authority to determine—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member will relate his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I am glad you have made reference to that, Sir, because I would remind you that this is most appropriate. What I am endeavouring to show—and I am sure you will agree with me in a few minutes—is that as a result of the attitude of the then Opposition, of which you were an illustrious member, we were prevented from giving the Arbitration Court power to determine whether certain people engaged in the building trade were workers or contractors.

As a result of that, I believe the tendency will be for a deterioration in industrial conditions in the building industry. The Minister for Railways said—and I quite agree with him here—that apprentices on the termination of their apprenticeship are not guaranteed employment. But it is not customary to dispense with their services. In my view the Government of the day has a great responsibility to the youth of this country; and if the Minister for Railways will check the figures in regard to apprentices, both in the railways and in the State Engineering Works, as well as the public works, he will find that a maximum number of apprentices has been engaged, and they form a substantial proportion of the qualified and skilled work force in the building industry in this State.

It is obvious that if we have 1,500 men in the day-labour organisation of the Public Works Department, a great number of them will be tradesmen, and consequently there will be a great number of apprentices harnessed to those tradesmen. If in 15 months or 18 months' time that number has dwindled considerably to a maintenance force of 200 or 300

men, one can immediately see that there will be a restriction imposed on a number of the youths of Western Australia.

As I mentioned a few moments ago, when speaking about the contracting and sub-contracting business in the building industry, there will be a definite tendency to reduce the number of apprentices engaged in the building trade.

I should now like to make reference—and this is quite legitimate, too—to a statement of principles—and I use the word "principles" in this case—and refer again to the Minister for Railways. Earlier in the evening I asked a question regarding the principles enunciated or enumerated by the Government on the proposed sale of State trading concerns. The member for Murray is not here, but if I asked him, in the appropriate way, whether he would favour the disposal of the Wyndham Meat Works—

Mr. Jamieson: Or the State Shipping Service.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Yes; I will come to that in a moment. I would suggest that the member for Murray would be one of the last to agree to the disposal of the Wyndham Meat Works. I know that last year the then Government was asked by a prominent member of the Liberal Party, which is always against socialism and State trading concerns, to establish a meat works at Derby.

I ask the Government: Does it propose to sell the State Shipping Service? In this regard it is colossal political hypocrisy. The State Shipping Service is the lifeline of the North-West. I can recollect the time when there was no State Shipping Service. I was working as a shearer and station hand in the North-West, and what we used to call the black boats called at the ports; but they would not go to any of those ports unless it paid them.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must confine himself to the amendment before the Chair.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I am certainly going to confine myself to the amendment, Mr. Speaker. For your information, Sir, it reads—

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.

I am going to say, with your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, that the policy proposed by this Government in regard to the Wyndham Meat Works, and the State Shipping Service, will accentuate the unemployment position in this State.

When a previous Liberal-Country Party Government was in office from 1947 to 1953, its policy was to oppose socialism, but I understand it extended the operations of the State Brickworks during the six years it was in office.

Mr. J. Hegney: And also the State Electricity Commission.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I will now deal briefly with the three principles I have mentioned, because they are worth repeating. I think the Minister for Railways must have drawn these up, because he knows them off by heart. The first is: "A fair and reasonable price". The Government will determine what is a fair and reasonable price if it carries out its intention to sell the State Engineering Works and other State trading concerns. The fair and reasonable price will be infinitesimal compared to what it should be today. I will leave that thought with the members of the Government, and particularly the new members.

The second of these three principles is: "The protection of existing employees". Earlier this evening the Premier got out of his straitjacket. I asked him a series of questions, but I received unsatisfactory answers. When I asked the Minister for Railways the same questions, he replied that the State was certainly not going to dispense with the services of good employees.

Mr. Court: Why would it?

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I did not ask the Minister for Railways that question. I will ask the question again. Do the words, "protection of existing employees" mean that, in any agreement or contract entered into by this Government with a private employer or company, there will be a clause providing that existing employees must be protected in their employment; that clause to apply not only to some of them, but to all of them? Of course the Minister for Railways would not agree with that!

The Government is guilty of political dishonesty in trying to hoodwink the employees of the State instrumentalities and the State trading concerns into believing that, if they conform to the policy of the Government in regard to the transfer of those concerns from Government ownership to private ownership, their employment will be ensured, because I am certain that this Government will not agree to anything like that.

The third principle is: "The continuation of the enterprise within the economy of the State". This Government would dispose of the State trading concerns if it was satisfied that its political friends would play ball, and a fair and reasonable price would be determined by the representatives of the Government and those of the prospective purchasers. I said that behind the Government's move was the objective to bring about a deterioration of industrial

conditions; that is, among other things. I also said that the trend would be for unemployment to increase. There is no doubt that the Government is making an attack on the high standard of industrial conditions associated with the day-labour employment.

I was the Minister responsible, when the Hawke Government was in office, for introducing a measure to grant three months' long service leave to all Government employees after 10 years' service; but members of the Government who were then sitting in Opposition voted strongly against that proposal, despite the fact that the granting of three months' long service leave after 10 years' service had been enjoyed by many Government workers since January, 1928. I understand also that foremen and other leading hands in the Public Works Department are granted three months' long service leave after 10 years' service; and others enjoy this privilege after serving seven years, having already completed 10 years' service. I believe also that wages men are granted three months' long service leave after serving 10 years; and then after serving seven years.

All employees of the State Engineering Works, State Brickworks, State Saw Mills and the State Shipping Service enjoy three months' long service leave after 10 years' service. Further, there are many men in the Public Works Department who will lose their pro rata long service leave because they will not have served the requisite period if these concerns are disposed of by the Government. Will the Government ensure that the years of service they have given to the departments will be credited to them by the new owner, or will those employees be dismissed without any undertaking as to the protection of their interests?

Mr. Court: We said that they would be protected in their employment.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: A responsible member of the Government said that the Government would not fire anybody, and yet many men have already been dismissed. The Government cannot hoodwink me on its definition of protection of existing employees, because I do not believe that the Government will ensure the continuity of employment of those men in the State Brickworks or in the State Engineering Works if those undertakings are sold to private enterprise. I do not think any employee in Government service or any member of the public should be hoodwinked into believing that such would be the case.

The Government has been extremely unwise and injudicious by commencing to attack a large organisation such as the Public Works Department so early in its life. This organisation has performed wonderful service in the interests of the State. The Minister for Education will

agree with me when I say that the Public Works constructional organisation has been responsible for the building of urgently needed classrooms so that, as far as was possible, accommodation would be available for school children in various places at the commencement of the school year. Also, in regard to the construction of hospitals, that organisation is geared to present-day requirements.

This attack on a very fine section of our Government service is unjustified and unwarranted. The Government, upon reflection, will come to realise that the opposition voiced by members on this side of the House is well merited, and the protests of the men concerned and their industrial representatives are justified. I hope the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition will be carried.

MR. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—on amendment) [10.29]: I join with other speakers in wishing you well, Mr. Speaker, upon your appointment to such an elevated office. I congratulate the Premier and the members of his conservative Government upon their assumption of office, and I wish him the best of luck. He may not stand in need of my congratulations, but I am sure—and I only hope for the sake of Western Australia—that he will stand in need of the best of luck.

My purpose in speaking to this amendment to the Address-in-reply is to deal with many aspects arising from the recent election campaign, and also several disquieting features of the Government's activities during the short three months it has been in office. Chief among these matters will be the mantle of revocation that this Tory, conservative Government has so gladly and hastily thrown around its shoulders. Secondly, there is the failure of the Government, in times of great need, to continue the payment of assistance to single unemployed persons. The third matter upon which I will speak is the intention of these disciples of private enterprise to sell the State trading concerns; and the last, but certainly not the least—especially in its effect—is the matter of the sacking of Public Works Department men, and the effecting of retrenchments in the State Engineering Works.

Mr. Brand: I thought there were only two points in the amendment.

Mr. EVANS: I have given the Premier another one to think about. The decisions of this Government, which have been made with quite considerable haste, are the revoking of a proclamation by the previous Government; the decision to continue the building of the Rural and Industries Bank by day labour; and the changing of the name of a certain bridge. In my opinion the original name was much more appropriate as a tourist attraction—and this rings so deeply in the Premier's heart—than the narrow-minded name given to it by this conservative Government.

Another matter revoked by this Government was the order, legally made, by the Hawke Labour Government calling for a redistribution of electoral boundaries in this State.

The SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member can connect electoral boundaries with the amendment before the Chair.

Mr. EVANS: These matters show that the Government is a past master in acrobatics. No sooner was it in power—and I would say drunk with power—than it showed its true colours as an instrument of vested interests. I know the Liberal members do not have a conscience; and that they have a very small heart. I am surprised to learn, however, that the Country Party members seem to share the same anatomy. I am surprised at the Country Party members. However, this Government has cancelled the payment made by the previous Government to single unemployed persons. The result is that a single unemployed person now receives the rich sum from the Commonwealth Government of £3 5s. a week.

This treatment is worse than the shabby treatment meted out by the Menzies conservative Government to the aged people—and that was shabby enough. These people now get £3 5s. a week, while an age pensioner receives £4 7s. 6d. a week; and, in some cases, £4 17s. 6d. a week if he is single and paying rent. Before the election, this Government said it was a Government which would stand for the interests of the common people; that it would do what was right for the common good of the State. It was so much poppycock; and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you did not indulge in such propaganda in your election campaign. Had you done so, I am sure you would not have been returned.

It all goes to show that this Government enjoys power—I will not say it has a mandate—but it does not possess any sense of responsibility at all. I would point out to the Premier that small pots soon boil over, and that it is later than he thinks. Where the Liberal Party and the Country Party contested seats in five rural electorates, they are now only allies; not friends. This great marriage of convenience may soon be on the rocks, and a Labour Government may be restored in time to promote the common good of the people and of the State.

Mr. Graham: Commonsense.

Mr. EVANS: And, as the member for East Perth says, to promote commonsense. During the election campaign we heard much by way of a slogan which was rallied around the State by the Liberal Party, and the Liberal Party inspired Press, to dismiss the guilty men. In view of what I have said, would I be wrong in asserting that this slogan has now boomeranged back on to the guilty men?

I would like to castigate the Government for its intention to sell the State trading concerns, many of which were established and instituted in times of need, and on occasions when private enterprise had either failed or refused to provide a service required by the people. I can speak with particular knowledge and emphasis in relation to the State hotel at Gwalia. Those few members of the Opposition—and I speak of the Government as my Opposition—who have been further than the Darling Range, will realise that people living at Gwalia are living under great difficulties.

Mr. Brand: What sort of beer do they drink at Gwalia?

Mr. EVANS: I can tell the Premier that. They drink draught Swan and bottled Hannans; and the bottled Hannans they drink at Gwalia is due to the efforts of the member for Kalgoorlie. The Premier did not expect that. These people at Gwalia live under great difficulties. What do we find? Several years ago they sought to have a hotel built there; and because private enterprise refused to build one, it was constructed by the State. The member for Murchison will know that what I am saying is the truth.

This is one of the best buildings on the north-eastern goldfields; it is an edifice to the inspiration and sympathy felt by a Labour Government for people living in difficulties, where private enterprise would not provide a service they required; a service that was necessary. I was in Leonora early in October, and I expressed concern, while having refreshment in the hotel there, that the price of a schooner of beer was 1s. 1d., which was the price prevailing in Kalgoorlie. Yet I had to pay 1s. 2d. at Kookynie. I asked the publican at Leonora for his comment; and he said, "If there was not a State hotel at Gwalia you would not be paying 1s. 1d. but 1s. 4d."

