

the Treasury and not through a Minister who has charge of other departments and who cannot give his full attention to the North. We must look at it from a national angle.

That part of the State is not going to remain sheep and meat country forever and somebody must go into it; otherwise we may be faced with the problem of defending it. For such a position we require a man with a full knowledge of the problems, one who places the interests of his country above his personal gain, who is prepared to use some vision and foresight, a statesman and a man of courage who will tackle the job of lifting the North to its rightful place in our national affairs.

On motion by Hon. L. A. Logan, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT
(Hon. C. H. Simpson—Midland): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Tuesday, the 22nd August.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 8.33 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 16th August, 1950.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Electricity supplies, as to South-West scheme charges	257
Housing, (a) as to objections by local authorities	258
(b) as to Commonwealth-State homes, maximum rentals	258
(c) as to Commonwealth-State homes, economic rentals	259
Building supplies, as to production	259
Transport, (a) as to bus license applications and tenders	259
(b) as to bus licenses, metropolitan area	259
Railways, (a) as to replacing Merredin barracks	259
(b) as to warning signals at level crossings	259
(c) as to flood water at Midland Junction Workshops	260
(d) as to payment for "A.S.G." locomotives	260
Fisheries, (a) as to Government assistance	260
(b) as to tabling report of Royal Commission	260
(c) as to license fees	260
(d) as to proposed export	261
Mining, as to mineral production	261
Superphosphate, (a) as to withdrawal of Commonwealth subsidy	262
(b) as to approval of withdrawal	262
(c) as to Premier's attitude	262
(d) as to Premier's personal opinion	262
(e) as to subsidy on undelivered orders	262
Roads, (a) as to improving sections of Great Eastern Highway	262
(b) as to contract for widening Bayswater-Bassendean section	262
Meat, (a) as to sale of vealers	263
(b) as to effect of indiscriminate slaughter	263
Chandler Alunite Works, as to manager's visit to Eastern States	263
Coal, as to haulage to Kalgoorlie and Boulder	263
Address-in-reply, eighth day	263

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

QUESTIONS.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES.

As to South-West Scheme Charges.

Mr. HEARMAN asked the Minister for Works:

(1) When will he be able to make public the policy of the State Electricity Commission with respect to rates and charges as applied to the South-West power scheme?

(2) Can he say what route the power line will follow to Boyup Brook?

(3) Can he say when power will be available in Boyup Brook from the Collie power house?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Schedule of rates and charges as applied to the South-West power scheme will be announced at least one month before the Collie power station comes into operation.

(2) The South-West power scheme plan provides for a transmission main from Collie via Mumballup and Wilga to Boyup Brook.

(3) Boyup Brook is included in the first stage of the South-West power scheme, which is to be completed within five years.

HOUSING.

(a) *As to Objections by Local Authorities.*

Mr. GRAHAM asked the Honorary Minister for Housing:

What local governing bodies in the metropolitan area have raised objections to, or prevented the erection of, houses either within their entire districts or in certain portions, under each of the following headings:—

- (a) standard 9-feet ceiling;
- (b) timber-framed dwellings;
- (c) cement-block walls;
- (d) flats;
- (e) duplex houses;
- (f) expansible houses;
- (g) insistence on a minimum value of all dwellings erected?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied:

(1) There is necessity for uniform building by-laws. Present conditions vary in many local government districts in the metropolitan area.

(a) Nine feet Ceilings.—By-laws generally provide for a minimum ceiling height greater than 9 feet, but with one exception (Melville) local governing authorities accept Commission-built houses of 9 feet ceiling height.

(b) Timber-framed Dwellings.—Many local governing authorities have areas set apart wholly for the construction of brick houses. No difficulty has been experienced by the Commission in building timber-framed houses in areas set apart for such purpose. Bassendean Road Board is at present considering the Commission's proposals to build timber-framed houses in a certain area in that district.

(c) Cement-block Walls.—Cement and concrete blocks of approved manufacture are not objected to by local governing authorities even in brick areas.

(d) Flats.—Objections have not been raised to the Commission building flats in areas agreed to by the local authorities.

(e) Duplex Houses.—Generally, local authorities have co-operated with the Commission in the erection of duplex homes but in certain cases objections have been raised which have been overcome.

(f) Expansible Houses.—Most local governing authorities object to construction of expansible type of house in areas where a minimum value or size is stipulated. By negotiation, however, the Commission has been permitted to build expansible houses with the consent of the authorities in view of house shortage.

(g) Insistence on a minimum value of all dwellings erected.—Certain local governing authorities have adopted a minimum value for house construction, but in view of present cost of construction, restrictions do not generally apply.

(2) The above answers to questions have been framed as a result of the Commission's experience in the metropolitan area—conditions generally with the local governing authorities are overcome by negotiation.

(3) The position, as it affects the private builder, could only be established after an intensive investigation of all local authority by-laws and their application to buildings other than those constructed by the Commission.

(b) *As to Commonwealth-State Homes, Maximum Rentals.*

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE asked the Honorary Minister for Housing:

What are the highest weekly rentals being charged at present for—

- (a) three-roomed Commonwealth-State rental homes;
- (b) four-roomed Commonwealth-State rental homes;
- (c) five-roomed Commonwealth-State rental homes;

The HONORARY MINISTER replied:

(1) Metropolitan Area—

- (a) South Perth (brick), 34s.; Belmont (timber-framed), 34s.
- (b) Claremont (brick), 42s. 6d.; Belmont (timber-framed), 37s.
- (c) Bayswater (brick), 45s.; Midland Junction (timber-framed), 41s.
- (d) (Six rooms) Bayswater (brick), 47s. 6d.; Hilton Park (timber-framed), 42s.

(When present contracts are completed, it is not proposed to build any further six-roomed types.)

Country Area—

- (a) Collie (timber-framed), 34s.
- (b) Wagin (timber-framed), 46s.
- (c) Wagin (timber-framed), 50s.

(c) *As to Commonwealth-State Homes, Economic Rentals.*

Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Honorary Minister for Housing:

(1) What is the present economic weekly rent for the following types of houses built under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement in each of the years 1945 to 1950, both inclusive—

(a) four-roomed wood, or wood and asbestos;

(b) five-roomed wood, or wood and asbestos;

(c) four-roomed brick;

(d) five-roomed brick?

(2) How many Commonwealth-State rental homes were occupied by tenants on the 30th June, 1950?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied:

(1) Average rentals—

(a) 1945, 25s.; 1946, 25s. 6d.; 1947, 27s.; 1948, 30s.; 1949, 34s.; 1950, 35s.

(b) 1945, 27s. 6d.; 1946, 28s.; 1947, 29s. 6d.; 1948, 33s.; 1949, 37s.; 1950, 38s. 6d.

(c) 1945, 25s.; 1946, 26s. 6d.; 1947, 27s. 6d.; 1948, 30s. 6d.; 1949, 35s.; 1950, 37s.

(d) 1945, 27s. 6d.; 1946, 28s. 6d.; 1947, 30s.; 1948, 34s.; 1949, 39s.; 1950, 41s.

(2) 3,566.

BUILDING SUPPLIES.

As to Production.

Mr. CORNELL asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) What was the production of bricks, cement, tiles, plaster-board and asbestos cement sheets for the six months ended the 30th June, 1950?

(2) Was production for that period greater or less than for the same period of 1949 and by how much in each case?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) and (2) Comparative figures for the two periods referred to are as follows:—

January-June, 1949—Cement, 27,960 tons; bricks, 24,158,000; tiles, 3,453,000; fibro-plaster sheet, 662,000 square yards; asbestos-cement sheet, 480,000 square yards.

January-June, 1950—Cement, 28,990 tons; bricks, 31,635,000; tiles, 4,480,000; fibro-plaster sheet, 700,000 square yards; asbestos-cement sheet, 654,000 square yards.

Percentage increase—Cement, 3.7; bricks, 30.9; tiles, 29.7; fibro-plaster sheet, 5.7; asbestos-cement sheet, 36.2.

TRANSPORT.

(a) As to Bus License Applications and Tenders.

Mr. MARSHALL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

(1) Have any applications for new omnibus licenses as defined in Section 10 (d) of the Transport Co-ordination Act, 1933-1948, been lodged by, or on behalf of the Crown, since the 21st January, 1949?

(2) If so, how many?

(3) If applications have been lodged, have tenders been called in accordance with the provisions of Section 10 (d) of the Transport Co-ordination Act, 1933-1948?

(4) If not, why not?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Forty-seven new omnibus licenses as defined under Section 10 (d) of the State Transport Co-ordination Act, 1933-1948.

(3) Yes; for one service.

(4) Except in the one instance it was not considered necessary to call tenders.

(b) As to Bus Licenses, Metropolitan Area.

Mr. STYANTS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

How many transport passenger buses were licensed in the metropolitan area at the 30th June, 1947, 1948, 1949 and 1950 respectively?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

1947, 242; 1948, 262; 1949, 362; 1950, 481.

RAILWAYS.

(a) As to Replacing Merredin Barracks.

Mr. KELLY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

(1) What expenditure is contemplated in replacing present dilapidated railway barracks at Merredin?

(2) When will this work be commenced?

(3) Will refrigeration be installed?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) No expenditure is contemplated in the near future for replacement of existing barracks.

(2) Answered by (1).

(3) This will be considered when plans for new barracks are being prepared.

(b) As to Warning Signals at Level Crossings.

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

(1) Is he aware that two serious level crossing accidents have taken place during the last four days in the metropolitan area?

(2) Will he state the cost of installing warning signals on crossings?

(3) Will he state if warning devices are procurable in Australia?

(4) Can he state reasons for delay in installing warning signals at level crossings to avoid frequent accidents, many with fatal results?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) About £500 to £2,000 per crossing, according to individual requirements.

(3) Yes.

(4) Slow delivery of equipment. Twelve sets ordered about two years ago are just coming to hand now.

(c) As to Flood Water at Midland Junction Workshops.

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

(1) Is he aware—

(a) that all traffic ways between the various shops at the Railway Workshops at Midland Junction aggregating several acres constantly flood with water during wet weather;

(b) that hundreds of employees are obliged to use these traffic ways in course of their employment;

(c) that the flood waters are getting greater in volume each year;

(d) that the workshops employees are getting tired of promises that the matter will be attended to?

(2) Will he state if immediate action will be taken to draw off storm water into an area suitable for the purpose adjoining the workshops?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) (a) A certain amount of flooding takes place during wet weather.

(b) Yes.

(c) No.

(d) No.

(2) Approval has been granted for bituminising the roadways and for drainage, amounting to £21,000. The work will be undertaken as soon as the progress of other urgent commitments will allow.

(d) As to Payment for "A.S.G." Locomotives.

Mr. STYANTS asked the Premier:

Was payment for "A.S.G." engines amounting to £256,927 paid from Loan Funds or from railway revenue?

The PREMIER replied:

The Commissioner of Railways for this State estimated the life of the "A.S.G." engines purchased from the Commonwealth Government at ten years. As the

engines had been in use for seven years, when payment was made to the Commonwealth Government on the 30th June last, seven-tenths of the cost was charged to Railways Revenue and three-tenths to General Loan Fund.

FISHERIES.

(a) As to Government Assistance.

Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) Has the State Government assisted financially in the establishment of Seafoods Ltd., and if so, to what extent?

(2) What finance has been made available to any other canning factories?

(3) Was the Government financially interested in bringing the trawlers "Ben Dearg" and "Commilles" to W.A.?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes; £32,150.

(2) Four others; £6,070.

(3) Yes.

(b) As to Tabling Report of Royal Commission.

Mr. KELLY asked the Premier:

(1) When is the report of the Honorary Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the fishing industry of W.A. to be tabled?

(2) Will it be printed and distributed to members?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) Today.

(2) The report has been duplicated and copies will be made available by the Fisheries Department to members desiring them.

(c) As to License Fees.

Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Fisheries:

(1) Were license fees of fishermen and fishermen's boats raised during 1949 or early in 1950?

(2) If so, what fees became payable in each instance?

(3) Have these fees been varied since first gazetted?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes, by notice in the "Government Gazette" on the 16th December, 1949.

(2) Professional fisherman's license fee, £5 per annum; domestic fisherman's license fee, 10s. per annum.

Fishing boat license fee—

(i) for boats of whatever length propelled solely by oars, £1;

(ii) for boats propelled by motor or sail—

(a) not exceeding 18 feet in length, £2;

- (b) exceeding 18 feet in length but not exceeding 35 feet in length, £5;
 (c) exceeding 35 feet in length but not exceeding 55 feet in length, £7 10s.;
 (d) exceeding 55 feet in length, £15.

(3) Yes, by notice in the "Government Gazette" of 5th May, 1950, as follows:—

(i) Professional fisherman's license, £2.

(ii) Fishing boat license—

(a) not exceeding 25 feet in length, £2;

(b) exceeding 25 feet in length but not exceeding 35 feet in length, £5.

(d) As to Proposed Export.

Mr. FOX (without notice) asked the Attorney General:

(1) Did he notice a paragraph in last night's "Daily News" stating that a large quantity of fish would be shipped to the Eastern States if increased prices were not granted to the vendors?

(2) In view of that statement and the view of his Government that State Governments can control prices equally as well as the Commonwealth Government, will he explain how he intends to deal with this particular question?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied:

(1) and (2) I did see the paragraph in the "Daily News," but I am not aware of any of the facts surrounding such statement. The prices of fish are determined by the Prices Commissioner after due investigation into each case.

Mr. FOX: That does not answer my question. I want to know how the Price Fixing Commissioner intends to deal with this particular question. The vendors of that fish will send it to the Eastern States if they do not obtain an increase in price. The Minister has stated that his Government can control prices as well as the Commonwealth Government. All I want to know is how he is going to deal with this particular question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

MINING.

As to Mineral Production.

Mr. KELLY asked the Honorary Minister for Mines:

(1) What was the individual yield in tons and value for W.A. in the years 1948, 1949 and 1950 (to date) for the following minerals:—Alunite, arsenic, asbestos, feldspar, gold, glauconite, gypsum, kyanite, pyrites, lead?

(2) What is the price of lead in W.A.?

(3) What is the price on overseas markets?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied:

(1) The answer is contained in the following tables:—

	1948.		
	Tons.	Mineral Content Tons.	Value £
Alunite	Crude Potash 39,131	Crude Potash 1,778	Crude Potash 49,480
Arsenic	214	4,494
Asbestos	963	37,761
Feldspar	1,011	3,538
Gold	Fine Ozs. 664,986	7,156,909
Glauconite	319	7,975
Gypsum	25,522	35,173
Kyanite	1,125	6,516
Pyrites Ore and Conc.	Sulphur. 37,499	Sulphur. 15,729	Sulphur. 164,203
Lead Ores and Conc.	Lead. 2,192	Lead. 1,408	Lead. 114,268

	1949.		
	Tons.	Mineral Content Tons.	Value £
Alunite	Crude Potash 32,264	Crude Potash 1,448	Crude Potash 43,417
Arsenic	33	982
Asbestos	1,207	125,332
Feldspar	1,049	3,934
Gold	Fine Ozs. 648,425	7,962,808
Glauconite	204	5,266
Gypsum	25,907	18,010
Kyanite	N/A	N/A
Pyrites Ore and Conc.	Sulphur. 31,209	Sulphur. 12,081	Sulphur. 125,857
Lead Ores and Conc.	Lead. 2,922	Lead. 1,972	Lead. 154,777

	1950 (To 30th June).		
	Tons.	Mineral Content Tons.	Value £
Alunite	Crude Potash 904	Crude Potash 84	Crude Potash 1,822
Arsenic	N/A	N/A
Asbestos	487	60,833
Feldspar	573	2,149
Gold	Fine Ozs. 298,670	4,638,090
Glauconite	170	4,577
Gypsum	*8,532	*8,196
Kyanite	N/A	N/A
Pyrites Ore and Conc.	Sulphur. 16,375	Sulphur. 6,962	Sulphur. 74,840
Lead Ores and Conc.	Lead. 936	Lead. 685	Lead. 53,339

* Slightly incomplete.

(2) Increased from 12 to 13 cents per pound as from 16/8/50 equals approximately £A130 per ton.

(3) Price in Australia pegged at £35 a ton.

SUPERPHOSPHATE.

(a) As to Withdrawal of Commonwealth Subsidy.

Mr. KELLY asked the Premier:

(1) Is he in agreement with the Federal Government in its policy of withdrawing the subsidy on superphosphate?

(2) Has he protested emphatically to the Prime Minister pointing out the injustice of this action to those settlers endeavouring to develop pastures; those bringing new land into use; those newly established in primary production; potato growers; market gardeners, and returned servicemen trying to establish themselves?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) and (2) The Commonwealth Government provided the money to pay the subsidy and did not consult the States in making its decision. It is not considered that the suggested protest would serve any useful purpose.

(b) As to Approval of Withdrawal.

Mr. KELLY (without notice) asked the Premier:

Arising out of the Premier's reply to that question, does he agree with the withdrawal of the subsidy on superphosphate?

The PREMIER replied:

I answered the hon. member's question by stating that this is a matter for the Commonwealth Government. That Government provides the subsidy and is therefore in a position to know whether the finance necessary for the payment of the subsidy is available.

(c) As to Premier's Attitude.

Mr. KELLY (without notice) asked the Premier:

As the Premier has still not answered my question does he or does he not agree with the lifting of the subsidy on superphosphate by the Commonwealth Government?

The PREMIER replied:

I do not know the reasons that prompted the Commonwealth Government to make this decision and I am therefore not in a position to answer the hon. member's question. The Commonwealth Government evidently had reasons for the withdrawing of the subsidy, and I would suggest to the hon. member that he should address his question to the Commonwealth Government.

(d) As to Premier's Personal Opinion.

Hon. F. J. S. WISE (without notice) asked the Premier:

Does he or does he not personally agree that the subsidy should be paid on superphosphate?

The PREMIER replied:

It is not for me to say what I think in this regard. It does not come within the jurisdiction of the State Government, but is a matter for decision by the Commonwealth Government.

(e) As to Subsidy on Undelivered Orders

Mr. CORNELL (without notice) asked the Premier:

(1) Has he made appropriate representations to the Commonwealth Government for the payment of the subsidy in respect of superphosphate ordered by farmers prior to the 30th June, but which, due to transport difficulties, could not be delivered until after that date?

