

work over the past 16 years, particularly by the country members of the committee. I feel we should have due regard to their opinions, which are born of long experience, and give them the support to which they are entitled in bringing forward this Bill. It has been said that this is mainly a Committee Bill and, judging by the amendments on the notice paper, it is: If there is anything else that members want to know, if they will tell me about it, I will have inquiries made and endeavour to have the information available for them before we go into Committee next week.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

House adjourned at 5.6 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 21st October, 1954.

CONTENTS.

Page

Questions: Free milk, as to supplies to schools	2270
Native welfare, as to Cundeelee mission	2270
Technical education, as to building trades section, Leederville	2270
Grants Patch hall, as to removal and compensation	2271
Fremantle harbour extension, as to Cabinet and Assembly's resolution	2271
Country swimming pools, as to Government financial assistance	2271
Midland Junction Abattoir, (a) as to control board, disputes, etc.	2272
(b) as to cost of feeding sheep	2272
Beach development, as to Government assistance	2272
Air Beef Pty Ltd., as to withdrawal of Government aid	2272
Railways, as to continuing Mundaring branch line	2273
Bill: Supply (No. 2), £15,000,000, Standing Orders suspension, Message, Com. of Supply, report	2273

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

QUESTIONS.

FREE MILK.

As to Supplies to Schools.

Mr. BOVELL asked the Minister for Education:

(1) How many Western Australian schoolchildren are entitled to receive free milk under the free milk scheme?

(2) What is the average number of children actually receiving this benefit?

(3) What schools have been, or are, excluded from the free milk scheme due to difficulties in securing adequate supplies of fresh milk?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Approximately 97,200.

(2) Approximately 61,800 children are receiving free milk.

(3) No school is excluded from the free milk scheme. In areas where fresh milk is not available, the schools can arrange for powdered or evaporated tinned milk to be supplied.

NATIVE WELFARE.

As to Cundeelee Mission.

Mr. McCULLOCH asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

(1) How many aborigines are there at Cundeelee mission—

(a) adults;

(b) juveniles?

(2) How many missionaries are on the staff of Cundeelee mission?

(3) What is the approximate average cost per annum of conducting and maintaining Cundeelee mission?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) (a) Thirty-two adults;

(b) Twenty-seven juveniles.

(2) Eight missionaries.

(3) Cost to the Government—

1951-52—£2,317.

1952-53—£3,956.

1953-54—£3,296.

To 30/9/54—£810.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

As to Building Trades Section, Leederville.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Education:

The report of the Education Department speaks of "the nucleus of a Building Trades School" at Leederville.

(1) What sections of such school are absent from the present technical school at Leederville?

(2) What further accommodation is required to house the sections not now at Leederville?

(3) Could not the present architectural students be accommodated in the Leederville school without any structural alterations?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Plumbing and sheet metal work, furniture trades and, when classes are established, glass trades.

(2) An estimate of further accommodation required is being prepared but this will take some time to finalise.

(3) It is not proposed to accommodate architectural students in the Leederville Technical School.

GRANTS PATCH HALL.

As to Removal and Compensation.

Mr. YATES asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Did the Railway Department remove a building comprising a hall, bio-box, stage and electrical fittings erected on land situated at Grants Patch?

(2) If so, from whom did it acquire the property?

(3) Has a claim been lodged by the Grants Patch Progress Association to the building or any portion thereof?

(4) Does the Government admit the claim of the Grants Patch Progress Association to the building, or portion thereof?

(5) If the answer is "Yes," is the Government prepared to compensate fully the Grants Patch Progress Association in respect of its claim.

(6) If the Government is prepared to compensate the association, what is its estimate of the value of the property removed by the Railway Department and owned by the association?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The hall was purchased from the liquidator of Ora Banda Gold Mines No Liability.

(3) At a very early stage there was a telephone communication from Mr. H. T. Kingdon of the Grants Patch Progress Association and former chairman of the Grants Patch Hall Committee. This contained an offer to dispose of the auxiliary buildings, comprising bio-box, stage and supper room attached to the hall, and the offer was accepted. The buildings were not removed without authority.

(4) The questions of legal ownership and the right to payment have been examined by Crown Law officials who rule that the Grants Patch Progress Association as recently formed was not the legal successor to the Grants Patch Hall Committee (the owner of the hall annexes) which became defunct about seven years ago, and left a provision in its book of rules (Rule 22) that the annexes were to be sold and the proceeds handed to the St. John Ambulance Association. The St. John Ambulance Association has made claim, through its solicitors, to payment of the money and finalisation has been delayed because of this. It is anticipated that when finality is reached payment will be made to the progress association. Obviously, payments could not be made to an unincorporated body like the Grants Patch Progress Association without completing the legal formalities that would satisfy both the Solicitor General and the Auditor General.

(5) Answered by No. (4).

(6) A valuation of the adjuncts gave a figure of approximately £150. The association's claim is £200.

FREMANTLE HARBOUR EXTENSION.

As to Cabinet and Assembly's Resolution.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN asked the Minister for Works:

(1) In view of the fact that this House a few nights ago decided against upriver development of the harbour and the building of a wooden bridge adjacent to the traffic bridge at Fremantle, and according to a reply given by him to the member for Greenough, in spite of the decision by this House that Cabinet reaffirmed its decision to build berths upstream when required, does this mean that decisions of this House are to be ignored by Cabinet?

(2) If so, will he inform the House what poor, humble private members have to do before they can have their decisions given effect to?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Decisions of either House on motions like the one in question, which are introduced by private members, are expressions of opinion only and invariably receive such consideration by Governments as would appear to be warranted by the importance of the matters dealt with and the circumstances surrounding the decisions.

In accordance with this custom, the motion of the member for Fremantle was considered by Cabinet on Monday last when it was decided that the interests of the State would be best served by adherence to the policy previously decided upon after most careful and thorough examination of all aspects of harbour extension proposals.

(2) Governments give effect to decisions which conform to their policy.

COUNTRY SWIMMING POOLS.

As to Government Financial Assistance.

Hon. D. BRAND asked the Premier:

(1) What districts, if any, have applied for financial assistance to construct swimming pools?

(2) What centres have been assisted or promised assistance, and to what extent?

(3) What is the policy in regard to "aid to country centres" to construct swimming pools?

The PREMIER replied:

In reply to Nos. (1) and (2), information is being obtained and will be available next week. In reply to No. (3), the policy of the Government is to make available one-third of the total estimated cost of any swimming pool that it is proposed to construct in a country town, with a maximum contribution of £10,000. The Government would give approval only where suitable

plans were first prepared and the work was substantially carried out under expert supervision, and finally approved by the Government representatives as being satisfactory in every way. For record purposes, I will supply the answers to the three questions on Tuesday next.

Mr. SPEAKER: The questions will be placed on the notice paper next Tuesday.

MIDLAND JUNCTION ABATTOIR.

(a) *As to Control Board, Disputes, etc.*

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Does the Abattoir Board of Control meet regularly?

(2) How often has the board met in the last 12 months?

(3) Is there any significance in the fact that there have been more disputes in the abattoir since the appointment of the board than formerly?

(4) Does he consider the board and industrial relationships between employees would be improved by the appointment of the comptroller and a union representative on the board?

(5) If the answer to No. (4) is in the affirmative, will he introduce legislation to make the appointments referred to?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The board meets frequently.

(2) In the year ended the 21st October, 1954, the board met on 43 occasions. In addition, the chairman or one of the members is usually in daily contact with the abattoir.

(3) I cannot see any significance.

(4) Yes.

(5) The Government introduced a Bill during the parliamentary session last year to give effect to this representation on the board, but the Bill was defeated at the second reading in the Legislative Council. A further attempt this year would probably have met with the same fate.

(b) *As to Cost of Feeding Sheep.*

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY (without notice) asked the Minister for Agriculture:

Yesterday I asked the Minister who would bear the cost of feeding the thousands of sheep held at Midland Junction. Is it expected that the producers shall pay for it or will the Government bear the cost?

The Minister for Railways: Socialism again!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: There is no socialism about that.

The Minister for Railways: Not much!

The MINISTER replied:

The hon. member is a changed man from when he was sitting on this side of the House. If he will put his question on the notice paper, I shall obtain the information.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Do you not believe in doing anything? I gave you notice yesterday. You have had plenty of time to make up your mind.

The MINISTER: I asked the hon. member to place his question on the notice paper before, but he has not done so.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: You have had plenty of time. Why do you not get on with your job?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER: If the hon. member had placed his question on the notice paper, he would have received a reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the Minister for Agriculture to keep order.

The Minister for Railways: The member for Murray has a liver today.

BEACH DEVELOPMENT.

As to Government Assistance.

Mr. NIMMO asked the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

Will the Government give consideration to supporting local governing bodies financially in the upkeep and development of their beach areas?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied:

Yes.

AIR BEEF PTY. LTD.

As to Withdrawal of Government Aid.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY (without notice) asked the Premier:

(1) For what reasons has the Government decided to cease the financial assistance given to Air Beef Pty. Ltd?

(2) Does the Government not consider the fostering of the Kimberley cattle industry should be encouraged by continuing with this comparatively small expenditure?

(3) Could he give any indication whether the Commonwealth Government will continue its assistance now that the State Government has withdrawn its assistance?

(4) In view of the fact that the flying of beef project is still in its experimental stages, and also the fact that drought conditions have applied for the past two years, does he not think that this is a most unsuitable time to withdraw any financial assistance?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) It is believed that the operations of this company benefit air transport companies and not the cattle industry.

(2) Only a very small percentage of the cattle industry of the Kimberleys is now affected by the company's operations.

(3) No.

(4) The company has been operating for seven years and should now be well beyond the experimental stages. The total amount of subsidy paid to the company to date by the State Government is £42,785.

RAILWAYS.

As to Continuing Mundaring Branch Line.

Mr. OWEN (without notice) asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) In view of the serious delays in rail traffic in the hills section of the main line, caused by the recent accident near Parkerville, and other accidents that have occurred on that section, does he consider that the Mundaring branch line should be maintained for emergency traffic?

(2) If so, would it not also be possible to operate economically a diesel service on that branch line to convey workers to and from their work in the metropolitan area?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The question of the necessity of retaining the Mundaring line from Mt. Helena to Bellevue, as a by-pass, was taken into consideration before the decision was made to close the line. It is the opinion of the Railways Commission that the expenditure necessary to keep it open as a by-pass, in the event of an accident occurring on the main line between Mt. Helena and Bellevue, which would perhaps take place once in ten years, is not justified.

(2) The important factor is not the difference in cost between operating a steam-hauled train and a diesel train, but the expense of keeping this branch line open. The difference between the cost of operating a diesel train and a steam train, would not be very great. The principal reason for closing the line is the maintenance cost. Because of the hilly nature of the country, which is traversed between Mundaring and Bellevue, the upkeep is very heavy. Even if we decided to run a diesel train on that line, the upkeep of the line would be just the same as if we operated a steam train on it. I think that for the last year of operation of this line, speaking from memory, the upkeep was about £14,500, whilst the earnings of the branch amounted to £3,000 or £4,000.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 2), £15,000,000.

Standing Orders Suspension.

On motion by the Treasurer, resolved:

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable resolutions from the Com-

mittees of Supply and of Ways and Means to be reported and adopted on the same day on which they shall have passed those committees, and also the passing of a Supply Bill through all its stages in one day.

Message.

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the purposes of the Bill.

In Committee of Supply.

The House resolved into Committee of Supply, Mr. J. Hegney in the Chair.

THE TREASURER (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam) [2.33]: I move—

That there be granted to Her Majesty on account of the services of the State for the year ending the 30th June, 1955, a sum not exceeding £15,000,000.

A sum of £16,500,000 has already been granted for the current financial year. That sum was made up as follows:—

	£.
Consolidated Revenue Fund	11,000,000
General Loan Fund	4,000,000
Advance to Treasurer	1,500,000

The expenditure for the three months, to the end of September last, has been £10,981,981 from Consolidated Revenue and £3,323,366 from the General Loan Fund while the total amount of revenue during the three monthly period amounted to £10,643,854. The deficit in the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the period of three months was, therefore, £338,127.