That shows what private enterprise thinks of State trading concerns, because the hotel at Leonora is a private hotel. State trading concerns are giving the people great service. They are providing a cheap service. The publican at Leonora and the others must be making a profit out of their beer because they have not closed their hotels. They have all reapplied for their licenses, and yet it was their intention, in a private hotel, to charge 1s. 4d. It is only reasonable to expect these things from the Liberal Party, because we know they represent vested interests. We know that the tycoons in the Liberal Party have only to command the members of the Government in order to make them jump up, click their heels, and stand to attention.

I am surprised, however, that the Country Party should allow itself to be dictated to by vested interests in St. George's Terrace. The hearts of the Country Party members are with the producers of the

State, just as our hearts are with the consumers. The Country Party should be leaning towards the Labour Party, not towards the Liberals. I am not surprised at what the Liberals are doing, but I am surprised at the Country Party members.

However, I shall continue with the Government's intention to sell out and dispose of the State trading concerns, and I shall go on and refer to the hedging of the Premier and his reluctance to give an assurance to members on this side of the House that workers in State trading concerns would be properly protected. The Premier has hesitated to give that assurance; and it would seem that the employment of 6,300 workers engaged in State trading concerns at present is in great jeopardy. I was interested tonight to hear answers given by the Minister for Works to the Deputy Leader of our Party. I took the figures down as the Minister read them out; I hope they are correct. The first question was—

How many men have been sacked by the Government from the Public Works Department since it assumed office?

The answer was, as I wrote it down—

Two hundred and fifty-one men.

The next question was—

To what number does the Government intend to reduce this labour force by the end of this year?

The figure given in the answer was—

Eight hundred and fifty men.

What did the Premier have to say about this question prior to the elections? I looked up *The West Australian* of the 5th March, 1959, and found, under the election points provided by the leaders of the various political parties, a contribution by David Brand, Leader of the Liberal Party, in which he said there were too many jobless in this State, and the Liberal Party Government would ensure full employment.

Again, on the 13th March, David Brand, the Leader of the Liberal Party, under election points, is reported in *The West Australian* to have said—

Our policy in industrial relations is to recognise that people are the most important factor in industry. Industry is for the people . . . We intend to create conditions in which people and industry will all prosper together.

He was too shrewd to mention the profit kings.

As we cast our eyes on the figures given, we find that 251 men have been sacked from the Public Works Department, and another 850 are intended to be sacked before the end of this year. That seems to be a strange prospering of people and industry together. It would seem that the Premier pays little devotion to the truth,

and no application of it whatsoever in carrying out the policy of his makeshift Government.

It seems that the members of the Liberal Party do not have any concern whatsoever for the under-privileged and the unemployed. Perhaps some of its shabby members may have. It seems to be the rule for the shabby members of the Liberal Party, when they get down on their heels, to feel a little sympathy for the people I have mentioned. But shabby members of the Liberal Party are few and far between; they are taken around the city, hidden in the boots of Cadillacs and Chrysler Royals. Those who feel sympathy for the under-privileged and unemployed are kept hidden in that manner.

The members of the Government do not seem to care who lives in gloom, so long as they themselves can live in the glory of their political friends. Before I conclude on this point, I would ask the Government to think over this matter again, and particularly of the men who are over 45 years of age and who will be thrown on the labour market. These men will have little chance of gaining new employment. They are too old for that, and they are too young for the pension. Are they to be thrown on the economic scrap-heap? Is this the way to build a flourishing community in this grand State of ours?

Is the Premier dogmatic? Is he going to maintain his dogma on this question? A famous quotation by G. K. Chesterton springs to my mind. He had this to say—

Dogma is not the absence of thought.
It is the complete end of it.

That is where I leave the Premier at the present, because he shows not an absence of thought; he has completely stopped to think about it at all. Therefore, commonsense, common justice, and common honesty—all these combine to rebel against this Government, which has wrought more harm in three months than its counterpart, the McLarty-Watts Government, brought about in six years. Believe me, that is saying something! If it is not symbolic, it is certainly significant. The Government has broken the law. I mention in passing a reference to the cancellation by the Government of the proclamation affecting the electoral districts.

It has broken its election promises. The Liberal Party said that if it were returned, it would not fire anybody; yet since it became the Government it has fired 251 men. Its action has broken the hearts of the workers. This Government is not the brand suitable for Western Australia. It is only the bosses' brand and, as such, Ned Kelly would not "keep nit" for it.

From all this we can learn one thing: The Australian Labour Party is the only party left to carry the burden of humanity. That is why it is always right. You, Mr. Speaker, may be surprised to learn

that I intend to support the amendment moved by my leader.

MR. GRAYDEN (South Perth—on amendment) [10.46]: I do not intend to speak at length on the amendment before us. Notwithstanding the wording of the amendment, I believe that the real issue we should consider is not whether the day-labour system is good or bad, but whether the elected Government of the people of this State should have the right to implement its election promises.

I say at the outset that I intend to oppose the amendment. I do so for reasons which, to me at least, are extremely clear. Firstly, the abolition of day labour is an integral part of the Liberal Party policy, to exactly the same extent as the preservation of day labour is the policy of the Labour Party.

Mr. Graham: What did you advocate during the election?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I shall come to that. What I advocated was extremely specific. That is why on this occasion I am making my position perfectly clear. The abolition of day labour is an integral part of the Liberal Party's policy. It is not a policy which has recently been decided upon. It is one which has been discussed and debated in this House over a period of years. That question has also been discussed and debated on public platforms, outside of this House, over many years. It is a matter which is well known to every elector in Western Australia.

Mr. Andrew: Why didn't the McLarty-Watts Government act upon it?

Mr. GRAYDEN: If that Government did not act upon it, it must have been for some reason best known to itself. The fact remains that it has always been the policy of the Liberal Party to oppose day labour, just as the Labour Party is in favour of it. I do not want to go into the pros and cons of this matter. There is much that can be said of day labour—some good and some bad.

Mr. Graham: I can appreciate why you decided to leave the Liberal Party.

Mr. GRAYDEN: It had nothing to do with that. In support of the contention that every elector in Western Australia knew the policy of the Liberal Party, I quote from *The West Australian* of the 4th March, 1959. The Premier dealt with the Liberal Party's policy at great length.

His statement was to the effect that "there would be a reversion to calling tenders for public works with a progressive change-over from day labour to the letting of contracts." Nothing can be more specific. Anyone not having had the opportunity to hear his speech could have read it the following morning in the newspaper. He would have seen that the policy was a reversion to calling tenders for public works with a progressive change-over from

day labour to the letting of contracts. The Liberal Party made that a part of its policy in the election campaign.

It made that statement and was prepared to go before the electors of Western Australia on its policy. It went before the electors; and it has, so far as the parties are concerned, a majority in this House. Therefore, it behoves people in a position such as I am in, to allow it to carry out the policy for which it has been given, in my opinion, a mandate.

Mr. Graham: You are going to lead them to their execution.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Earlier this evening the member for East Perth asked about my position in this matter. I welcome the opportunity of stating it, because it is extremely clear. My position is as clear as the Government's in relation to this particular matter. If the Government did not implement this policy—whether it be right or wrong—it could be and would be charged in this House with failing to implement its election policy. It would be charged with being a Government elected on false pretences.

Mr. Graham: What do you think about the promise to fire nobody?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I have not read about that in the policy, but it would seem to me that it conflicts with this particular policy. If that statement was made—I do not doubt that it was made—people who are being retrenched should be found employment elsewhere. When a Government falls down in relation to a promise in that regard, that is the time for the Opposition to take action against the Government.

Mr. Graham: We will tack that on the amendment and have you with us.

Mr. GRAYDEN: If the Government did not implement its policy it would have been elected on false pretences. There is no question about that. It went to the people and said, "We stand for the reversion of calling tenders for public works with a progressive change-over to day labour and the letting of contracts." Even if the Government changed its mind about that policy, it would still be obliged to implement it.

Mr. Bickerton: Even if it thought it was wrong?

Mr. GRAYDEN: Yes.

Mr. Bovell: It is not wrong.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GRAYDEN: If there are any grounds for criticism of the Government, I think it is in respect of the fact that it has decided to implement this particular portion of its policy at this time, because a recession has existed in Western Australia for the last two years, particularly in the building industry. It has always

been a well-known economic theory that in times of recession, the Government of the day should indulge in public spending to counteract a recession; and in boom times it should restrict public spending and allow private enterprise to function to its fullest extent.

Here we have a case where there is a recession; and it would seem, on the surface, that the Government is aggravating that recession by its policy of retrenchment. That would be so, if it were not for the fact that the Government—the Minister is apparently convinced of this—has certain schemes in mind which will take up any unemployment which is created as a consequence of its action to such an extent that the Minister assures us there will be no unemployment within the building industry in a few months.

If we are going to criticise the Government—apart from the timing of its change-over—for the manner in which the change-over has been effected, again we have an unequivocal assurance from the Minister that he has issued an order that those who were taken on last by the Public Works Department will be the first to be retrenched. I think that is the only possible way to do this, and I trust the Government will adhere to that policy.

Mr. Andrew: People who have had 13½ years' service are being put off.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Undoubtedly there are people with long service in the public works; and if any vacancies can be found for them in other branches of the public works, every effort should be made to do it.

The second thing I was pleased to hear from the Minister was the fact that he had written a letter to the Master Builders' Association, and other building associations, advising them that when retrenchments were to take place at the Public Works Department they would be informed 14 days before of the names of the people concerned and the trades in which they were employed, in order that private enterprise or people engaged in the building industry might have the opportunity of taking them on their staff.

I was also pleased to note that the Minister included in that letter to the building trades people a fairly blunt statement to the effect that unless they co-operated in employing those retrenched from the Public Works Department, the Government would reconsider the action which it was taking in respect of the retrenchments. I can assure the Minister that every person in this House, irrespective of the side on which he sits, and irrespective of the party he supports, will watch the happenings in respect of the Public Works Department with extremely close interest over the next few months.

I have not the slightest doubt that the Minister will honour his promise, but I can assure him that everyone will watch to see that this policy which has been embarked upon—rightly or wrongly—by the Government is implemented in a way that will cause a minimum of hardship to the people involved.

The member for East Perth mentioned earlier the basis on which I was elected. I can tell him what it was; and I think the most effective way will be to quote from one of the pamphlets I issued at that time. It is as follows:—

Bill Grayden stands as an Independent Liberal. As such, he is automatically obliged to support a Liberal Government or Opposition on all matters of Liberal principle to exactly the same extent as any endorsed candidate.

Several members interjected: Hear, hear!

Mr. Graham: These people who tried to cut your throat are saying, "Hear, hear!"

Mr. GRAYDEN: There are not a great number of issues that come before this House that could be placed in that category. I have pledged myself to support the Government on all matters of Liberal policy to the same extent as an endorsed candidate. Be that as it may, this is clearly a matter of Liberal policy.

Mr. Graham: Sacking a few thousand chaps!

Mr. GRAYDEN: No. It has been emphasised in regard to those who have been retrenched that employment has already been found for 60 of them.

Mr. Heal: Those figures were totally wrong.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The total may be wrong, but the figures are not.

Mr. Heal: If the total is wrong the figures are wrong.

Mr. GRAYDEN: According to the Minister—

Mr. Heal: He cannot add up.

Mr. GRAYDEN: —of the number of men retrenched from the Public Works, 60 have been found employment. A further 72 have obviously found employment of their own accord, and 76 are not accounted for as they have not registered for unemployment benefits.

It would seem that they, too, have found employment. But that is not the issue at all. The issue is that the Liberal and Country parties went to the election on a specific policy, and they are now carrying out that policy. Whether it is right or wrong is not the issue. The point is: Should the Government be allowed, without censure, to implement that policy? As far as I am concerned it is extremely clear.