(2) What was the approximate quantity of fertiliser involved?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) Yes, representations were made to the Commonwealth Government for the payment of the subsidy in regard to super. that was ordered.

(2) I do not know what quantity was involved, but representations were made to the Commonwealth that the subsidy should be paid on that superphosphate.

ROADS.

(a) As to Improving Sections of Great Eastern Highway.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Is it proposed to improve the surface of the Great Eastern Highway between (a) Sawyers Valley and Chidlow's Well turn-off; and, (b) between the Northam military camp and Newcastle-road, Northam?

(2) If so, when is the work to be started?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) (a) and (b). No proposals for improvement by re-surfacing of either section at present.

(2) Answered by (1).

(b) As to Contract for Widening Bayswater-Bassendean Section.

Mr. J. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Has any contract been entered into with private contractors in connection with the widening of Perth-Guildford Road between Bayswater and Bassendean?

(2) If so, who are the contractors?

(3) If no contract has been let, has the Government called for tenders for the work?

(4) If tenders have not been called, is he in a position to indicate that the work will be carried out directly by the Main Roads Department?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No.

(2) Answered by (1).

(3) No.

(4) No work on this road has been authorised.

MEAT.*(a) As to Sale of Vealers.*

Hon. F. J. S. WISE asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) How many carcasses classed as vealers were submitted for sale and sold at the meat section of the Metropolitan Markets Trust premises during the following periods:—July, 1939; July, 1943; July, 1947; July, 1950?

(2) What was the average price per pound paid for vealers wholesale for each of the abovementioned periods?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) and (2) This information is not available.

(b) As to Effect of Indiscriminate Slaughter.

Hon. F. J. S. WISE (without notice) asked the Minister for Lands:

Does he not think that the indiscriminate slaughter of calves of the vealer type is a matter of great concern and something likely seriously to prejudice the future of the beef as well as the dairy cattle industry of the State?

The MINISTER replied:

Yes; the Government is very concerned and the matter is at present being considered by Cabinet.

CHANDLER ALUNITE WORKS.*As to Manager's Visit to Eastern States.*

Hon. J. T. TONKIN asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) Was he aware of the arrangement which was made by the Board of Management of the State Alunite Works for the manager of the works to visit the Eastern States "in pursuance of inquiries being conducted by them at the time"?

(2) Did he approve of such visit being made?

(3) On what date did the manager leave for the Eastern States, and upon what date did he return?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Not until after it took place.

(2) Answered by (1).

(3) Left Perth on the 9th February; returned on the 14th February, 1950.

COAL.*As to Haulage to Kalgoorlie and Boulder.*

Mr. OLIVER asked the Honorary Minister for Mines:

(1) What tonnage of coal is hauled to Kalgoorlie and Boulder for purposes other than fuel for the railways?

(2) What is the monthly tonnage, if any?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied:

(1) First consignment of 300 tons on 7/7/50, and thereafter 600 tons per week.

(2) Answered by (1).

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.*Eighth Day.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

MR. OWEN (Darling Range) [4.52]: I would like to join with other members in congratulating you, Sir, on your re-election to your high office. I am sure that under your guidance the proceedings in this Chamber will continue to be conducted with dignity and according to the best traditions of this House. There has been some talk about my being a new member and when this subject was broached one of my friends on the cross benches said, "You are not a new member, but only an old member rehashed."

Mr. Marshall: The hon. member was only compulsorily retired.

Mr. OWEN: Because the electorate which I had the honour to represent prior to 1947 has been cut about a little and because I have re-entered Parliament attached to a party, perhaps the intention behind the word "rehashed" might be excused. However, as the member for the new district of Darling Range I am very pleased to be back here and I would like to thank the members of all parties on both sides of this House and in another place, as well as members of the staff for the welcome they have accorded me. I feel that I am almost entitled to become a member of the "Caterpillar Club". As you are probably aware, Sir, that is not a club which has anything to do with nature study but is an organisation in aviation circles composed of members who have crashed but who have been fortunate enough to have walked home.

Speaking to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply, I wish to refer to that portion of the Governor's Speech dealing with the need for increased food production. In many countries throughout the world there are thousands of people who are still suffering from under-nourishment and whilst it is reported that the United States of America has stored large quantities of preserved foods in order to stabilise the local market, generally speaking, the world is in great need of food and this State of ours is no exception. Admittedly, it exports a great deal of food, particularly wheat, some meat and also other commodities, but just recently there have been grave shortages, and we should direct our attention to increasing food production in this State. It is easy to say that we have vast areas of land and that we should increase production, but some attention should be given to why we are short of certain foods. In some cases, the

primary producers have not been getting a fair spin. Certainly, quite a number of them have been receiving high returns for their produce but they are sadly handicapped by the lack of building, fencing and many other types of materials. Also, the labour position is extremely acute. There has been a continued drift to the city where the amenities afforded to the workers are much better than in the country.

We hear of the long hours which the dairy farmers have to work because they are short of labour. Although in many instances the labour that is employed on dairy farms is well paid according to the basic wage rate, neither the dairy farmer nor the worker is in a position to afford the amenities that can be obtained by others in the city. It is no wonder, therefore, that workers will migrate to the city where they can enjoy shorter hours at a higher rate of pay, and we cannot blame them for that because it is only natural. However, I feel that some endeavour should be made to provide those amenities so that the primary producers and those working in the industry can live under conditions similar to those enjoyed by their city brethren.

In his Speech the Governor also made reference of the intention to take full opportunity to develop the large areas which hitherto have remained unproductive. It is a fact that such areas do exist but, unfortunately, I think that for many years some of these will continue to remain so, and it is only natural to ask why. Western Australia is an extremely large tract of land of nearly 1,000,000 square miles and it is quite understandable that it will contain areas where soil proves to be lacking in natural fertility which makes it not easily productive. Thus many tracts of land close to settlement have been passed over. Also, the cost of clearing and of bringing that land and other types of country into production is extremely costly and quite often, in the past, it has been so expensive that the returns received from such development have not been commensurate with the amount of money expended. This Government, and also to some extent its predecessor, must be commended on its efforts to clear many acres of such land.

Modern machinery has been used and is being still further used to a greater extent, but I point out that bulldozers and other mechanical equipment used for the clearing of land do not necessarily constitute the cheapest method of doing the work. In fact the bulldozer does not fully clear the land; it merely pushes over the timber, which then has to be burnt, and leaves a lot of work to be done by hand. The cost of clearing by such mechanical equipment is fairly high, but the great advantage is that, by availing ourselves of its use, we can bring areas of land into production fairly quickly and so profit by the existing high prices. I feel that if there were a plentiful supply of labour, the cost

of production could be modified by using a better system of mechanical equipment in conjunction with more hand labour.

Another reason why land has been left unproductive is that we have lacked knowledge of what such land can produce. The Department of Agriculture, over the past 30 years, has done a wonderful job in discovering what the land can produce, but I consider that an increasing amount of research into agriculture is needed to give us a better idea of the potentiality of this land. There are many areas which the scientists have pointed out could be brought into a high state of production by the use of certain minerals. It is only a matter of 30 years or so since the use of super. became general. Before that much of our land could be classed as only third-rate and would grow only small crops of grain and support a very low population of stock.

Just as the use of super. has greatly increased the productivity of our land, so the use of other minerals, such as copper, zinc, manganese, molybdenum and, in some cases I believe, magnesia will enable many of our so-called poorer classes of land to be brought to the stage of high productivity. I am pleased to say that the present Government is doing a lot of useful work along those lines but, if we are to bring into production great areas and so increase the food supplies of this State, there is need for further work in agricultural research.

There is another cause for large areas of land in this State being left undeveloped and that is the wide-spread deficiency of water. Western Australia has a large proportion of its lands in very low rainfall areas, and while it is true that in the South-west, particularly the lower South-west, and also in the Kimberleys, the rainfall is comparatively high—there are many thousands of acres that receive 40-50 inches per annum—generally speaking the production of our lands is limited by the lack of water. It is unfortunate that Western Australia should be almost devoid of high ranges and deep inlets, and so we find that only the coastal strip receives any considerable rainfall. Also, a large part of the State is situated in that region of low and uncertain rainfall between the portion served by the westerlies and the winter rainfall and the portion served by the monsoons and the summer rainfall.

The Leader of the Opposition, in his speech, made several references to the fact that people are apt to regard Western Australia as being constituted in that portion of the State from Geraldton southwards. If Western Australia were more kindly treated in the matter of rainfall, the Murchison and north-west areas would have been already opened up agriculturally, as well as pastorally, and would have served as a connection with the heavier rainfall areas of the Kimberleys, and ag-

ricultural, as distinct from pastoral interests, would have occupied much of the land which at present is undeveloped.

Unfortunately there are no known scientific methods of producing rainfall in comparatively rainless areas. It is true that, by the judicious sprinkling of clouds with dry ice, they have been induced to give up their moisture in the form of rain. But we have huge areas where there are usually no clouds that could be induced to shed their moisture and, because of the high cost involved, I feel that we must be resigned to the fact that these areas can be brought into production only for the purpose for which they are naturally suited. That is why most of our north-west areas are utilised only for pastoral purposes, the farming done there being of a very minor nature.

It seems, therefore, that in order to make progress in agriculture, we must use the rainfall or the natural water that we have. This has been and is being done over fairly large areas, particularly in the wheatbelt. I should like to refer to the use of water for the purpose of irrigation to provide plant life rather than water supplies as generally utilised in the wheatbelt for stock and domestic purposes. If we could make two blades of grass grow where one grew previously, we could in many instances more than double our production. To do this it is necessary to make use of irrigation.

Some months ago I had an opportunity to visit Mildura on the border of New South Wales and Victoria and see what has been accomplished by irrigation in that area. In the matter of rainfall, Mildura can be compared with our outer wheatbelt area, where the average is in the vicinity of eight to ten inches per annum. The areas of Mildura, however, have been built up by an irrigation settlement that is well worth seeing. In an area of land probably not more than 20 miles across, the irrigation settlement around Mildura and including Redcliffe, Merbein, Irymple, and even over the border to the Wentworth district, now produces very large quantities of dried and citrus fruits. The wealth of citrus fruits produced is almost twice as much as we produce in the whole of our State and the dried fruits—lexias, currants and sultanas—average annually a production something like 15 times that of the whole of Western Australia. This conveys some idea of what can be done by the judicious use of water for irrigation.

After seeing that settlement, one cannot fail to admire the foresight and energy of the Chaffey brothers who, in the latter part of last century, planned and originated the development of the Mildura settlement, as well as of the Renmark settlement in South Australia. The Chaffey brothers were not greatly assisted by the Government in Victoria, though they received some encouragement. After many

trials and hardships, however, they brought that land into production. In reading the story as written by Ernestine Hill in her book "Water to Gold," one can gain some idea of the hardships they suffered, but by dint of perseverance and faith in the country and irrigation, they brought that land to its present high state of production.

We in Western Australia are unfortunately inasmuch as we have not a river of the proportions of the Murray in the Eastern States. Though some of our rivers extend many hundreds of miles inland, they traverse areas of intermittent, light, winter rainfall and they are not the flood rivers such as the Murray and its tributaries in the Eastern States. Apparently, therefore, we have no chance, as far as we know, of developing all our inland country to a high state of productivity as has been done in the irrigation areas in the East. There is the possibility that on our northern rivers, particularly the Ord River, something of large-scale irrigation might be done. There the product would be different, the country being more tropical, and I believe that even citrus fruits would not thrive in the Ord River country, but rice, tropical fruits, and possibly other food products could be grown that would help not only to increase the food supplies of the State but also to populate those northern areas.

In the South West we have the Wellington and Stirling dams, as well as other dams, which are being used to irrigate areas, particularly the Harvey district, which originally was a citrus-growing centre and has now become a dairying centre; and the area from Waroona as far south as North Dandenup about the foothills and extending towards the coast is fairly well served by irrigation. But unfortunately the storage capacity is limited and the land will not be able to be developed fully, owing to the restriction of water. It does seem strange that in areas served by a rainfall of 30 inches, and in some cases up to 50 inches, we should be short of water, but it is only in isolated places, even in the extreme South-west, in districts such as Albany, Vasse and Blackwood, that we can see small areas of permanently green pastures. That is due to the fact that we often have five to six months of the year without rain. As there seems to be no great future in impounding large quantities of water, apart from what has already been done, I think we must look to other means of irrigation.

There is great scope in investigating the possibilities of underground water supplies, particularly along the coastal plain. Although in Australia these supplies have not featured largely in irrigation, in parts of inland Queensland, New South Wales and northern Victoria, artesian and sub-artesian waters are used

for stock purposes. Not much irrigation is carried out by means of those underground waters. The Government could investigate the possibilities of our underground water supplies, particularly along the parts I have mentioned, for irrigation. I have seen that done in small individual instances at Armadale and along the foothills, particularly at Maida Vale, and in the Swan Valley. There, in some cases, by means of bores equipped with power pumps, some irrigation has been undertaken. In one case at Caversham there is an artesian water supply and, although it is not exploited to the full, it is being used to a large extent to irrigate some paddocks that are being used for grazing.

At Maida Vale there is a small property where for many years an orchardist had struggled on during the dry seasons with a shallow well from which he was pumping a few hundred gallons per hour. By that means he had managed to keep his citrus orchard in production, but in the last few years he explored the country a little deeper and, by sinking a bore to about 90 ft. and equipping it with a power pump, he is drawing out something like 6,000 gallons to 8,000 gallons an hour, day and night. Although that is only a small quantity compared with the large irrigation areas, it does enable him to have a magnificent citrus orchard. I have had the same experience with growers in other areas, and so I point out to the Government that something more might be done with them than is occurring at the moment. Perhaps some of the districts that we read about a couple of months ago, along the old coast road to Bunbury—although most of that area I fear is rather poor—might, with the use of minor elements and super., together with some irrigation, be brought into a high state of production.

Before leaving this subject, I must refer to the small irrigation projects in our market garden areas of Spearwood and Osborne Park. In those places there are numerous pumps operating mostly from shallow wells and bores from which there seems to be an unlimited quantity of water. What is done in those districts could, I feel, be done in many others. There is also the possibility of storing surface water from the natural rainfall by means of small dams in many of the creeks in the hills. In my own particular electorate, the settlers have made use of irrigation in the last 15 to 20 years and, as a result, have more than trebled the output from their holdings. In the particular area where I live, we are fortunate in that most of the creeks are permanent. Even at the end of this last dry summer they were providing quite a lot of water for irrigation. But in other parts of the hills areas the people are not so lucky because the creeks dry up in the summer months. I would advocate the storage of water by means of small dams or weirs in which

individuals, or groups of individuals, could impound 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 gallons which could be used with great benefit in the summer.

Mr. Marshall: Could you dehydrate it for the summer months?

Mr. OWEN: It is a pity we could not dehydrate some other things. I have in mind an instance at Parkerville where two brothers, returned soldiers, realised that their production was greatly limited because of lack of summer water. They made use of a tractor and a scoop to build a dam across a creek there. In the first year they impounded something like half a million gallons, and the next year they increased the amount so that at the present time the dam holds probably 2,000,000 gallons, and they hope to increase it further. That has been done by their own individual efforts. I feel that other settlers could do the same if they were given encouragement; and particularly if the department gave them assistance by providing competent engineers or surveyors to indicate the best spots at which to place these dams. If that were done, I feel our production could be greatly increased in the hills areas, and possibly right throughout the South-west. There is a similar place worth mentioning, I think, in the Kendenup district where, by blocking the Auroop Creek, one settler is impounding something like 11,000,000 gallons of water. That is a great asset to him during dry summers. He irrigates his orchard and, I understand, his pastures, to assist his dairying project.

Whilst I was in the Mildura District, I saw what was being produced there, and I had an opportunity of telling fruitgrowers from the mainland States of Australia what we had in Western Australia, which almost puts Mildura in the shade. There they have a magnificent river which, when I saw it, was something like 150 yards wide and possibly 10 or 15 feet deep, and running at the rate of about three miles per hour. There must have been hundreds of millions of gallons of water passing Mildura every day, so that they had water to play with. I pointed out to them that in Western Australia at Carnarvon, or just inland from Carnarvon, we had a dry river bed from which water was pumped and where we were growing tropical fruits in an almost desert area. I felt it was something quite as remarkable as what was being done at Mildura. If we keep in mind that in the wetter months of the year millions of gallons of water run to waste to the sea, and that many of these, on their course, are a big factor in soil erosion, we realise we could make much better use of the water with which Nature provides us.

Something a little more local, as far as my electorate is concerned, but also dealing with water, is the matter of

water supplies, mainly for domestic purposes, in some of the centres, particularly Kalamunda, in the Darling Range electorate. This subject has been a hardy annual for many years. Just prior to my enforced retirement from the political field some three years ago, the Government of the day had agreed to make a survey for a water supply for Kalamunda. I am pleased to say that that survey has been made, and it is possible, and very probable, that a start will be made on a water supply for Kalamunda in the very near future. It seems incredible that a township of the size of Kalamunda—it has a population of about 2,000 people—has not a public water supply.

During the very dry summer which we have just experienced, the water supply there consisted of a 500-gallon tank on the back of a truck. The cartage contractor supplied water to householders at 12s. to 15s. per 500 gallons. I might say that the water was more or less free, but cartage cost that amount. The member for Eyre has talked of the high rate charged for water at Norseman, but I feel that a rate of up to 30s. per 1,000 gallons, within a 15-mile radius of Perth, is very high indeed, particularly as the source of the water which supplies most of the Eastern Goldfields is Mundaring, which is within eight miles of Kalamunda. I might mention that the position became so desperate last year at Kalamunda that one person made a practice of taking home with him a water bag full of water on the bus from Perth each night.

I would like to touch briefly on a matter which is of vital importance to the Darling Range electorate, and that is the fruitgrowing industry. We have heard quite a lot of controversy, particularly during the last season, on the high prices charged for fruit. Whilst I agree that a high price to the consumer does not always mean a high price to the grower, it is a fact that the individual returns per case to the grower were quite satisfactory. But that does not always mean a high income for the grower. I would like to mention one instance of an orchardist—he happens to be a close relative of mine—who obtained a record price—something like 73s. per case—for peaches, equal to something like 2s. per lb. wholesale. That particular grower had something like 3 acres of one variety of peach and because of crop failure the total crop from those 300 trees—which normally should have been 500 or 600 cases—was 2 cases and 3 trays. That is possibly a gross return of £7 or £8 for three acres, so members can realise that a high price per case does not always mean a high income to the grower.