The sum of £15,000,000 now sought includes £11,000,000 for the Consolidated Revenue Fund and £4,000,000 for the General Loan Fund. These funds are required to enable the services of the State to be carried on until the Estimates have been passed by Parliament. Copies of Revenue and Loan Estimates for the current financial year have been made available to members and contain details of the proposed expenditure from each fund.

HON. SIR ROSS McLARTY (Murray) [2.35]: Of course this Bill is necessary in order that all the activities of the Government can be carried on. It is not usual to make a speech of any length on this measure, particularly as we have both the Revenue and Loan Estimates before us and an opportunity is given to members to speak on each of those items if they so desire. I take it that I am in order in making reference to any matters where Government expenditure is involved when speaking on this motion. I think the present Treasurer is most fortunate that money is so easily obtainable at the

moment and that he has such a tremendous sum to spend both in regard to revenue and loan.

The Minister for Works: Oh!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Minister is very fond, when moving around the country—

The Minister for Works: Where is it stacked?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: —of telling people that he is sorry, but he cannot do certain things because he has no money.

The Minister for Works: That is the truth.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: It has become threadbare.

The Minister for Works: Has it?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I think the Minister should tell people that from revenue and loan—

The Minister for Works: The truth cannot be told too often.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: —as was pointed out in the supplement to "The West Australian" the other day—£90,000,000 of public money is to be spent in Western Australia from the State and Commonwealth angles. Perhaps he would be better employed if he told people what priorities are being given to works and why some important undertakings cannot be carried out.

The Minister for Works: They are being told.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: They are not very satisfied about it.

The Minister for Works: They are being told.

The Minister for Agriculture: The member for Murray is becoming a bit threadbare now.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I will deal with the Minister in a few moments.

The Minister for Agriculture: You are going to do a lot, you are!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I am hoping that I will have an opportunity to speak on the Loan Estimates. It is probable that I will leave for Canberra in a few days and I would like an opportunity to speak before I go. In answer to a question without notice today, the Treasurer gave me some information about the withdrawal of the subsidy for the Air Beef scheme. I must say that I am particularly disappointed that this subsidy has been withdrawn. The project has created interest throughout Australia and I found, as no doubt did the Premier, that there was considerable interest taken in it in Great Britain and in parts of the Continent.

The Minister for Housing: It is of considerable interest to the few shareholders.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: No.

The Minister for Mines: How many stations did it serve?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I do not think that matters so much.

The Minister for Mines: One station.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: No, Glenroy was not the only station that is served.

The Minister for Mines: Yes, it was.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The growers will be concerned and the stations will suffer because of their inability to get certain stock to market. The amount of expenditure involved was, as I said in my question, comparatively small. In the development of a huge area, such as the East and West Kimberleys, such a scheme as Air Beef is worthy of perseverance. Many of the growers in those areas face restricted markets, which does not apply to producers in other parts of the State. The East Kimberley cattle grower has but one market—the Wyndham Meat Works. The West Kimberley cattle growers can bring a limited number of stock to the metropolitan market and the rest of their cattle have to go to the Broome Meat Works.

I think I would be right in saying that no other cattle growers anywhere in the world receive a lower price for their beef than do the growers of the Kimberleys. I refer to the price that they get from the meatworks both at Wyndham and Broome. On the other hand, I doubt whether any other growers face the same expenditure in getting their cattle to market. I do not know what is amusing the Minister for Mines; perhaps it is because he lacks practical knowledge of this subject.

The Minister for Mines: Your understudy is amusing me.

Mr. Lawrence: I think the member for Murray needs a dose of Andrew's liver salts.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Before I go to Canberra I would like to find out which side members opposite are on so that I can take a message with me. Even at this stage I suggest to the Treasurer that he give further consideration to this question before the subsidy is withdrawn. The Government of which I was a member introduced the subsidy because it believed that some experiment was justified in connection with beef production in the Kimberley areas. I think that experiment has indicated that the flying of beef is a practical proposition. But with such schemes there is need for some Government assistance, and I repeat that, in view of the small sum involved, the Government has been niggardly in its action in withdrawing the subsidy.

The Minister for Housing: To whom do you want the Government to give assistance?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: In reply to my question, the Treasurer said that the transport company was benefiting from this subsidy, but I do not think that is so.

The Minister for Housing: Oh, yes, it is.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I do not think so; I feel there is no doubt that because of the subsidy provided, great benefit has accrued to producers in that area.

The Minister for Housing: On the contrary.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I do not think the Minister for Housing knows very much about this matter.

The Minister for Housing: Apparently far more than the Leader of the Opposition does.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: If he would discuss this matter with some of the growers concerned, he would find that what I say is correct.

The Minister for Housing: Do not say some of the growers, because there are mighty few.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I admit there are only a few.

The Minister for Housing: There are mighty few.

Mr. Rhatigan: Why do not you set an example and supply them with some cattle?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The hon. member knows that the cattle in which I am interested go to Broome, which is the nearest accessible market.

The Minister for Housing: You get more that way than through Air Beef.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I do not wish to indulge in the personal side.

The Minister for Agriculture: Not when it does not suit you.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Minister is in a nasty mood this afternoon; and I would ask him again to spend more time in his office and less time in gallivanting about the country.

Several members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot hear the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I would ask the Premier whether the support given by the Federal Government does not have some effect on this scheme. I would now like to refer to the unfortunate strike at the Midland Junction abattoir. I regret that information which we have every right to seek on this side of the House is denied to us by the Minister for Agriculture.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is not so.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: It is so

The Minister for Agriculture: It is not true.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Yesterday I asked the Minister who would bear the cost of feeding these thousands of sheep at the abattoir.

The Minister for Agriculture: And you know what I said.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: We do not want the same state of affairs to arise in Western Australia as arose in Brisbane recently, when there was some trouble in that State.

The Minister for Agriculture: Do not try and slide out of it! You know the answer I gave you.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I know the Minister was as evasive as he could possibly be.

The Minister for Agriculture: I asked you to put the question on the notice paper; but when you did not do so, I assumed you were no longer interested.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The question I asked the Minister yesterday was asked again today, and he was still as evasive as on the previous occasion.

The Minister for Agriculture: I asked you to put it on the notice paper.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Surely the Minister and the Government should know whether they are prepared to bear the cost of feeding these sheep.

The Minister for Agriculture: You have no priority over any other member of this Chamber.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I do not ask for any priority.

The Minister for Agriculture: You do your job, and you will get your answer.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Minister was most evasive.

The Minister for Agriculture: I would give you an answer tomorrow, if you put the question on the notice paper. You would have had your answer today, if the question had been on the notice paper.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: If the Minister had been attending to his duty, there is no reason in the world why he could not have supplied us with the information today. He knew that the question was asked yesterday.

The Minister for Agriculture: And I know why. It was for political reasons.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Yet the Minister was unable to give us any information at all. Is he disinterested?

The Minister for Agriculture: No; are you?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: If I were uninterested, I would not have asked the question yesterday and again today.

The Minister for Agriculture: Put the question on the notice paper.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: A highly unsatisfactory state of affairs exists at the Midland Junction abattoir.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is so.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Government should give the matter high priority and should tell us what it thinks about it.

Mr. Lawrence: It is your fault.

Mr. Heal: If you had allowed Mr. Rowland to be on the board there would not have been any trouble.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Do not be stupid?

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Chairman, I object to the member for Mt. Lawley calling my confrere stupid.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I might draw the attention of the Leader of the Opposition to the fact that he has only half a minute to go.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I do not know why it is our fault. Is the reason, as suggested by the hon. member, that we did not put a union representative on the board? I think that is plain nonsense.

Mr. Lawrence: Do not presuppose.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Is that the only reason why unions will obey the law—when they have a representative on the board? The law is there to be obeyed, and it is the Government's duty to see that it is obeyed.

Mr. Lawrence: Is Air Beef represented on the Board?

HON. A. F. WATTS (Stirling) [2.50]: There are one or two items to which I would like to make reference. The first point to which I would draw attention is with reference to pages 110 and 111 of the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the year ending the 30th June, 1955, which the Premier mentioned when introducing the motion. The matter I am particularly interested in is that under the heading of "Country Area Water Supplies Scheme." I find that the vote for 1953-54 is given as £839,750; but the expenditure for 1953-54 is shown as £718,985. Accordingly, there is a difference between the vote and the expenditure of approximately £121,000.

When one is dealing with expenditure, whether it be from revenue or loan, I am sure all of us agree that at this stage of the history of the country areas water supplies, we are entitled to know why an estimated expenditure of £121,000 was not expended. I have sought to ascertain what the difference might represent. It occurred to me that possible rises in the basic wage when the Estimates were prepared could have had some influence on the change in the expenditure.

But an increase in the basic wage did not take place, and calculations of the overall expectations of what increase in the basic wage might take place, and its

effect on the State's expenditure as a whole, derived from statements made by the Premier when introducing his Estimates and other financial matters last year, show that that amount could in no circumstances—in respect of the sum of £839,000—have exceeded £25,000 or £30,000 for the year. Accordingly, if I make allowance for £30,000 for the year, I find that £748,000 has been expended, leaving short expenditure of approximately £89,000.

As a matter of fact, this question has been brought to my notice not by any member of either House but by representatives of certain local authorities in country districts who, through their local member—not myself—had obtained a copy of the Estimates of revenue and expenditure and were interested themselves in an examination of certain aspects of them. I must confess that when the matter was pointed out to me, I was considerably surprised, and the more surprised to find that the total estimated expenditure for this year was only £733,000—an amount of £106,000 less than the estimated expenditure for last year; and only some £15,000 greater than the actual expenditure for the year ended the 30th June, 1954.

Accordingly, it seems to me that we require an explanation of the difference in the figures. If on a matter such as that, the department and the Government were prepared to budget from expenditure of £839,000 which, after making allowances for anything I can think of, is still about £89,000 greater than the amount expended, it seems to me that we are entitled to an explanation as to why the £89,000 was not expended. In some other matters where we hear less about the inability to expend money, this might not be regarded so importantly by those who raised this question.

But in this particular matter of country areas water supplies, which has been the subject of much discussion, particularly on the lines that funds are too short to allow work to be done, it occurs to me that either there should be an explanation forthcoming as to the difference, or alternatively, that the Government should be criticised for not succeeding in expending the amount budgeted for during the year under review. That is how it strikes me. Knowing that on this particular occasion I am limited to a quarter of an hour, and as the next subject which I propose to raise deals with the Minister for Railways, I will take the opportunity of bringing the matter forward when he is present.

HON. C. F. J. NORTH (Claremont) [2.58]: This is another opportunity when it is possible to say things which are not definitely concerned with the subject under the notice of the Chair. I happen to have

seen two very interesting news items in the last two days, and I take this opportunity—the earliest I have had—of bringing them to the notice of the Premier and the Minister for Industrial Development. I would think that they should be of great interest and concern to both those hon. gentlemen, because the Premier was formerly in the position now held by the present Minister for Industrial Development.

One news item to which I refer appeared in yesterday's issue of "The West Australian" and it reads as follows:—

De-salted Sea Water May Irrigate Inland.

We have heard that before in this House, but on this occasion it was by another party. The news item continues—

De-salted sea water might be used to irrigate Australia's outback, the deputy chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission (Professor J. P. Baxter) said today.

"I believe the water problem can be solved in the interior by de-salting sea water and delivering it where it is wanted in big quantities," he told the federal conference of the Primary Producers' Union.

It would not be possible to get by people with a statement like that because it was being made to hard-headed men from the country. He goes on to say—

"It sounds like a dream, but the power is in the sunshine which only has to be turned into power to convert the water," he said.

"It might be far more revolutionary than the use of atomic power."

That seems to be of great interest to the Minister for Industrial Development, although today it may be said that in a practical sense, we cannot afford to get enough water pipes to convey our fresh water; that we are years behind in the moving of ordinary water, and that this is purely a matter for the long-distant future. Ever since I have been here, it has always seemed to me that the more important things of a later day are, at the time mentioned, regarded as not of such great importance.