One other matter that has been brought into this censure motion, if it can be termed that, is the question of supplementary unemployment benefits. The Government has again rightly or wrongly, taken upon itself to abolish the 17s. 6d. which for some time has been paid to single unemployed people who are drawing £2 10s. unemployment benefit. When that 17s. 6d. was introduced by the last Labour Government, the unemployment benefit for single people was only 25s.

[The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Roberts) took the Chair.]

Mr. Graham: No. You are wrong.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I do not think I am wrong.

Mr. Graham: Yes; you are.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I think the hon. member will find it was 25s. a week. If I am wrong then the Director of the Commonwealth Unemployment Bureau is wrong, because I checked with him this morning and he gave me that figure.

Mr. Graham: You must have misunderstood him.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Roberts): Order! I suggest the hon. member address the Chair.

Mr. Graham: It was £2 10s. not 25s.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The fact is that I received that information this morning; and he said that when the 17s. 6d. was introduced, the unemployment benefit for single people was 25s. Then the Government supplemented their income.

Mr. Graham: But we kept that 17s. 6d. on when the social service benefit went up.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Subsequently the benefit was increased to £2 10s. The present Government has now abolished the 17s. 6d.

Mr. Graham: Do you think it had a mandate for that?

Mr. GRAYDEN: That is not the question. The Government is obviously trying to effect economies.

Mr. Graham: By increasing the pay of the Public Service Commissioner.

Mr. GRAYDEN: It is up to the Government to honour its election promise, and the only way it can do that is by being given the opportunity to implement its policy.

Mr. Graham: While we sit idly by for three years.

Mr. GRAYDEN: You have criticised the Government most forcibly.

Mr. Graham: We want to kick it out.

Mr. GRAYDEN: But the Government is equally entitled to the opportunity of implementing its policy and proving, as far as the people are concerned, whether it is

a good policy or not, and whether it was right or wrong in its policy. I suggest it will not be many months before we see whether the policy was right or wrong. We will either have economic chaos or full employment and virtually a boom period.

On this other point of the unemployment benefit, the fact is that it was introduced at the time I mentioned. Then the unemployment benefit went up to £2 10s. and the Government did not withdraw that 17s. 6d. This Government has said that in deserving cases, people need only apply and the case will be examined.

Mr. Graham: That is not true.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The Government has said so. If it is not true, members on both sides will have an opportunity of disproving the statement during this debate. It is easy to prove or disprove. One has only to submit an example of one person suffering extreme hardship having been refused.

Mr. Graham: Who would not suffer hardship on £3 5s. a week?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I agree with the member for East Perth. I only hope that when the Commonwealth Budget is introduced next month, additional benefits will be made available to single unemployed people; and it seems there is less likelihood of that occurring if the 17s. 6d. is continued.

When a single unemployed person is mentioned, one immediately thinks of a young, strong, physically fit person; but there are many people who are elderly and others who are physically incapacitated. But dealing with those who are reasonably well, the fact does remain that there is employment available at present on the State and Commonwealth railways. Admittedly this employment is in isolated places; but the work is available, and it would seem to me that single men with no ties, who are reasonably physically fit, should, in certain circumstances, be prepared to go out to those jobs even though they be in isolated places.

At the outset, I mentioned that I did not want to speak at any length on this issue but that I simply wanted to make my position clear. The position as I see it is that I am committed, irrespective of what I think, to support the Government on matters of a Liberal principle; and this is definitely a matter of Liberal principle.

MR. J. HEGNEY (Middle Swan—on amendment) [11.7]: I propose to support this amendment. I listened with great interest to the previous speaker, who represents South Perth, and I just had a look at the statistics, which show that he had a majority of 839 at the last election. It would be very interesting indeed to interpret the mandate that he has and very interesting to say whether more than 800 people

voted for Mr. Grayden to defeat the Liberal Party candidate. He has been tonight trying to interpret his policy and where he should stand.

Mr. Brand: You did not think he would win.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: Who has the floor now?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Roberts): Order!

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I will address the Chair, but I think the Premier should stand up if he wants to make an interjection. The position in respect to the last speaker is that he was endeavouring to interpret the situation as to where he stood in regard to the amendment now before the House. I suggest that the Labour supporters who voted for his return to Parliament would not have given him support if they had known how he was going to vote tonight.

He talked about the recession of unemployment during the last couple of years in Western Australia. It is a well-known fact that the Treasurer at the time sought to gain increased resources for the purposes of developing activities in this country to provide employment for those who were unfortunate enough to be out of work. The Treasurer was seeking an extra amount of £2,000,000, but the Liberal Party in another place was not prepared to grant it. The Commonwealth Government, had it made the money available, would undoubtedly have given an impetus to employment in Western Australia. I well remember that only a few years ago, when the late Mr. Chifley was Prime Minister and Treasurer of this country—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Roberts): Is this relevant to the matter under discussion?

Mr. J. HEGNEY: Yes; it is very relevant to employment in this country. Unemployment has been created by this Government, which has, on its own admission here tonight, deliberately sacked men from their employment. During the election campaign, the present Government made the statement that it would work up to full employment. Neither this nor any other Government in Western Australia can work up to full employment, unless it receives financial help from the Commonwealth, which controls the monetary resources of this country.

That was the position when the Chifley Government was in office. There was then a policy of full employment throughout Australia, and there was plenty of work available; but, with the passing of the years, we find today—on the admission of the Commonwealth Minister for Labour and the Commonwealth Treasurer—that a great deal of unemployment still exists in Australia and particularly in this State. The member for South Perth apparently

expects this Government to solve the problem of unemployment in Western Australia, but that is only wishful thinking.

The Minister for Railways said tonight that, in cases of hardship, unemployed single persons would receive sympathetic consideration in regard to the payment over and above the amount received from the Commonwealth Social Services Department; but I know one member who has been in communication with the Minister for Child Welfare and has made submissions to him—one such letter was submitted to the Minister on the 23rd May—and up to date the Minister has not moved in the matter. Certainly there has been an acknowledgment from the Acting Director of the Child Welfare Department; but the Minister has not replied to the member concerned, although six weeks have passed since the cases of hardship were submitted. That indicates that, while the Minister for Railways might know something about the portfolio he has to administer, he is not altogether au fait with the administration of other Government departments.

The Minister for Child Welfare in the previous Government advanced the additional 17s. 6d. per week as a humanitarian gesture, to help people in great difficulty, thus showing that that Government took a humane interest in the difficulties confronting single people; but anyone would think, from the attitude of the present Government, that those persons had been receiving money that they should not have received. We are told that if they submit their cases to the Commonwealth social service organisation they will be investigated, and if the case is considered a proper one to receive the benefit it will be paid.

The excuse as to why the money should not now be paid is a materialistic one, because under the Liberal Government the materialistic and not the humanitarian outlook prevails. The present Government states that, if it continues to pay the 17s. 6d. to the single unemployed people, this State will be penalised in the matter of State grants. When the Labour Government was in office it took that risk, in looking after the common interests of humanity, and I feel it is a reprehensible action for the present Government to have withdrawn that payment—immediately it took office—as a means of saving in order to build up the economy of the State.

There are many other issues involved in this debate. I have worked in heavy industry under both private enterprise and the day-labour system. In many instances I worked much harder, under the day-labour system that operates in various States of the Commonwealth, than I did when working for private contractors. From time to time I have heard the Midland Junction Workshops decried in this

Chamber, but in days gone by there were skilled workmen there, the equal of any in other parts of the world. They always gave a good account of themselves, and the work that they did for the Railway Department was of an outstanding character. Often, when we imported boilers and engines from other parts of the world, they required renovation, because they did not stand up to local conditions, and it was those men who did the necessary work.

The day-labour system has a great deal of merit, and I cannot see why the Government has set out on this wild policy of wholesale retrenchments in the organisation that has been built up by the Public Works Department, as there is no question about the work which those men have done throughout the State. Now, almost overnight, with the support of the Independent votes in this House, the Government claims it has a mandate to carry out a policy of that kind; but that is wrong. I do not think members of the Government are altogether sincere in that respect.

When I was out of this Chamber from 1947 to 1950 I worked for the State Housing Commission; and, if my memory serves me rightly, the Minister for Works opened a second State brickworks at Armadale in order to step up the production of bricks, which was lagging.

Mr. Wild: All I did was to continue what had been started.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: It was done in order to step up the production of bricks. When the member for Murray was Premier and Treasurer, he bought out the City Council's rights, within a five-mile radius of the City of Perth, in a lease which had about 70 years to run before expiry, in order to develop the State Electricity Commission, so that it would become a first-grade State instrumentality and give service to the people. Today the State Electricity Commission is practically the only producer of electricity in Western Australia.

It is never suggested—in the Commonwealth sphere—that the P.M.G.'s department should be run by private enterprise and that the men employed by that department should be retrenched and sent to private employers; because it would be against commonsense to do that. Yet, on these issues, where it suits the Government's book, it states that it will proceed to get rid of the employees.

While the McLarty-Watts Government was in power for six years it passed a law for getting rid of State instrumentalities, but did not proceed with that policy. I do not think that Government sold any of the State instrumentalities, because it found out, on investigating the matter, that there was no merit in the suggestions that had been made in that regard.

I think the Government's actions call for censure; because, over the past few months since it became the Government, its actions have been disturbing the public mind. Unless a person has been through the mill, and been out of work, and has walked the streets looking for a job, he does not know what it is like. Many of the men involved in this difficulty at present have commitments to meet; many of them would be buying their own homes and many of the necessities of life, such as washing machines, refrigerators and the like. Each week they would be paying out instalments on those goods; and to say overnight, after they have been in a job for 10 or 20 years, that they have to find other employment is undoubtedly disturbing their minds.

From that point of view alone the Government's actions are reprehensible. They are disturbing the industrial peace of Western Australia and have created considerable discontent among trade unionists. I know for a fact that many workers were beguiled into voting for D.L.P. candidates at the recent elections, and that many of those candidates helped the present Government to occupy the Treasury benches. Many members opposite would not be here if it were not for the support of the D.L.P. most of whose supporters would be workers who have been lured away from supporting the traditional Labour Party.

By voting for the D.L.P. they have given their second preferences to the Liberal Party when they were never really Liberal supporters. Many of these people, since the election, have been doing some deep thinking about the matter, and when the time comes, as it will in due course, for the Government to face its masters once again, a lot of these people who were taken away from the Labour Party will be finding their way back to supporting it because of what has taken place since this Government took over. I shall not delay the debate any further, but I propose to vote for the amendment because of the Government's actions.

MR. ROWBERRY (Warren—on amendment) [11.22]: With all due deference to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must say that I am sorry that the Speaker is not in his usual position at the moment. Had he been in his usual place I would have offered him my congratulations.

Point of Order

Mr. HAWKE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, and for the guidance of the Speaker and of members generally, I would like to ask whether, when the Speaker is within the House, he should not be in the Chair.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Roberts): I think it is the prerogative of the Speaker to decide whether he occupies the Chair or not.

Mr. HAWKE: I think he should be in it.

Debate resumed

Mr. ROWBERRY: As I was saying, had the Speaker been in his Chair, I would have offered him my congratulations on being elevated to the position that he now holds; I would also have offered him my congratulations for the statement he made in Bridgetown just before the elections. What he said is of vital importance to this debate. Among other things the Speaker is reported in *The Blackwood Times* of Friday the 13th March, 1959, as saying—

The erection of schools, hospitals and the construction of roads and public works generally in this electorate reflect the progress over the past nine years.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

For six of those nine years a Labour Government was in control of the State of Western Australia; and I would suggest to you, Sir, that you should take the Minister for Railways and the Premier aside and, in a friendly way, draw their attention to the statement you made and what I have just pointed out.

