

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Isolation is one of the chief factors from which Western Australia suffers. I think that the East, by some means, has to be brought closer to the West. It is expensive for a person to travel East to West, or vice versa, by train, aircraft or ship, and I am going to suggest—in the same well-meant terms as used by Mr. Wise in regard to the committee he envisages—that inquiries on a top-level basis be made in order to see whether Western Australia, South Australia and the Commonwealth can combine and provide a sealed road East to West, thereby bringing more people to this State from the East. I believe that if it were easier to get to Western Australia more people would come here.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What is wrong with a toll road?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Suggestions have been made from time to time about toll roads. I believe that in America they are not paying and are not as successful as was hoped. However, so far as Western Australia is concerned, we have, at times, literally poured millions into the drain in State enterprises, and I think it is time some of the money went into a proposition of this nature. From a defence point of view, with the modern methods we now have of waging war, it would not mean much, but it would mean a great deal to Western Australia if this State were more closely connected to the rest of the continent by an all-weather road.

Mr. President, I leave the matter at that for the time being but, before I sit down, I would like once again to ask the Government to take stock of the situation so far as the economic standing of Western Australia is concerned at the present time, because, if the Government pursues its policy of doing as much public work as it can, rather than let it out to private enterprise, employment in Western Australia will suffer as a result.

I am quite sure it must be the concern of us all—no matter which side of politics we happen to be on—that Western Australia should have a growing rate of unemployment; and we must not allow it to get any worse. I would say to the Government that it should give private enterprise more of a go, because this State of ours was not built on the basis of socialised industry but on the pioneering spirit of free enterprise which was prepared to risk its capital for a return.

On motion by the Hon. C. R. Abbey, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.12 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 12th August, 1958.

CONTENTS

	Page
Motions :	
Condolence—	
The late Hon. A. J. Rodoreda, M.L.A.	28
The late Mr. J. H. Ackland, M.L.A.	28
Federal Senate Vacancy :	
Message	29
As to Joint Sitting	30
Vacancy filled	30
Questions on Notice :	
Overseas trade mission—	
Cost of incentives offered	30
Reaction of Unfair Trading Act	37
Agricultural scientists, shortage and contemplated action	30
State land tax, receipts	31
Crown land—	
Project areas	31
Number of applications received, approved, etc.	31
War service land settlement, number and categories of outstanding applications	31
Education—	
Government policy on pan system of sanitation	31
Proposed new school quarters, Jarrahwood	32
Busselton hospital, commencement of additions	33
Railways, duplication of Bunbury-Picton Junction line	33
Preston River, inspection of levees	33
Port Hedland jetty, adequacy of extensions	33
Traffic—	
Collection of fees	33
Fees allocation	33
Loan revenue, financing deficit	34
Albany regional hospital, system of construction, etc.	35
State Shipping Service, "Koolama's" list to starboard	35
Government and semi-Government instrumentalities, printing requirements	35
Pensions, effect of amendments to superannuation laws	35
Unemployment relief, administration and basis of payments	35
Narrows bridge, technical problems, etc.	37
Kwinana, erection of factories by Government	37
Licensing Act, amending legislation	37
Questions without Notice :	
Metropolitan Transport Trust—	
Bus take-over and telegram from Federal Treasurer	38
Commencement of bus take-over	38
Amount of compensation for bus take-over	38
Perth Modern School, change of name	39
Iron ore, availability of original market	39
Coal, export to Japan	39

CONTENTS—continued.

	Page
Deputy Chairmen of Committees, appointment	39
Sitting days and hours	40
Government business, precedence	40
Committees for the session	40
Bill :	
Supply (No. 1), £21,000,000, Message, Standing Orders suspension, all stages	40

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

CONDOLENCE.

The Late Hon. A. J. Rodoreda, M.L.A.

THE PREMIER (The Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam): I move—

That this House desires to place on its records its profound sense of the loss sustained in the passing of the late Hon. Aloysius Joseph Rodoreda, a member of this House, and that an expression of the sincere sympathy of members be conveyed to his widow and family by Mr. Speaker.

The late Mr. Rodoreda, as you very well know, Mr. Speaker, served in this House for a considerable number of years, firstly as a private member and later as Speaker of the House. He represented, as we all know, a North-West electorate, and he was a typical North-West type. He was rugged in his outlook, a man of tremendously strong convictions and one who was most outspoken in his advocacy of a better deal for the people he directly represented and for the people of the North-West generally.

We all referred to him very affectionately as "Rod," and we remember with great affection the privilege we all had in having him as a colleague, as a fellow-member of Parliament, and as a personal friend. He was one who made no conscious effort to make friends, but his spirit was such and his attitude was such that he attracted friends to him wherever he went and with whomsoever he came in contact.

We regret very much his passing, and particularly the sudden circumstances in which his passing occurred. We will always remember him with great affection and with considerable gratitude. To his widow and to the members of his family we have all of us already conveyed direct expressions of sympathy; and now, collectively, as the members of the House, we are in a position to record our sympathy to Mrs. Rodoreda and to the members of the family.