The Minister for Industrial Development is confronted by the fact that a large portion of the territory of Western Australia is now hardly considered to be on the map—hundreds of thousands of square miles which are not in the picture of rainfall and which receive no consideration. The question that occurs to me is whether we cannot enlarge the department to deal with these matters, find the answers, and be up to date, so that when the time comes and steel pipe, cement and other supplies are available, as well as fresh water, the Minister will have this information in front of him and will be ready to go ahead.

This raises another matter worth mentioning. I wonder whether our Clerk of Records is in possession of the requisite information to answer the questions that members could ask as to what is going on in the world, or whether we are really in a by-lane, scratching along, content with what we can find published in "The West Australian" today, tomorrow or the next day. I seriously suggest that we should, as soon as the session is over, send the Clerk of Records on a trip around the world to brush up his knowledge of affairs. Then when he returned, he could be authorised to enlarge his research office so that members could go there and find out things for themselves with some backing of practical knowledge and not be independent persons scratching around as best they can to glean information from newspapers and magazines. This idea would work in with the activities of the Minister for Industrial Development. That is one item.

The second item, which is mentioned in today's newspaper, is of tremendous concern at this time to the Minister for Industrial Development. It might not have been so important 30 or 40 years ago, but it is important now. The statement is as follows:—

State Must Build Own Atom Plants.

Canberra, Wed.—The building of atomic power stations was a State and not a Commonwealth matter, the Acting Government Leader in the Senate (Senator McLeay) said today.

He was commenting on a reported statement by the Deputy Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission (Professor Baxter) that the Federal Government would build atomic stations in South Australia, Western Australia and the Northern Territory before the other States.

Senator McLeay told the Senate that Professor Baxter had denied having made the statement.

The Eastern States had natural power sources and States like South Australia had a greater need for industrial atomic power, Senator McLeay said.

The responsibility to the Government for dealing with this matter rests with the Minister for Industrial Development. He knows as well as I do that hundreds of thousands of square miles of this State are represented by merely a blank on the map; no one gives them a thought. Both the questions to which I have referred have a direct bearing on the subject, and we are justified in urging that our research office under the Clerk of Records should be largely increased in its scope to make research and bring us up to date in this and many other matters that could be mentioned. We are too much in a sort of backwater; we are too apt to revert to the past with its wool and wheat and all those things in the old, old way, and the time has come to have a brush up.

I know that the Premier at times thinks along these lines. In his last policy speech, he made what I consider was a very important suggestion, though I have not heard of any outcome from it, although there may be some move to that end. His statement was that the Government of the day should not try to cure illness but should endeavour to prevent it. That is a point I wish to make. We should move ahead, see what is going on in the world and prepare the way for the future. If we are going to handle this country successfully, we shall not do it by confining our energies to developing the areas having a good rainfall. We shall have to create a new department and get down to dealing with these hundreds of thousands of square miles to which nobody now gives a thought. The two cuttings I have quoted are right to the point, and I commend them to the consideration of the Premier.

MR. JOHNSON (Leederville) [3.6]: The Leader of the Country Party raised the question of the money spent on country water supplies. On referring to the Loan Estimates, I find that another £160,000 was spent in that direction last year, which amount the hon. member left out of his calculation, and on pages 10 and 11 of the Loan Estimates, there is an assumption that this year a sum of £1,200,000 will be made available under that heading. Because of the manner in which our accounts are presented, we are apt to have regard purely to the amount of money that is spent. I would have been happier had the hon. member made his comments along the lines of whether a suitable amount of work had been done and not whether the whole of the money had been spent. It could be—I am not in a position to say whether it is or not—that the money spent has been laid out more effectively and more work obtained for it, or it could be that the money has been wasted.

This highlights one of the points I have tried to make on previous occasions to the effect that our method of presenting the accounts is not a good one. When the general debate on the Estimates takes place, I hope to say a little more on that subject. The question before us at present is the expenditure of loan money, and this brings to my mind an important point relevant thereto, namely, the interest rate on those loans. We are aware that, as a result of the deliberate policy of the Federal Liberal Government, the interest rate on loans was increased. The Federal Government, like leading economists at the turn of the century considered that the raising of the loan rate was in itself a sound policy. More modern economists have queried that idea.

I point out that the result of the policy in this State has been an increase in the cost to the people of £77,795 10s., this having been caused by the renewal of expiring loans at a higher rate of interest. The

figure for next year, once again purely as a result of the renewal of loans at a higher rate of interest, will be £123,394, and this does not take into account the extra money that will be required to meet the interest bill on the loan-raising we are now authorising.

It is my opinion that very serious consideration should be given to the effect upon Government revenue of the amount of money that has to be set aside for the meeting of interest payments. This amount is a growing one and, unless our revenue expands at a greater rate than it has been increasing, the percentage which interest will absorb out of the total revenue will increase.

Mr. Hutchinson: You must have regard to the loan market, too.

Mr. JOHNSON: The loan market is a different proposition from the interest rate. The problem with which I am dealing is the effect of interest charges on the revenue of the State. There is no absolute necessity at all to spend loan money; there are no theoretical reasons—though there are practical ones—why all Government expenditure should not be made from revenue. It would probably be wiser if at least the greater portion of Government expenditure were made from revenue, because all the money spent from loan funds lays a debt upon our children, grandchildren and our grandchildren's grandchildren. A great deal of money expended from loan is devoted to matters that are completely used up in our lifetime, so it behoves us, as a responsible Parliament, to examine more closely the implications of this matter. We cannot continue indefinitely spending future money.

If, as has been rumoured, there is a downturn evident in the wool market, that will have a direct effect on the revenue of the State. We know there is difficulty in marketing our wheat, and that will have a direct effect on the income of the State. Thus, if there is a slight downturn in the position, the matter of interest charges on loan moneys and the effect on revenue becomes important, and yet, since I have been in the Chamber, I have not seen the slightest sign of any detailed debate on that aspect.

Mr. Court: The member for Moore dealt with it last session.

Mr. JOHNSON: If he did so, I did not understand it. I should like to comment on matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I am pleased to see that he is being converted to the socialistic idea of using Government money for the benefit of the State. However, I was rather surprised that he did not follow on to the logical point by saying that it is not proper to use Government money for private profit. And that appears to be what he is really asking for. He is urging that the people as a whole should support in profitable condition the industry of others who do not

have the same outlook. No one who preaches private enterprise has any moral right to ask Government support for his industry, because Government support is socialism.

Hon. D. Brand: What Government support was asked for?

Mr. JOHNSON: The Leader of the Opposition asked for Government support for some people who have sheep that have not been killed today. I would imagine that to be one of the risks of private enterprise.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: The risk that strikes will occur? Of course it is.

Mr. JOHNSON: If the member for Mt. Lawley agrees with me, I must further examine my thoughts, because there must be something wrong with them. Those who preach private enterprise should rely upon it. Those who seek Government money to test and experiment in a venture like Air Beef, should be prepared for the support to be withdrawn when the experiment has been well tested.

Hon. D. Brand: Has it been well tested?

Mr. JOHNSON: I think seven years is a fair test. There appears to have been no change or improvement in methods over the last two or three years. The idea of Air Beef is probably capable of useful expansion at some stage; but if it cannot stand on its own feet, those concerned should hand it over and should not try to extract profits from it at public expense.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Does that apply to the tramways and railways?

Mr. JOHNSON: They are not private enterprises paying dividends.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: No, but they receive subsidies and the people who use them get dividends.

Mr. JOHNSON: That is not so. I have used those services for years and have never received a dividend cheque from them. There may be benefits received from them, but no dividends. The benefits there are given to the public as a whole, but they are not dividends.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: They are gifts to the public, according to what you said, and such gifts or benefits are dividends.

Mr. JOHNSON: The hon. member said they gave dividends and I say they do not.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member addresses the Chair he will get on much better.

Mr. JOHNSON: I do not see how public enterprises, run for public benefit and with no shareholders and no dividends, and possibly receiving Government support, can be compared with private enterprise which shows its dividends to private people and still asks for Government support. It is a contradiction in terms for private groups

to seek support from the public purse and it is even worse if they apply pressure or persuasion in any form to achieve their end.

Everybody who receives a Government subsidy should be precluded from preaching any form of private enterprise, because as long as such people receive Government support we can take it that they do not really believe in private enterprise. No enterprise which receives Government assistance is completely private. I would like those who talk a great deal about private enterprise to examine their thinking and get their points clear. If they receive Government support, as, for instance, the various primary producers do in the form of transport subsidies, they should be willing to pay to the Government the full economic value of the service they receive.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. BRADY (Guildford-Midland) [3.20]: I do not think I would have risen to speak to this debate had the Leader of the Opposition not referred to the industrial trouble at the abattoir. As member for the district where the abattoir is situated, I thought that, in the circumstances, I should have something to say. I do not know whether members are aware that in recent years there has been great activity in the reconstruction of the abattoir at Bushmead, just outside Midland Junction. When that work is completed, I believe our abattoir will be one of the most up to date in Australia. I understand that the total sum to be spent is in the vicinity of £750,000 and that the facilities to be provided will be the most modern available, with the result that the cost of working should be reduced to a minimum.

In recent times I have paid more visits to the abattoir than in many years past. In the last six months I have paid five or six visits, on several occasions in company with other members of Parliament, and I find that the employees at the abattoir are a good type of worker. Many of them are getting on in years and are not looking forward to changing their industrial occupation at this stage of their lives. They made their present calling a vocation in which they intend to remain for the rest of their working lives, but when we have continued industrial disputes it would seem that something is wrong there. It is hard to determine where the fault lies.

Today I asked the Minister for Agriculture how often the abattoir board had met and the reply was that up to October, 1954, it had met 43 times, and that the chairman is in daily contact with the abattoir. We know that in recent times there have been more disputes at the abattoir than in the previous quarter of a century. Is it because the board is incompetent to do the job which it was set up to do, or

are the men to blame? I feel that we should have more information as to the cause of the trouble at the abattoir.

I believe the men are being asked to accept industrial conditions which are unnatural and for which, if they have to endure them, they should be paid extra remuneration. As they are not receiving extra money for those unnatural conditions, the blame lies with the board of control. When I visited the abattoir several times recently in company with other members of Parliament, we found as many as 25 or 30 men confined in a very limited space, slaughtering sheep and doing all the work necessary to dress the carcasses and make them ready for market. The conditions were such that the men were working elbow to elbow. There was an obnoxious effluvia present, such as would not improve the temperament of the men and, generally speaking, the working conditions were bad. If such a position is to continue and the men are not to be compensated for the bad conditions—

Hon. Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver: Do they not receive free meat?

Mr. BRADY: I do not know of their receiving free meat as part of their conditions. If the present bad conditions continue, we are bound to have a repetition of these industrial disputes from time to time unless the board of control does something to compensate the men for the conditions under which they are working.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Are the conditions worse now than those they worked under previously?

Mr. BRADY: I would say the conditions are bad now as compared with previously. Quite a lot of the work is now done differently. Working on the chain system, the men have to stand in a more or less erect position and cannot get the carcass down on the ground as they used to when they were able to put a foot on the neck of the sheep and hold it while they lifted off the skin. Half-a-dozen of the jobs involved are now done differently from previously. I have spoken to men with 25 years' service at the abattoir and their hands were raw from trying to get the hides off the bodies of the sheep. That condition can be compared with the old system where they put a foot on the skin or the carcass and tore the hide away in the old fashion.

Under the changed conditions the men are naturally becoming temperamental. Sometimes they are forced to work in the slaughtering section of the works despite the fact that they did not intend to do so. Some of them went there to work as labourers, but because they have a knowledge of slaughtering they have been forced to do that class of work. I am not in close contact with the present dispute but I understand that the labourers want

something above their present remuneration because they feel that their work justifies it.

I desired further information and I thought that the best way in which to get it would be from the report of the abattoir board of control. In the Act there is a section which says—

Annual Report—The board shall prepare an annual report of its proceedings and operations during the preceding year, which report, together with copies of the balance sheet and statements of account then last prepared and audited and the Auditor General's report thereon, shall be laid by the Minister before both Houses of Parliament as soon as practicable in each year.