One point which has figured prominently in the debate is the question of whether this Government has a mandate from the people. Throughout the history of Parliament, and particularly throughout the history of responsible Government, especially since we have had party politics, it has been the custom, and common usage, for the parties to go before the people with a clear, unambiguous and truthful statement of their policy; and, on that statement of policy, they are elected or rejected. I submit that this Government has no mandate from the people.

On the question of numbers in the House, the only party which enjoys a majority, and the confidence of the people of Western Australia, is the Australian Labour Party, to which I have the honour to belong. As the member for Guildford-Midland has said, the percentages of votes cast at the election were 45 for A.L.P. and 35 for the L.C.L. The member for South Perth gave, as his reason for supporting the Government and voting against this motion, that the Government was elected on Liberal policy. But the Government does not consist of Liberals; it is a coalition of 17 L.C.L. members, eight Country Party members and two Independents.

I stated a few moments ago that a statement of policy to the people should be clear, unambiguous and truthful. Let us take a statement of the policy of the Hon. D. Brand, as reported in *The West Australian* of the 4th March, 1959. Among other things he said—

There would be a progressive transfer of State trading concerns to the field of private industry without loss

of employment so that their continued operation would no longer be a drag on the economy.

Further, in *The West Australian* of the 18th March, 1959, the Hon. D. Brand said—and this has been mentioned several times tonight, but it bears repetition—

Our policy in industrial matters is to recognise that the people are the most important factor in industry. Industry is for the people and industrial relations should be based upon the general good.

I hope that was a true statement of the Government's policy. He also said—

We will fire nobody nor close any concerns down.

In the light of what has been brought forward tonight, how can the Government reconcile its actions with its statement of policy and intentions prior to the elections?

I submit, therefore, that the truthfulness of that statement is much in doubt. We have a coalition Government in office and, therefore, the parties comprising it should be in complete agreement on policy; but are they? I will now read a statement made by the Hon. A. F. Watts, the Deputy Premier and the Leader of the Country Party, which was published in *The West Australian*, dated the 28th February, 1959. It reads as follows:—

The party therefore proposed to set its face against any further State trading and to encourage private capital instead.

On the face of it this statement would make it appear that the Country Party is in complete agreement with the Liberal Party. However, let us examine it again. By his training and experience the Deputy Premier knows, or should know, the value of words. His statement contained the word "further", and I would have inferred that that statement was in complete agreement with the policy expressed by the Premier in his pre-election speech.

However, I took the opportunity to look up the meaning of the word "further" and the dictionary shows that, as an adjective, it means—

Going beyond what already exists; in addition; more extended.

This means that the Country Party is not in complete agreement with the policy laid down by the Liberal Party in regard to disposing of the State trading concerns. Had the statement by the Deputy Premier not included the word "further", I would have been inclined to admit that the Country Party did agree with that policy. Should the House wish to know further what the Deputy Premier thinks of the Liberal Party policy, I will now quote from this booklet entitled, "State Election: The Fall of the

Hawke Government". This is a brief account by F. K. Crowley who is a lecturer at the University of Western Australia. He states —

When the decision was first announced in July, 1957, Mr. Watts described it as "a shabby deal," and the—

Mr. Watts: If that is in there it is definitely untrue because I have never used such a phrase in my life. Those are the words of Mr. Hayes, not mine.

Mr. ROWBERRY: Continuing with the quote—

—reasons given for it were described by the Country Party President as sheer "gobbledygook."

Mr. Watts: That's better!

Mr. ROWBERRY: I apologise to the Deputy Premier, and I continue to quote—

Mr. Watts declared in March, 1959, that the "L.C.L. membership, management and outlook was composed of vested interests, not interested in the country."

Mr. Evans: With which we heartily agree!

Mr. ROWBERRY: I have just heard a remark expressed that this was four years ago. That is not correct. This was in March, 1959, just prior to the last general election.

Mr. Watts: Are you charging me with saying that, too?

Mr. ROWBERRY: This is what was quoted in March, 1959—

—that the "L.C.L. membership, management and outlook was composed of vested interests not interested in the country."

Mr. Watts: I shall have to sue Dr. Crowley for defamation of character.

Mr. Hawke: I think he took that from the *Bridgetown Courier*.

Mr. Watts: No, he took it from someone else's speech.

Mr. ROWBERRY: In the light of these figures, this Government has not a mandate from the people of the State to carry out the policy it has enunciated. If the Government insists it has a mandate, it has obtained it under false pretences, because here are some of the methods used to secure that mandate. We had the member for Harvey—

Mr. Toms: He was woeful!

Mr. ROWBERRY: In mentioning the timber industry that hon. member tried to draw certain conclusions. He said that because of the operations of the State Saw Mills, men employed on private timber mills in his district would have voted against the Labour Party.

In travelling around my electorate I have found that those concerned with the management of timber mills—and these are

the only people with whom the Government is familiar, whereas we are familiar with the thoughts of the workers—told the workers that if the Labour Party was returned to office they would lose their jobs. That is a complete falsehood. The reason for there being a recession in the timber industry was that for a certain period the greater portion of the timber produced by the mills was for building materials used for housing in this State and, therefore, we could not keep up our exports of timber to the Eastern States.

If the member for Harvey took the trouble to read the year book published by Mr. Fraser he would find that the greater portion of our exports of timber went to the Eastern States. If he is desirous of finding a remedy for that, I would suggest that he put up a suggestion to his party at its next meeting that it bring pressure to bear on the Commonwealth Government to place a tariff on American pinewoods, because the importation of that timber is destroying the market for our Western Australian hardwoods at the present time.

If, as he says, the people employed in private timber mills are being deprived of their jobs because of the operation of the State Saw Mills, how is it that in the last issue of *The West Australian*, Bunnings Ltd. 10s. shares are quoted at 13s. 6d.? Does that indicate that private timber mills are being suffocated and driven out of existence by the operation of the State Saw Mills? Decidedly not!

Whilst I am on the question of the State Saw Mills, I point out that I spent the greatest part of my existence in this State as an employee in a State mill. I heard the member for Collie say, "Put yourself in Gilligan's place." I can say that I have often been in Gilligan's place.

When I entered this State as a new Australian I soon discovered that the only secure source of employment was in Government employ. I commenced work as a farm labourer, and I was housed in the same shed as the horses. My sleeping quarters were separated from those of the horses by only a partition.

The SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member is going to link his remark about horses to the amendment before the Chair.

Mr. ROWBERRY: I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that it is very interesting. Its relationship to the amendment is this: When one looks back on the improvement of working conditions that has taken place as a result of the efforts of the Labour Party and the granting of the basic wage and better conditions to farm labourers—

Mr. Perkins: What gave you that idea?

Mr. ROWBERRY: The hon. member would not know.

Mr. Perkins: I am perfectly sure that you are wrong.

Mr. ROWBERRY: The hon. member who has just interjected is, I daresay, one of the farmers who employed people, and housed them beside the horses. That was in the days when we had horses.

Mr. I. W. Manning: You had better confine your horses to Gilligan's place.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member had better address the Chair and relate his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. ROWBERRY: It has come to my notice that among the men who have been put off from the Public Works Department are several ex-service men. It is a shame and a disgrace that any Government should deprive a man of his livelihood when he has been overseas and offered to sacrifice his life for his country. It is shocking that, when he returns, he should be deprived of his employment. That is one aspect into which the Minister should inquire. To my mind this action of the Government is going to have far-reaching effects on the economy of the country; its impact will be tremendous. It will have a far-reaching effect inasmuch as it will destroy our overseas markets.

There exists a queer and distorted idea amongst certain members of the Government that, by cutting down costs, they will be able to sell our goods much more easily and with greater facility. No greater fallacy ever existed. Export markets and export trade are reciprocal. We enjoy an export market to the extent that we take in imports. If we are going to put people out of employment and keep them out of employment, and destroy their means of livelihood, we will not only cause turmoil, uncertainty, and uneasiness among the people, but we will destroy our economy as well. I ask the Government to have another look at this matter, and to think about it again. This whole question is exemplified in the township of Pemberton. A few days ago I asked a series of questions of the Minister for Railways, and in his replies he assured me that a fair and reasonable price would be paid; that there would be protection of existing employees; and that the industries themselves would continue within the economy of the State.

I ask members what guarantee anyone has, if ever these industries are passed over to private enterprise, that he will continue to enjoy the same conditions and the same level of employment as he does now. Owing to the fact that a mill was burnt down a few years ago the men in one of the mills at Pemberton are working double shift. Will the Minister give an undertaking that they will continue to work double shift, and that they will employ all the people who are now employed, if private enterprise takes over that mill? Will the Minister tell me what formula he proposes to use? Will it be the same

formula as that employed by the Menzies Government when it sold the whaling station up north?

Mr. Hawke: All you will get from the Minister for Railways is bird lime.

Mr. ROWBERRY: The Minister insisted that there was no turmoil; that there was no mental distress; that there was no worry; and that if there was, it was created by members on this side of the House. The greatest worry I have had since this Government was elected was in calming the fears of the people of Pemberton; in trying to assure them that their livelihood would not be destroyed; that I did not think the Government would implement this policy.

It is not right that such a policy should be implemented. If it is carried out, Pemberton will be destroyed as a town. The economy of Pemberton and the livelihood of most of its people depend on the State Saw Mills, and I cannot for one minute imagine that a private employer would continue to do what the previous Labour Government did; namely, employ these people, and maintain the level of employment, and so prevent the whole of Pemberton becoming a ghost town. I support the amendment, because, in my opinion, this Government has not had a mandate from the people. If the Government insists that it has, I submit that the mandate was obtained under false pretences.

Mr. Graham: Hear, hear!

MR. OLDFIELD (Mt. Lawley—on amendment) [11.47]: At the outset I would like to say to the member for Warren that he need have no fears about any State enterprise being sold, because my experience has always been that private enterprise will not purchase anything that is operating at a loss. A lot has been said this evening backwards and forwards, and politics has been played left, right and centre. Early this evening we witnessed what I think could aptly be called the battle of the galleries. The Opposition endeavoured to ensure that there would be a crowd of their supporters in the gallery. The Government, however, beat them to the punch and filled the gallery with its supporters, because the Government supporters apparently do not have to go to work. We saw that while the galleries were full, all members were in their places. When the Government supporters left the gallery, the Government members went out for coffee; which meant that the Government benches were empty. The Opposition supporters are still in the gallery, and their members are in their seats. All in all we have had a most interesting evening in the battle of the galleries, and I think we can say that honours are about even.

Mr. Andrew: What about the Independents?

Mr. OLDFIELD: We do not have to go gerrymandering for an audience.

Mr. Bickerton: Are you lily white?

Mr. OLDFIELD: We can get by. The Government could be criticised, but not because of its policy; that was announced before the election, as has been stated by the member for East Perth, and by other members on the Opposition benches. The Government's policy on day labour was set down.

It was a policy endorsed by the majority of the electors in the electorates which were contested during the last elections. We cannot criticise the implementation of any policy, because the Government is entitled to carry it out. What we can criticise is the way in which it is implemented.

Mr. Andrew: That is 5s. each way.

Mr. OLDFIELD: At least I have the liberty to do something, which is more than the hon. member has. I think the Government has been a little hasty in implementing its policy. At the outset it started to lay off day-labour tradesmen before it had even called tenders for any of the works being carried on by the Public Works Department, let alone having let a contract. When workers are laid off, the job is at a standstill until tenders are called and the contract is let. The successful tenderer has to organise the men to carry out the work. Therefore, there must be a lag of time during which no work is performed. That can only result in unemployment.

Had the Government stopped one job and let the contract, and then stopped another job and put the men off, the impact on the economy and on the pool of unemployed would not have been as harsh as it is today. No-one can say that unemployment is not prevalent in the metropolitan area at present.