There has been considerable controversy over the Apple and Pear Board, and many people have said, "Let us be thankful that the Apple and Pear Board is just about finished." It is true that the apple and

pear growers have voted against continuing control by the board for the coming year. However, over the last 11 seasons that the Apple and Pear Board has operated it has done much to preserve the apple and pear growing industry. During the war years in particular, when export outlets were entirely cut off, the Apple and Pear Board did ensure that growers received some return for their fruit. Whilst mistakes have been made, and there has been a great degree of control which has been irksome to both the growers and consumers, the Apple and Pear Board has, in the past, done a good job. But, like most other growers, I feel that it has now outlived its usefulness and it will go by the "board" after this season.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Do you know the prospective export figures?

Mr. OWEN: During the last two years the growers voted for a continuation of the Apple and Pear Board only because of the uncertainty of the export position. It was felt that a Government organisation would have a better chance of tying up the shipping for export and dealing with the British market particularly, where the imports are controlled by the British Ministry for Food. Mainly because of the dry season, the apple crop has not come up to expectations, particularly last year when most of it could have been consumed within the State. However, it is anticipated that the coming year's crop will be a good one and that there will be a possible export surplus of 1,000,000 cases. Although the shipping position is not easy, growers feel that they will be much better off working under normal channels of export and local distribution. So, they have voted against a continuation of the powers of the Apple and Pear Board.

On numerous occasions the Apple and Pear Board has been blamed for high prices ruling for apples during the last season. That is not altogether true. In fact, if it had not been for the Apple and Pear Board, which has controlled prices, in many instances the price of apples would have been much higher than has been the case. It must be admitted that controls tend to become a little top-heavy and very often they add to the cost to the consumers. However, they are not always to blame for the high prices. Potatoes are controlled but their price has been reasonable—when we can get them. Almost hand in hand with potatoes, which have been kept at a reasonable level, we find that swedes, which have not been controlled, have soared in price and in many instances a price as high as 6d. a lb. wholesale has been paid. All that ties up with what I have previously said about the difficulties of the man on the land particularly in regard to the labour question, and results in the shortage in production of some commodities.

Mr. J. Hegney: Does the grower get that amount?

Mr. OWEN: I particularly want to mention the matter of research in relation to fruitgrowing. As a representative of the Western Australian Fruitgrowers' Association I have discussed the matter with the Honorary Minister for Agriculture, and am pleased that he is favourably disposed towards the establishment of a research station to cover main lines in the fruitgrowing industry. I hope that when suitable land is available for the project the Government will give consideration to the establishment of that research station.

There is also the question of the extension of electricity supplies, particularly to the Darling Range electorate. Three years ago it appeared that we had reached the limit of the present power of the generating station at East Perth. To come back and pick up the reins as the member for Darling Range seems almost as though I had not been away at all, because the people in the electorate still have the same problems. I refer to the electricity extension to Wattle Grove, a little centre in the foothills. Some 11 or 12 years ago the people of this district lodged with the Electricity Department a sum of £125 or £150 as a guarantee of their first year's revenue.

Mr. J. Hegney: Has it been returned?

Mr. OWEN: The people became a little tired of waiting and applied for a refund of that amount. The individual settlers who had subscribed amounts of £5 to £10 received it back without interest and less one penny for the duty stamp. These questions seem to have remained at a standstill, particularly in Wattle Grove and other areas in the Eastern hills and they are all still awaiting electricity extensions. There again we are confronted with a shortage of manpower and materials. This question of the shortage of manpower and materials is one which will be with us for a long time. Many people say, "Oh, yes, it is the fault of the workers. They do not work. They have a 40-hour week and we cannot hope to get production unless we increase hours." But I feel that it goes deeper than that. It has become ingrained in all of us that times are fairly good, wages are good and we are not starving. We have plenty of everything, so why worry? We work our 40 hours and we receive good pay, therefore we need not work any harder. As well as that, the industrialists, who could in many cases increase production, say, "Why worry? We have quite a good turnover and profits are high, so let us go on as we are now." We must get away from that selfish viewpoint and look to the wellbeing of our country and of our fellow men. That can be done only if we are prepared to do our utmost, even if it does mean working harder, or taking greater risks, and we should do more for this great State of ours.

In concluding, I wish to quote those famous lines of Sir Walter Scott:—

Breathes there a man with soul so dead,

Who never to himself hath said,

"This is my own, my native land."

I sometimes feel that with some of us, although our souls are not dead, they are far from being in a healthy and virile condition.

HON. J. T. TONKIN (Melville) [5.41]: In speaking to this motion of thanks and expressions of loyalty to His Excellency, I am not able to congratulate His Excellency upon the standard of the Speech which he was pleased to deliver.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Do not blame him.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I do not blame His Excellency for the Speech.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Blame the Premier.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: But, over the years it has become more and more a formal matter and, so far as this can be taken as any reliable guide to what can be expected in future or giving any information to members, then the Speech is almost worthless. It is true that at last there is an indication that we are to have some legislation on vermin. This very urgent matter, so urgent that it was necessary to call for a special motion four years ago, is now, we are told in His Excellency's Speech, to be dealt with. But, not in the way that we were assured three years ago. The statement made then was that the recommendations of the Royal Commission would be given effect to but now His Excellency's Speech says that many of the recommendations will be dealt with.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It does not mention the one on the rating of city property.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: No. We are left guessing as to which ones among all the recommendations of the Royal Commission will be given effect to. We must wait and see just what type of Bill, after this time—

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: If any.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: —reaches the House. Therefore I shall reserve further comment on it until that time arrives—if it does. I propose first of all to direct myself to the subject of education, because this is one of the most important with which the country has to deal. This matter was tucked away towards the end of His Excellency's Speech in a couple of paragraphs which tell us precisely nothing of value at all. When I read the two paragraphs I could not help thinking of the nursery rhyme, "Little Jack Horner." This is what the Speech had to say about education:—

Expenditure last year on educational services exceeded £2,250,000, the highest in the State's history. School enrolments have increased by 10 per cent. during the last two years.

School buildings estimated to cost £820,000 have been authorised during the last three years, and at present there are more school buildings in course of erection than ever before.

As an emergency measure it has been decided to purchase 30 prefabricated schools equivalent to 60 classrooms. Renovations to existing school buildings are being carried out as speedily as possible.

Here we have little Jack Horner who put his finger into the Christmas pie, pulled out a plum and said, "What a good boy am I." It reminds me of the newly-married housewife who went down the street last week and spent 15s. on the purchase of the Saturday dinner. On her return she said to her husband, "I have done some marvellous shopping for you, hubby. This dinner cost only 15s. and I got a leg of lamb and a pound of peas."

Hon. A. H. Panton: She was lucky to get that for 15s.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Are we to judge what has been done for education by the amount of money spent during this period of inflation? That is no guide whatever. One would think that there would be mention in the Governor's Speech of what the Government had actually done to tackle the problem. The position regarding education is simply terrible. There is no adequate supply of teachers for the future years. Instead of that, we are building up a position whereby in 1953 we shall be in an absolutely chaotic condition.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Do you think there are too many teachers entering Parliament?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: No. I have been in Parliament for 17 years and there have been only two teachers here in that time. In order to show just what the problem is, I propose to quote from publications that are available to most members. Before I do so, I make this passing comment that the new member for Cottesloe appreciates the situation and knows there is a shortage of teachers—but his Minister for Education does not. If we go back to 1947 when members of the present Government were assailing the Government then in power, especially regarding the education position, we find that the Minister for Education, who at that time was Leader of the Opposition, had this to say—

More teachers better trained must be provided.

That is what he thought then.

As speedily as possible classes must be reduced in size conforming to the modern teaching recommendation. We will set up area schools where the conditions are suitable. We will make provision for the actual raising of the school leaving age to 15.

That was what he said in 1947. Now in this present year those area schools have not been set up yet. Smaller classes have

not eventuated, nor has there been an increase in the number of teachers. I shall quote first of all from "The W.A. Teachers' Journal" of the 2nd August, 1948, which contains the report of a speech made by the present Minister for Education. It reads—

In a recent address the Minister (Mr. A. F. Watts) said that it would be necessary not only to have a considerably greater building programme in many centres, but also a considerably greater number of staff in order to maintain the existing number of school children per teacher, whereas modern practice indicated that the number of scholars per teacher should be substantially reduced.

In view of the housing and building problem generally he held out little hope of raising the school leaving age for some years.

Before he was a Minister of the Crown and when he was assailing the then existing Government, everything was wrong with the size of classes, school accommodation and so on. In consequence, he appealed to the people to put him in power and he would fix everything up. In 1948, after more than 12 months in office, he told the Teachers' Union that he could hold out little hope of raising the school leaving age for some years.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: He was not even prepared to concede that there had been a war during our time.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Next I shall refer to another report appearing in "The Teachers' Journal" of the 1st October, 1949, under the heading of "Recruitment of Teachers." It deals with a conference of teachers at which a report framed by a special committee was being presented. It reads—

The report emphasises the seriousness of the present shortage of teachers in W.A. . . . From 1945 when the war ended, the annual loss of teachers has averaged 58 over and above the intake.

That statement is surely sufficient to make any person, let alone the Minister for Education, sit up and take notice. Let members consider the position—the annual loss of teachers has averaged 58 over and above the intake. There can be only one end to that.

These figures would have been much worse but for the considerable number of ex-Service personnel who have entered the department through the Ex-Service Teachers Qualifying Course. Next year, however, these numbers will dwindle away and we will have to depend once again on the intake of monitors alone. Seeing that we were about 70 monitors short last year, it is quite clear that the position will become worse.

Then later on the report states—

If we take the figures prepared by the Commonwealth Office of Education in "The Education News," June, 1949, we see that the primary school population in W.A. is expected to increase from 57,000 in 1949 to 66,000 in 1953.

With regard to that phase, let members bear in mind the wastage of teachers every year.

No-one dare suggest that we are getting enough teachers.

There is one who dares—the present Minister for Education, as I shall show later on. My next quotation is taken from the issue of "The Sunday Times" of the 30th October, 1949. Under the heading, "Teacher Shortage Acute Next Year," an article appeared in which it was stated—

Our schools will open next year with a far from adequate number of teachers. By 1955 there will be a shortage of 930 teachers in W.A.

The "Teachers' Journal" of the 2nd June, 1950, brings us right up to date and in that issue appeared an editorial headed, "Education in a Democracy." It states—

The education of the great majority of our citizens stops at 14 years of age. The analysis of a questionnaire shows that a high percentage of our school population is taught in classes of 40 and upwards. . . .

Further on the article says—

In England the aim of the 1944 Education Act is a leaving age of 16, with further part-time education to 18 for all children.

In 1945 a leaving age of 15 became compulsory throughout England and Scotland. In parts of the country a leaving age of 16 is already operative as well as part-time education to 18. In Western Australia, due to an inadequate provision of school buildings and an alarming decline in teacher recruitment, the school leaving age is still 14.

The problems before us are to acquire as speedily as possible buildings enough and teachers enough to reduce the size of classes so that individual attention can at any rate to some extent replace mass instruction and so that our children will not be thrown on the world at the age of 14 with a truncated education.

In an effort to meet the building shortage, caused by unavailability of materials, the Minister is importing prefabricated aluminium classrooms. These, he hopes, when the building situation improves, to utilise for school libraries, visual education and so forth.

As essential as the provision of buildings is an adequate supply of the right kind of teachers. No-one will dispute nowadays that the quality of a nation depends upon the standard of its education. If that standard is to be a high one, there must be quality in the teaching.

Are we on the right way to get that quality? The answer is "No!" Apparently the department has not realised that we are again living in a different world from before the war.

Further on there is this—

It is indisputable that the main source of supply must continue to be the high schools. With the variety of openings now offering, it is certain that the number of children who have reached leaving standard, however it may have sufficed in the past, will no longer suffice to meet present-day needs.

Next I come to the issue of "The W.A. Teachers' Journal" of the 3rd July, 1950, wherein there is an article headed "Curriculum Making." I take from it this extract—

There has been some criticism of the type of curriculum as exemplified in the history syllabus and in its predecessor on geography on the score of adherence to tradition. But, bearing in mind the fantastic growth in the number of large classes due to shortage of classrooms and of teachers, it is fair to assume that our curriculum-makers sensed the impracticability of applying a really modern type of curriculum under such conditions.

I wish to emphasise the particular phrase—"The fantastic growth in the number of large classes." The next quotation is taken from "The West Australian" of the 3rd July last. It reads—

Replying to an editorial published in "The West Australian" relating to the union's attitude on the question of the size of school classes, the secretary of the State School Teachers' Union (Mr. W. E. Thomas)—

Unfortunately Mr. Thomas has since died—

—said yesterday that in pressing for a reduction in the size of classes he had expressed the views of teachers and parents and, at the same time, also had in mind that the number of out-size classes was seriously on the increase.

Statistics compiled by the Teachers' Union, Mr. Thomas said, showed that such classes were more than double what they were during the war when the great majority of male teachers were not teaching but in the Services.

What has the Government to say after that, in view of the criticism, by present-day Ministers, of the Wise Government at

the 1947 election? At that time they went throughout the country criticising us because of the size of school classes, and because children were being taught in hat-rooms and public halls and so forth. Now in 1950, the present Government, after it has been more than three years in office and is so much further away from the war than we were, has so dealt with the position that the number of large classes is more than double what it was during the war period. The Government is content merely to record in His Excellency's Speech the money it has spent on education—and thinks it is doing its job.

The actual position today would cause the greatest alarm if the parents were fully aware of the situation. If they were fully aware of it, they would be making their presence felt very strongly on this question. The pity of it is that they are not aware of it. The drift is terrible and in view of the way we are going on, we will soon be hundreds and hundreds of teachers short. Let us see what the Minister thinks about it. I quote again from "The Teachers' Journal" of the 2nd August, 1950. Here is a letter under date the 22nd May, 1950, from the then general secretary of the union, Mr. W. E. Thomas, to the Minister for Education—

Dear Sir, I am instructed by my executive to ask you to receive a deputation consisting of the President, Mr. Hutt, Mr. McDonald and the writer to present to you three resolutions which were passed at a mass meeting of over 600 teachers held during the May vacation.

The resolutions are:—

1. That this mass meeting from all parts of the State protests against the inadequate salaries paid to teachers in Western Australia and urges the Minister to afford immediate access to the arbitration of the Public Service Appeal Board.

2. That this meeting of teachers declares its alarm at the failure of the department to take realistic and practical steps to overcome teacher shortage.

3. That a deputation from the executive to the Premier be sought through the Minister before the new budget is made up to bring about an earlier reclassification.

To that the Minister replied under date the 26th May—

Mr. Marshall: What year?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: This year. His reply was as follows:—

The General Secretary,
State School Teachers' Union of
W.A.,

13 Murray-street, Perth.

Dear Sir,

Acknowledging your letter of the 22nd May and referring to the first resolution mentioned, I know of no

means whereby, supposing it were otherwise desirable, you could at the present time be afforded "immediate access to the arbitration of the Public Service Appeal Board." The right of appeal to this tribunal is surely dependent on a reclassification which, as already known to you, it is proposed should be made to take effect as from the beginning of next year. The work involved in such a reclassification will extend over a period of some months and involve considerable inquiry, and instructions have already been issued for this work to proceed.

Regarding the second resolution, there is no shortage of teachers—

That is what the Minister says—there is no shortage of teachers. He continues—

although more permanent teachers would be desirable. There is at present no class without a teacher, no unoccupied class-room, and no small school without a teacher. Therefore no increase of the total number of teachers employed would at the present moment achieve any result, save that, if they were permanent teachers, they would replace those on supply. The department has, I would say, a far more realistic outlook on the matter than is revealed in your correspondence, and is neither unwilling to give nor dilatory in giving consideration to ways and means of meeting future difficulties which are likely to ensue. You may rest assured that you will be informed in due course of the action that is to be taken.

So although there is a wastage of about 60 teachers a year—60 going out in excess of the intake—and although classes are larger than they were in 1947 and there are more than double the number of such large classes; and although in 1947, when we were so short of teachers, the Minister said we could do what South Australia was doing and bring them from England; despite these facts, now, in 1950, he says there is no shortage of teachers and there would not be any beneficial results if we trained any more! Let us see what the Union thought of that. Writing to the Minister, under date the 30th June, 1950, the General Secretary said—

Your letter of 26th May has been considered by my executive.

I would like to know what they said on the quiet!

Mr. Marshall: I wonder whether the member for Cottesloe was there.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The letter continues—

With reference to your first paragraph, you could afford immediate access to the Public Service Appeal

Board by technically (if such qualifying term is preferred) designating the recent adjustments as a reclassification, and gazetting them in compliance with section 28 (1) (e) (2 and 3) of the Education Act, 1928. Alternatively, the adjustments could be added to the 1947 award and the whole gazetted. However, should it be desired first to supersede the adjustments by more adequate and comprehensive increases the examples of other States show no need for the time-lag here. This apart—the months which our Department needs for such work can be entirely dismissed from discussion, if the reclassification is dated back to 1st February, 1950.

Conflicting with statistics, Teachers' College trends, and other facts—your statement "there is no shortage of teachers" astounds us.

And well it might, as it astounds everybody who knows anything about it! The letter continues—

Educationists—as, for example, in England—find in the congestion of schools through lack of accommodation not support for an insufficiency of teachers, but cause to ensure more teachers than classrooms. The zeal of the Department is not impugned; but its "realistic outlook" has not allayed the unrest and dissatisfaction of the teachers in Western Australia as reflected in the overflow mass meetings held on 9th May. Tremendous advances are necessary in this State before the rights of the children can be reconciled with a suggestion that the acquisition of another quota of teachers could not "at the present moment achieve any result save" to retrench some teachers already in employ. True, the aid of large numbers of supply teachers has so far enabled schools to struggle on; but often supply teachers are available for favoured localities only and for too limited periods. Even with their help the Service is sadly undermanned.

Your statement "more permanent teachers would be desirable" is fully endorsed.