This amendment was made in 1952 and in 1953 a year had passed. Now, more than three-quarters of the way through 1954, I can find no annual report or balance sheet on the Table of the House in connection with this matter.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: When did the board take over?

Mr. BRADY: I am not sure of the date, but it has been functioning for over 12 months.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: No, I do not think it took over the operations.

Mr. BRADY: That might be the explanation, but I feel that if the board has been working for more than 12 months, the report and balance sheets should be on the Table of the House. It may be that the board has not been operating sufficiently long, but if we could get a report of the board's operations, it might show what the trouble is. I would like to see the annual report. I do not know what the report will contain.

As the member for Blackwood has mentioned the appointment of a union representative, it has occurred to me that if we had a practical man on the board with a knowledge of union conditions instead of having one with no knowledge of the workers' conditions, the number of industrial disputes might have been far fewer. Such a man would be aware of what is fair for the employees in regard to their working conditions. It may be that the present members have no knowledge of such matters. If they do not, the Minister should introduce an amendment to the Act to appoint members who have some practical knowledge of what is required. I am inclined to think that the present members are only concerned with the profits that are to be made by master butchers and certain other vested interests.

Mr. Oldfield: You get some nasty thoughts.

Mr. BRADY: If that is so, it may be that the workers' conditions and their wages are regarded as of secondary concern, but they should be considered in conjunction with other interests in the abattoir. I did not want to introduce this aspect into the debate. The member for Blackwood and the member for Maylands feel that they have something up their sleeves and they apparently think that I am trying to put over something sinister this afternoon.

The only reason I rose to my feet was to ask why there is no annual report and balance sheet laid on the Table of the House. That is a fair approach to the question. I have not referred to a union representative being on the board. However, if the appointment of a union representative would assist in promoting better industrial relations at the abattoir, it should be done. In my opinion the annual report and balance sheets of State trading concerns and other Government departments are not tabled promptly enough.

I am more concerned about the report by the Railways Commission than I am regarding a report from the Abattoir Board. I have found that invariably the report by the Railways Commission is placed on the Table of the House either towards the close of the session or issued after the close of it, when it is of very little value to members. We should have that report now so that when the Revenue Estimates and the Loan Estimates are considered, we can talk with authority on the railways. If I want to deal with a railways question, I have to go to the employees to obtain the information that I desire, and if I do, they are likely to be carpeted or given the sack for supplying information to a member of Parliament. We should not be placed in a position where we have to ask employees or departmental officers for any information we seek. We should be able to have that information made available to us promptly.

Last year I could not help noticing that within a couple of months after the close of the financial year, the report and balance sheet of the State Electricity Commission had been placed on the Table of the House. If one Government instrumentality could do that, then all other Government departments should be able to do the same. Why cannot annual reports and balance sheets of the departments be presented to Parliament within a few weeks of the end of the financial year? I hope that the departmental heads of the various departments will be asked by the Ministers concerned to prepare their reports and balance sheets at an early date so that they can be tabled in this House as soon as possible.

HON. D. BRAND (Greenough) [3.35]: We have heard a great deal about the abattoir today and I want to add a few

more words. By way of explanation I had a number of questions to ask the Minister for Agriculture in reference to this matter, but when I showed them to the Minister he explained that it was rather difficult to answer them at that stage and, out of deference to him, I reduced the number of questions to two, which I thought he should be able to answer. However, for reasons best known to himself, he directed that I should place them on the notice paper.

The first question referred to the cost of feeding the stock which, in many hundreds, are now being kept at Midland Junction because of the stoppage of work. I think that is a fair and reasonable question regarding which the Minister had fair notice. If my memory serves me rightly, the Minister replied that the Government was giving consideration to the matter. If that is so, the Minister should be able to tell members on both sides of the House, who are very interested from the point of view of the consumer and the producer, what is being done.

The Minister for Agriculture: The reply I gave was that the stock will be fed and the question of payment will be considered later.

Hon. D. BRAND: I said that I recall that the Minister had replied that he was giving consideration to this question.

The Minister for Agriculture: You ought to tell your leader that, too.

Hon. D. BRAND: We wanted to know who would be responsible for the cost of feeding the stock and I think it was a reasonable question to ask at this stage, especially when we have a week-end intervening between this sitting of Parliament and the next.

The second question I asked was that, in view of the problem existing now, would the Minister have an investigation made and present his report to Parliament? Evidently the problem is expanding and because of the stoppage of work at Midland Junction the trouble seems to have spread to Anchorage Butchers Ltd. at Coogee, because yesterday work was suspended there. The Minister must admit that any member of Parliament, particularly one interested in primary production, and also those people who are sending stock forward to Midland Junction, may well ask what is the position.

The Minister for Agriculture: When did I say that members are not entitled to ask questions?

Hon. D. BRAND: The works at Coogee are now refusing to take stock for a week or two because they cannot cope with the supplies coming forward. That, of course, can well be understood. Surely we are justified in asking such questions and the Minister should be able to answer them in a general way! The problem is topical. It is one which is exercising the minds of

everyone at present. I do not agree that he should put it aside and ask for the question to be put on the notice paper.

The Minister for Agriculture: You cannot tell me anything about asking questions without notice. I know what you and the Leader of the Opposition did.

Hon. D. BRAND: I appreciate that the Minister for Agriculture should know a great deal about asking questions without notice because when he was on this side of the House he asked his share, well and truly.

The Minister for Agriculture: I know. I promised you a detailed answer to your question next week. However, I also know that your party had a meeting this morning and all you want to do is to kick the answers around the Chamber this afternoon.

Hon. D. BRAND: I am interested in the meat position as the Minister would be if he were sitting on this side of the Chamber and was directing his question to the Minister for Agriculture. In fact, he would be asking his questions with righteous indignation if he had been put off in the same way as I was today.

The Minister for Agriculture: I would not say some of the things that the Leader of the Opposition said this afternoon.

Hon. D. BRAND: The Government seems to think that the whole answer to this problem would be to appoint a union representative on the board of control.

The Minister for Agriculture: Is that what you think?

Hon. D. BRAND: I do not. I cannot see any logic in that move because, in the first place, the Government works at Robb's Jetty have had a strike problem and it does not seem to me, with all the representations being made by the Minister and departmental officers, that they are able to overcome the situation. The following is a report on the position which appeared in "The West Australian"—

Abattoirs men said yesterday that they believed the stoppage was the worst crisis the industry had had to face since the introduction of the chain system.

The men are idle in defiance of a Meat Industry Employees' Union order to go back.

The assistant-secretary of the union (Mr. J. R. Flanagan) said yesterday that he had given this order at a lunch time meeting of both slaughtermen and labourers yesterday.

Evidently the union is not—

The Minister for Agriculture: Does not that tell you what the story is and, in addition, it is now in the hands of the president of the Arbitration Court.

Hon. D. BRAND: We know now that the matter is before the president of the Arbitration Court, and rightly so.

The Minister for Agriculture: Well, what are you going to do about that?

Hon. D. BRAND: However, seeing that emphasis has been placed on the problem per medium of a question and speeches by members on the Government side, the answer to this problem would seemingly be—and the Minister said so yesterday—for the personnel of the board to be altered to include a representative of the union concerned.

The Minister for Agriculture: I think the present controller of the abattoir will make a much better board of it.

Hon. D. BRAND: I cannot see why a neutral body of three men could not direct the abattoir affairs as satisfactorily as if it were comprised of one man representing the union and another man representing some other organisation.

The Minister for Agriculture: Your Government made an impossible situation of the Abattoir Board, and I will debate that question with you at any time.

Hon. D. BRAND: The problem is one which the Minister will have to face and it is pleasing to know that at least the matter has been brought before the Arbitration Court. I hope the Minister will use all his authority and power to settle this dispute as soon as possible in the interests of everyone concerned.

The Minister for Agriculture: What? Override the president of the Arbitration Court!

Hon. D. BRAND: I hope the Minister will use his influence towards obtaining a satisfactory decision and get the men back to work as soon as possible because, on the one hand we are facing up to a shortage of meat and, on the other, we have the problem of dealing with the stock which are coming forward in increasing numbers because of the dry season.

The Minister for Agriculture: I admit that it is a very bad situation.

Hon. D. BRAND: Great emphasis and high priority should be given to this problem by the Minister.

The Minister for Agriculture: And so it is; today and yesterday. You want to talk to your Leader and wake him up to it. He is a bit too quiet.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: What are you muttering about?

Hon. D. BRAND: The other matter I wish to raise is the question of the Causeway. I know that the Minister for Works has issued a warning to the public about the difficulties that will arise when the traffic is diverted from the hump on the old section of the Causeway to the new roundabout or traffic circus which it is proposed to put into operation very shortly. Having had experience of the problems associated with the Causeway when I was Minister, I support the Minister for Works

whole-heartedly in his efforts, and I trust that the public will co-operate in what will undoubtedly be a difficult situation.

At the same time, from week to week we see this problem of traffic clearance becoming more and more difficult. On Fridays particularly motorists are delayed for long periods on the Causeway. In the last issue of the "Sunday Times" publicity was given to the difficult traffic problem which exists at the intersection of Adelaide Terrace and Plain-st. A similar problem also exists at the intersections of Hill-st. and the other streets which carry traffic from the city block into Adelaide Terrace.

In view of this ever-increasing problem, I would suggest to the Minister that during the period when the traffic will be using the roundabout, he should try to arrange for men to work over the week-end or even place them on overtime for a short period in order that the traffic will be able to be re-directed on to the road proper and the traffic circus as soon as possible. I also ask the Minister whether the road leading from Hay-st. to the Causeway circus will be completed at the same time as the traffic will be using the roundabout because I think if no relief is to be given by the completion of this road, the problem will be accentuated.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.5 p.m.

Hon. D. BRAND: Before the suspension, I was speaking about the problem associated with the completion of the Causeway roundabout, and I would now like to complete what I was saying about connecting Hay-st. with the proposed roundabout as soon as possible, because by that means the traffic leaving the city block could travel along Hay-st. and enter the stream of traffic further down, thereby overcoming the problem, to which the "Sunday Times" referred, of traffic entering the stream in Adelaide Terrace. I am hopeful that if the Minister for Works gets the opportunity he will tell us just what is proposed in this regard.

I know that the City of Perth, as the constructing body, is involved, but I have no doubt it would be willing to co-operate to the fullest extent, and so ensure that this problem of traffic congestion, as it is associated with the Causeway, will be dealt with as quickly as possible, because it is an increasing one, day by day. It is no wonder that the public are irritated by the hold-ups—especially those in the afternoon, when the main body of people are leaving the city.

At the outset of my remarks, I spoke about the abattoirs, and I would just like to close by saying that in the Press tonight we are told that the strike-hit butchers are to get meat from the country. This, no doubt, is as a result of the hold-up. We must conclude that this meat will be more costly than if it were obtained from some

place in the metropolitan area. This is one item of the "C" series index which was responsible for some of the increase in the cost of living. Therefore it is hoped that the Minister and the Government will do everything possible to settle the problem at the abattoirs and so keep down the price of meat and enable the retailers and wholesalers to sell at a reasonable figure.

MR. HILL (Albany) [4.10]: Coming up in the train on Tuesday morning, I was handed "The West Australian" which contained a supplement on the industrial development of the State. From that supplement it would appear that the position in Western Australia is a very happy one, but when we consider what the position is, we know that it is sufficient to cause a first-class headache. Western Australia is a big State with many potentialities.

What is the position today? In this Chamber we have 20 members representing the metropolitan area, which is one-tenth the size of the Albany electorate. It is a tragedy that of every three people who come to Western Australia, two stay in the metropolitan area. It is essential that we develop the State as a whole and look a little beyond what was originally the Swan River Settlement. In recent weeks we have heard a tremendous amount of talk about the extension of the Fremantle harbour. I congratulate Cabinet on its decision to go ahead with the upriver extension.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: You congratulate Cabinet on giving you something temporary at Albany.