I have checked through my list of steps taken in my eight years of parliamentary life. Up to the 1st April, 1959, only eight persons had approached me for assistance in seeking employment. However, since the 1st April, 1959, 28 people have approached me in this connection. The tragedy is that the youngest of them is 55 years of age.

Mr. Lawrence: They were out of luck.

Mr. OLDFIELD: I tried to find them work. Work is not available for people of that age. They came to me in sheer desperation, because they could not obtain work at that age.

Mr. Evans: They are too young for the pension.

Mr. OLDFIELD: They were unskilled workers. I contend that, whether a person be skilled or unskilled, he is entitled to earn a livelihood and to be employed.

Mr. Andrew: I give you full marks for that.

Mr. OLDFIELD: Ninety-five per cent. of this debate is centered around the Public Works Department and the retrenchments in that department. Mention was also made of the sale of State trading concerns.

An examination of the figures given this evening in answer to a question asked by me shows that since the 1st April, 345 persons have been retrenched from Government departments and instrumentalities. Of those, only 153 were from the Public Works Department work force. I do not know whether these figures are accurate, but I take it they are. That means there are 192 others in the community who have been retrenched from other Government departments. There were 26 retrenched from the Railway Department who, according to the statement of the Minister, were seasonal workers. There were 33 from the Tramway Department. An investigation will show that the reason for the Tramway Department laying off those men was to get rid of excess staff before the Metropolitan Transport Trust took over, to avoid Mr. Adams the embarrassment of dispensing with their services. That is obvious from the reshuffling in that department.

The Railway Department has proved that it can dispense with staff and decrease its work force without sacking one person. It does that by adopting a policy of non-replacement. The Railway Department reduced its work force by 1,000 in some 12 months by adopting that policy. Had the Tramway Department done the same, we would not have the set of circumstances which has arisen today. Two men with 39 years of service have been compulsorily retired from the Tramway Department at 63 years of age. The reason was that they elected, years ago, to take out their superannuation for retirement at 60 years of age.

Mr. Heal: That is not so in one case.

Mr. OLDFIELD: I may be speaking about different people. I know two people, over 60 years of age, who have been retired compulsorily because they took out superannuation for retirement at 60. The department decided that they had to go, because they took out that form of superannuation.

From time immemorial it has been understood that, if a person worked for the Government and took out superannuation for retirement at 60 years of age, on reaching 60 years of age he could continue in his employment until 65, without the necessity to pay further to the superannuation fund. The full contributions to that fund would have been paid as a result of larger instalments. In the case of one of these persons a lump sum was paid by him at 60 years of age.

What it costs these people as a result of losing two years of further employment is almost incalculable. One person with 39 years of service would have been entitled to a superannuation payment of £7 10s. a week had he been able to continue two more years in employment. He and his wife would have been entitled to draw the maximum of the old age pension. His superannuation benefits have been reduced from £7 10s. to £5 5s. a week. He not only loses £2 5s. a week for the remaining two years of his normal working life, but he also loses it for the remainder of his life and his wife's life.

If the Tramway Department had found it necessary to retrench 33 persons, and to adopt the policy of non-replacement on retirement, resignation, sickness, or death, there would have been no necessity to sack anyone. It would have avoided implementing the policy of retrenchment.

One of the hardships which arose as a result of this policy concerned a temporary hand, 62 years of age, who was unable for health reasons to get on the permanent staff. He was earning 8s. above the basic wage, and that was his full earning capacity. This shows that he was unable to provide himself and his family with comforts. He battled on with a bare margin of 8s., and he was unable to amass anything. Now at 62 he finds it absolutely impossible to obtain work. So, for three years, he will have to live on social service payments. That is an economic loss not only to this State but to the Commonwealth, because he and his wife have to be fed and clothed.

The economy of Australia will have to provide the wherewithal for clothing, food, and shelter for that person and his wife, until he reaches the age of 65 in three years' time. By then they will both be able to draw the old age pension and look forward to a life of comparative ease when related to his present circumstances.

I have tried hard to find work for this person, but it is just impossible. When one goes to a person who, he thinks, may be able to provide employment, one is laughed at when he mentions the age of 62 years.

Mr. Evans: Those reasons should make you vote for the motion.

Mr. OLDFIELD: The saving of 345 salaries each week could represent a considerable saving to the Government. No doubt it will. However, I do not know that it will be good for the economy of the country when some people will be out of work for three, four, or five years.

I know of another man who is 55 years of age. He was compulsorily retired from the Air Force at that age. He always understood that his ticket in the Air Force as a rigger—he was a sergeant-major—or rather a flight-sergeant—would entitle him to work on civilian aircraft. He

secured employment for himself with the MacRobertson-Miller Company; but when he went to work, the Department of Civil Aviation officers checked his ticket, and said they were sorry that only recent tickets in the Air Force were recognised. At 55 years of age, an aircraft rigger, who has spent almost 20 years in the Air Force, is not permitted to take employment in that field, and finds it is hopeless and useless to look for work, because it is not available.

Some of these men have not used a pick and shovel, laboured with an axe, or done hard physical work; and they are too old to start. A person who takes on a shovel at 20 years of age can carry on until he is 70, but a person cannot start at 55 or 60 years.

It is only natural that the Public Works Department day-labour employees—the building trades section—are concerned about their future, because the Public Works Department—and I suppose it will remain so—is the only avenue of permanent employment offering to building tradesmen, unless they secure executive positions with a private firm. However, these positions are few and far between.

I can just imagine the state of mind of a lot of these people. It has been stated quite often, especially by economists, that unemployment begets unemployment. There is no doubt about it that the threat of unemployment will beget unemployment. It is only logical to assume that each and every person employed on the day-labour staff of the Public Works Department has, under the existing policy, naturally curtailed his expenditure. There is no doubt that in each and every household where the breadwinner is a building tradesman on the Public Works Department labour staff, a decision has been arrived at that there will be no new refrigerator this year and no new furnishings. They have probably said to themselves, "We can only afford the bare necessities, because we do not know when the axe is going to fall."

I feel the Government should pursue a policy of non-replacement, and should not have made the announcement which has been made in order to avoid the psychological fear which has been set up. Under those conditions the reversion from day labour to private tender and contract would have been effected more smoothly.

Where a decision has been made in households to curtail expenditure, it can only result in a lessening of business turnover throughout the whole of the business community; and that again results in dismissals from private enterprise.

As I stated earlier, no-one can have any real quarrel with the policy of the Government, because it was a pre-election policy. It was accepted by a small majority of people; and no-one can blame the Government for implementing its policy. However, the Government does deserve

some criticism in regard to the way in which this policy has been implemented.

In conclusion, I reiterate that the Government may have been a little hasty in regard to these retrenchments in other than the Public Works Department, and I feel it should have taken its time with a policy of non-replacement.

Mr. BICKERTON: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

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

Ayes—23.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Nuisen
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. May
Mr. Jamieson	

(Teller.)

Noes—26.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Brand	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Court	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Craig	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Owen
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Hena	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Watts
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Wild
Mr. Mann	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller.)

Majority against—3.

Motion thus negatived.

MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara—on amendment) [12.11 a.m.]: I would like to deal briefly with this matter because I feel it is one of utmost importance to the people of this State. Owing to the speed with which the Government has seen fit to implement its policy, I feel that it is possible that the people who saw fit to give the Government 25 seats, and also those people who saw fit not to give it 25 seats, may not fully realise the importance of this matter.

This could be looked on as just one other amendment to the Address-in-reply. But personally I feel it is an extremely important matter so far as the economy of the State is concerned and, what is more important, so far as the prosperity of the State is concerned. This debate is also important because it reflects very clearly the vital differences between the policy of the Labour factions and the policy of the particular factions which belong to other political parties in this country with their many and varied political outlooks.

This is nothing new to Parliaments throughout Australia. I suppose that what has transpired in this debate has been enacted and re-enacted throughout the Parliaments wherever the Labour factions have argued with the non-Labour forces over the matter of policy and principles.

To Labour, labour is labour. To Labour, labour in the work-force sense of the word, is a living thing; it is something that is real. It builds nations and continents and is alive; whereas I feel that Labour in the work-force sense to the non-Labour person—and I do not necessarily mean everyone who is a member of a party which is not a Labour party—is as an army is to a general. It is something to be used, to be set up, set down, discharged, remobilised, demobilised, or resurrected, just as the battle of the day warrants. That is not the outlook of Labour men and never has been; and I feel that it is because of this vital difference between the two forces—the Government with its coalition on one side and the Opposition Labour Party on the other—that they cannot see eye to eye on this matter. I hope that Labour will never view it in the light that non-Labour people view these things.

It appears to me that the Government has made this matter before us now one of public enterprise versus private enterprise in a State where I consider those two forces have, up to the change of Government, apparently—if one can judge by surface indications—worked quite harmoniously together; and, in fact, I recall that the Premier of the previous Government last session pointed out to this Parliament the assistance that had been given by the Labour Government to various private enterprise organisations that required help during the term of that Government.

If, in fact, the battle is one of public enterprise on the one hand versus private enterprise on the other, there can be only one winner; and, unfortunately, whichever one should win or whatever method should be adopted by the Government, it appears to me that the real victim in this matter is the living thing known as the work-force. It is the thing that under this system of change of Government is going to be pushed ruthlessly around, regardless of the humanitarian side of the issue.

I honestly believe that perhaps the Government, intentionally or unintentionally, has overlooked the humanitarian side, because by the remarks of the Minister, I gather it has looked upon this thing, and said that so many have gone out of work here but have been offered jobs somewhere else. It is so easy, after men have worked in a particular occupation for many years, for a Government to adopt the attitude that such men are just so many sheep to be pushed wherever that Government may feel inclined to push them.

It is to be hoped that the Government, in its desire to rid this State—as it puts it—of the principles and policies of the previous Government, does not lose sight of the fact that it has its obligations to the people of the State as a whole. That is a most important thing. Whilst it has

a mandate, perhaps, to govern as it considers fit, I still say that its obligations are to everyone in this State, not just to those people whom it may wish to help.

I have long felt that a labour force, properly constituted and efficiently administered, is an important part of a Government's equipment. I believe that that work force is there to protect the taxpayer and the Government from exploitation by the unscrupulous type of contractor or from collusion among contractors.

The honest contractor has nothing to worry about. He has no opposition from a Government work force. On the other hand a Government work force is needed in opposition to the unscrupulous type of contractor; and it is in that way that it can be used by the Government when it sees fit in its wisdom to prevent the taxpayer from being exploited. Many Governments from time to time face a set of circumstances where they have been dictated to by monopolies in regard to jobs that have to be done or goods that have to be supplied, and they have to overcome that situation and create their own work force, and in some instances, their own suppliers or manufacturing concerns.

And many of these things created by one Government have been carried on by another, even though it was of a different political colour; and a glaring example of that is T.A.A. I see no reason why, if something created by one Government is working efficiently—particularly when it is a work force, which is a human and living thing—it should be dispensed with by another Government within a couple of months of its coming into office.

Much has been said by members on the Government side of the House to the effect that the Government intends to save money, in the main, by replacing public enterprise, as it exists in this State, by private enterprise. Does that mean that the men who belong to this work force in public enterprise are inefficient? Does it mean that the people who administer the various offices within the Public Works Department and other Government organisations are inefficient? Does it mean that the Ministers who control these departments are inefficient? If, in the eyes of the people who advocate this immediate change because they believe they can have this work done so much cheaper by private enterprise than by the efficient work force that exists at present within the department, the present policy is the right one, it seems to me that they are attacking the problem at the wrong end.