Instead of puffing his chest out about the amount of money he spent being an all-time record, the Minister should inform the country what steps he proposes to take to arrest the alarming drift with regard to teachers. Lest this information which I have quoted might be suspect by some people because it comes from the journal of the Union, I propose to quote from correspondence direct from the Education Department itself and from the Minister. I submitted an inquiry to the Education Department, asking for figures showing the number of students in the Training College at February, 1947. That was the year that the Wise Government went out of

office and those students were already in the college when that Government went out. The figure submitted by the department was 379. For the year 1948 the number was 440, an increase of approximately 60 students. For 1949 it fell to 415 and at the beginning of this year there were only 328.

So there were actually fewer students in the Training College at the beginning of this year than in the last year of my term of office as Minister, when the members of the present Government were assailing us because we were not taking adequate steps to ensure the requisite number of teachers. Let us reflect on those figures for a moment. There were 379 students in training in 1947 and 328 in 1950, a decline of 51 teachers, or over 13 per cent. in recruitment. The figure with regard to 1950 was given to me by the Minister himself in a letter dated the 17th February, 1950, in which he says—

With regard to your letter of the 14th February, I wish to inform you that the following numbers of students are receiving training in the Teachers' College as at 10th February:—

Male	191
Female	137
Total	328

That is 50 teachers fewer than in the year we left office, and when the present Government was loudest in its condemnation of the incapacity of the then Government to deal with the situation. I want to know, and the people are entitled to know, what steps the Government proposes to take immediately to increase the number of students in training and recruitment to the teaching services. It is essential that steps be taken immediately for that purpose. If these facts became thoroughly well known outside, the country would be in an uproar, when it is realised that there are large numbers of migrant children coming to this State, and there is our own natural population increase to be taken into account; and yet there are fewer teachers being trained than four years ago. A little reflection will show members where that will lead us.

We will have a repetition of what occurred after the Training College was closed during the depression years and no teachers were trained. Subsequently we experienced a very grave shortage of teachers in this State. And no wonder! The position is going to be almost hopeless by 1953 unless immediate and adequate steps are taken to deal with the situation. But there has not been a suggestion, not a line from anywhere, as to what is going to be done. And time is running on. The position would be bad enough taking the figures as they are, but

it must be infinitely worse when the Minister believes that the situation is all right. That is the tragedy of this. If the position were bad and the Minister knew it was bad and said so and was prepared to take steps to deal with it, we might have some hope.

But the Minister says there is no shortage of teachers and that appears to be the angle from which he is approaching this matter. It is a cause for the gravest concern. We must first of all awaken the Government to the reality of the situation, and when we have done that we have to prod it into taking measures to deal with that situation. What chance have we of getting any results whatever when the Government believes there is nothing wrong, while everybody else is crying out about it and when the daily papers, the weekly papers, and the teachers in their journal and at their mass meetings, are drawing attention to the serious lag in training and the inadequate supply of teachers?

Mr. Marshall: Where have vanished those cobwebs of a year or two ago?

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I come now to the subject of prices. In order to get this question into its proper perspective it is as well to see what the Premier had to say about it in his policy speech in 1947. That was at the time when the Government made all the promises that got it into office. The Premier said, "We are not going to spend our time in following political theories or trying to secure party advantages—"

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Not much!

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: "—but in seeing that the householder and the housewife can go into a shop or warehouse and get what they want, and that our money in our pay envelopes can be converted promptly and at a reasonable price to meet our requirements"—there was no pun meant there—"for a satisfactory and expanding standard of living." How successful has the Premier been in that direction? I have here a cutting from "The West Australian" of the 16th May last. Under the heading "Rise in Retail Prices Still Unchecked" there appears the following:—

The inflationary trend continues to force up retail prices. The latest retail price index of food and groceries in this State shows an advance of 20 to 25 points in the last month.

Then, in the letterpress, it says:—

Mr. Muirson said that the greatest increases were recorded in food and groceries and miscellaneous aggregates.

So it will be seen how the money in the pay envelopes has been enabled to purchase more—I don't think. Instead of that, prices have been on the up and up.

The commodity with which we are immediately concerned and upon which this price spiral has had such great effect, is meat. It has been proved conclusively, as the result of the inquiry recently made and the definite statements published, that, despite the Minister for Prices, there is an extensive blackmarket in meat in this State. Mr. Kelly, whom the Government brought here for the purpose of carrying out that inquiry, found that clearly proved, and said so.

The Premier: Do you consider that meat has ever been satisfactorily controlled, at any time since control was first exercised?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I will develop this subject in my own way as time progresses, and I think I will answer the Premier's question.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It certainly has not been controlled in the Premier's time.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It is as well to deal with these things in their proper sequence. In "The West Australian" this morning, dealing with the meat position, there appeared, under the heading "Traders Critical of Report on Meat," the following:—

"The McLarty Government stands condemned for its weak handling of the meat position," said Mr. Pethick. "The Government instigated the Kelly inquiry to cover its own weaknesses and to delay taking decisive action."

I agree with every word of that. It is justly deserved criticism.

The Minister for Lands: What does Mr. Pethick want us to do?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I will tell the House what I want to tell it, and nothing else. I am making this speech and will tell the Minister what I wish to, and not a word more.

The Minister for Lands: Only half the story!

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I will tell the full story before I am finished and the Minister may wish it were only half the story.

The Minister for Lands: I will not.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You will wish you were half full.

The Minister for Lands: I will not.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I repeat that I agree with every word of that criticism. There is not the slightest doubt that the Government held this inquiry in order to delay decisive action.

The Premier: The Government did nothing of the sort.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Very well! I will give further examples later. We have become used to this technique.

The Premier: Is there anything wrong with seeking the best possible advice?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Not a bit.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Government had all the information and knew all the facts, without any inquiry.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Later on I will give the Premier an instance of where he might well get more expert opinion. I agree that it is desirable to get the most expert opinion before one acts, but that was not the reason why the Government brought Mr. Kelly here.

The Premier: It was.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Not very long ago, with a great flourish of trumpets, the Government appointed the Meat Advisory Committee and when, at that time, I said that it would not do anything useful or be of any value the Minister for Lands stated in this House, in answer to my question, that the committee was a wonderful idea and would be of great advantage to the country.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Then it could not have been his own idea.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I asked the Minister could he give me a single instance of where the committee had made a recommendation of value on which the Government had acted, and he could not do so. Instead he gave a very evasive reply about some recommendation possibly being the subject of further legislation, and said that therefore it could not be disclosed, but we have heard nothing more of it since then. This Meat Advisory Committee, which was established with such a great flourish of trumpets, apparently was not of much value when it came to the question of telling the Government what should be done in this situation. If its advice was of no value in this regard, of what good is the committee? This is the only real difficulty with which the Government has been faced in connection with meat, yet instead of getting the advice of that committee and doing what it suggested—it probably suggested the same thing as did Mr. Kelly—the Government brought Mr. Kelly over—at some expense I have no doubt—and he made a recommendation.

The Attorney General: You will agree that he is a very able man.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Definitely. I do not desire in any way to throw doubt on his credentials. He is a most able man, and knows his job, but I was told by the Government that the advisory committee knew its job. It was a definite vote of no confidence in the committee when the Government brought somebody else over to do the job. Does the Government intend to keep this committee in existence? If so, what for? There has been no evidence yet that it has been permitted to justify its existence. Members of this Government profess to know something about meat and some profound utterances have been made by Ministers from time to time on that subject. If members turn to "The West Australian" of the 27th March, 1948, they will find that the Honorary Minister for Agriculture, in

charge of the department at that time, had this opinion—I wonder if he is still of the same opinion because, if so, he agrees with Mr. Pethick—

A temporary lifting of the ceiling price or a substantial rise in the ceiling price was necessary.

He told the Government and the country that two years ago. The Hon. G. B. Wood was, of course, looking at it from the point of view of the producers who comprise the majority of his electors. He said—

If either proposal was accepted the worst that could happen to consumers would be that they would eat a little less meat for the same money.

A Daniel has come to judgment! What a profound utterance. He said that if the ceiling price was lifted or a substantial increase made in the price the worst that could happen to consumers, who would have to pay the price, would be that they would eat a little less meat for the same money.

Mr. Marshall: The Minister for Health made a similar statement.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Minister was not alone in the Government with his knowledge of meat, as the Minister for Supply and Shipping also had a viewpoint, which she expressed. She said that if lamb was too dear for old age pensioners they could eat beef.

Mr. Styants: Where is the beef?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That statement is to be found in "Hansard," 1948, Vol. 1, page 531. She said that if meat prices generally rose all that people needed to do was to buy less meat or cheaper cuts.

Mr. Marshall: That was the idea of the Minister for Health.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That appears at page 533 of the same volume of "Hansard."

Mr. Marshall: The good old Subiaco workers, who support the Minister for Health!

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That is how to deal with the meat position, according to the Minister and the Government; lift the ceiling price or effect a substantial increase in the price and then, when the poor old consumers have to pay that price they will not have much to worry about. All they need do is to buy and eat less, and buy cheaper cuts. That is the sort of wisdom that comes from the Government, is never contradicted and is put out for public consumption on the question of meat. Does the Minister for Lands want that aspect developed further?

The Minister for Lands: I would like to hear a little more from you.

The Attorney General: I would like to hear something constructive.

The Minister for Lands: Tell us about the farmers having to eat boiled wheat during the depression.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: What has that to do with the price of meat?

The Minister for Lands: It has something to do with the question of food.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: At the time when the control over lamb was lifted the price was about 1s. 8d. a lb., and now it is up to 2s. 4d. for leg, 1s. 6d. for forequarter and 2s. 4d. for lamb chops. According to the Minister for Supply and Shipping that need not worry the people. She said they can eat less, and she should have added "if they can get it, and if that is too dear then they can ask the butcher for cheaper cuts."

The Minister for Health: They are often better for one than are other cuts.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: On the Goldfields and in certain country towns they can get no cuts at all, and that is the way in which this Government, which came in with such a flourish of trumpets and was going to move mountains, has dealt with the meat situation. It has not done a single thing to effect an improvement. The Premier, if he were frank in the matter, would admit that the situation has never been worse than it is today. We had the same difficulty when we were in power and the butchers staged a temporary strike. We told them that we proposed to buy meat on the weight-grade basis and that if the shops would not handle it, the Government would, following which we had no further trouble.

The Premier: There was more meat available then than there is now.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Yes; a different Government!

The Premier: No, different seasons and less population.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Bullocks were not £40 a head then.

Mr. Yates: What year would that be?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That was in 1946. I pass now to what happened to the report of the Royal Commission on mill offal. For some time we have had difficulty with the supply of bran and pollard, and the Government decided, in order to make a gesture to the electors, to appoint a Select Committee. I immediately said that such a committee would be useless because it would not obtain the necessary information, and apparently the Premier took some notice, because he turned it into a Royal Commission. This commission laboured and made a recommendation as follows:—

That a voluntary committee, consisting of the various interests, be appointed to regulate the distribution of mill offal.

Was that committee ever appointed? Of course not! Do members know the reason why? The mill owners just would not agree, and that was the end of it. There was no suggestion of legislation to deal with the matter; it was just thrust aside. This Royal Commission carries out its inquiry, takes evidence, makes recommendations to the Government as to how to handle the situation, and the mill owners say, "We will not agree," and that is the end of it.

Mr. J. Hegney: And the Premier said he would act upon the recommendations.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: In the January, 1950, issue of a publication called "The Dairy Farmer," this statement appears on page 5—

In our previous issues of "The Dairy Farmer," we referred to the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the position of bran and pollard and stockfood concentrates, and that the recommendation of this commission was that a voluntary committee consisting of the various interests be appointed to regulate the distribution of this mill offal. It has now been ascertained that the mill owners would not agree to the appointment of a committee. This clearly indicates that they do not desire to allow the control of the distribution of bran and pollard to pass from their hands, nor to allow anyone to inquire too closely into this business.

Without reading all of this article, I would like to quote these additional lines which are to be found further down the page—

The Government should not hesitate to provide legislation to take control of all bran and pollard throughout the State.

That is the opinion of those who publish "The Dairy Farmer."

Mr. J. Hegney: That would be socialism.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It is well known that a highly qualified engineer was appointed manager of the Fremantle Harbour Trust. I refer to Colonel Tydeman. This is a most remarkable story. Mr. McCartney, who had been in the position for many years, was, I think, on a salary of about £1,400 a year. I am not too sure of that figure, but I think that was the salary. He retired and the Trust had to consider its future action. It made a recommendation to the Government that the position be advertised at £1,750, but the Government was not too pleased with that suggestion because it thought the salary was far too much, and argued the point. But the Trust felt that it was necessary to hold out an inducement to the best men offering and that, as the sum which Mr. McCartney was receiving was considered insufficient today, at least

£1,750 ought to be offered. Reluctantly the Government agreed, and the position was advertised at that figure.

There were considerably more than 100 applicants; a number of men particularly well qualified, and Colonel Tydeman's name was not among them. So he was not an applicant for the job. Furthermore, I believe he told the Government that he did not intend to apply. Therefore, it was not a question of his missing the advertisement. By deliberate intent he was not an applicant. In due course, the applications were carefully considered, three persons were selected by the Trust, and an engineer in the employ of the Government Service, Mr. Henry, was recommended as No. 1 choice and, while I have no way of proving this, I understand the selection was considered by Cabinet, which finally agreed to the appointment. I have reason to believe that that was true. No announcement was made, which appeared to be an extremely strange thing, and this matter dragged on for weeks. Then rumours started to circulate around Fremantle—as they will in such cases—that the reason why Mr. Henry was not appointed to the job was that there was objection from someone higher up, on the ground that the department was very short of engineers and that Mr. Henry could not be spared. Furthermore, if he were appointed to this job at £1,750, then Colonel Tydeman would be in an inferior position.

The next we know, after a long delay—as a matter of fact, up to the eve of the election—is that Colonel Tydeman was appointed, and at what salary do you think, Sir? Less than the £1,750 which the Government thought was too much? Oh, no! It was £1,750, plus £500, making a total of £2,250. That is the salary at which he was appointed to a job for which he was not an applicant. I thought the Government was short of engineers. It could not spare Mr. Henry; but it could spare the top-notchers, whose services would be more valuable than Mr. Henry's, and put him in control of the Harbour Trust. And he was not an applicant for the job!

The Premier: A very good appointment, too.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It might be, but what particular peculiar forces were at work to bring about this result, because, when the Government was considering the position, it did not want to offer £1,750, but the job was advertised at that? Subsequently, Colonel Tydeman was appointed at £2,250. Apart altogether from the other issues involved, this aspect presents itself to me: If this job had been originally advertised at £2,250, it is possible it would have attracted somebody with qualifications superior to those of Colonel Tydeman.

The Premier: He is still engineer for harbours and rivers.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Well, Mr. McCartney must have had a great deal of spare time if Colonel Tydeman is able to do both jobs.

The Premier: That was thoroughly gone into.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: The Premier does not want a part-time engineer in charge of the Harbour Trust, does he?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Either Colonel Tydeman must be ever so much superior to Mr. McCartney, which I do not concede for a second, or else Mr. McCartney must have had a lot of spare time, and I do not concede that for a second, because, if Colonel Tydeman is doing both jobs satisfactorily, he must be doing twice the work which Mr. McCartney did. What is the explanation for one man doing a job which previously two men were employed to do?

The Attorney General: He is a very clever man.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: He might be, but that does not answer my question. Does the Government think it is fair to the other applicants who applied for the job advertised at a salary of £1,750 when the man who did not apply should get the position at a salary of £2,250? Normally if applications close on a certain date and a person does not forward his application within that time, he misses out. The application is not considered. Let some student submit an application to sit for an examination and see how he gets on if his application is not in before the closing date! But this man was not an applicant for the job, and he gets it at £500 a year more than when the Government advertised it. What is the explanation? We are entitled to know if there is one.

The Premier: There is an explanation.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Let us have it. The Premier cannot do that sort of thing and expect the people to swallow it. It does not add up. The Government advertised this job at £1,750, but at the time wanted to offer a lesser figure, but it finished up appointing a man who was not even an applicant, and giving him £2,250 and, I believe, a promise of something more.

The Premier: Where do you get all this information?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Strange, is it not?

The Premier: Very!

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Of course, I do not move about in a dream.

The Premier: There is a good bit of dreaming done over on that side.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Surely this matter calls for explanation on several points. Firstly, in justice to the applicants who were prepared to take the job at £1,750;

and secondly, to the general public who make a contribution to pay a salary of £2,250, when the Government thought £1,750 was too much. Surely these explanations are overdue. Just imagine what Mr. Henry must think of the way things are run in this country! He is a bright young man, I understand, selected from a long list of applicants and recommended in every way by the Trust as suitable for the position but he is unsuccessful. Why? Just to give Col. Tydeman £500 a year more! Here is a case where the Government could have obtained a suitably qualified man at £1,750 whom the Trust recommended, but no, the Government appointed a man at £2,250 to do two jobs.

Col. Tydeman might possess wonderful qualifications and might be the best engineer on earth. I do not know whether he is or not. However, that does not justify the Government in not throwing the job open for applications again if it decided that there was not one applicant who could fill the position. It is feasible that throughout the world there might be persons who have superior qualifications to Col. Tydeman and who would have been interested in the management of the Fremantle Harbour Trust.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: J. C. Duncan-Raine would have applied for the position if he had known the salary was to be £2,250.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Having dealt with Col. Tydeman's appointment, I am led on to his proposal for the extension of the Fremantle harbour. Earlier, when I dealt with another subject the Premier wanted to know whether I agreed that expert opinion should be obtained. I agree wholeheartedly. I am going to suggest that before we embark on this project, which is to involve up to £20,000,000, we should obtain another expert opinion. I, as a layman, would not presume to dispute or argue the statements of Col. Tydeman. All I propose to do is to read a number of his statements which leave me in a complete maze, and ask whether Ministers are in a more enlightened state. Of all the contradictory statements I have discovered in any report, these statements easily lead. When I commenced reading this report I thought that Col. Tydeman was in favour of a seawards extension of the harbour. Later on I thought, "No, I am wrong. He is in favour of an upstream extension." As I continued reading, I said, "No, I was right the first time; he is in favour of a seaward extension." I kept on reading and then said, "No, he definitely favours upstream extension." And at the conclusion I decided that he favoured both. At page 9 of vol. 1 of his report he says:—

Cross-River Communications.—As normal development of more intensive conditions eventuates, direct communication by means of continuous highways between these isolated town

areas and downstream of existing bridges will become essential, creating familiar and difficult problems faced today by many older ports. Posterity will thus be confronted with what may prove to be insoluble problems resulting in impasse.