Mr. HILL: Cockburn Sound is not to be compared with King George Sound at Albany. If the Government tries to build a harbour outside of Fremantle, it will strike trouble spelt in very big letters. If breakwaters are built at Cockburn Sound, we might have another Bunbury, or worse; which rather frightens me.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: You will get a new berth after that.

Mr. HILL: On Tuesday, the 1st September, 1954, the Premier, after two days' consideration, answered these questions of mine—

Has the Government ever given consideration to the relief of congestion at Fremantle, on the railways leading to that port, and to endeavouring to bring about a policy of decentralisation by—

- (a) The provision of land transport facilities between the lower South-West and the port of Albany;
- (b) adjustments of railway charges to encourage the use of the Great Southern railway and the port of Albany?

The Premier replied—

The subject of general transport and shipment of goods is constantly under review.

What is the authority that continually has this problem under review? The Premier went on to say—

Shippers of goods have a big influence in deciding the points from which goods are shipped.

That is quite true, but the Government has a definite responsibility to provide port and transport facilities ahead of production. I do not know how many members have read the Tydeman report on Albany, but in that report he refers to the Thompson scheme of 1911. The difference between the Thompson scheme and the Tydeman scheme, which is now in the course of being implemented at Albany, is that under the Thompson scheme a wall was to start from the deep-water jetty. In that year, unfortunately, Albany elected a Labour man to Parliament. What was the result? The Thompson scheme was scrapped, and three years later a new arm to the deep-water jetty was forced on the people of Albany.

The question that I have just mentioned refers to land transport facilities between the lower South-West and Albany. Before the change of Government in 1924, the then non-Labour Government—Sir James Mitchell was the Premier—had in mind a scheme for opening up the lower South-West, and this scheme involved the provision of a railway between Denmark and Manjimup, another between Manjimup and Mt. Barker, and a third between Boyup Brook and Cranbrook. Albany again backed the wrong horse because it returned to Parliament a Labour man, my predecessor, the late Mr. Arthur Wansbrough.

What thanks did the people of Albany and those of the lower Great Southern and the South-West get for doing that? Railways were constructed between Manjimup and Northcliffe, and between Denmark and Nornalup, but a 55-mile gap was left in the middle. Bills were passed to authorise the construction of railways between Manjimup and Mt. Barker and between Boyup Brook and Cranbrook, but they were never constructed. Between 1924 and 1947, when the McLarty-Watts Government took office, the only expenditure on the port of Albany was £175.

The Minister for Education: Did the McLarty-Watts Government build the railway you mentioned?

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: You have not been very successful down there. You should get a new member.

Mr. HILL: In 1946 the people of Albany nearly backed the wrong horse again, but, fortunately, they did not; they backed the right one. I remember one of my friends

saying, "The Wise-Hawke Government used everything against you but the atom bomb." I was talking to my then opponent only last Sunday; I was getting a hot dog from him, and he said he thanked his lucky stars that he was defeated in 1946. He has a nice little spot at Middleton Beach.

The Minister for Labour: He has gone to the dogs!

Mr. HILL: When the McLarty-Watts Government took office, it set out to develop Albany and adopted a scheme which will make Albany one of the finest ports in Australia and far superior to anything else. We have a bulk-handling terminal nearly completed, as well as a super works. But we had a nasty hit when we read the announcement of the Government that there is no money available for the No. 2 berth. If the real reason is that the money is required for the comprehensive water scheme, I would, like Sir Phillip Sidney, say, "Thy need is greater than mine."

Bunbury is finished as a port, and we could use the £80,000 that is being spent there. That would enable the works at Albany to be continued. The greatest argument I have yet heard in favour of continuation of the construction of the No. 2 berth at Albany was put forward by the Minister for Railways in the Albany council chamber when he was chairman of the outports Royal Commission. He truly said that jetties are inadequate. I would again like to quote the Premier's remarks to the effect that shippers of goods have a big influence on deciding points at which goods are shipped. Shippers will not use a jetty port when a port with modern wharves and facilities is available. I sincerely hope that the Premier, when he considers the position, will find sufficient money to continue the work. We want the berth to encourage wool sales at Albany and to handle general cargo.

We also want an adjustment of railway freights to encourage traffic south of Merredin to use the port of Albany. The substantial economies effected would be in the interests of the State as a whole. The use of Albany as a port would also relieve congestion on the railways between Spencer's Brook and Fremantle. In 1927, an independent expert, Sir George Buchanan, said that it would be cheaper to build railways to Albany than to make Bunbury into a port. The link between Nornalup and Northcliffe would have cost £550,000, and since then a losing fight against silting has gone on at Bunbury and has cost over £1,000,000.

I can remember that on one occasion I was near Bunbury and talking to a resident of that town. He said, "It is a pity that the people of Albany and Bunbury

cannot be more friendly." I looked at him and said, "We have no reason to love Bunbury; you have been built up at our expense. We have the harbour but you have the coal and water. The sooner you realise that as a port Bunbury is a hopeless proposition, the better your future from an industrial point of view will be." I want to assure the Premier that any attempt to get industry at Collie or Bunbury in preference to Fremantle will have my whole-hearted support. But do not let us forget that it is much better to work in with Nature than to try to fight her.

HON. DAME FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER (Subiaco) [4.20]: I had no intention of speaking but, as I have said so little this session, I intend to say a few words on the port of Albany. Ever since I have been in this Chamber I have heard the most wonderful speeches regarding the port of Albany by the member who represents that district. I do not agree with him. The point is that it is not a good port but is an excellent harbour. I say that because when I was Minister for Supply and Shipping I went thoroughly into the question and interviewed shippers of world-wide experience. They told me Albany is considered to be a third-class port but a very good harbour because during certain months of the year—

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: She has turned Albany down!

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: I am coming to that. He will be all right.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: He has the right of reply.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: I do not want members to miss the point. If one is going to Albany and intends to use it as a port, one passes through the Bight, and during certain months of the year, because of rough weather, a ship cannot carry the same quantity of cargo that it can during other months.

Mr. Hill: No. Do you not know that the problem of Russia has something to do with it?

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: We were travelling in the car, and the hon. member told me all about it.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: You are very observant.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: Albany is a very good harbour. During the war, 400 ships a year used Albany as a harbour; they were not there all at once, but men who should know have told me—and they have shown me records to prove it—that Albany is a third-class port.

Mr. Hill: Why has the bulk-handling terminal been established there?

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: I would like the member for Albany to know that I am with him a hundred per cent. in his endeavours to get something done for Albany. I lived in Albany for a little time, and it is a beautiful place. I firmly believe the day will come when Albany will be a big town and that, in no small measure, will be due to the member for Albany who has told us so much of the wonders of that place. But there is that little snag—he talks about the wonders of the port. It is a harbour.

The other day I was leaving the Chamber when the Premier was talking, and unfortunately I was not feeling very well and did not hear all his speech. But as I was on the way out, the Premier said that he was horrified to find that 8ft. of water was washing over the breakwaters and the stones were falling away—he was talking about the breakwaters at Fremantle. Such rubbish!

The Premier: I think the hon. member is mistaken. I did not say anything of the kind.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: The Premier said that about 8ft. of water was washing over the breakwaters.

The Premier: Not even one foot.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: I am sure it was the Premier.

The Premier: No. I think you heard the Minister for Works.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: No, the Premier.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: It was the Minister for Works.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: He was talking about shipping as I was going out. However, irrespective of who made the remark, I want members to hear a little tale about these great rocks that are falling out of the breakwater. One day I happened to be walking along the road near the breakwater and saw two boys with hammers.

The Premier: Was this at Fremantle?

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: Yes. They were hammering the cement away from behind these great rocks, and I said, "What are you doing?" As I spoke, one of the rocks fell into the sea and there was a great space where it had been. One of the boys said, "We want to see the rocks fall into the sea." I said, "It is very naughty of you because you must remember that those rocks have to be put back." One of the boys—they were children of about 10 or 12 years of age—said, "We are making work for men. They have to put them back." I said, "Do you know that your mother and father have to pay for that work?" One of them said, "Go on. She don't know nothing; she doesn't know that it is the Government that pays!" These children should have known better.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: They would not be local children; they must have been visitors.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: However, I still feel sure it was the Premier that mentioned the 8ft. of water. The motion moved by the member for Fremantle regarding the upriver extension of the harbour was carried overwhelmingly.

The Minister for Works: Overwhelmingly!

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: When such a motion is carried overwhelmingly, one would think it was time for the Government to get out.

The Minister for Works: Overwhelmingly! What were the figures?

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: It was a majority, anyhow.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: It was a good majority; a bigger one than the Government has on the floor of the House at present.

The Minister for Works: Is the hon. member quite sure that she was here?

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Yes; she voted.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: I am quite sure I was here.

The Minister for Works: It is a wonder, because you heard things that I did not say.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: I think the Minister is wrong.

The Minister for Works: You are wrong because your name does not appear on the Votes and Proceedings as being present that day.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: I do not want to get away from what I said.

The Minister for Works: If you wanted to do the right thing, you would apologise for what you said.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: I am not going to apologise. It would be the greatest mistake in the world to build berths further up the river. Since I have been in Western Australia, the river has become, in many parts, a series of mudholes.

The Minister for Works: Where do you think the berths should be built?

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: Go out.

The Minister for Works: Out where?

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: To the Sound; out of the port, even though it might cost £1,000,000.

[Mr. Brady took the Chair.]

The Minister for Works: But out where?

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: Outside; go around.

The Minister for Works: But where? Outside is a big place. Do you mean Cockburn Sound?

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: Where the member for Fremantle suggested. He knows more about it.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Refer him to me; I will tell him.

The Minister for Works: You voted for the motion. Surely you know where it ought to be built!

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: In my opinion, the berths should be built outside.

The Minister for Works: Over near Rottnest.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: Do not be silly!

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Subiaco has the floor.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: That is the rottenest statement I have heard. I trust the Government will reconsider its decision and will build the berths outside, and that in 50 years our river will recover its earlier beauty, even if extending the harbour outside costs a large sum of money. I know that the Premier will get money from somewhere if he requires it.

MR. ACKLAND (Moore) [4.28]: There is one Government department about which I shall speak this afternoon—I refer to the Department of Native Affairs. I am beginning to wonder whether the expenditure made available to this department each year is justified because on this side of the Chamber, and in country districts, there are many people who have the greatest sympathy with, and are desirous of helping, our coloured population, but they are of the opinion that the administration of the department is not for the good of the natives any more than it is for the good of the State.

The Minister for Native Welfare: You seem to have a good drink of vinegar each time you speak about natives. You are the nearest approach to a Pharisee I have ever struck.

Mr. Manning: A man is entitled to his opinion.

Mr. ACKLAND: I believe that the Commissioner of Native Affairs, and the policy he is adopting, is encouraging a feeling of persecution among the coloured people of the State. I believe it is encouraging a greater inferiority complex among them than they already possess. He is leading them to believe that they are being badly treated by the rest of the community and at the same time he and his department take every opportunity of relieving the department controlling natives of any responsibility towards these coloured people.

Last year we had a Bill before us which intended to give natives citizenship rights. I do not profess to know anything about the way natives should be treated in the North-West. I believe their problem is entirely different from that applying to those of the coloured people who live in the South-West Land Division. As the member for Avon Valley said last night, he believes the condition of the natives is growing progressively worse, and I agree with him. The Department of Native Affairs is putting its responsibilities on to other departments.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the hon. member is out of order in discussing a matter which is already the subject of a Bill before the House.

Mr. ACKLAND: The Bill before the Chair deals with loans and other members have adopted the same attitude. This has reference to finding money for the administration of these departments about which I am trying to speak. I believe the Department of Native Affairs is putting its responsibility on to the Police Department to keep order in the country districts; secondly, it is pushing the responsibility on to the Health Department to attend to the health of the natives and, thirdly, on to the Education Department not only for the purposes of education but also to look after the cleanliness of the children who attend the State schools.