If they consider private enterprise to be so much better than the present work force, it should be the job of members of the Government to bring the efficiency of their own organisation up to the level of that of private enterprise; because in that way they would be preventing the hardship

which they are creating at present, and would be preserving an efficient buffer force against any unscrupulous private organisations which might adopt the gun-at-the-head tactics which have been adopted in many instances.

If the Government admits that it cannot organise its small work force to the same extent as private enterprise can organise its work force, it is admitting defeat in that direction, and that does not augur well for the taxpayer. If those who control private enterprise are so much more efficient than the men controlling public enterprise, should they not be sitting opposite us in the House, rather than the Ministers who are already there?

I would not like to think that pressure of some description had been brought to bear on the Government by a minority of individuals in this regard, in Tammany Hall tactics, with payment made after the election for services rendered in kind during the election. As I said before, this is a question which should vitally concern all the people of Western Australia, regardless of whether they are champions of private enterprise or of public enterprise. I repeat, that some of those who sneer at public enterprise might well give this matter more thought.

Employment brings prosperity and all the advantages accruing from it; but, on the other hand, unemployment brings hardship and poverty; and, while it is unfortunate that those at the bottom of the ladder will suffer first, those a little bit higher up the rungs may, if the matter goes far enough, have cause to look back and regret their views of the days when there was such a thing as full employment. Those who advocate a pool of unemployed, instead of just being for it, could very well be of it. This question concerns me deeply from the point of view of the North-West; and I would like the Premier, at the earliest opportunity, to give me—as a member representing North-West towns—some assurance as to how this policy will affect that area.

As all members of this House know, many North-West towns are comprised almost solely of Government employees. If we were to take from them employees of the Main Roads Department, the Public Works Department, the Department of Native Affairs, the Harbour and Light Department, the State Shipping Service, and Commonwealth employees, many North-West towns would become practically ghost towns.

In view of the Government's desire to implement its policy of a change-over to private enterprise, I would like some assurance from the Premier that that policy will not mean that the people who inhabit the towns in the North-West and who are doing an essential job—and who have combined with private enterprise people over the years in keeping that part of the

State populated—will be retrenched. I hope that the Premier will not go right off the deep end and reduce the present population of the North-West by about half.

I have no doubt that if someone tried to run the North-West entirely from a private enterprise point of view, he would immediately consider at least half of the people at present there to be quite unnecessary. All that is required in the North-West, to put that part of the State back to the starting point, is for some darned fool to get the idea that it can be run economically as one would run a private business. We know it is not and cannot be an economic proposition; nor do I suppose it can be so for a long time to come.

I therefore support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, because I truly believe that no-one has a guarantee that this is the end of the matter. The question I would like answered is whether this is the end or just the beginning of the unemployment—

Mr. Hawke: The Premier would not know. The Minister for Railways has not yet told him.

Mr. BICKERTON: Is this the start or the finish? I do not think anyone interested in the prosperity of Western Australia should take this matter lightly. If the Government could give us sufficient assurance that more prosperity will be obtained in this way than under the previous policy, that would be one thing; but we know the way the previous policy has operated in the North-West. We know that, allowing for the conditions under which they have had to work, the various Government organisations have done a mighty job up there.

I know, from what I have seen of their work down here, that they have done well. If they are not being administered properly it is not the fault of the work force, but of the people at the top. I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo—on amendment) [12.30 a.m.]: So far during this debate on the amendment to the Address-in-reply various speakers have tried to indicate whether or not the present Government has a mandate for the action it has taken, and is continuing to take. During the seven sessions I have been privileged to be a member of this House I have never yet been able to find out clearly what a mandate is; because I have seen Governments with majorities of about eight on the floor of the House but which have still not been able to have legislation passed.

Mr. Hawke: Hear, hear!

Mr. JAMIESON: If they had a mandate from the people to form a Government, surely they should have been able to have

their legislation passed. Now we see a Government, which has a hair-breadth majority, claiming that it has a full mandate to put into effect a policy which, to my mind at any rate, is completely detrimental to the interests of the people of Western Australia.

Another remarkable feature about this debate so far is the fact that despite the inclusion in Cabinet of three Country Party members from this House, so far not one Country Party member has spoken either for or against the proposition that is before us. Their views on the day-labour issues are not very clear; that must be obvious.

Mr. Perkins: Yes they are. You need have no doubts about that.

Mr. JAMIESON: We do not want the Tory section of the Country Party to intervene. We know your views; we have had them over the years and we do not want them.

Mr. W. Hegney: What does the Minister for Agriculture think of it?

Mr. JAMIESON: We want the views of the genuine Country Party members and not the views of these nigger drivers and others.

Mr. Perkins: Do you think there are two Country Parties?

Mr. JAMIESON: As far as the Minister is concerned, yes.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must not use unparliamentary language when speaking of other members of the House.

Mr. JAMIESON: It is obvious that the Country Party members have not indulged in any discussions on this matter. When searching through the policy speeches, or those that were reported by the Press, we find a very small section dealing with State trading concerns in the policy speech of the Leader of the Country Party; it is the only section which could be construed as having any bearing upon this debate. One sentence of this speech has already been read by the member for Warren; but I feel that it justifies inclusion in *Hansard* in its entirety so that posterity might know—if posterity cares to fathom out the history of this State and people are keen enough to go through *Hansard* to do so—just exactly what we are talking about when we refer to Country Party policy. It is headed, "State Trading" and it is reported in *The West Australian* of Friday, the 28th March, 1959. This extract is part of a speech made by the Leader of the Country Party, who is now the Deputy Premier. He said—

The Country Party believes that this State, which is always short of money for many of its essential services, cannot afford to involve its restricted loan funds in developing State trading concerns.

That is a very good statement. It is a statement of fact because we are always short of funds and it is a problem to know where best to spend them. He went on to say—

The Party therefore proposes to set its face against any further State trading and to encourage private capital instead.

And finally—

Legislation should be passed to enable State hotels to be disposed of when good opportunity offers.

The State hotels were the only trading concerns that the Country Party had in mind; and no doubt this was the considered policy of the Country Party. It would not be the policy of one person, as would be the policy of the Liberal Party, as we can see in various stages of the campaign, from the remarks the Premier made on behalf of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Brand: It was made quite clear by both parties when the member for Narrogin moved a motion in this regard some time ago.

Mr. JAMIESON: It is not clear, because the hon. member's motion did not make the position clear. The Premier went to the country and said, "I am going to do something", so the position was not clear. I understand, although the position is very obscure because of the reporting of the issue in the newspapers, that the Premier did, as Leader of the Liberal Party, indicate during the elections that he intended to dissipate the day-labour force and do away with State trading concerns to some degree. I think that, on the 4th March, the Premier's policy speech clearly indicated his attitude in that regard when he said that his policy was progressively to transfer State trading concerns to the field of private industry without loss of employment so that their continued operation would no longer be a drag on economy.

That was a fair enough statement so far as policy went. The member for South Perth put the matter fairly correctly when he said that there could be no argument once the people had decided on a Government policy as such. But the hon. member is fair. I can remember a previous occasion when another Act, which was upsetting to members who now comprise the Government forces, was before the House. He said exactly the same thing then—that the Labour Government had been returned to office with a substantial majority—on that occasion we were dealing with the unfair trading legislation—and it was his belief that the Government of the day was entirely correct in the procedure it was following, although he did not believe in the legislation.

That is a fair statement of fact; and although at times the Government might not have a franchise, it can get its legislation passed; and on other occasions it might have a franchise and not have the numbers to get it put into effect. In this case it looks as though the Government is relying on members who are prepared to support the Liberal line of thought to some degree.

I should now like to refer to the article, "Election points", in *The West Australian* of the 13th March. Various sections of this have been rehashed during the course of the debate; but there are certain sections of it that still need rehashing in order to remind the Premier just what he had to say on that occasion.

In view of the contradictory statements in the course of the election campaign, one wonders what it is all about when we hear it said that the Premier clearly indicated that his Government intended to get rid of State trading concerns and dissipate the day-labour force. He had this to say in *The West Australian* to which I have referred—

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 nor close any concerns down.

In the face of what has happened since, that is one of the greatest acts of political hypocrisy that has ever been committed by any party in the history of the State. Any party that is inclined to commit such hypocrisy by making one statement as against another deserves the full censure of the people as soon as they are given a chance to do so on that issue.

I believe that the public was made well aware of what the Government would do if it were returned to office; not because of the policy put forward in a roundabout way by the Premier and his colleagues, but because of the clearly-worded full page advertisements in the Press which were paid for by supporters of the Labour Party and which indicated what would happen to the day-labour scheme and the State trading concerns. Despite this, the people of the State decided, by a very slender majority of 23 votes—that is what it actually amounted to—that the Liberal-Country Party coalition Government should have the opportunity to govern this State until such time as a majority of this Parliament decided otherwise, or another election was held to depose it from that position. With that I have no argument.

I will not agree or disagree that the Government has a mandate; because, as I have already said, since I have been a member of this House I have been unable to ascertain when a Government has or has not a mandate. That subject could be argued at length without any satisfactory conclusion being reached.

I am indebted to the Minister for Works for a remark that he made today. I have no desire to be indebted to the Minister for Works for anything; but fortunately for him, I have to pay him a compliment. That is, he substantiated something which I thought was beyond actual reality when it was brought to my notice; namely, that there had been collusion between a Commonwealth department, the Builders' Guild, and the Master Builders' Association in order to soften the blow made by the Government in dismissing these men employed under the Public Works Department day-labour scheme.

Several of the men came to me and said: "It seems strange that when we go to the Commonwealth Employment Office we are immediately told, 'Yes, you have been allocated to such-and-such a builder, and you will be picked up for a job'." Those men are allocated to jobs before they go to the Commonwealth Employment Office. The Minister now indicates that 14 days before they are retrenched, the Commonwealth Employment Office, the Builders' Guild, and the Builders' Association get in contact with one another as to the future of these men. Of course, this smacks of collusion between the parties concerned. These men are picked up for jobs and there is no squeal from other workers.

However, unfortunately men who should be employed on private building jobs are walking the streets hunting for work day after day because of the priority that has been established by the Government in adopting the practice of ensuring that these ex Public Works Department tradesmen will be picked up to the detriment of private building workers.

That is the gratitude shown by the Government to those who support private enterprise. Their reward is that they will be left out of the picture until the blow to the men engaged under the day-labour scheme is softened; until the effect of this move to absorb the extra labour force coming on to the market to be employed on building work around the city is nullified.

The Minister for Railways, in his usual figurative way, tried to prove to us that there were fewer building tradesmen out of work than there were before. Anyone who has had any dealing with the building trades will appreciate what has happened. A trend is taking place similar to that which occurred in the building trades during the boom a few years ago with the establishment of the Kwinana Oil Refinery and the stepping up of our housing programme. In those times, when Victoria was suffering from a slight recession in the building trade, there were more building tradesmen out of work in that State than in Western Australia. Because of this, men came to Perth to secure employment.

That trend is in reverse today. If a check were made on the travellers going over the Nullarbor Plain to the Eastern States it would be found that a great many of them are building tradesmen who are seeking employment in other States. Those men say that there is no future for them in Western Australia. I agree with them while the Government insists on fooling around with what has been established practice in our community for a number of years. There is no need for the Government to interfere with the system that has been in existence for such a length of time. This was proved when a Liberal-Country Party Government was in office from 1947 to 1953 because, during that time, it did nothing to upset the Public Works Department day-labour system.

The reason for the Government's non-interference then, of course, was that there were plenty of pickings for the large building contractors around the city. They were not interested in Government contracts in those days. They were likely to be subject to strict supervision to ensure that they carried out good work. The contractors did not want that sort of work in those years, but now they are clamouring for Government contracts because they realise that there is not so much private work forthcoming.