So we have to contemplate presenting to posterity insoluble problems.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: If the extension goes up the river.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Yes. He goes on to say:—

If port development takes place upstream, existing rail and road bridges also must be re-sited further upstream. In consequence there will be an even greater extent of intensified township area downstream on both river banks, requiring direct cross-river communications for the greater traffic involved; more high level bridges or tunnels (the only positive communication method that does not obstruct shipping) will be required in consequence. This problem to posterity, of virtually insoluble difficulties of bridges high enough to pass increasingly large ships beneath, or tunnels deep enough to allow gradually deeper navigable dredged depths of water, will thus be intensified by upriver development.

At page 10 he says:—

Purely from the viewpoint of cross-river communications, in order to avoid immediate complications, or to hand on to posterity intensification of future insoluble or extremely expensive problems, upstream development of the port is better avoided. Port expansion, therefore, if undertaken, would better be seawards and not upstream, unless there are cogent reasons for doing so.

Such important reasons exist. Both rail and road bridges should be re-sited upstream in the near future. This will automatically open up the river for expansion, which even including the bridge structures and approaches is more favourable in cost initially than seawards expansion.

A very important reason why the existing rail bridge must be re-sited further upstream is that reasonable and economic port railway operating efficiency is impossible with rail approaches as they are today, limited by the location of the existing rail bridge.

At page 20 he says:—

Upstream v. Seawards Scheme.—Port extension sufficient to last Fremantle for several centuries is possible in the immediate vicinity of the existing inner harbour, either—

- (i) Upstream, and/or
- (ii) Seawards.

Upstream development would involve the re-siting of existing rail or road bridges, deepening and straightening the shallow rock-bottomed waterway, and extensive land resumption of built-up and developed adjacent areas.

At page 21 he continues—

Seawards development would involve secondary protection of port works by breakwaters, dredged waterways, and reclamation to produce port and possibly additional township land.

Here we reach the stage where we can please ourselves.

Whatever scheme is adopted must provide sufficient land to operate the berths efficiently, and not repeat the serious restrictions in land area now extant . . .

Development seawards of the port, unrestricted in the matter of land area, will be more to the advantage of town planners than upstream development in congested and developed areas, and where land resumption and considerable changes would have to take place.

Now he is a bit in favour of the seawards extension.

The Chief Secretary: He is balancing the two schemes and makes his choice. If you connected it up, you could get a better picture of it.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Minister can do that later on.

The Chief Secretary: I shall do so.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: At page 31 he says:—

Ultimate Development Scheme.—This scheme incorporates the initial improvement to existing facilities of Stages I and II, and provides for subsequent upstream and seawards expansion. It avoids initial difficulties of site conflict with large existing installations such as oil and wheat by absorbing them within the scheme without alteration.

The scheme is flexible and incorporates future development of Fremantle's greater land and marine facilities on the following lines:—

- (a) Upstream development up to but not beyond Point Brown;
- (b) Seawards development at North Fremantle, indicated as limited in scope initially, but capable of vast development northwards (as shown dotted on Appendix 23), and/or
- (c) Seawards development at South Fremantle, also shown as limited in scope, but capable of ultimate unlimited development southwards.

At page 34 he says:—

The seawards scheme has variations sufficiently to permit development either north or south of the river, or both, as future policy directs. The schemes of Gibb or Stileman allowed development to the north only.

Mr. Marshall: That is where he balances up again.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: In volume II., page 26, he says:—

Need for Cross-River Communications.—The existing road and rail bridges prevent any upstream port expansion unless they are re-sited. Wherever the first low-level bridge is sited it will always remain an obstruction to port development upstream beyond that point. But, if the bridges are re-sited further upstream than at present for the purpose of port expansion, they are being moved further from the origin of road traffic. As the port develops in the future, so will the township and industrial areas expand adjacently, creating dense development on both banks of the river, including downstream of the low-level bridge. More bridges downstream of this bridge will therefore be required to relieve roads and bridge of the increased traffic burden.

So his up-river extension involves not only the re-siting of those two bridges, but also the erection of further bridges between them and the ocean. He continues—

But if such bridges again are low-level, the port is restricted and pushed further seawards. The problem is thus always present and never solved, irrespective of the site decided upon for the first upstream low-level bridge.

So he says that if we embark on this upstream development, we shall have a problem that we shall never solve.

Some ports overcome the problem partially by means of bridges with opening spans or ferries systems, intermittent to ships and road traffic alike, and unsatisfactory to all. Some ports are forced to instal expensive high-level bridges or tunnels giving positive movement to ships and road traffic. Again, high-level bridges or tunnels may not even be possible or acceptable. Thus a problem will arise ultimately to provide at Fremantle a suitable river crossing downstream of the existing low-level bridge, which will permit the passage of ships and land transport at the same time.

At page 27 he says:—

Thus, if cross-river communications are not considered in all aspects, particularly for the future,

the provision of costly permanent cross-river structures may be handing to posterity costly, difficult and perhaps insoluble problems.

What sort of statesmen would we be if, without obtaining another opinion, we embarked upon a scheme the author of which warns us beforehand that we might be presenting to posterity insoluble problems? It would be a nice trick to serve posterity, would it not? If there is a possibility of passing on to posterity insoluble problems because of the step we propose to take, we should examine it thoroughly. I wish to read two statements here which to me appear to be completely contradictory. At page 32 this appears—

Bearing in mind that the Swan River is virtually tideless and non-estuarial, with resulting small range in water level due either to tides or floods, effects of port extensions can only be very limited.

He says very definitely that the Swan River is virtually tideless and non-estuarial. If we turn to page 87 we find this statement—

The port must be cited to be as free from sand drift and silt as possible. In the case of Fremantle, similar to all estuarial ports, the flow and flooding of the river must be allowed for.

If it is virtually tideless and non-estuarial, we can forget it as an estuarial port. That being so, why must we consider Fremantle as being similar to all other estuarial ports and make our answers accordingly? I am in no way criticising those two statements, but I should like someone to reconcile them.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: The Chief Secretary will do so.

The Chief Secretary: I take it that by "flooding," he means from inland and not from the sea.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: In the first instance he says that the river is virtually tideless and not estuarial. Very well! Then he says that in the case of Fremantle, similar to all estuarial ports, the flow and flooding of the river must be allowed for. If it is not estuarial, why have we to consider it in the same light as estuarial ports? That is a question which the Minister should answer.

With regard to pollution and the possible effect of obstructions on the river, I have some information for which I cannot absolutely vouch, but I am told that it is reliable. These are measurements taken for a full period of a month at weekly intervals at the recording station at Mill street in 1948. The rise in tide on the first day was 6 in.; on the same day of the following week 8 in.; on the same day

of the following week 11 in.; on the same day of the following week 4 in., and finally a rise of 5 in., or an average of 7 inches rise in the tide over that period. At the mouth of the river, at the harbour, the measurements taken over the same days gave the average rise in the tide as 2 ft. 1 in. Surely that shows that the water is held up at the mouth; banked up there, causing the increased rise in the tide. Colonel Tydeman seems to have overlooked that, or completely disregarded it. This appears to be another inaccuracy.

On page 33 he deals with the overflowing of dams and reservoirs and for the year 1926 he makes this statement, "Canning dam, not built." He gives some figures for Mundaring and for the Swan at Guildford. For 1945, in regard to the Canning dam, he makes no comment. The report just shows a few dots. We are unable to ascertain whether he means that the dam was not built, that it did not overflow, or what happened. In point of fact, the dam was completed in 1940, so something should have been said about it for 1945. It overflowed in 1942. There is no information about it at all in this table. Either his data was incomplete, which might have led him to a wrong conclusion, or else he felt it was not necessary to take any notice of that data. If he had some information, why was it not included in the report? There appears to be a discrepancy at page 34 where he says this—

At the Causeway the river debouches into comparatively large expanses of water connecting with the sea and which, for some nine months of the year, comprise sea water. These water expanses, Perth water, 1,000 acres in extent and 8 ft. deep in flood time, and Melville water of 6,000 acres area and up to 80 ft. deep, are connected to the sea through a deep channel about 1,000 ft. wide.

If we add those two figures together we get a total area of 7,000 acres for Melville and Perth waters, yet, according to a letter I have seen from the Minister for Works, there are only 7,470 acres in the whole of the river area from Canning Bridge to the harbour mouth. Well, there is something wrong somewhere. If Perth and Melville waters together are 7,000 acres, how can there be only 7,470 acres from Canning Bridge to the harbour mouth? Either Mr. Tydeman's information or the Minister's is wrong.

The Chief Secretary: In that case probably the Minister is wrong.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Were you the Minister?

The Chief Secretary: I could not say. I do not know what date you are quoting from.

Mr. Marshall: It would not make any difference; you could still be wrong.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: At page 39 Colonel Tydeman was dealing with river pollution and he said—

In conclusion, the effect of port expansion on the pollution problem will be negligible, and, if anything, beneficial. The existence of the major port of Fremantle means acceptance of its normal adjacent soiling effects in both air and water.

To me that sums up the Colonel's attitude—we just have to put up with it. If the extension of the harbour for the need of commerce pollutes the river and spoils the countryside, it is just too bad.

The Premier: He says it will not pollute the river.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That is so, but he has not proved it. I asked the Colonel at a meeting in Fremantle this question: If it were shown that upstream expansion of the harbour would pollute the harbour, would he still recommend upstream expansion, and he replied that he was not going to supply an answer to a hypothetical question.

The Premier: He had already been definite about it.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: He would have committed himself. His statement here shows his attitude, in my view, and that is that we have to accept some nuisance as the price of having a port. I feel that if it is possible to preserve the Swan we ought to do it.

The Premier: We all have that view.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Colonel Tydeman's scheme is one to go up the river, which may spoil it, and outside as well. So, someone at some future time has to go outside for additional berths. If we must go outside, why have this upstream extension in the first place, and present to posterity an insoluble problem—the Colonel's own words—and then eventually go outside? Why not do the proper thing and go outside in the first place and not present posterity with these insoluble problems. I think the matter requires to be looked at by an expert.

The Chief Secretary: Did you ever put that question to Colonel Tydeman?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: He would say it was hypothetical.

The Chief Secretary: You have not given him a chance to make an explanation at all.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I gave him one chance, and that was his answer.

The Premier: Has it not been looked at by four different experts now—Buchanan, Gibb, Stileman and Tydeman?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Yes.

The Chief Secretary: And all arrived at the same conclusion as Tydeman.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: No.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: I think the member for Albany could put forward a solution to all this.

Mr. Yates: And he would not be far wrong.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: At page 86 we find Colonel Tydeman saying this—

The Outer Harbour offers vast area for distant future port development.

That is worth knowing. Further down he goes on to say—

In other words, the Outer Harbour coast from Swan River to beyond Rockingham is a suitable potential for port expansion sites at some distant future date.

At page 87 he says—

Schemes within the Inner Harbour involve costly and difficult problems of cross-river communications; Nature has provided but shallow waterways which would involve considerable cost of deepening and straightening; and land resumption of surrounding township and commercial areas might prove expensive.

That is strange for a man who is advocating this special scheme. He goes on to say—

Thus, assuming engineering possibility in all cases, the problem of choice of site for immediate future extension resolves itself to one of an Outer Harbour site near (i.e., seawards of) the existing port, or to an Inner Harbour site, and the decision of either or both for future development will revolve mainly on considerations of cost of works, of land available, and developability of the site.

If it is only a question of the cost of the works, I think it is worth considering going seawards if we can preserve the Swan, more especially as if we go upstream we are likely to present to posterity some insoluble problems. He goes on—

The port must be sited to be as free from sand drift and silt as possible.

I have already read the balance of that paragraph. This is a statement that leaves me very much in a dilemma in view of the fact that Colonel Tydeman has recommended an upstream development. He says—

Thus, any site chosen must:—

(i) Be near the existing trade centre of Fremantle.

(ii) Have good road and rail access, i.e., undeveloped flat land.

(iii) Have ample land for port development.

(iv) Provide safe ship navigation and entry.

(v) Have shelter from north-westerly seas and southerly swells.

(vi) Be free from silt or sand drift.

(vii) Cater for Swan River flow or flooding.

Those are the requirements. Then the Colonel says—

Schemes for seawards expansion provide all these requirements.

Well, what is wrong?

The Chief Secretary: The price, for one thing.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The price of preserving the river.

The Chief Secretary: No, the far greater price of making your initial improvement outside.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Let me finish the statement—

Schemes for seawards expansion provide all these requirements, but up river schemes have insufficient land for unrestricted layout.

The Chief Secretary: Unrestricted, yes, but sufficient for our needs for probably 50 years.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Sufficient for now, and let posterity look after itself.

The Chief Secretary: No.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Colonel sets out what are the requirements for a port, and then he says that a seawards expansion has all those requirements, and tells us that an upstream scheme has all but one, or so I assume, because the only one he mentions is that the up river scheme has insufficient land for any unrestricted layout. He says—

The cost of various schemes is investigated later and thus only the question of land requirements and availability need be pursued here.

At page 90 there is the heading, "Extent of Development" and he deals with the entrance channel and the number of berths, and finishes up by saying that considerable upriver development is thus not practicable, economically or otherwise. Then he says—

On the other hand, seawards extension is unlimited in area, as well as offering favourable land transport approaches. Thus, disregarding capital cost, extension seawards in the vicinity of the Swan River mouth is the most rational, providing not only for immediate needs, but unlimited adequate space for the port requirements of posterity.

That will stand reading a second time, because even if the Premier is clear as to what it means, I must admit, in view of Colonel Tydeman's recommendation, that I am not.

Considerable up-river development is thus not practicable, economically or otherwise.

On the other hand seawards extension is unlimited in area, as well as offering favourable land transport approaches. Thus, disregarding capital cost, extension seawards in the vicinity of the Swan River mouth is the most rational, providing not only for immediate needs, but unlimited adequate space for the port requirements of posterity.

That seems to boil it down to a question of cost only.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Think that one out.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Then the point we have to consider is whether this additional cost is worthwhile if it gives us a better harbour and preserves indubitably the Swan River for posterity, and prevents handing down to posterity those insoluble problems of which we are warned. Then, he finishes up by saying—

Assuming, therefore, that extensions become necessary in the future in batches of seven or 11 berths, the problem resolves itself to one of relative cost which must be considered against certain advantages and disadvantages. Thus, seven or 11 berth schemes can be produced either upstream or seawards; whilst schemes envisaging more than 11 berths are only practical seawards.

Yet we are told that we should go for the upstream development because he recommends it. Now, does he? These reports leave me in the position, as I said when I started, that I am unable to make up my mind as to which scheme Mr. Tydeman really favours. Finally, it seems to boil down to a question of cost and he may even be out in his estimates in that. Before this scheme, which involves many millions and many problems, some of which might prove insoluble if we go the wrong way about it, is agreed to, it demands that further opinion should be sought on what Mr. Tydeman has said. If a further opinion confirms his, what have we lost? A few additional thousand pounds on £20,000,000 is neither here nor there.

The Chief Secretary: If it were not more than a few thousand pounds it would be all right.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: What did it cost the Government for Mr. Tydeman's report?

The Chief Secretary: You would have saved yourself a lot of worry over this question if, at the commencement, you

had submitted your queries to Mr. Tydeman. He would have saved you all this worry but you did not give him a chance.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: There are the reports and if members can make up their minds as to which scheme Mr. Tydeman favours, then they are more adept than I am. I must admit that he had me changing my mind as I kept reading the reports. First of all he advanced one idea and then another until finally I did not really know what he was leading up to.

Mr. Graham: Like the member for Beverley.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: He finishes up with a recommendation that the Government should do both. He said that the Government should re-site the bridges at Point Brown and extend the inner harbour up to there and take the risk of handing on insoluble problems to posterity. He then says that we must go outside because it will be necessary eventually. That is his final conclusion.

The Minister for Works: If this inquiry is made and it differs from Mr. Tydeman, what then?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Then we will say, "It is a good job we did not go on with the project."

The Minister for Works: Another Commission to inquire into the Commissioner.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Surely the Minister for Works is not going to argue that we should not have another opinion because it may not conform to the one we have already.

The Minister for Works: We have so many already. You agree that he has considerable skill and ability as a harbour engineer because you appointed him for that special purpose.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That is so and I still believe that Mr. Tydeman is a highly qualified man, but I will not admit that he is necessarily the last word on harbour development. I am sure he would be the last one to claim that he is infallible.

The Minister for Works: Exactly

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: And I think there is sufficient here to indicate that some of his data is wrong. Take those two statements about the Swan being tideless and non-estuarial!

The Chief Secretary: No. He said, "virtually" meaning not completely. Virtually—to a degree.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: If the Chief Secretary wants to split straws that is quite all right but from an early age I have always understood that if a thing was virtually non-existent you could, for all practical purposes, neglect it; otherwise what is the sense of the statement! Then he follows up by saying that it has to be considered like all other estuarial ports. How has he considered it; as an estuarial port or a non-estuarial port? Perhaps the Minister can answer that one.

The Chief Secretary: No, I will admit that, on the face of it, it does seem to be contradictory.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I conclude on this subject by saying that the cost of another expert opinion would add very little to the total cost of the scheme and, in my opinion, would be well worth while. It might prevent handing on to posterity insoluble problems because of cross-river communication and might result in our preserving the river, which we are very fortunate in having, for those who will come after us. I am afraid that once we start to go upstream we will encourage those who have wanted to go up there for years and it will be a bit more, then a bit more and we will finish up by having a port in Perth.

Mr. Hoar: Get out of that one.

Hon. A. H. Panton: That would be the end of the bridge across the "narrows."

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: There was a reference in the paper this morning, by the Minister for Works, to harbour improvements at Albany and Bunbury and I desire to make a few comments about something concerning the Bunbury harbour development. About last November or December I read in the paper that the Government was purchasing a vessel, which is a rock-breaking craft, and the Government intended to use a loebnitz needle for the purpose of smashing up the basalt in Bunbury harbour. I want to know who recommended the purchase of this vessel, what it cost to buy, what it has cost since we have had it and what is the value of the work that it has done? I will tell the Minister that it never did a single complete eight-hour shift during the whole time it was on the job.