If this policy continues, it must prove detrimental to the coloured people and it will retard their assimilation into the rest of the community for many years. The Government and the Minister concerned should see what is being done in the department. If the Department of Native Affairs is anxious, as it appears to be, to transfer its responsibilities to other Government departments, then the expenditure which is granted to it becomes less justified. I believe that with a proper policy, the natives could become good and useful members of the community. But unless we alter our attitude towards them we will do more harm than good. There is little one can do for the adult native in this State. There are some good natives and they are already received into the community. If we decide that it is in the young children that the hope of the native lies, I think we would make a good deal more progress if we took these children away from those natives who could not give them a reasonable home, and brought them up as wards of the State.

I find that some of those women who lobbied this Chamber last year and got so hot and bothered about the way the native people were being treated, have come to the conclusion, in many cases, that what they tried to do then, and what the Minister tried to push through Parliament, would have resulted in a lowering of the standard, and the retarding of the ultimate absorption of the native into the

community. If the children were brought up in a different environment and had less connection with the unsatisfactory homes and conditions in which they live, through the years they would be justified in being received automatically into the general community. I do not want to speak much longer but I feel that the present expenditure on the Department of Native Affairs is not justified because it is so keen to push its responsibilities on to other Government departments.

MR. HILL (Albany) [4.35]: I would like to make an explanation of the remarks made by the member for Subiaco. She was quite right when she said that Albany was a harbour and not a port. Albany is not a good port because it is not well equipped. Sydney has a wonderful harbour but as a port it has disadvantages as compared with the muddy Yarra. I think it was in 1930 that an international conference was held which divided the world into different zones. There was the winter zone, the temperate zone and the summer zone. The summer zone takes in the parallel on which Albany stands, but as a port Albany was put in the winter zone. No other port in the world is cut by such a narrow margin.

The Commonwealth Government has been battling for years to have Albany included in the summer zone. We got to the point where the British Board of Trade—though it did not consider it worth while to convene an international conference—consulted all nations that were signatories to the conference, and it was agreed that Albany should be included in the summer zone. All the nations agreed, except Russia and the satellite nations behind the iron curtain.

Albany could not handle wheat for 14 years because the Government would not itself put a terminal in, and would not permit Co-operative Bulk Handling to do so either. I would like to congratulate the McLarty-Watts Government for permitting Co-operative Bulk Handling to put in this terminal, which has meant so much to Albany. There is also the super works, the Shell Oil Co. and other oil companies which are anxious about port depots or installations in that area. Not only that, the main distributing firms in Western Australia have built warehouses in Albany to serve the southern part of the State. It is the Government's responsibility to see that the port is properly equipped.

MR. COURT (Nedlands) [4.38]: I would like to say something about two matters. Firstly, I wish to refer to the Air Beef subsidy and, secondly, to the Government decision to provide a launch for the police on the river. I must confess with respect to the Air Beef subsidy that I cannot understand the reasoning behind the with-

drawal of the subsidy at this stage. The nature of the assistance given by the Government is not generally appreciated. My own understanding of it is that the Commonwealth Government gives a subsidy of 1d. per lb. to assist with the transport problem, and the State Government undertakes to see that the charges made by the Wyndham Meatworks do not exceed 1.2d. per lb.

In other words, if the cost of the Wyndham Meatworks was 3d. per lb. because of a small number of cattle put through; or if it dropped to, say, 1d. per lb. because of the larger number put through, that would regulate the amount of assistance called for from the State Government. It is not a straight out payment of subsidy of so much per lb., as is the amount paid by the Commonwealth Government, on the basis of a straight 1d. per lb., which we understand will be continued. From the public statements and the comments made in this House, I do not know whether the company concerned was consulted with respect to this matter. Neither do I know whether there has been any proposition for the tapering off of the assistance given.

The facts are confused in the public announcements we have had and Air Beef Pty. Ltd. is now in the position that it does not know what handling charges it will receive per lb. from the Wyndham Meat Works for the next killing season. If there is a low usage of the works, the charge will be high; if there is a heavy usage, the charge could be less. I know the company has seven years of history behind it, but it is still in an experimental stage and is still being watched by world interests in its approach to air transport over this rugged terrain.

In the short life of the company, it has experienced at least two years of drought, and accordingly there has not been a very fair test of the venture. The drought has seriously affected the economy of the Kimberleys and we must take all that into account when we say that the company has a history of seven years behind it. In view of the fact that the Commonwealth Government is to continue its 1d. per lb. subsidy, one would assume that that Government has examined the scheme and feels that it warrants encouragement at this stage of its history. The information given me the last time I was in the area was that a discontinuance of this scheme would mean a loss of approximately 50 per cent. of the cattle now being handled through the air beef scheme rather than through the Wyndham Meat Works. If I remember rightly, the figures given to me at Glenroy Station were that if, say, 2,000 head of cattle were being put through a year, the out-turn would be restricted to approximately 800 a year. That would mean a very big drop.

These operations represent a definite gain to the meat supply produced by the State. With our expanding commitments, the question of the meat supply will become of ever-increasing importance to the Government of the day, and although this scheme in toto is a comparatively modest one, nevertheless it is making a worthwhile contribution, firstly, by the supply of additional meat and, secondly, as an experimental basis for handling supplies over long distances by air transport.

Earlier in the afternoon the Minister for Mines stated by interjection that this service catered for only one station. If he checks up his information, I think he will find that the venture is, in fact, serving more like 14 stations. The names of some of them are—Glenroy, Mt. House (the two adjacent to and associated with the scheme), Mornington, Tableland, Gibb River, Mt. Elizabeth, Napier Downs, Fossil Downs, Gogo, Christmas Creek, Cherubinton, Spring Vale, Bedford Downs and Landsdowne.

I do not know whether that list is exhaustive. I do not say that each and every one of those stations uses the facilities every year, but at least six of them have done so consistently and the others intermittently. The fact remains that this facility has its greatest value to those people in the time of their greatest need. I should not like to think that, because of the sudden cessation of this assistance from the State Government, the scheme is in peril and will be lost to the Kimberleys. It would also be a loss to Australia because of its value experimentally.

Mr. Rhatigan: What price are those stations receiving at present?

Mr. COURT: I am discussing not the price, but the merits of the scheme of the air beef lift. The hon. member would bring up the point that they are not receiving as much as they would obtain at Wyndham but, following the matter to its conclusion, the producers who use this facility do infinitely better than they would if they drove their cattle to the Wyndham Meat Works. It is much more profitable to market 100 per cent. of their cattle through this facility, rather than 50 per cent. through Wyndham and one could accept a much lower price per lb. at Glenroy when there is no cost entailed of droving and getting the cattle to Wyndham.

Mr. Rhatigan: That is absurd.

Mr. COURT: It is not absurd. If they can deliver double the number of cattle there than would be possible otherwise, a lower return per lb. could be accepted. That is what happens. This is an added facility providing an outlet that otherwise

would not be available. I know that the Minister for the North-West does not feel very happy about the scheme; for some reason or other he has expressed himself strongly against it, but it has done a commendable job for the Kimberleys.

The Minister for Works: If it is more profitable for the producers, why do not they use it?

Mr. COURT: They do use it.

The Minister for Works: Not to anything like the extent they could if what you say is true.

Mr. COURT: They are using it, and the fact cannot be denied that double the number of cattle is being turned out from those properties than there would be if this facility was not provided.

The Premier: Practically the only stations using air beef lift now are those with shares in the company.

Mr. COURT: Surely that is something to commend it, but I understand that is not quite right. They might have some minor interest in it. Mt. House and Glenroy were the original sponsors, but there are six stations using it consistently, while others are using it intermittently. I recall that one station used Air Beef as a convenience because the season was not suitable for getting stock through to Wyndham; otherwise, the revenue from the cattle would have been lost. I hope that the Government will review the matter with a view at least to tapering off the assistance and ensuring that the future of the venture is not imperilled.

I should like to touch on the question of the police launch for the river. I appreciate the courtesy of the Minister in advising me that the Government had decided to provide a launch and at the same time was considering a craft that would serve the purpose of river and outer harbour work. The absence of a launch is causing much concern. With the increase of population and a greater encouragement to yachting, it is only natural that more and more young people are using the facilities of the river, and there are more and more using very small and spectacular craft such as the V.J. It must be borne in mind that some of the stretches of the river are wider than some people imagine.

The Minister for Police: Are not those V.J.s unsinkable?

Mr. COURT: Technically they are, but in fact that is not so. There are occasions when they have been found to leak, and the virtue they normally have of not letting the water in then becomes a disadvantage by not letting the water out.

The Minister for Police: I have seen them capsize and righted again.

Mr. COURT: On a rough day like Saturday last, such craft drift very quickly. Unless a boy is alert, is a good swimmer and does not panic, the craft is apt to get away from him before he can reach it. If the crew stayed with the craft, they would be safe, but if it gets away, there is great difficulty in catching it, and an inexperienced person, even though a good swimmer, is apt to panic when he realises how far distant he is from the shore.

I hope that the Government will try to make some temporary arrangement by using the good offices of the yacht clubs to provide launches, either on a roster or on a permanent basis, to fill the gap until the official launch is provided. I doubt whether a craft suitable for outer harbour work would at the same time be suitable for river activities. However, the Minister would receive the utmost co-operation from the clubs if he sought suitable craft to assist the police in patrolling the river until such time as the new vessel was provided. I assure the Minister of my co-operation in inducing them to assist, and I am sure he would receive the utmost help, because they appreciate the good work done by the police when they have the facilities.

The Minister for Police: Which yacht club?

Mr. COURT: There is the Yacht Racing Association that co-ordinates all activities, but failing that, the Royal Perth Yacht Club.

MR. NIMMO (Wembley Beaches) [4.55]: Today I asked a question as to whether the Government would consider supporting local governing bodies financially in the upkeep and development of their beaches. The answer I received was "Yes." This is certainly encouraging. The beaches in my area extend from Swanbourne to the border of Marmion. The Life Saving Association is strengthening its activities. It has revived the old club at Swanbourne, has a fairly big club at City Beach, a club was started at Trigg Island last year and there is a club at North Beach that extends its activities to Waterman's Bay, and now a proposal to go on to Marmion is being considered. The reason why the Life Saving Association is increasing its activities is that more people are patronising the beaches. On several occasions I have asked questions and spoken on this matter and sought some assistance from the Government.

I intend to speak only for the beaches in my area. The upkeep of the City Beach is borne by the Perth City Council and the people who pay for that upkeep are ratepayers of the City Council area cover-

ing the districts from Victoria Park, through the city, and out to the beach. Since the transport to City Beach in the summer has run from Welshpool, Mt. Lawley, Subiaco and Leederville, the patronage has greatly increased.

The Scarborough beach is one of the most popular and is patronised at a hot week-end by thousands of people. Often I have read letters in the newspaper from people living outside the area complaining about the paucity of amenities at the beach. The reason why the Government should help the local authorities to support these beaches is that 90 per cent. of the people who patronise them are from other areas. Yet the people of Scarborough have to foot the bill for the upkeep of that beach. In a growing area such as this, the money of the road board is needed for the construction of footpaths and other works and for the widening of roads, so that it is impossible to provide money for the beaches.

That is another reason why the people generally should share in the upkeep of the beaches. Coming next to Waterman's Bay, North Beach and Marmion—the latter is in the Toodyay electorate—we find that residents of those small centres have to foot the bill for the amenities enjoyed by visitors to those beaches. This is a matter that requires a lot of consideration. A couple of weeks ago, in company with a visiting Eastern States engineer, I went as far as Kwinana and Rockingham. He observed to me, "You have marvellous beaches on your coast. What an asset they are to the people of Western Australia." He then said, "The growth of this place"—referring to the area from Fremantle to Rockingham—"is such that in time it will be a mass of industrial development and I am wondering what will then happen to your beaches." I thought then that it is up to the Government to protect our beaches because, as the population of the State grows, so also will the use of our beaches become greater. If we desire to have amenities on the beaches and do not want to tamper with Nature, we will have to spend a great deal of money. I do not think there are many parts of the world that have better beaches than ours, and I feel that if we do not begin now to preserve them, it will be a sin.