Moves such as these create delay, and from the Minister for Works I would like to find out what has happened in regard to the building that was to house the linear accelerator. I understand that we have, because of the Government's muddling in this matter, lost our priority to obtain a linear accelerator for this State, so that the people might enjoy its benefits.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You mean as a result of the muddling of the previous Government.

Mr. JAMIESON: No, the muddling of this Government by its reverting from the day-labour scheme to be used for construction of this building to the system of calling tenders for the work.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That was done in the era of the previous Government.

Mr. JAMIESON: With due deference to the Minister, I would point out that if he placed the file on the Table of the House for all to see, he would get a shock as to what did happen.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I have just written a letter to the Trades Hall on the matter.

Mr. JAMIESON: The newspapers proved to be another factor in softening the blow of the Government's reverting from day labour to the system of contract. The newspapers, of course, say that they have been abused and are badly done by. If you buy the evening paper, Mr. Speaker,

you will be aware that in last Saturday's issue of the *Daily News* that newspaper took to task, in screaming headlines, one of my colleagues in another place in respect to a statement he had made, claiming it to be untrue.

I know a lot more about this incident than the Press, because the person concerned spoke to me on this matter. That hon. member was much nearer the truth than the newspaper, and I hope he does not retract one word of what he said. It is true that he might not have presented it in its correct order; it is true that the meeting referred to was not a public meeting, but a meeting of building workers. There are quite a lot of half-truths that can be construed as not being quite right, and at which the newspaper has taken umbrage.

The fact is that Larry Finlay, who was featured, did come on to the stage of the Unity Theatre to complain to people on the stage that he had been used in this issue. That was abundantly clear to me, because I happened to be sitting at the end of the line at the time. He told, quite clearly, the story of how he went to the employment bureau on the morning of the 22nd May, and how he was told there was nothing available for him. He was given a form, and told to take it away and bring it back later after he had filled it in. This he did. A period of some 10 minutes had elapsed, and when he returned to the counter there was a photographer and a reporter also present. They told him at the counter at that juncture that there was a job for him, and asked if he would mind the story being given to the paper. He did not know at that moment that it was going to be put forward in the light in which it was.

Now we find that the newspaper has obtained affidavits from him. He has probably been pilloried, because he is now at the complete mercy of private enterprise, and it would be naturally to his detriment if he did not play along with them. It is shameful for the Press, or for anybody else, to use a person's position and state of unemployment to gain political advantage.

Mr. Brand: Are you sure he has been pilloried?

Mr. JAMIESON: He must have been pilloried for the Press to have obtained an affidavit which stated that nothing like this had happened. I know it did happen, because I was there at the time. What was the purpose for his having come on to the stage at the Unity Theatre? There was no need for him to have done so had he not wanted to object to the manner in which the Press had presented his case on the previous day. Now of course the newspapers say that newspapers do make mistakes, but when they make mistakes they are genuine mistakes; that when a

member of Parliament makes a mistake he does so under the cloak of privilege. If there was any right in this State, the newspaper would be called on to explain this breach of privilege. One day, in the not too distant future, the newspapers will have to answer to the people as to why they do not present their cases fairly and impartially.

The SPEAKER: I would like the hon. member to relate his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. JAMIESON: The Government's policy of sacking so many of its employees, and the newspaper campaign that has been going on to soften this blow must, in some way, relate to this particular issue. Another important matter that concerns me as a member of this community—whether it be as a Labour member, or as a lay person in the community—is that I do not like any set-up which gives an opportunity for graft and corruption.

By doing what it has, the Government has made it possible for graft and corruption to be practised. It has left itself open to the charge, whether the practice exists or not. Where there is a day-labour scheme operating there can be no graft or corruption, but when contracts are being constantly let there is always trouble; there is always the disgruntled person; there is always the person in high places who can be got at to some degree to do a favour for a friend or, as the member for Pilbara has said, do a favour for a particular party. That can always occur where contracts are concerned. By leaving the door open, and by having everything done by contracts, we give the people who consider themselves badly done by some reason for complaint.

There was quite a lot of criticism in the building world when one of the persons who tendered for the work on the Rural and Industries Bank was recruiting his labour force before the tenders closed for that particular job. That in itself does not show up too well in the light of day, when we find that the person concerned was not given the contract but that it was given to the man who was hand in glove with him on that occasion. This savours of something that should not be fostered in a community such as ours, where we are handling vast sums of the taxpayers' money. Particularly does it reflect badly when it applies to the administrators of the community; to those 10 people charged with the immediate responsibility of looking after these matters.

During the debate much prominence has been given, particularly by the last member to speak from the Government side—disregarding the two Independent Liberals—to the effect that the Hawke Government was the most socialistic Government that this State had ever seen,

and that the election was a complete reaction to the foisting of socialism in its entirety on to the community of Western Australia. As members may, or may not, know I have fairly close contact with Trades Hall and the opinions expressed there; and the district council considered it was justified in pillorying the Government, because it would not take action to socialise some particular venture or the other.

Members opposite cannot have it both ways. It would be a case, Mr. Speaker, of having a dog biting one foot while trying to kick a cat away with the other. For the previous Government to have been charged by both extremes for doing the wrong thing, it must surely have been treading a very middle path. Perhaps that could have been the cause of the undoing of the previous Government. It was too good to some people in refusing the request for certain action to be taken.

Much has been said during this debate about the previous Government having caused the present situation to arise by its policy and by the legislation it introduced; and these matters were bandied about widely overseas. We have a very great friend of the Liberal Party to thank for that, in the person of Sir Halford Reddish. If he has associates who are prepared to bring finance to this State only under conditions imposed by him, I for one do not want it. I say that his type of conditions should not be attached to these investments.

The Liberal Party may be happy at his coming to this State, and at the possibility of a few thousand pounds more being placed in its funds, should an election become imminent in the future. He is not the sort of person we want in this community. We want the genuine businessman who is prepared to invest in this State and who desires to see the State prosper—one who expects a reasonable return, but not one who is prepared to come only on his own terms.

Finally, I touch on the aspect of the Government depriving many deserving unemployed persons of the supplementary payments. This point has been fairly thoroughly covered by the many members who have already spoken in this debate. There is little need for me to emphasise the fact that we are opposed to the action of the Government in depriving those persons of this small allowance. But what else can one expect when at least two Ministers in this House learned three letters of the alphabet before any of the others? They knew L.S.D. before any of the other letters; and they have gone along all their lives without experiencing hardships.

Mr. Court: Who are you talking about?

Mr. JAMIESON: They are not very far away.

Mr. Court: Who are they?

Mr. JAMIESON: I am stating no names. They know. If the cap happens to fit the member for Nedlands he had better pull it down over his head.

Mr. Court: We are curious, because those of us on the front bench of the Government came up the hard way.

Mr. JAMIESON: The hon. member would be in the forefront of those I mentioned.

Mr. Court: Some of us have come up in a harder way than you.

Mr. JAMIESON: The hon. member has come up with a silver spoon too close to his ears.

Mr. Court: I wish that were true.

Mr. JAMIESON: They definitely disregard any humane treatment of their fellow beings who are not so fortunate in life; who have had to struggle hard and are still struggling. The Government is to be condemned for the action it took.

Regarding the calling of tenders, the points which have been made will be borne out in time. We have heard much debate on that matter. We heard all the ramifications associated with the calling of tenders, as against the day-labour scheme, and whether one is more desirable than another. Personally, I see no reason why day labour, if properly controlled and exercised, should not be the best scheme for any Government to adopt for its works. Whenever anything goes wrong in a private organisation, the fault lies with the administration; there is nothing wrong with what is done by the workers. They are told what to do; they are skilled tradesmen; and provided they are supplied with the materials and told what to do, they will do a good job.

Bearing in mind that the private contractor must make a profit on the capital invested, one will appreciate that on any job undertaken by the Public Works Department, such margin of profit will enable the Public Works Department to put in better materials and workmanship. I support the amendment.

MR. PERKINS (Roe—Minister for Transport—on amendment) [1.5 a.m.]: Members opposite seem rather concerned with the matter before us. I rise to assure them that there is no division among members supporting the Government.

Mr. Jamieson: They took a long time to make up their minds.

Mr. PERKINS: I decided to hear what the member for Beeloo had to say before I spoke. Maybe he is very much in need of further information about the political history of the Government parties, particularly of the Country Party. Some of the remarks which he makes in this House from time to time indicate very clearly what a "Johnny-come-lately" he is to State politics.

Mr. Jamieson: You are a "Johnny-come-lately" to this State.

Mr. PERKINS: There again the hon. member betrays his ignorance. In regard to the policy of the Country Party I would hasten to assure him and other members opposite that the policy, as enunciated by the party's leader, was not the work of any individual. Each of the items was considered severally by every member of the party, and each took full responsibility for what the leader said in his policy speech.

Mr. Tonkin: What leader?

Mr. PERKINS: The Leader of the Country Party—the member for Stirling.

Mr. Evans: You mean every member of the political party.

Mr. PERKINS: Every member of the political party. That interjection by the hon. member would seem to indicate that he has some doubts as to whether the members of the political party adequately represent the true opinion in country districts. I should have thought that members sitting on the opposite side would have been far too concerned with deciding the real policy of the Labour Party and who dictates it, than with trying to tell us what are the policies of our political parties.

Mr. Evans: What are they?

Mr. PERKINS: We are very definite on the policies we put to the electors. All we do in this matter, as in any other matter which comes before this House, will be in line with the promises we made to the people at the hustings.

Mr. Hawke: What promises did you make in connection with the two issues covered by the amendment?

Mr. PERKINS: If the hon. member listens he will find out.

Mr. Hawke: We hope.

Mr. PERKINS: The Country Party has held for a very long time that the contract system should be used wherever possible for the provision of goods and services to the Government. If by any chance some Government agency can quote a better price than a private contractor, surely we as a Government would be foolish if we did not use the Government's service.

Mr. Evans: Will the Premier agree with you?

Mr. PERKINS: I think he agrees with me. The point at issue covers the contracts which have been called by the Public Works Department. We have good reason to believe that the quotes in private tenders will be more favourable to the Government than the quotes which may be obtained from a Government agency.

Mr. Hawke: That way you are refusing the Public Works the right to tender.

Mr. PERKINS: That is in line with the action taken in regard to the State Engineering Works. The Minister for Works read the list of concerns which were given an opportunity to tender for those school seats and desks.

Mr. Tonkin: We do not know who has the contract yet.

Mr. PERKINS: Of course we do not.

Mr. Tonkin: That is the vital matter.

Mr. PERKINS: That will be the time for the member for Melville to discuss that question.

Mr. Tonkin: That is the only issue.

Mr. PERKINS: I suggest the hon. member will have an opportunity to discuss the question when we have that information. I think I can speak on behalf of all Country Party members—

Mr. Hawke: That is a pity.

Mr. PERKINS: —representing country districts when I say that country people are fed up and extremely dissatisfied with the amount of work done in country districts during the time of the previous Government—

Mr. Evans: Rubbish!

Mr. PERKINS: —particularly during the last three years of that Government. The standard of the buildings necessary for Government services in our country districts has deteriorated during that period to an alarming degree. Members of this House will hear something more on that particular question as the session proceeds. The Minister for Education will paint a really alarming picture in regard to the extent to which our educational facilities have deteriorated—particularly in the country, but in the metropolitan area as well.

Mr. Tonkin: You did not build one high school in the metropolitan area in six years.

Mr. PERKINS: The member for Melville is getting red herrings in action. We know from personal experience what the position is. If the member for Melville wants to know, I suggest he ask the ex-Minister in the back seat—the member for Merredin-Yilgarn.

Mr. Kelly: He would get much closer to the picture than by listening to you.