The Chief Secretary: You would not care to say who gave you that information?

Hon. A. H. Panton: A little bird whispered in his ear.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I will tell the Chief Secretary who gave me the information; it was the Master of the vessel.

The Chief Secretary: That is what I wanted to know.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I will tell the Chief Secretary something more; the Master of the vessel told the Government that he was giving the information to me.

Hon. A. H. Panton: A bigger bird than I thought.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The story about the "loebnitz" is that despite the fact that the Minister said its trials were satisfactory, they were not. This was just misleading the public. Its trials were never satisfactory and it was unsuitable for the job because it would not take the weight of the needle when the needle was dropped through the blue clay on top of the basalt; the clay hung to the needle and so heavily weighted it that the plates of the ship

parted. One would think that an engineer who knew his job would have foreseen the fact that in going through the blue clay it would stick to the needle.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: I think the Attorney General would agree with you there.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: This blunder—and I can call it nothing else—must have cost the taxpayers many thousands of pounds.

Mr. Oliver: Who worries about that?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The work has not been done and now I am told that the scheme has been changed. So, if the original scheme required the smashing up of the basalt, and now because we cannot smash the basalt we are going to adopt some other scheme, I would like to know what the scheme is and whether the man who was responsible for the first will be the one responsible for the second.

The Minister for Lands: Does the hon. member not know who it was?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: No, I do not.

The Minister for Lands: I wonder who appointed him?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I think that the present Government bought this vessel.

The Minister for Lands: On the recommendation of the man whom your Government appointed.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Who was it?

The Minister for Lands: I am asking you.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Minister knows; I do not. Perhaps the Minister will tell me later how much the vessel cost, who recommended its purchase and how long it has been in commission.

The Minister for Lands: I will ask for notice of that question.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: This vessel started in tow of the steam tug "Uco" on 16th February on its voyage from Fremantle to Bunbury.

Mr. Styants: A little before the last election.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: On arrival the crew were paid off on the following morning. There was then some haggling between the crew and the department as to whether these men were entitled to 5s. 6d. or 12s. 6d. an hour, but the dispute had to go before a tribunal and the men received the higher rate.

The Minister for Lands: They generally get their own way.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: They must have been right or they would not have got the higher rate.

Mr. Yates: It is usually so.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It is usually so when they go to the Court on these matters. Perhaps the hon. member can quote me an instance of where they have failed. More often than not it is the other way. Instead of the public being told of this, they were informed that the vessel was successful in its trials and that the development scheme was progressing wonderfully, when that was not the true picture at all. The vessel was a complete failure—not just a partial failure—and was absolutely unsuitable for the job. What is to be done with the vessel? Is it to be put into operation? Is it to be used for something else, or will it be sold as scrap? Those are the questions that the Government should answer.

Mr. Marshall: They might sell the needle to a tailor.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Premier advised the House that the report of the Commission on the marketing of fish was to be made available to members. When this report did come to light we expected to hear some pronouncement but, no, as is the Government's wont, it just sat on the report for weeks and weeks and kept the public in the dark. When it looked as though something might develop in the House along comes the report. A few days ago the Premier made a cryptic statement about this report but it was impossible to get any idea from what he said as to what the Government's intentions really were, although we were able to hazard a guess. It must be remembered the Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party was a member of this commission. He is a Minister in the Government and he believes in the recommendations made.

The Premier: He withdrew before the recommendations were put forward.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Well!

The Premier: I think he did.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I find nothing in the report which indicates that he did not agree with the recommendations made.

The Premier: He became a Minister.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: What difference does that make? I ask him now, does he agree with what they found?

The Premier: He will not answer.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: The Premier will not let him. The Premier instructs all his Ministers along the front Bench as to whether they shall answer or not.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: This matter is of such importance that it merits being dealt with separately and I do not propose to say much more about it except this: The Minister for Prices has been known to state publicly that he is not at all in favour of boards and controls and as he has a very powerful voice in the Cabinet. I

assume it is not likely that anything will be done by the Government with this report. Just another report, just another inquiry to put off the evil day and to gain time!

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Does the hon. member mean that the Attorney General has a very loud voice or a very powerful one in the Cabinet?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I want to make a few brief remarks about housing. Occasionally, when the Ministers are off their guard, they give the show away. When the Minister for Works was at Nungarin I suppose he felt he was tucked securely away amongst his own folk.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: He should not have taken a pressman with him.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I should say that the Minister was at Tammin. I do not want to misreport the Minister but the report was headed as coming from Nungarin. The Minister said that the time had come when the Government should cease building houses willynilly throughout the country. Certain people strongly favoured socialisation but it should be understood that the Government itself was becoming the greatest landlord in the State.

The Minister for Works: Is not that so?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: He said that it could soon become a colossal burden of expense for the upkeep of homes already built. It might be true that the Government is becoming the largest landlord in the State, but how could it be otherwise when one cannot obtain a permit to build houses to let to someone else?

The Minister for Works: One can now.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Oh, can one? How long has that been the policy? The Minister knows quite well that that is not so.

The Minister for Works: Yes. Go on!

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: So, if private individuals cannot become landlords—and even if they could I do not think they would at present building prices—what other alternative is there than that the Government should be the big landlord and, what is wrong with it? The Minister was allowing his conservative ideas to come uppermost. He dislikes the Government's providing houses for the people and we have heard that statement before. Some years ago, when Mr. Willcock was Premier, he introduced a Bill to enable the Government to build homes to let to tenants. That Bill passed this House but when it went to another place it was defeated and the arguments used by the members of the Liberal Party in that place were that they were not going to agree to the proposition because they would not permit the Government to become a landlord. "Hansard" will prove that statement.

Hon. A. H. Panton: The member for West Perth agrees with that.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Had the Bill been passed at the time, then the Willcock Government would have been some years ahead of the present scheme of building rental homes. We would have been so much better off. We had a Labour majority in this House and so got the Bill through, but we could not get it through the Legislative Council because a majority of the members there would not allow the Government to become a landlord. They did not like the idea of the Government's building homes for rental purposes. They wanted to adhere to the original proposal of building homes for sale only, and that is the idea the present Minister for Works has in mind. He does not like the idea that the Government must build homes to let to tenants. Whether he likes it or not, there is no alternative.

The Premier: No, he hopes that the tenant will become the owner.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: So do I.

Hon. A. H. Panton: He would not live long enough to become the owner.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Clearly, if this is to become a reality and not just something in the distant future for us to aim at but never attain, we have to do something about writing off the cost of the homes built under abnormal conditions. It is absolutely absurd to expect that, at the present price of commodities and the present wage rates, it is possible for any worker ever to own the home he is going into.

Many years ago when I first commenced studying accountancy, I was taught that any person who contemplated purchasing a house should not consider paying more than the equivalent of two years' salary for it. That is to say, if his income was £350 a year, he should not buy a house costing more than £700, and if his income was £500 a year, he could undertake a debt of £1,000. It should be equal to not more than two years' income. Take the position today. We have to contemplate people paying five years of income in order to buy a house, and that is utterly impossible. Consequently we shall have to give consideration to what shall be done if we really mean that we want people to own their homes and are not just giving lip service to an idea.

Very early in this session, I asked for the file to be tabled dealing with the bulk bins in the Yarramony eastwards area. I had a very good reason for so doing. I had read an interesting statement in "The West Australian" which decided me that when the opportunity occurred, I would ask for the papers. Anybody who follows politics will know that "The West Australian" put this Government into office. It was the wonderful publicity and building-up that the paper gave members of the Government parties in 1947 that put them into office, and I say quite definitely,

because I believe it, that "The West Australian" put this Government into office, and not only does "The West Australian" know this for a fact, but the Government also knows it. Therefore, when "The West Australian" criticises the Government, we can take it as being fairly certain that what the Government is doing is not too good. Consequently when I read a statement in "The West Australian" of the 29th April, 1949, I wondered. This is the statement—

New Wheat Bins. In the pioneering days of bulk handling in Western Australia there was a contest to determine whether the scheme should be controlled by co-operative enterprise or the State. To the benefit of wheat-growers and the State, the day was won by co-operative enterprise. Unfortunately, the principle then established has been endangered by the Government's decision to provide bins on the route that would have been taken by the Yarramony-eastward railway line had past Governments been so incautious as to proceed with construction. Mr. Watts, in his capacity as Minister for Industrial Development, has pointed out that Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. is authorised by statute to provide facilities only at railway sidings, but this difficulty could be easily overcome, if necessary, by an amendment of the Act. He has also argued that a precedent for what is intended exists in the Lakes district to the east of the wheatbelt railway system. The circumstances, however, are not analogous, as wheat transportation and marketing methods have undergone radical changes since bins were built in that remote area.

There is a moral, if not a legal, obligation on the company to provide an adequate service throughout the wheatbelt. True, the company will operate the bins, but it is much more competent than the Government to say where facilities should be provided. Mr. Watts's statement means, presumably, that if it is necessary to transport wheat from, say, Yorkrakine to Tammin instead of hauling it direct by road to port or mill, the Government will meet the cost. This seems to be asking too much of taxpayers. The inevitable effect would be to draw to the new bins wheat that should be delivered to installations on the Eastern Goldfields and Wyalkatchem lines, thereby duplicating haulage and upsetting the economics of bulk handling. For some years to come, no doubt, the Government's liability will be small, but its long-range policy envisages the eventual rehabilitation of the railways and the elimination of long-distance wheat haulage by road, creating circum-

stances in which the Government's liability must become much more formidable.

The member for Moore knows all about this subject. He was one that gave consideration to it before the Government went on with it. As a member of Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., he often tells us of the hardships the farmer suffers and the contributions he makes to the general community, instancing such things as the home consumption price of wheat. He is never tired of pointing out what benefits the general public receive from the farmer because of what he foregoes. I propose, in dealing with this matter, to show something on the other side of the ledger. This is something the general public will have to do for the farmer, whether they like it or not.

When this proposition was put up to the Government, to its credit, let me say, it turned it down. The file shows that the first Cabinet decision was against it. The Deputy Premier, being urged very strongly by one of his colleagues, submitted the matter to Cabinet again in very strong terms though not very sound argument, in my opinion, because he left out important features that would have weighed against the decision. He submitted it again and Cabinet reversed its decision.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: The Chief Secretary will be asking you who told you that.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Believe it or not, when this proposition was put up to Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., it recommended against adoption because it was not economically sound. Despite that, the Government went on with the proposal. I intend to analyse this and show just what is involved.

Mr. Ackland: Would you rather the Government honoured the promise of a previous Government to build that railway? That is why those people went into that district.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: This deals with the establishment of bulk bins. What better claim had those people than others who live in the northern parts of the Lakes district? They are many miles further away from a siding whereas the average distance of these people is only 15 miles.

Mr. Ackland: These people were promised a railway.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The average distance of the farms to be served is only 15 miles. But they got this special treatment because they had friends at court and other people in other parts of the State have to depend upon the subsidy system and pay for the first 10 miles themselves, and 4d. per mile for the balance and receive a subsidy of about 5½d. That is the system that should have operated here, quite clearly; and because it has not, it is going to cost the State about £3,000 a year every year. That is a contribution that the taxpayers are making to the farmers.

So far as I can see—and the files under this Government are never complete—there is nothing appearing to suggest that the question was ever submitted to the Transport Board for an opinion. It might have been or it might not have been. It does not say so here.

The two bins to which I refer to commence with are those at East and West Yorkrakine. The bin at East Yorkrakine has a capacity of 236,000 bushels and that at West Yorkrakine has a capacity of 152,000 bushels. During last season the former bin stored 176,000 bushels and the later 119,000 bushels; or, approximately 7,900 tons. No subsidy is required at present because this wheat is transported from bin to mill or to the port by road and the cost is paid by the Australian Wheat Board. But when the time arrives, if it does, when road transport of wheat ceases, and the wheat from these bins has to be transported to the nearest siding, this is what will operate: The Government will have to subsidise the transport of wheat from the bin to the siding and that will cost a considerable sum. According to this map which is on the file for all to see, the distance from East Yorkrakine to Bungulla is about 18 miles and from West Yorkrakine to Tammin 21½ miles. Assuming 6d. per mile as the cost of transport, the cost to the farmer would be 3d. and the subsidy required in the first instance would be 7s. 8½d. and in the second 9s. 1½d. per ton.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: What about the 10 mile provision?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I will deal with that. On this year's quantities—assuming the harvest does not increase in this area, and a good season would mean that it would increase—the cost would be about £1,800 for the first bin and £1,400 for the second, or a total of £3,200. In a good season that could easily reach £4,000, and that is the subsidy we will be up for as soon as road transport ceases and the railways are able to cart the wheat. But do members know how the Deputy Premier proposed to get over that? He put forward the idea to Cabinet that even though the time arrived when the railways were capable of carting the wheat, they should not be allowed to cart this particular wheat, but road transport should continue. That is on the file at page 134. Here is a letter to the manager of Co-operative Bulk Handling from the Deputy Premier, dated the 17th March, 1949:—

Dear Sir,

After consultation with the Minister for Agriculture (the Hon. G. B. Wood) and with his concurrence, I now write to inform you that after reviewing the question of the provision of wheat bulk handling facilities on the Yarramony-eastward railway route, the Government has accepted the principle that wheat handling

facilities should be provided on this route, but has decided that before a final decision is reached to implement this view your company should be approached for a review of the estimated cost to the Government contained in a communication to the Honourable Mr. Wood some little time ago.

It is considered unlikely, and I think you agree in this, that facilities at more than two points can be provided for the next season and it would be desirable for us actually to work on this basis, but as the figures in your communication are based on the maximum requirements at seven points, and as the matter of equipment of further points would doubtless proceed, it may be desirable to proceed with our estimates on the basis of the whole seven. We do not, of course, dispute the figures of the total capital cost given as £40,040. We anticipate that you yourself will have no reason to revise these. We do, however, desire an immediate review of the estimate of annual and operating costs.

It appears that depreciation has been worked out on a basis of 10 years. Experience has indicated that the life of bulk bins would probably be 40 years and the life of what is known as "pig sties" could, I understand, be reasonably calculated at 20 years. Consequently, we feel that a substantial reduction could be made in that item.

In regard to the operating costs, it appears that your calculations have been based on the assumption that the wheat would be placed in the roadside facilities, and thereafter removed to bins at the nearest railway and, therefore, that a complete set of double handling charges would have to be met. The production of the whole of this route is estimated at a little less than 1,000,000 bushels. It is felt that the carriage of it to railway bins and its subsequent removal either by railway or road to some other destination could easily be avoided by the direct transport by road to the Kellerberrin and/or Northam Flour Mills and direct transport to the port of Fremantle.

It is unlikely that the railways will be in a position to handle all wheat by rail for a number of years. I feel that it could be so arranged (and am prepared to obtain a decision on this) that a guarantee could be given that road transport would be available for this particular route not only while road transport is used elsewhere but also in respect of the quantity which it is necessary to transport to the

water front (there being, I should say, no difficulty in regard to the transport to flour mills by road) that road transport to be used even if the railways were in a position to handle.

What hope have we that the railways will eventually pay and do the work for which they are intended if Ministers of the Crown are prepared to make separate arrangements, in order to get schemes put into operation, that the railways will not cart stuff and road transport will continue to be used? That was the argument used in connection with this matter. There is no need for me to read the rest of the letter. That establishes the point I was making. If we take the Lakes district, the bins are from 40 to 80 miles from Newdegate, the nearest property to the rail being just under 40 miles. At Yorkrakine, the farthest property is just over 20 miles. There is the difference; a vast one. So we have farms in the north portion of the Lakes district that are 20 to 50 miles from the railway, and there are no bins. That is the important thing. But in the Yarramony-eastward railway, the average distance is 15 miles, and there are bins.

If we take these farms in the northern portion of the Lakes district and make a calculation, we find the reason they have not got bins is because it is less costly to subsidise the transport. The farmer pays for the first 10 miles at full rates, and after that he pays only $\frac{1}{4}$ d. per mile and gets a subsidy for the balance. If this scheme were operating east and west of Yorkrakine, there would be a considerable saving over what is involved in the present arrangement. Taking the average distance at 15 miles, and subtracting 10 miles which the farmer would have to cart at his own expense, we have five miles to be subsidised. That distance, at $\frac{1}{4}$ d., would cost the Government 2s. 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per ton which, on approximately 7,900 tons annually, would be £840, as against more than £3,000 that the establishment of these bins will involve. No wonder Co-operative Bulk Handling could not recommend the proposition, and said it was not economical!

In order to give members a little more information on this rather sticky subject, I propose to read a letter from the Honorary Minister for Agriculture to Mr. G. M. Cornell, M.L.A., which appears at page 104 of this file—

Replying to your letter of the 22nd inst. in reference to the installation of bulk wheat facilities in the Yarramony-eastward district, I regret to advise that Cabinet rejected the proposal.

Cabinet considered that Co-operative Bulk Handling should instal the facilities without Governmental assistance. I have discussed the matter

with Mr. Braine and he informs me that C.B.H. would not on any account do the work as they considered that the necessary installations already existed.

There may be a possibility of the Government agreeing to a carting subsidy instead of the rejected proposal.

Of course, the member for the district, Mr. Cornell, was not very heartened by that reply, and he did not sit down under it. At page 90 of the file there is a letter dated the 26th August, 1948, from Mr. Braine, of Co-operative Bulk Handling, to the Honorary Minister for Agriculture, Mr. G. B. Wood, M.L.C.—

In response to your request as to my Directors' opinion of what should be done in regard to East and West Yorkrakine, although there was no formal resolution at their last meeting, every Director individually thought that, from an economic point of view, a road carting subsidy would be preferable to an installation away from a railway line.

It is generally conceded that the organisation that has most to do with wheat handling in this State is Co-operative Bulk Handling. The member for Moore is never tired of quoting this company and singing its praises. If the installation of bulk bins were necessary here this company would most decidedly know but, when the proposition was put up, not a single director favoured it. Although the company did not pass any resolution, the directors intimated that they could not favour the proposition because they considered that a carting subsidy would be preferable. Of course it would. It would save the State hundreds of pounds annually and, over the years, thousands of pounds. Because the Government reversed its decision on this matter, the taxpayers have to make this contribution to the wheat farmers of the Yarramony-eastward railway. I hope the member for Moore will not overlook that, but will put it in the ledger as an offset against some of the advantages that the farmers are supposed to be bestowing from time to time on the consumers. I think this is the letter which the Deputy Premier put up to Cabinet and which caused it to reverse its decision. The letter is at p. 111 of the file—

Hon. Premier (In Cabinet):

Regarding the provision of wheat bulk handling bins on the proposed route of the Yarramony-eastward railway and consequent on what is stated as the rejection by Cabinet of the proposal, a deputation led by Mr. G. M. Cornell, M.L.A., waited recently upon the Minister for Agriculture and myself. I undertook in consequence to have the matter reconsidered.