MR. OLDFIELD (Maylands) [5.2]: I take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, of expressing my views on the installation of traffic lights within the Perth city block. I understand they are being installed upon the recommendation of the Traffic Advisory Committee, but am also led to believe that the committee was not altogether unanimous in its decision to make that recommendation to the Government. I rise this afternoon to criticise that re-

commendation because of the experience in other cities of the world where traffic lights have been in operation for many years.

It is interesting to note that the city council in Sydney has seen fit during the last two years to remove all the traffic lights from within the actual City of Sydney itself. It was found that far from doing what they were intended to do—that is, to speed up the flow of traffic and control it effectively—the lights became more of a hindrance than anything else and caused a great number of traffic snarls which reached such proportions, at times, that the lights had to be switched off and a police officer moved in to untangle the traffic as best he could.

I do not decry the benefits of traffic lights at certain intersections. I feel that they are an absolute necessity in some places for the effective control and safety of traffic. I think that the site of the installation of our first traffic lights, at the West Perth subway, was an admirable spot to select. I believe, further, that along Guildford-rd., at the Mt. Lawley subway, they are essential, as they are also at the corner of Garratt-rd. and Guildford-rd., as well as on Stirling Highway at the intersections of Broadway, Bay View Terrace and Napoleon-st.

Traffic lights are of wonderful assistance in the control of traffic along arterial roads and would be of great use at the main intersections in Beaufort-st. and also at the intersection of Vincent-st. and Loftus-st., where there are danger points at which the number of accidents over the last few years has been alarming and, in fact, far greater than at most of the city intersections. Most people would probably think that the lights should be installed where the traffic is thickest—in the city block—but I am expressing an opinion given by those who have had a great deal of experience of traffic lights.

Why are we at this stage installing traffic lights in the city instead of along Stirling Highway, Beaufort-st., Guildford-rd., Loftus-st., and other main thoroughfares which handle the heaviest flow of traffic in and out of the city? Canning Highway and Albany Highway are other danger points. I reiterate that traffic lights have not been found necessary in the City of Sydney, even when the police are not on duty. During the busy period of the day in that city a traffic policeman is on duty as pointsman at each major intersection, and it has been found that he can handle the traffic more effectively than can the lights.

The reason is that the police officer is endowed with commonsense, is trained for the job, can see where the heaviest traffic is coming from and can alternate the flow in whatever manner is best to facilitate

the movement of the traffic, whereas the lights, being an automatic device, may hold up heavy traffic in one street while there is very little traffic moving along the intersecting street. I would like a full inquiry to be made from the authorities in Sydney as to why they took the traffic lights out of the city block.

I think it was obviously done because the lights did not operate satisfactorily, although I admit that, apart from those in the city block, traffic lights are retained in Sydney and work efficiently. We will probably find that when the traffic lights begin functioning in the City of Perth, it will be necessary to switch them off during peak periods and have pointsmen operating at the intersections. Of course, experience may prove that the decision to instal the lights is a correct one, as they may be very handy during the off-peak periods. From my experience of watching traffic in other cities in the Commonwealth, however, I cannot see how these lights will be very advantageous to the City of Perth, especially during peak traffic hours.

Next I wish to touch on the answer given by the Minister for Works this afternoon to the member for Fremantle, in relation to Fremantle harbour. The Minister's answer took the form of a statement that the motion, as agreed to, was only an opinion of this House, whereas the motion, as I remember it, was that this House requested the Government to do something. The Minister must know that anyone who listened to the debate would be aware of the intention of those who voted with the member for Fremantle, because their reasons for voting in that way were given. They said that, in their opinion, upriver development was wrong, whereas those who voted with the Minister thought it was the right thing.

The Minister for Works: Is that what the motion said?

Mr. OLDFIELD: It requested the Government not to proceed with upriver development.

The Minister for Works: It said something else with regard to going outside.

Mr. OLDFIELD: It said to proceed with the seaward development—

The Minister for Works: What did that mean?

Mr. OLDFIELD: I do not know—

The Minister for Works: You should know, because you voted for it.

Mr. OLDFIELD: For what?

The Minister for Works: What it means.

Mr. OLDFIELD: What is that?

The Minister for Works: Extension outwards and to the south.

Mr. OLDFIELD: To continue with the first phase of the Tydeman plan. The original plan was to come upriver as far as Point Brown and then extend seaward and the Minister, because of the attitude he took against that plan on three or four occasions when in Opposition, has now reached a compromise and says he will go as far as the traffic bridge with three or four more berths, and then go outside. The member for Fremantle has taken the long-sighted view and has said, "Why not start seaward development now?" It must come some time, so commence it now and leave the river alone.

The Minister for Works: Who says that it has to come some time? Outward development may be in Cockburn Sound.

Mr. OLDFIELD: Heavens above! Surely the Government knows what will happen eventually! Engineers have to work out where the first part of the seaward development shall take place.

The Minister for Works: They have, and they suggest it be Cockburn Sound.

Mr. OLDFIELD: It is a matter of principle. Why is Parliament called together? Is it called together purely and simply as a rubber stamp for actions of the Government and to endorse those things that the Government cannot do without the power of Parliament, because of the Constitution? Surely we are not going to reach a stage where we have a dictatorship in this country and where Parliament cannot express its views!

Supporters of the Government voted against a Cabinet decision on that occasion. If this Chamber does not agree to the policy of Cabinet, is Cabinet going to say that it will persist and do what it wishes? That is nothing but a dictatorship and if we reach that stage Parliament might as well remain in recess and not be called together. In that event Parliament will be called together only to ratify certain legislation requiring its authority.

We might as well go back to our electorates and do nothing. As a private member, and as one who is elected to represent a district, in the same way as 49 other members, I shall not accept that view. In the first place, Ministers are elected to represent districts and if their electors have an idea that Parliament's decisions will be ignored, I think they will rapidly lose faith in the Government of this country and in Parliament itself. Parliament is called together to make decisions for the benefit and welfare of this State, and if this Chamber makes a decision, it should be adhered to even if it is wrong. We all make mistakes; Parliament has made wrong decisions before—and Cabinet has, too.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Plenty of them.

Hon. D. Brand: It would be interesting to hear the member for Fremantle on this point.

Mr. OLDFIELD: It is a slight and an insult to private members of this Chamber that their decision is to be completely ignored. The answer the Minister gave to a question asked this afternoon was the most wicked that has even been given in reply to a question.

The Minister for Works: In what way was it wicked?

The Premier: Do not take him seriously. He is talking to the member for Fremantle.

Mr. OLDFIELD: It is not a matter of whether the development of the harbour should be upriver or seaward; it is more than that. It has developed into a question of principle. Apparently Parliament is to be ignored by Cabinet and the departmental chiefs.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Now you are on the right track.

Mr. OLDFIELD: The departmental chiefs have told the Minister what they want and Cabinet has decided, rather than have an argument with the engineers, that it will agree with their suggestion. The Minister has said to his departmental chiefs, "Parliament has decided that we are not to have upriver development" and these officers have said, "That does not suit us. Cabinet can still defy Parliament and go ahead." Cabinet has been weak, and Parliament is to be defied. We have reached a stage where we will be without a Parliament and instead have a bureaucracy, because we are allowing civil servants to run the country.

Mr. Yates: Internal dictatorship.

MR. J. HEGNEY (Middle Swan) [5.15]: I was listening to the member for Maylands criticising the Traffic Advisory Board for trying to extend the use of the lighting system to control traffic. He was pointing out that it has been removed from the City of Sydney. I have recently returned from London and for most parts of the City of London the traffic is controlled only by the lighting system, and I would say that their traffic is as heavy as it is in Sydney. In London there are narrow streets and broad highways but in the city and suburbs lights control the traffic. However, in one place, Hammersmith, three policemen are used for this work during peak hours, but for the most part lights are used. I hope that the Minister in charge of this department and the Traffic Advisory Board will continue to extend the lighting system be-

cause in many ways it will slow down our traffic in the City of Perth and ensure that drivers learn some manners.

The CHAIRMAN: There are too many conversations in the Chamber.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: When the police leave intersections and traffic is uncontrolled, chaos reigns. One flow of vehicles tries to intertwine with the other and the position becomes hopeless. When traffic lights are installed, the driver of each vehicle knows what he has to do and in London the two unforgivable traffic offences are driving against the red light and driving over a crosswalk when pedestrians are crossing the road. Over there they have zebra crosswalks, and I would suggest to the Minister in charge of traffic here that our crosswalks be more clearly defined. At night-time in London the crosswalks have two lights on both sides. They do not control the traffic but they blink from time to time to indicate to a motorist that he is about to approach a crosswalk.

Around the City of Perth the authorities have inaugurated a number of one-way streets and that, I think, is all to the good. They have marked these one-way streets with "no entry" signs but in London and parts of the Continent, they have more definite signs, known as international signs. They should be adopted here because, instead of painting the sign on the road, they can readily be seen and almost poke a driver in the face. I notice that Howard-st. has been made a one-way street and I suggest that Sherwood Court be made a one-way street running the other way. That would enable traffic to turn down one street from St. George's Terrace and then up the other street. They are both narrow streets and should not be used for two-way traffic. I think the Traffic Advisory Board is to be commended for introducing the lighting system, because it is in the interests of motorists generally. It should have been introduced years ago.

I rose to my feet to refer to two matters that affect my electorate. One is in regard to the extension of the water supply to Morley Park. I cannot see any item on the Loan Estimates which makes provision for this extension to be put in hand this year. Representations were made to the previous Government, and the present Minister for Water Supplies has also been approached to have this extension made so that the needs of this fast-growing district may be met.

When I first made representations to the Water Supply Department, I was told that the work would cost £60,000. The last time I made an approach I was told that the estimate was £100,000, and I suppose, when the work is finally done, it will cost twice as much. The population in this district is growing fast and the Government should make an attempt to extend

the service as far as practicable; that is, as far as the Morley Park school or a little beyond. Many people in that area have found themselves in difficulties because of the lack of water.

The other matter I wish to raise is the extension of the sewerage main in the Belmont Park district. I have been in touch with the Belmont Park Road Board and I would point out that representations had already been made to the Minister's predecessor who then promised that he would make a small amount available so that the initial stage of the extension could be made. However, to date nothing has been done.

The Belmont Park Road Board is most anxious to have the sewerage extended in its district. The area has gone ahead by leaps and bounds, principally because of the activities of the State Housing Commission and also private builders. This sewerage extension is required to meet not only the needs of Rivervale, but also East Victoria Park. I have been absent from the State for six months, and possibly this matter has been overlooked. The reason why I have raised these two matters again is to bring them to the notice of the present Minister and request him to see if something cannot be done to place them on the Loan Estimates this year.

MR. HEARMAN (Blackwood) [5.23]: The matter I wish to discuss is that of having vacant land made available for selection by private individuals. The Minister for Lands would know that there is a location in my electorate known as the Tone River area which has been reserved for some years by the War Service Land Settlement Board on the excuse that it may be required for war service land settlement purposes. Some of the farmers in that area wish to take up that land, but permission has not been granted for settlement to be made on it by private individuals. Although this is a matter which has great significance in my electorate, I think it is also one of State-wide interest, or at least of interest in the agricultural areas.

When people are anxious to take up land, it is only right and proper for the Government of the day, regardless of its political colour, to offer every inducement to them to do so. It is difficult enough now to get young people to settle on the land, and if a young man cannot see his way clear to obtain a piece of land that he desires, there is a tendency for him to lose his interest and take up some other occupation. As a result, possibly one of the best types of farmers, namely, a man who has been brought up on the land, is lost to the agricultural industry. Therefore, this is a matter which should be

given serious consideration. A case which I have in mind comes within the boundaries of my electorate.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is too much conversation going on in the Chamber.

Mr. HEARMAN: Nothing further is required other than for a man to select his block of land and to take it up under normal conditional purchase conditions. In most instances the requests come from farmers who already have properties and who want to assist their sons to establish themselves as farmers in these areas. In some cases plant could be made available for the use of new settlers by these established farmers, and therefore the cost to the Government would be slight. In fact, it would only be the cost of surveying the land.