Mr. PERKINS: If the member for Merredin-Yilgarn does not know the position, I suggest he meet the Merredin Road Board. Immediately after we took office I had an urgent call from the road board to examine the police buildings available in Merredin and I agree—

Mr. Kelly: What have you done about it?

Mr. PERKINS: —that the set-up is anything but a credit to the Government; and I have promised that as soon as we can allot funds for the purpose, we will get on with the work.

Mr. Evans: Were you asked by the road board or by Mr. Cunningham?

Mr. PERKINS: As far as I can recall, it was the Merredin Road Board.

Mr. W. Hegney: Did you look at the high school there?

Mr. PERKINS: I have just quoted an instance as to how public buildings have deteriorated.

Mr. Kelly: You did nothing about it, anyway.

Mr. PERKINS: I hope we will. If the member for Merredin-Yilgarn doubts whether we are going to do anything, I suggest he give us time.

Mr. Hawke: He would if he had the chance—with hard labour!

Mr. PERKINS: When we have to go before the people again it will be time enough to castigate us. However, if we have made considerable improvement in the facilities which the Government is called on to provide, I hope we will be given due credit for what we are able to do in the next three years.

Obviously, one of the means towards effecting this improvement in public buildings is to make the loan moneys which are available stretch as far as they possibly can.

Mr. Tonkin: You are in for a rude awakening there.

Mr. PERKINS: As custodians of the taxpayers' money, we desire to do that very thing. If we can make a saving of 5 per cent. or 6 per cent. in the cost of the erection of public buildings by the use of the contract system rather than by day labour, members will realise—if they calculate for a few moments—just how much it will mean in each of the electorates in this State towards the provision of better facilities for the people who are called on to carry out Government services.

Mr. Tonkin: Who led you to believe you would make a saving of 5 per cent. or 6 per cent.? It is a pure guess.

Mr. PERKINS: Figures indicate that.

Mr. Hawke: Whose figures?

Mr. PERKINS: If the Leader of the Opposition listened carefully tonight to my colleague, the Minister for Works, I do not think he could have come to any other conclusion than that this is a reasonable expectation.

Mr. Hawke: Just an assertion.

Mr. PERKINS: I hope we have some signs in that direction. The point I am making is that we told the people we were

going to do this very thing. If we do not succeed, I suggest that will be time enough for the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Melville to criticise us. There again, having been in this House for 16 or 17 years, I have very grave doubts as to whether we will be given credit if our policy works out all right.

Mr. Tonkin: Did you give us any credit for anything we did?

Mr. PERKINS: We have given great praise, but the member for Melville did not always take it in the right spirit and tended to use any praise we did bestow on him for very unworthy political purposes.

Over the years we have become somewhat chary of extending too much praise; but, on the other hand, I hope the member for Melville will treat us as generously as we treated him. If he does so, we will be satisfied.

Mr. Tonkin: There will not be much difficulty in doing that.

Mr. PERKINS: One or two points were raised by the member for Beeloo to which I would like to refer. He said that criticism was made against the Hawke Government, because it had not been socialistic enough. That may be an opinion held by the member for Beeloo; but I think the majority of people with whom we associate consider that if we had a Government more socialistic than the previous Government, we would be going a long way to the left. I do not think any of the people to whom the member for Beeloo refers could justly criticise the Hawke Government on that particular score. Apparently businessmen overseas rather shared that fear because—

Mr. W. Hegney: Because of the poison that was sent over.

Mr. PERKINS: —great efforts were made to induce companies to come to this State. Unfortunately, the previous Government had very little success. There again, we hope that the policy we are pursuing will have the effect of stepping up industrial activity in this State; and I share the hopes of other Ministers, already expressed to the House during this debate, that the time is not far distant when there will be actually a shortage of tradesmen rather than a surplus. I think we have some reasonable hopes for that coming about. I will now turn back to the specific question mentioned in the amendment before the House regarding Government policy on retrenchments.

Reference has been made by various speakers from the Opposition as to the policies followed in the department under my direct control. Some criticism was made about the serving of notices on 37 men in the Tramway Department. First of all, I would like to make it clear that the decision to discontinue the running

of trams was made by the previous Government. The trams have already been disposed of. Most men in the Tramway Department were engaged on specialised work, and the great majority of them were transferred into the omnibus or trolley-bus sections of the department. But there was this final core of 37 men, and it was not possible to transfer them to comparable jobs for which they had been trained in the Tramway Department.

Mr. Hawke: What did they specialise for?

Mr. PERKINS: Some were what is known as pit men; others were electrical fitters. Again I depend on the technical advice given by officers of the department. They say that men who were trained in that particular work in the department are not entirely suitable for electrical work or similar work of that nature on omnibuses or in any other section of the department. Where it was possible to do so, these men were placed in other jobs. If the Leader of the Opposition were to inquire from the member for East Perth I am sure he would learn that actually those men were surplus before the election.

I have no quarrel with the manager of the department. I would hope that the management would treat us the same. It would have been extremely embarrassing no doubt if a minute had been sent up to the effect that these men were surplus and inquiring what was to be done with them. That was the position actually at the end of last year. The trams had ceased running and very little of this particular type of employment was available.

I would like to make it clear, in fairness to Mr. Thomas, the manager of the Tramway Department, that he had the greatest possible concern for the welfare of the employees under his control. It was a most distasteful thing for a man in this position to have to give notice to men with whom he had worked for so many years.

When he finally came to me, he said that he had explored every possible avenue elsewhere in the service, and that he was in a very difficult position. I understand that four of the men, when they knew the notice was coming up, resigned, and that left 33; and a considerable number of those were placed elsewhere. Some of them were employed as conductors because they were able to take that type of work, whereas others were not very suitable for it.

The two men referred to particularly in this House tonight—I think by the member for West Perth and the member for Mt. Lawley—were two men about whom I felt very concerned. The unions asked me whether I would receive a deputation—which I did—from four of the union secretaries, representative of those men. I discussed the situation with them very thoroughly and agreed with them that it was a tragic position that some of those men who had given so many years of their

lives to specialised work, should now be forced out to other employment. The two men most vitally concerned were about 63 years of age.

When the union officials had told me the story, I told them that to avoid the possibility of the two men having hard feelings about the way they were treated by the department at that stage of their lives, I would agree to pension them at the full rate of £7 5s. or £7 10s. a week rather than at the £5 that they would have received had they voluntarily resigned.

Mr. May: Did they have to pay any extra money?

Mr. PERKINS: No. Whether those men decided to take that offer, or whether they found some other employment, I do not know; but I did tell Mr. Thomas, as I told the unions, I had agreed to do that rather than have the men who were so close to retirement, and had to retire because the trams had been abandoned, feel they had been hard done by. I thought we could treat them generously to that extent.

There are several men down there, too, who have been placed in difficult positions. Irrespective of playing politics, I would not like to think that anyone in charge of a department would place undue hardship on loyal employees who had given good service to a department or a private employer.

Over the years, I have gained some knowledge of private employers, and I think that if anyone of them had a person in his employment for a long period he would treat that employee very generously if such a decision as this had to be made. Therefore, I would like to make it clear that we have tried to ease the severity of the position wherever we could, and have taken extreme steps to find alternative employment.

This has nothing to do with any question of day labour. Many things have been thrown into the ring which have had no direct connection with the change-over from the day-labour system. A question was asked as to how many men have been given notice of dismissal, and how many other men have been put on since this Government took over. Entirely false conclusions can be drawn from that information, unless the circumstances are known; because a lot of this change of employment is due to the ordinary ebb and flow which is experienced in industry in any case, and which cannot be avoided.

I believe that employees have got to accept something of that; but I would like to make the point that when it came to those older employees, we took particular steps to see that they were treated as generously as possible.

Mr. Hawke: Is the Minister telling us that the Government could not place those two employees anywhere at all in the Government service for one year?

Mr. PERKINS: That is exactly the information I received, and it was not my decision. I would like to impress upon the Leader of the Opposition that it was the advice tendered to me by the same technical officers as advised the previous Government and whose advice, I have every reason to believe, the previous Government valued as much as we do.

I have noticed a tendency on the part of some of the union representatives who have interviewed me from time to time to fear and extremely dislike the change-over from Government to private employment. One of the union representatives referred to employment outside Government employment as the law of the jungle. That was a point of view that I had great difficulty in following, but I think there are plenty of private employers who are at least as good as any Government department can ever be—and in many cases they are much better.

Mr. Tonkin: But they do not want men.

Mr. PERKINS: They do. Industry cannot be carried on without men; and if we can expand industry it will want still more men. That is the policy which all Ministers of this Government are following with the full support—I believe—of those behind us. We are aiming to expand industry, so as to get away from the restrictive thinking which has been the curse of the previous Government, and on to a basis where we can expand employment, with greater prosperity for the people of Western Australia.

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

Ayes—23.

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

(Teller.)

Noes—26.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Brand	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Court	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Craig	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Owen
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Henn	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Watts
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Wild
Mr. Mann	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller.)

Majority against—3.

Amendment thus negatived.

Tabling of Papers

Mr. HAWKE: I would like to know whether the Minister for Works has yet placed on the Table of the House the papers and documents from which he quoted this afternoon, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. WILD: I have not; but they will be placed there immediately.

On motion by Mr. Tonkin, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 1.36 a.m. (Wednesday)

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 8th July, 1959

CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :	
Legislative Council elections, right of housewives to vote	189
Black Rocks, Derby, construction of deep-water Jetty	189
Traffic lights, installation at intersection of Guildford and Garratt roads	190
Dental clinics, restrictions on treatment	190
Napier-Broome Bay, new port	191
Railway rollingstock, construction outside Midland Workshops	191
Departmental dismissals, Government's policy	191
ADDRESS-IN-REPLY, FIFTH DAY	191
Speakers on amendment—	
The Hon. G. E. Jeffery	192
The Hon. R. C. Matiske	195
The Hon. E. M. Heenan	200
The Hon. A. R. Jones	201
The Hon. W. F. Willesee	203
The Hon. G. Bennetts	204
The Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham	206
The Hon. E. M. Davies	210
The Hon. L. A. Logan	214
The Hon. J. J. Garrigan	218
The Hon. J. M. Thomson	219
ADJOURNMENT, SPECIAL	220

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

1. *This question was postponed.*

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ELECTIONS

Right of Housewives to Vote

2. The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON asked the Minister for Mines:

In view of the Minister's refusal to consider adult franchise for the Legislative Council, will he, at least, consider granting the democratic right of a vote in the Legislative Council to the housewives of Western Australia?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

The Government does not contemplate changing the system which continues to operate satisfactorily in the interests of Western Australia.

3. *This question was postponed.*

BLACK ROCKS, DERBY

Construction of Deep-Water Jetty

4. The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Has the Brand Government halted work and planning commenced by the Hawke Government for construction of the deep-water jetty at Black Rocks, Derby, which was requested by an all-party State Parliamentary delegation to Canberra in 1955 and approved in 1957 by the Federal Government which is meeting the full cost?
- (2) If this is so, what is the reason for further delay?
- (3) If such is not the case, when will work commence on foreshore works and jetty construction?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) The whole question of deep-water ports for the West Kimberleys is currently examined, and investigations are being continued in connection with the Black Rocks proposal, with particular reference to ocean bed conditions.
- (2) Following the Commonwealth Government's approval of the Black Rocks proposal, re-soundings were made, and these proved that there was less depth at the proposed jetty head position than was recorded in the soundings taken in 1951 and shown on the plans of the submission.

The position was reported to the Minister for Works on the 17th February, 1959, and subsequently a naval lighter was taken over from the Navy. Further investigations are in hand to test the ocean bed conditions at possible jetty head sites in deeper water. The altered conditions would necessitate a substantial increase in the length and cost of the jetty structure.

- (3) Covered by No. (2).