The previous Government agreed to a similar proposal in the Lakes district.

I say that is definitely incorrect.

Mr. Ackland: Who did, if the previous Government did not?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The previous Government agreed to a proposal, but it was not similar. That is my quarrel with this. Have I not already quoted the distances? How can it be similar when there is no comparison between the distances and the cartage involved? In one case the closest farm is a little under 40 miles distant and in the other case the most remote farm is just a little over 20 miles distant. It was not a similar proposal that the previous Government agreed to, at all. The only similarity was that it was a proposal to establish bins for wheat. There the similarity ends and the merits of the two cases are entirely different. He said—

This Government agreed to a similar installation at Ravensthorpe. The Act does not permit Co-operative Bulk Handling to instal such facilities at other than railway sidings. There are no railway sidings on the route but a railway was authorised and settlement proceeded accordingly. To ask the settlers to carry almost 1,000,000 bushels of wheat to the sidings on the nearest railway line is a severe strain.

But the people in the North Lakes district are under a more severe strain, though that is not in Mr. Watts' letter. It continues—

The settlers have asked for these facilities over a period of years, I am informed. Materials and labour would only enable two points to be fitted up this year out of the seven desired. The settlers would be satisfied with this as a start to be proceeded with by stages each year.

So we are in for seven of these bins, involving the taxpayers in considerable unnecessary cost.

The capital cost is for seven bins approximately £40,000. This would be repaid by the Government over 20 years. For two bins it would be approximately £11,500. The company claims that depreciation would amount to £3,883 per annum. This seems ridiculous—

Apparently Mr. Watts does not think much of the calculations of Co-operative Bulk Handling.

This seems ridiculous even for 20 years life. Indications are that the bins will last 40 years, however. Based on 20 years depreciation should not exceed £2,000 on seven bins or £700 on two bins. Operating costs are claimed by the company because the

wheat would theoretically have to be handled twice—once by the farmer into the bins away from the railway and again by the company in and out of railway bins. These operating costs would as claimed by the company be approximately £4,600 for seven bins or £1,300 for two. The maximum costs for seven bins would therefore be—

(1) According to the company, £10,000 a year.

(2) According to my adjustment of depreciation £8,200 a year.

But for two bins—

(1) According to the company £2,856.

(2) According to my adjustment £2,340.

But I am of the opinion that in this case and for many years road haulage could and should take the wheat direct from the bins to Northam or Kellerberrin flour mills or direct to Fremantle thus avoiding the double handling and reducing the costs by £4,600 for seven bins and by £1,300 for two bins, thus reducing the totals respectively to £5,400 (or if my depreciation argument is correct to £3,600) and £1,040 for two bins. I therefore recommend and in this I have the support of the Minister for Agriculture, that we accept the proposal in principle for two bins this year and others later. But that before action is taken the company be approached about depreciation and avoidance of double handling charges. A copy of the letter to the company to be sent as quickly as possible to the manager, and also to the chairman (Mr. W. J. Russell) and a member (Mr. Ackland) who has taken some interest in the matter and is anxious to help.

So the member for Moore apparently had a finger in this pie. When this came before Cabinet, according to the minute at the bottom, Cabinet accepted the recommendation and reversed its previous decision and so we are to have in this district the establishment of seven bins, each of which will not be an economic proposition from the point of view of the State, but each of which will be put in because of the strength of the argument used by the Deputy Premier, that in order to avoid double handling we should continue to haul this wheat by road, whether the railways can handle it or not. I will take a lot of convincing that that is a sound proposition.

Mr. Marshall: Did the Premier put this before the Grants Commission when he presented his case?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: There are two matters, of local interest to my constituents, with which I will deal before concluding. I will touch on the question of

water supply and am sorry the Minister for Works is not at present in his seat. The pressure of water in the Fremantle district could scarcely be worse. For weeks and weeks I walked up and down various streets, watching people attempting to keep their lawns alive, and in many cases, by the aid of a watch, I calculated the quantity of water that was issuing, per hour, from the nozzles of the hoses. The results were such as to show how utterly impossible it was for these people to keep their gardens alive. And on top of that they had to put up with water restrictions.

Mr. Perkins: That applied in country areas, also.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That might be so. The hon. member can put up his own case, but I am the member for Melville and I am telling what is happening in my electorate. Houses are being built and are being connected to the water mains which already are not large enough to carry an adequate supply. The result is that there is available a mere trickle of water. Attention must be given to this question. It is simply too stupid to go on rating people for water consumption when they cannot get water out of their taps. In many cases when they turn on a tap at the front of the house they cannot use the bath-heater. If they neglect to tell the person who is watering the garden that they propose to have a bath, and light the bath-heater, the result is often that the bath-heater is burned out.

The Minister for Health: It is the same at Cottesloe.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: What is the Minister doing about it?

The Minister for Health: I do not know—

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Minister should know.

Mr. Marshall: The Minister for Health could play the devil when she was on this side of the House, but since going to that side has been able to do nothing.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: This trouble apparently is more widespread than I was led to believe. I was dealing with the situation in the Melville electorate, but now I hear that the position is the same everywhere. Apparently it is the same in the country. The Minister for Works had better bestir himself and give immediate attention to this problem, because we cannot go on building hundreds of houses and connecting them to an already inadequate water supply and still expect the people to be satisfied. It is a fine state of affairs when we cannot give our people an adequate water supply. We have been able to solve the problem of giving people an adequate supply of beer. There seems to be no shortage of that commodity now. Let the Government emulate that example and treat as a matter of urgency the supplying of adequate quantities of water.

The final matter upon which I wish to touch is one that I think will have the support of other members in this House. It is that the Government should give some financial assistance to local authorities for the establishment of municipal libraries.

Mr. Perkins: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: In the Fremantle district the Fremantle Municipal Council has made a substantial contribution and has established a library. Other local authorities have joined in and are paying cash, too. But, when a request was made to the Government by the local authorities, under date the 25th November, 1949, an unfavourable reply was received. I hope the Government will have another look at this because it is a worthwhile proposal and would not cost a lot of money.

Information could be obtained from Fremantle as to the number of people who use the library which is already in existence, and I have no doubt that that information would convince anybody that the establishment of a library is well worth while. Local authorities should be enabled to expand that excellent work and if the Government can throw money away in establishing wheat bins where they are not necessary, surely it could find a few thousand pounds to help the municipal authorities to set up these libraries.

I apologise for having taken up so much time on these matters but I have been sitting quiet on them for a considerable period. The Government closed down early last year, earlier than usual, and we have had a much longer time away from Parliament without any opportunity to ventilate our grievances; hence the accumulation of these matters. I feel that I have submitted to the House a number of things which call for replies and explanations—not excuses. If those replies and explanations are not forthcoming, then the Government will hear more about these matters.

MR. READ (Victoria Park) [9.33]: I desire to add my few words on several items contained in the Speech of His Excellency the Governor. Firstly, I would, with other members, congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on having been re-appointed to the high and honourable position you now occupy. All members have done this when it has been their turn to speak but none the less we are all sincere, and pleased that you again occupy the Speaker's chair. You have had three years of previous experience and have had to withstand the verbal barrage that has been hurled your way on occasions and possibly you will have to put up with something similar when Bills are before this House. Possibly the member for Fremantle will put forward his amendments, further amendments and disagreements with your rulings, which you will be able to take in your stride.

I now wish to comment on some of the actions of members on this side of the House during the recent elections. The member for Melville, in his remarks on the Address-in-reply in 1947, took exception to some of the advertisements of the Liberal Party. I intend to emulate his example and place before the House what I consider was the most unfair treatment meted out to me. When the ex-member for Middle Swan taxed members on this side of the House with having communistic ideas I did not believe him, nor do I do so now. But, my opponents in the recent election, assisted by members on this side of the House, were very pleased to use the Communist Party to further their interests against mine.

The first of the Labour circulars put out against my colleague, the member for Maylands, and myself, was to the effect—I believe it was Mr. Chamberlain who inspired it—that the electors should not vote for either of us because, although we might be friendly and good sorts of chaps, we were absolutely of no use to the electors. It was said that we had no power and that we sat in the back benches and, in fact, if the people voted for either of us our electorate would be disfranchised.

Mr. Bovell: According to the result, the electors did not believe that!

Mr. READ: Quite so, but we have our opinions and we think we have as much power in our vote, in the democratic setup of our particular form of Government, as any other member sitting in the back benches. Within two weeks the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Gascoyne, advertised that as Ray Read had voted on one occasion for three members on the price fixing commission, and then twisted and voted for one on the next occasion, it was detrimental to the interests of the electors of Victoria Park. He inferred further that the prices of commodities to my electors had gone up because of that fact. Then, the agents of the member for Murchison went a little further. He inspired a letter to tramway-men which was most damaging to me at election time. One week we were innocuous and had no power at all, and in the next two weeks we proposed selling the tramways and the buses and we had been the means of raising the cost of living. Members on this side of the House cannot have it both ways and therefore I think we are a little bit in between.

Hon. A. H. Panton: You got off lightly.

Mr. Marshall: Not one of those assertions is untrue.

Mr. READ: I am making this speech.

Mr. Marshall: Not one untruthful remark in any of them!

Mr. READ: I will develop my own argument and explain the hon. member's particular activities in my electorate in my own way.

The Minister for Lands: Give it to him!

Mr. READ: Of course, there is a fierce way of doing it.

The Premier: His bark is worse than his bite.

Mr. Marshall: There was no lying misrepresentation in anything I said in that letter, such as there was in some of the advertisements of the Liberal Party.

The Minister for Lands: You have to take it.

Mr. READ: The result of those two advertisements was that communists became very busy. I know them all. First of all the communistic ladies took the advertisement of the Leader of the Opposition and canvassed from house to house and told the housewives, "This is what happened. The member for Victoria Park, Ray Read, who voted for one member instead of three commissioners on the price fixing commission, has let you down. If he had voted for three commissioners you would not be paying the prices you do for food." This is what was happening and going on in my electorate. I know that is correct because those things were told to some of my own people.

That advertisement was also taken into the butchers' shops during peak periods. I know this to be true because I went into one shop at about 4 o'clock, when it was crowded. There was a lady with that advertisement and she accosted a customer who had just purchased a leg of pork. She said, "How much did that cost?" and the lady replied, "It cost 10s. 9d." The other lady said, "Isn't that a shame? Here is this advertisement: 'If our member, Ray Read, had voted for three price-fixing commissioners, we housewives would not have paid that price for pork.'" That is the sort of talk that is circulated in my district.

Mr. Fox: What does the hon. member expect from the Minister for Prices?

Mr. READ: Nothing! I will tell the hon. member about that.

Mr. Marshall: But you will vote to keep him there; you will not vote to put him out.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. READ: With prices going up and up what can the Minister do?

Mr. Fox: Prices go up before wages.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. READ: I am surprised at the member for Gascoyne publishing that because my opinion of him is that he is a man of great ability, education and experience. I honestly think that he is fitted to fill any exalted official position not only in Western Australia but in the whole of the Commonwealth. When I saw that advertisement I was not so much annoyed as I was

disappointed because I fear that the hon. member lacks that niceness of mind and sense of fair play which should be the adjuncts to his other attributes. I know that these people were communists because they are in my midst. Once becoming engaged in these activities in my electorate they proved to be very thorough and they wrote a letter to me. The letter is dated the 8th March, 1950, and gives the box number at the G.P.O., Perth, and it says—

Mr. Ray Read,
Albany Highway,
Victoria Park.

Dear Sir,

Members of the New Housewives Association, (Victoria Park Branch) would like you to meet a deputation to discuss the effective control of the cost of living, also the unsatisfactory position of housing, education and other matters which affect the working people with such unhappy results.

They are very thorough. They did not wait for me to accept or refuse that deputation but finished up by saying:—

I will ring you up tomorrow evening in order to save you the trouble of writing.

Hoping for a favourable reply,

Yours faithfully,

When they did ring me up I told them that as I was fighting an election and might not win the seat—and there was a chance of that—it was best to postpone the deputation until after the election.

The Minister for Lands: Who signed the letter?

Mr. READ: It is signed all right. Referring again to the member for Gascoyne, who was holding forth as to the workers. I find this statement in the "Worker" of July 28th—

Mr. Wise, addressing members of the State Executive of the A.L.P. on Monday night, said that Labour did not expect or wanted the support of the three Independent members of the Assembly.

Mr. W. Hegney: Since reduced to two.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: One left.

Mr. READ: What the hon. member should have said was that Labour did not expect or deserve the respect of the Independents.

Mr. Fox: Tut, tut!

Mr. READ: For the benefit of the new members in this Chamber I will explain what exactly took place when the Bill relating to price control was before the House.

Mr. W. Hegney: They read all about it in "Hansard."

Mr. READ: Possibly they did, but I will refresh their memories. The first price control legislation was introduced by Mr. Hawke in 1939, when one prices commissioner only was envisaged. When war broke out, Commonwealth legislation, which superseded that Bill after it had become an Act, also provided for only one prices commissioner. It will be remembered that when the people voted against the Commonwealth control of prices the Commonwealth price fixing administration and its regulations were used as a pattern for State legislation and control. In 1948, when the Bill to take over the Commonwealth powers was in committee, the member for Fremantle proposed an amendment for three prices commissioners and one member on this side of the House suggested that a consumers' representative from the Housewives' Association should be appointed. The member for Leederville and myself supported the three commissioners because it was considered they would not do any harm.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Did the hon. member say, "the member for Leederville"?

Mr. READ: No, not the member for Leederville.

Hon. A. H. Panton: That is what the hon. member said.

Mr. READ: No, I meant the member for Maylands.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Your apology is accepted.

Mr. READ: In committee the member for Fremantle supported the proposal for the appointment of three commissioners. The Bill then went to the Upper House and it would not agree to the amendment for the appointment of three commissioners and as the Government was adamant for the appointment of only one man, we voted for one commissioner instead of three. The time factor was everything when the Bill was before the House. The Commonwealth legislation was to expire within a week or so and there would have been no time to bring down another Bill, and thus if the legislation were not passed the country would have been in chaos. We therefore supported the proposal for the appointment of one commissioner. I have tried to explain that, no matter how many price-fixing commissioners we might have, they cannot keep down the price of an article.

Mr. J. Hegney: Not unless the Minister takes the necessary action.

Mr. READ: How can the Minister take action? Prices are a matter of wages, overhead and profit. We cannot control wages, but we can control profit, and profit to a large extent is controlled by taxation. I believe that in England, control is exercised to the extent of imposing income tax of 19s. 6d. in the pound on

large incomes. The member for Hannans, in his speech, stated that wages could be stabilised only if price regulations were enforced. I do not agree with him. Prices can only be fixed if wages are stabilised.

The way I view it is that wages constitute practically the whole of the cost of any article we purchase. Let me give an illustration. Fracteur is required to blow down iron-ore at Yampi. Fracteur is a chemical compound, which may be gelignite or some other explosive, and it is produced at the cost of wages. Wages have to be paid to men who use the fracteur to blow down the ore; the wharf lumper has to get his wages for handling the ore; when it is put on the railway, the railway employees get their wages, and when the ore is put into the factory or foundry to make bars of iron, wages again have to be paid. If wages increase, the whole increase is immediately passed on to the consumer.

The Government engineers or the City Council engineers can tell us what is a fact that the cost of a chain of road, 15 feet wide, is now £75, whereas previously it was £45, and 33½ per cent. of that outlay represents wages. But that is only the 33½ per cent. that is being paid departmentally. The material used on construction of the road had to be produced at the cost of wages, and there were the wages of the carters who transported the material to the job and of the employees of the suppliers of bitumen. If members analyse the matter, they will find that the major portion of the cost of anything we buy is the price of the wages necessary to produce it.

When Mr. Chifley and his Government unpegged wages, the workers through the proper channels, demanded and received higher wages, which advanced the price of all commodities and increased the cost of living. Then the upward spiral of the basic wage continued. Rightly or wrongly Mr. Chifley unpegged wages because of the pressure brought to bear upon him, but I think I have said sufficient to show that, regardless of how many price-fixing commissioners we might have, they cannot reduce the price of an article.

Mr. J. Hegney: Do not you believe in price fixing?

Mr. READ: Yes, but how can it be made effective? We are almost helpless. I have noticed that in Melbourne officers dealing with the formula showed that overhead and profit are fixed, but that it was impossible for them to fix the wages.

Mr. Graham: What do you say of a radio set that is sold for £30 and cost only £10 to produce? Would you say that that is wages?

Mr. READ: Perhaps that would be due to the rent. I say in all sincerity that what is most important and what is often

overlooked is that, whatever the cost might be, the standard of living has not been reduced. The standard of living for our people, including even the poor, is equal to what it was in the days before price fixing. If 1 lb. of beans cost 1s., when wages were £5 and 1 lb. of beans now costs 2s. when wages are £10, what is the difference?

This is borne out by the report in the newspapers that the savings bank deposits have increased, but they have increased only in proportion as the basic wage has risen. Taking into consideration the cost of living, deposits now are proportionately about equal to the time when deposits were smaller. Let members consider the amount of money passing through the totalisator and the money spent on beer and cigarettes. These amounts are up in proportion to the increased wages payable at the present time.

Regarding oversea prices for our products, while prices are high, we have a huge revenue and great spending power resulting from the great demand for our primary products, but if other nations produce at a lower price because of their lower wages and standard of living, this will give our leaders cause for some thought and action. All nations buy on the cheapest market. The Commonwealth Government bought potassium at Lake Chandler, but now it is obtainable at a more favourable price and so that show is closed down. When Wiluna was operating arsenic and other substances were produced, but when we could buy more cheaply oversea, we closed down that show.