It always seems to me to be a short-sighted policy to keep land such as this locked up, merely on the plea that at some future date it might be required for war service land settlement, when there are many people anxious to develop these areas. As members know, such schemes are always wasteful and costly to the State. The Government is always being approached for financial assistance that cannot be made available, and it seems a mistaken policy to reserve land, merely on the excuse that it might be required in the future, when we have excellent types of young men who are anxious to establish themselves on farms without any Government assistance and make their contribution to the agricultural production of this State.

Although there is timber on this area that I have in mind, it would be a simple matter to have it removed. It is already served by the Boyup Brook-Cranbrook-rd., and therefore no additional roads would be required to open up this location. It is a proved agricultural district. I have inspected a good deal of the land in this area myself and have discussed its possibilities with local farmers. I think it could be thrown open for selection by intending farmers, especially the sons of those who are already established in the district. They would know the problems they would have to face, especially in regard to water.

The land is suitable for sheep-raising and the clearing of it would not be particularly heavy. The water problem does not appear to be as great as it is in other areas. There is plenty of good solid country available and dam construction would be simple. At present it is merely a breeding-ground for vermin. It is the only area in my electorate where one can see large numbers of brumbies and countless kangaroos running wild, and they are possibly a greater pest than rabbits. There is

everything to be said for opening up this land and making it available for private selection.

If the Government does intend to proceed with any large land settlement scheme, I still do not think that that should be proceeded with to the exclusion of private settlers. If a man is prepared to spend his own money to develop a property, he should be encouraged. Numerous representations have been made in this matter since I have been a member of Parliament. Apart from the representations I have made myself, Hon. C. H. Henning has raised the matter, and the Upper Blackwood Road Board has frequently made it the subject of its discussion. Only recently it brought the question before the Deputy Premier when he visited the district. It is high time the Government declared itself on the question of private settlement of land and made known whether or not it intends to make the land available for selection.

I know there are certain objections to allowing people to select areas and it is suggested that they pick out only the good spots and leave the bad. I do not think that objection can be sustained, because the vast majority of the locations throughout the agricultural areas were selected in the first place, and I do not think it could be clearly demonstrated that any great disservice was done to the State by those early selectors. It is true that some of them selected excellent properties, and why not? If the Government desires to encourage settlement of an area, surely it is for the Lands Department to ensure that any selections made in the area are in conformity with departmental policy.

In the Tone River area at least 14 men have left and have gone to the city or to other agricultural areas. When we see a proved area like that, with land, which is obviously available, not being thrown open to individuals because it is locked up for some future departmental requirement for which the money has not yet been found, I think it is time that the Government declared itself on the matter. This is not a problem that is peculiar to my own electorate, because I know the member for Roe has often discussed these things, not only in the House but with me personally, and both of us would like to see far greater encouragement extended by the Government to private individuals to take up and develop land by means of their own resources. Particularly would we like to see this land given to sons of farmers who are born and bred on the land.

Hon. A. F. Watts: They have reserved 1,500,000 acres in my electorate and to get 100 acres out of it is like extracting a tooth.

Mr. HEARMAN: The member for Stirling suggests he has had some success; if so, he can claim more than I can, because so far not a single block of land in this

area has been allowed to individuals for development. It is regarded as a potentially suitable area for a Government scheme. How long are we going to keep this land locked up? It is well serviced by roads, and are we going to keep it locked up because at some future date the Government will go ahead and develop it at considerable cost to the taxpayer? Have we got to the stage where we do not want to see development and the opening up of new land other than by Government schemes? Or are we going to continue to depend on that sphere of self-reliance by which the greater part of the agricultural areas was opened up in the past?

Is it not a good thing to allow a private individual to stand on his own feet? Does the Government think it a bad policy if he does so? If the Government thinks along these lines, I feel it would be a good thing for it to say so and for the Minister to declare himself. I have an application here from a young fellow who is at that stage of life where he must make a decision. He wants to start on his own which, I think, is a very laudable objective for any young fellow. The application reads something like this—

Would you kindly accept this application for a block of land of about 1,650 acres in the Nelson district, plan No. 438/C40 situated adjoining the Tone River townsite 2½ miles south-east of the Tone River bridge along the Boyup Brook-Cranbrook road on the north side of the road. I am enclosing a sketch of the block. I am 17 years old and my father has the farm at the Tone Bridge and gives his consent for me to use all his plant to work and develop the block. He will also fence and stock the place for me.

What better offer could the Government get? All the man requires is land. The father, who is known to me personally, is anxious to see his son established there. There is not a sufficient living for the son and the rest of the family on the old block and it is natural that the father would like to see his son established near the old homestead so that he can give him the greatest amount of assistance.

For years that position has continued in the Tone River area. What advantage is it to the Government to prevent these people from going on the land? Why does the Government want to keep these people away from the land until such time as some expensive Government scheme is in operation to cover that particular area? What is to happen to these young chaps? If they are prepared to put up with 10 years of hard work and not much return, why should they not be encouraged to do so? Does the Government want new areas and if so, does it wish these areas to be

opened up by public money? Or does the Government not want private individuals to put their money into it and develop the land? If those are the lines along which the Government is thinking, I feel there should be a re-orientation of Government thought.

MR. McCULLOCH (Hannans) [5.39]: This is a little Bill for £15,000,000!

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: We have not come to the Bill yet.

Mr. McCULLOCH: I have just had a look at the Votes and Proceedings, copies of which are issued to members. I have often wondered where all the money goes. What I do know is that very little of it goes to the back country. We find that a new school is proposed at Redcliffe; we find reference to the completion of the Kalamunda water supply scheme; we find the question of the provision of a new main at Kenwick; Government grants for swimming pools; Government grants for transmission lines from Roleystone to Pickering Brook, and, of course, we must not forget the Fremantle harbour. In Kalgoorlie, however, a number of public utilities have been undertaken without any assistance from the Government at all. The people in Kalgoorlie built a swimming pool, and never asked the Government for any money; they built crosswalks without Government assistance. But we find the people in the metropolitan area continually asking the Government for financial assistance.

With reference to the question of air beef transport, I subscribe to a policy of decentralisation, and one which subsidises any person for the purpose of breeding fat stock. I have heard it said that Air Beef Pty. Ltd. has been operating for seven years. I do not know who the company comprises; I am not interested in the company, but in its activities. The annual report of the Rural & Industries Bank for the year ended September, 1953, states, on page 26, that this company has been operating since 1949, only a matter of five years. It also says that the company transported 3,523 head of cattle from Glenroy Station to Wyndham last year. That was a bad year, and the conditions did not suit the cattle industry at all. The report further says that the inland cattle stations covering an area of 15,000 square miles this year relied solely on Air Beef Pty. Ltd., and that under the adverse effects of the drought it is considered that, had there been no air lift scheme in operation, no more than 200 head would have been strong enough to make the gruelling overland trek to the meatworks at Wyndham and Broome.

Members will see that over 3,000 head of cattle were thus saved because the company transported 3,523, and had there been

no air transport, only 200 head would have made the journey. I subscribe to any scheme which subsidises the breeding of fat stock. I also subscribe to the policy of financially assisting any industry engaged in the manufacture of goods for the country. The Premier told us that the subsidy was £48,000, but that does not seem to me to be too much. I am not interested in the company nor its shareholders. Even if eight to 14 stations, as has been mentioned, are interested in the company, the subsidy to be provided would still be well spent in developing the country.

In projects in the metropolitan area, such as the building of bridges and other works, there seems to be no difficulty in obtaining finance, but when finance is required for a project in the outback, the Government cannot find the money. On many occasions I have been told that finance is not available for urgent work in Kalgoorlie. In 1949, the then Minister for Education, who is now the member for Stirling, granted certain funds for a project. Unfortunately, the job has not been done. On three subsequent occasions, I asked for money to be allocated for this work, but was told that it was not available.

Irrespective of its colour, any Government should look away from the metropolitan area and pay more attention to the outback. The Government has lost on the Wundowie project, but there was no hesitation in keeping its going.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: It is still losing money.

Mr. McCULLOCH: That is the Government's concern. Although Air Beef Pty. Ltd. is a private enterprise, we should encourage it as long as it is helping to develop the country, and the cattle industry. I looked through the Estimates to see if £48,000 had been provided for a subsidy, but I could not find such an item. Even if £48,000 is required, that company deserves it. It has taken the initiative of opening up the cattle industry in the back country and every encouragement should be given to it. The Leader of the Opposition knows more about this matter than I do. I expected the member for Kimberley to speak on this item. I waited for someone from this side of the House to speak, but no one did.

HON. SIR ROSS McLARTY (Murray) [5.45]: I was very interested to hear the figures quoted by the member for Hannans relating to Air Beef Pty. Ltd., and to hear the references quoted from the annual report of the Rural & Industries Bank, which I have not yet seen. The hon. member tells us that had it not been for Air Beef Pty. Ltd. during the particularly bad season last year which the Kimberleys

experienced, only about 200 cattle would have been sent from there to the Wyndham Meat Works. It seems ridiculous to imagine sending 200 head of cattle from an area which, according to the report, covers 15,000 square miles. It can be seen what a loss pastoralists would have suffered in the Kimberleys had this company not been operating.

When we consider that the area covered by Air Beef Pty. Ltd. is 15,000 square miles of pastoral country, it surely must convince every member of the House that the scheme is invaluable. I know that in his busy life certain matters escape the Treasurer's notice. I wonder whether he has seen the report of the Rural & Industries Bank, and what was read to us by the member for Hannans. If he had, I feel sure he would have given further consideration to the withdrawal of the subsidy and would have shown greater appreciation of the difficulties facing cattlemen in the Kimberleys.

In view of this very important additional information given to the House tonight from the report of the bank, will the Treasurer, to use a term that has been used in this House, have "a second look" at the proposed withdrawal of the subsidy with a view to seeing if financial assistance could not be continued, bearing in mind the detrimental effect which a withdrawal would have on this 15,000 square miles of territory? The amount of money provided was comparatively small for such a tremendous area.

It has been stated that the air beef scheme has been operating for seven years, though the report says for only five years. During that time, two seasons were extremely bad and, in fact, they were the only drought seasons experienced in the Kimberleys in living memory and certainly in the memory of those who first pioneered this district. I am extremely interested in Air Beef Pty. Ltd. It is generally known that I have some interests in the Kimberleys, although I have no financial interest in that company, but I have considerable sympathy with those pastoralists who are less favourably situated than those who can market their stock without having to rely on that concern. In a country like the North, there are many problems such as the cost of transport and long droving over 200 or 300 miles to the meat works at Wyndham, and we should do all in our power to assist a form of transport that is still in the experimental stage.

I was reading a report by a committee set up by the Federal and State Governments. On that committee were men whose advice the Premier would value; in fact, he sought advice from some of them previously, and I have no doubt that he attached great value to it. They recommended that the scheme should be put into operation and that other killing

centres should be established in the Kimberleys, as one of the most effective means of assisting the cattle industry.

I doubt whether any good purpose will be served by continuing to discuss this question. I am not speaking with any intention of filling in time; my desire is to convince the Treasurer and the Government that to withdraw the subsidy is a retrograde step. I do not agree that the transport company derives the sole benefit, but I know that the scheme does help the cattle men who are placed in a difficult position so far as transport is concerned. The Treasurer has expressed his desire to help the North-West; he has spent more loan money there in order that life may be made more attractive and that assistance may be given to people living in those wide outback areas. This is one practical way in which we can do something to assist to overcome the difficulties of transport, and I hope that the Government will reconsider its decision to withdraw the subsidy.

Certainly the Treasurer should have consulted the Federal Government as to the attitude it would adopt if the State subsidy were withdrawn. From information I have received from Canberra, I gather that, if the Government withdraws from the scheme, the future of this facility will be jeopardised. It will cause heavy financial loss to somebody if the scheme goes overboard, and it is much too serious a matter for the Government to say that it has withdrawn the subsidy without knowing what will happen to the scheme as a whole.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

10.4

House adjourned at 5.54 p.m.