Regarding the member for Murchison, I suggest that communistic support was definitely encouraged by him in favour of my opponent. Twelve or fifteen years ago two houses were purchased in Rushton-road, Victoria Park, for the purpose of demolition. The membership of the bowling club alongside had increased 100 per cent., and the land was required to provide further rinks. War broke out, control was imposed on building and demolition, the housing position became acute, and those houses were not pulled down. The member for Murchison asked the then Minister a question on this matter, and I say that that question was inspired by communists. I have a copy of a type-written notice directed "To whom it may concern" calling attention to the matter. It read—

Home demolition. He was not aware that the Perth City Council was endeavouring to induce a tenant of one of its properties in Rushton-road, Victoria Park, to vacate the premises so that they could be demolished to provide a bowling green, the Minister for Housing (Mr. McDonald) told Mr. Marshall (Lab., Murchison) in the Legislative Assembly last night. He

would endeavour to take whatever action was possible, he said, to prevent the council from demolishing the house while there was an acute shortage of homes.

There is a broad arrow in red directing attention to this notice and it says in green, "This is Ray Read's work," and in red it says, "Read This."

The Minister for Lands: It looks like a skull and crossbones from here.

Mr. READ: I was fortunate, or unfortunate, enough to know the individual who pasted this in a telephone box near my place of business, and I ripped it down while the paste was wet.

Hon. A. H. Panton: How would you like your notices to be ripped down?

Mr. READ: A similar notice was pasted in every telephone box in Victoria Park, and in other places. The member for Murchison had previously written a confidential letter to the secretary of the Tramways Union at the Trades Hall. The secretary replied to it, and both letters were sent to my opponent. Copies were given secretly to the tramwaymen and bus-drivers who had a vote in my electorate. The letter to the secretary of the Tramway Union reads as follows:—

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the member for Victoria Park, Mr. Ray Read, spoke in very strong terms against a resolution moved by me censuring the Minister for his action in stopping the No. 7 tram service, and to a degree eulogised privately-owned omnibus services.

As there are a large number of tramway employees resident in the Victoria Park electorate, I think they should be made aware of their member's attitude towards State-owned transport, and that a lively enthusiasm should be displayed between now and the next general election with the object in view of replacing this gentleman with a solid Labour supporter, which if there is any enthusiasm induced into the election, should be an easy task.

Well, it was not!

Mr. Graham: There was no enthusiasm.

Mr. Marshall: It was so close you will not re-contest it.

Mr. READ: I will guarantee the hon. member would not. He represents an electorate with about 4,000 electors. Years ago there were possibly fewer. Everybody knew the hon. member, but now he is known by name only and by what is seen in the newspapers, and not by what he is doing for the small man up there. This letter continues—

This is not the first time by any means that the member for Victoria Park has cast his vote against the interests of the worker, and I am now busily engaged from time to time in

making up a record of his voting in the House for the purpose of supplying the Labour candidate with the information so that he may use it at the next election.

What a nice man!

As this Ministry has added approximately 50 per cent. of an increase on private-owned transport systems in the metropolitan area, it will be readily seen that the time is not far distant when the whole of the State-owned transport system will be bled completely white so far as patronage is concerned and thus offer anti-Labour Governments good grounds for a change-over completely from State-owned to privately-owned transport.

I think every member of the tramways system at Victoria Park should get busy immediately with a view of discharging this individual who, so far as their personal interests are concerned, is a distinct foreigner.

Wishing yourself and members of the organisation health and success.

So do I!

Mr. W. Hegney: You won the election. What are you belly-aching for?

Mr. READ: I am not.

Mr. Graham: He is fighting it all over again.

Mr. READ: Then the member for Murchison had his reply, as follows:—

I would like to thank you for your letter dated 11th instant, and I quite agree with you that the present Ministry is bleeding the Government transport services white.

Mr. Marshall: There is no doubt about that!

Mr. READ: There is more, but I will not read it all. Here is another point—

I am having a copy of your letter posted in our union case.

The letter is signed, "Yours fraternally, J. C. Pereira." A copy of the letter was sent to each tramwayman. It was not posted but given to them. This letter says—

Copies of the enclosed letters were placed in my hands to use as I thought fit. They are apparently of great importance to you personally so, with the consent of the parties concerned, I am taking this opportunity of forwarding you a copy of each.

That is signed by Hugh D. Andrew, and it was sent by my opponent to each tramwayman.

Mr. J. Hegney: Did they send you a copy?

Mr. READ: Oh, dear, No! However, as one member has said, I won the election, so there is no use saying too much about the matter. But I resent the statement that

I am a distinct foreigner and opposed to the interests of the people of Victoria Park. I strongly resent that because, for 35 years, I have endeavoured to serve them. In season and out of season I have endeavoured to give service to the small man—to the working man, the roadmaker, the street-sweeper, men who perform most important but humble jobs in the community. It has been my pleasure to serve them always, so that I strongly resent that imputation.

Mr. Graham: Will you link your remarks concerning the Labour Party and the communists?

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The communists helped him to get in at the by-election after Mr. Raphael died.

Mr. READ: I would say to the member for Murchison that by his activities in the election, and as an ex-Minister of the Crown, he lowered the prestige of the party he served.

The Attorney General: Some of his statements were perfectly incorrect. That is apparent.

Mr. Marshall: What I put in that letter were actual facts. Your statements were propaganda.

The Premier: They did not take much notice of you.

Mr. READ: I am one of the few members here who represent the people. I did not address one meeting, nor did I have any canvassers, paid or otherwise.

Mr. Oliver: Yes, you did.

Mr. READ: Yes, I had one; but I had no organiser, and I did not engage one motorcar. Although I lost 2,000 electors in the reshuffle of the boundaries, I gained 2,000 of Charlie Cross's old crowd. I would like to place before the Premier and his Ministers the matter of the loss of revenue to the City Council and other municipalities because of the non-payment of rates on properties owned or occupied by Governments and governmental undertakings. That loss is increasing from year to year. Something has to be done.

Mr. J. Hegney: It applies at Midland Junction, too.

Mr. READ: Yes, it applies to every municipality. In this respect the Municipal Corporations Act is very wide. It exempts from rating—

(1) Land the property of the Crown and used for public purposes, or unoccupied.

(2) Land belonging to any religious body, or used or held exclusively as or for a place of public worship, etc.

(3) Land used exclusively as a public hospital, benevolent asylum, orphanage, public school, private school (being the property of a religious body), public library, museum, art gallery, or institute.

(4) Land used, occupied or held exclusively for charitable purposes.

(5) Land vested in any board under the Public Parks and Reserves Act, 1895, or in trustees for agricultural or horticultural show purposes, zoological gardens, etc.

(6) Land used or held as a cemetery.

(7) Land declared by the Governor, or by any Act passed before or after the commencement of this Act to be exempt from municipal rates.

Hon. E. Nulsen: That applies to road boards as well.

Mr. READ: Yes, but more particularly to the central city administration, because the administration in any capital city is not only for the people of that city but the whole State. The figures of actual loss of revenue to the Perth City Council over the last few years are £45,000 per annum. Such undertakings as the A.B.C. and the Taxation Department are Commonwealth, of course, but they are State-wide activities and the people of Perth should not have to pay for those amenities. The Perth City Council provides foot-paths, roads, drains and street lighting which are used by the Crown, and very largely by revenue producing departments. There is no good reason why some taxation should not be paid. In the last 12 months I have received a list of what has been going on year by year. It shows the following losses:—

	£
Airways House, St. George's Terrace (Govt. Depts.)	307 5 4
Hay - street (Govt. Tourist Bureau)	53 14 3
Hay-street	31 19 10
Pier-street (Commonwealth Postal)	39 15 0
Hay-street (Post Office)	60 11 3
Adelaide-ter (Tramways Extension)	106 4 1
Adelaide-ter (Tramways Extension)	56 0 11
Hay-street (Tramways Extension)	62 17 4
	<hr/> 718 8 0

The Lord Mayor of Melbourne convened a conference which was attended by most of the Lord Mayors. We sent our Lord Mayor for a joy ride. Question No. 1 at that conference dealt with payments of rates or the equivalent thereof on properties owned or occupied by the Commonwealth or State Governments. The resolution passed by those men representing the greatest number of units in Australia—the capital cities—was—

That, in view of the serious financial loss to municipalities because of the non-payment of rates in respect of properties owned or occupied by the Commonwealth and State Governments, the Commonwealth and State Governments be approached and requested to pay municipal rates, or the equivalent thereof, on all properties owned or occupied by such Governments, including all rented properties, and those occupied or owned by Government and semi-Government instrumentalities, such as Australian National Airlines Commission, trading as T.A.A., etc.

So it was proposed that the Premier of each State should be approached by the municipalities, and that the matter should be brought up at the Premiers' Conference.

I now wish to touch on the subject of superannuation and fixed pensions, that are really not sufficient for a person's sustenance, payable to people in these times. People could exist on their pensions in the days when wages were low, but now they are in distress and relying on semi-charity. I know quite a few couples who were paying £1 a week rent. I know three different couples paying £2 5s. a week—that is about £1 2s. 6d. each—for a flat in the East Perth ward. Those people are barely existing and would have a particularly hard time but for the charity of kind neighbours surrounding them. When a nearby housewife goes for her meat she buys an extra chop or two for these people, and she shares her tea and sugar with them. That should not be so in a country like this. Although this is not a State matter, something should be done to relieve the distress of these people. I have many letters from them asking what can be done, but as an ordinary member of a State Parliament I can do nothing. On the 6th August I received a letter—one of many—which I will read.

Now that Parliament is sitting, I beg to remind you of a letter I wrote to you before. In regard to the (1st) bringing the superannuation more to the ratio of the basic wage as existing when the superannuation was brought into being. Things were not so expensive, nor was it expected that prices would be so abnormal as at present. (2nd) Also in some Eastern States, persons on superannuation are allowed a reduced tram and train fare and one free pass per year on train.

The member for Northam when speaking at a public meeting—it was broadcast—in the Town Hall on the cost of living mentioned again, still keeping up the vendetta, that the two Independents had voted for only one representative on the Prices Commission. It is not necessary for him

to say that sort of thing now that the election is over. I feel that the children in my electorate will point at me and say, "That is the one-commissioner man." If the hon. member is to continue with such activities I suggest that a cheaper way to advertise that two of us voted for only one commissioner would be to put a slide on the pictures. It could show a long, lean, fierce man overlooking two little cringing Independents in the corner.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: "Cringing" is right.

Mr. READ: I sent several people to his meeting. They were people either on superannuation or pensions, in distressed circumstances. I believe some of them spoke at the meeting. I feel that with the backing of his strong Party, he could bring pressure to bear in the right quarters with a view to having the conditions of these people improved.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The member for Victoria Park is partly responsible for their present difficulties.

Mr. READ: Press reports suggest that Heirisson Island is to be transferred to the National Fitness Council, and I think that is wrong.

Mr. Totterdell: We do not want it.

Mr. READ: The Press stated that the Minister proposed to transfer the island to the Fitness Council and in the annual report of that body there is a photograph showing Heirisson Island. The report says—

For some years the Council has been desirous of more fully extending its work in the sporting spheres, as it was felt that organised youth groups were now ready for this partially neglected section of their activities. To implement this it is necessary that the council control and develop its own sporting areas in association with amateur sporting organisations and local governing authorities. In 1947, in association with the town planner, members recommended that when reclamation work was finished at the Causeway, Heirisson Island would be an ideal centre for this purpose.

Throughout that report reference is made to the grounds that are used by members of the National Fitness Council and in almost every instance it is shown that local governing bodies, all over the State, are the people who should cater for the youths belonging to the fitness movement. The National Fitness Council is doing good work, but its revenue is only about £4,000 per year. It has not the finance to undertake a task of the magnitude of preparing and equipping this island for such a purpose. The cost of putting the island into a condition in which it could be utilised for sport would be enormous.

Hundreds of thousands of pounds have already been spent on parks and playing areas that are used by people from all over the State during Country Week for sport of various kinds. Upkeep on those grounds comes to about £42,000 per annum. Heirisson Island should be held in reserve by the Government until the Causeway is almost completed. A decision could then be made as to what is to be done with it.

I strongly recommend to the Minister for Works that the construction of the Causeway should be proceeded with at all possible speed. It is four years or more since the work was begun and it looks at present as though another four years will be required to complete it unless the work is speeded up. I know there have been shortages of cement, iron girders and so on, but there is still a tremendous amount of work to be done on the approaches to the Causeway and a great deal of filling to be done in the river. One stream has to be filled in and a causeway built over it, and that will mean moving many thousands of tons of soil from the river bed. The Governor Stirling dredge was taken to Bunbury harbour, but it should never have been shifted. Unless that dredge is brought back and is put to work immediately, together with a grab dredge, it will be years before this work is completed.

The Minister for Works: You cannot fill in one section without deepening the other to allow for flood waters, and that cannot be done until the new section is ready.

Mr. READ: The Minister is thinking of only one little stream.

The Minister for Works: Three little streams.

Mr. READ: Work should be commenced on the north side of the river also. I know that thousands of pounds must be spent each year on the deepening of Bunbury harbour, owing to the silting there, but whether that harbour should have been established at Bunbury is another question. The work on the Causeway should be pressed forward continuously.

The Minister for Works: Ask the member for Bunbury.

Mr. May: He was not the member for Bunbury when the dredge went down there.

Mr. READ: There are a few other matters contained in His Excellency's speech. One paragraph states—

Last summer was one of the worst fire seasons on record and considerable damage was done. The Government has afforded aid to sufferers and Commonwealth assistance is anticipated.

Apparently the damage done to those farms, and farmlets, will be repaired by recouping the farmers who have suffered. But, there is another aspect and that is the hundreds and thousands pounds worth of damage done to the property of the Main Roads Department in bridges and culverts. If the Main Roads Department had spent a few pounds per annum in wages I do not think we would have lost one of those bridges or culverts. The scrub and undergrowth have grown right up to the timberwork and sometimes right under the culverts themselves.

It was this undergrowth that caused the fire to spread to the timber of the bridges and was responsible for the considerable damage. It would take only a few weeks each year to clear out that scrub and remove the menace to bridges and culverts. Not long ago I travelled along the area from Manjimup to Albany, just before the fire. I tried to return after the fire and have a close look at the damage done. That need not have occurred if the scrub had been cleared away. The large timber is all cleared but the real menace is the scrub and undergrowth. Even the deep river bridges at Nornalup and Shannon River suffered considerable damage. This could probably have been prevented if the officers of the Main Roads Department had used a little foresight.

I am fairly conversant with the setup of the State Housing Commission and although I do not intend to speak at great length there are one or two comments I wish to make. There is one aspect and that is the question of applicants who have applied either to build a house or to occupy a Commonwealth-State rental home. In my opinion inspectors are not required outside the metropolitan area because inspectors of the local governing bodies can give reports on applicants from their particular areas. In the city area we have 14 health inspectors whose duty it is to inspect these houses and I am sure that their inspections would obviate the necessity for Housing Commission inspectors. I do not say that that would be so in all cases but in nearly every case.

I know of one instance where a man bought a farm in the Premier's electorate at Pinjarra. The house on this farm had been condemned by the local authority's health inspector. The man who purchased the property applied for a permit to build a house because he wanted to get on with the job and sow a crop this year. He was held up for two months and when I inquired about the application I was told, "We have not sent an inspector down there as yet." That is a fine state of affairs.

The house was condemned by the local governing authority and on this man's file, in the Housing Commission, is the notice from that particular local governing body to the effect that the house "is not fit for human habitation and is condemned." Is not that sufficient without

waiting for two months to send down an inspector? Surely officers of the State Housing Commission can take the word of a health inspector of a local authority. If difficulties such as that could be overcome it would considerably reduce the overhead costs in that particular department. There are several matters I would like to discuss but will do so when the Estimates come forward.

On motion by Mr. May, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 17th August, 1950.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Pastoral Leases, as to watering places and tenure	297
Basic Wage, as to amounts allowed in computation	297
Public Service, as to purchase subsidy to officers	298
Native Affairs, as to opposed applications for citizenship rights	298
Korean War, as to re-instatement and pay of civil servant volunteers	298
Railways, (a) as to employees consulting members	298
(b) as to reports on "PM" boilers	298
Health, (a) as to chest clinic examinations	299
(b) as to Health Council's recommendations	299
(c) as to Minister's attendance at conference	299
Bush Fires, as to Commonwealth aid and basis of assistance	299
Pig Compensation Fund, as to credit, etc., and cancellation of levy	300
Onions, imported, as to cost, freight and profits	300
Housing, (a) as to Mr. L. F. Barry's experience	300
(b) as to McNess funds and homes built	300
(c) as to homes built and cost	300
Premier's Conference, as to Federal Aid Roads Agreement	301
Local Authorities, as to plant pools	301
Address-in-reply, ninth day	301

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

QUESTIONS.

PASTORAL LEASES.

As to Watering Places and Tenure.

Hon. A. A. M. COVERLEY asked the Premier:

In view of his statement in the "Sunday Times" of the 6th August, 1950, to the effect that between 300 and 400 new watering places are to be provided in the Kimberleys on private properties, will he advise—

(1) How many of these watering places are to be provided on the properties of resident owners or small companies, as distinct from large land holders such as Vestey's and Bovril Estates?

(2) Does he consider it necessary to subsidise large companies, especially foreign companies, to provide watering points on leases which have been held for very lengthy periods and upon which meagre improvements, including waters, have been provided?

(3) Is he of the opinion that large companies which have not considered the welfare of the land they use should continue to hold millions of acres, under different company names, and not be responsible for the carrying out of vital improvements from their own resources?

(4) Does he consider that land held in millions of acres to the exclusion of small holders should continue to be held by large companies until the present leases expire in 1984?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) The long range objective is to ensure that one watering point is established for approximately every 28,000 acres of grazing land in the Kimberleys.

(2) The Government regards the provision of additional water points as the first step towards controlling the increasing land erosion in the Kimberleys, and as therefore essential in preserving the land.

(3) The Government policy is to induce all lessees to improve their properties and assistance in provision of water points is a practical means of carrying out this policy.

(4) The provisions of the Land Act define the conditions under which the present lessees hold the land until 1984.

BASIC WAGE.

As to Amounts Allowed in Computation.

Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Attorney General:

What are the respective amounts allowed by the Court of Arbitration in regard to the following items for the purpose of computing the basic wage under the provisions of the Industrial Arbitration Act—

- (a) food;
- (b) rent;
- (c) clothing;
- (d) miscellaneous?