THE HON. D. BRAND (Greenough): I gladly support the motion moved by the Premier and more gladly support the sentiments which he expressed in moving the motion. Rod was a man of very fixed

convictions. It was a pleasure indeed to converse with him outside the Chamber when we had the advantage of his very impartial views on many of the problems which faced the outback people of Australia. If I recall rightly, Mr. Rodoreda was a paymaster in the early days during the construction of the Wongan line. From there he went into the North country and ultimately represented Pilbara as a member in this House.

I associate those behind me here with my remarks when I say that we extend to his widow and to his family our deepest and very sincere sympathy in the sudden and sad loss which they have experienced. I am sure that each and every one of us will miss Rod and the contributions which he made to the debates here. His remarks were always of great interest. Whenever he spoke, he commanded the attention of the House, and in doing so he marked himself as a well respected member of the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia.

THE HON. A. F. WATTS (Stirling): Those of us who went to South Australia with the parliamentary party in March last were deeply grieved, shortly after our arrival, to hear of the sudden and untimely death of our late friend. This took place just before he was due to join the party in Adelaide, and as a consequence, the blow was the more severe to his wife and other relatives. We can judge that, from the severity with which it fell upon those who were with us on that journey.

I knew the late Mr. Rodoreda from the time that I entered the House. He was a man in whom one could repose confidence and trust, and I deeply regret the fact that he has passed from us so early. I join with the other speakers in conveying my own sympathy, and that of those associated with me, to his sorrowing widow and family.

Question passed; members standing.

The Late Mr. J. H. Ackland, M.L.A.

THE PREMIER (the Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam): I move—

That this House desires to place on its records its profound sense of the loss sustained in the passing of the late Mr. John Hugh Ackland, a member of this House, and that an expression of the sincere sympathy of members be conveyed to his widow and family by Mr. Speaker.

It is certainly unfortunate that it is necessary for two motions of this type to require to be moved on the one day. That fact is proof, I think, of the strain of public life, and a certain proof that members of Parliament do suffer considerable strain and wear and tear in the service they give to the public when they take positions in this Parliament.

We all acknowledge the tremendous amount of work which the late Mr. Ackland did, particularly for his own electorate. If ever there was a member of Parliament who was a slave to his electors, it was Hughie Ackland.

I had the opportunity of visiting Wongan Hills only recently for the purpose of attending a public gathering there; and expressions of appreciation covering the services which he had given to the people in that area, particularly, were heard on all sides, as were, of course, expressions of regret that he too should have passed away so suddenly and in such tragic circumstances.

The late Mr. Ackland was certainly a very colourful personality which applied not only to his parliamentary career but also to his activities before he entered Parliament. I think his convictions were equally as strong as those of the late Mr. Rodoreda; and, as a result, he occasionally became involved in clashes in this House, and outside of it. But it can always be said to his very great credit that once the clash had concluded he came up smiling and met his opponents in the controversy on the most friendly terms possible.

I do not think it would be necessary to say anything more about the very worthwhile qualities of the late Mr. Ackland than to indicate that following his death there appeared in the death notices in the newspapers expressions of thanks and gratitude and affection from a number of schoolchildren in various centres in his electorate. Whenever a man, whether he is in public life or out of it, can win the affection and gratitude of children, I think it is about the greatest tribute which any person can ever hope to win. We all very much regret the passing of Mr. Ackland and we desire to join together in conveying very sincere expressions of sympathy to his widow and the members of the family.

THE HON. D. BRAND (Greenough): I join with the Premier and support him in his expressions of sympathy to the widow and members of the family of the late Hugh Ackland. To say the least of it, he was a colourful figure and one who will be sadly missed in this Chamber. He certainly had fixed ideas, and never hesitated to express them here no matter how intense the debate may have been at times; but there was something in his personality which attracted people to him and which always finally created a friendly relationship.

I share with the Premier the thought that the successor to Hughie Ackland as member for Moore will certainly have a full-time job if he attempts to carry out the programme of representation which was carried out by Mr. Ackland during his period as member for that district.

Although getting on in years, he was untiring in his efforts on behalf of individuals within his electorate, and always found the time to help in carrying the burden of community efforts.

Latterly he lived in the metropolitan area, but even there he interested himself in church and other community activities. That, I think, indicates the character of the man and the community spirit which prompted him originally to offer himself for election as a member of Parliament. I wish to express to Mrs. Ackland and family our deepest sympathy in their very sad and sudden loss.

THE HON. A. F. WATTS (Stirling): I and those associated with me, of course, feel the loss of Mr. Ackland even more intimately than perhaps other members of this House do because for 11 years—and I say this advisedly—he adorned the ranks of this party, and on many occasions kept us very much alive. He had a very fertile and active mind and he worked extremely hard, as the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition have said, not only in the interests of his electorate and the State but also in the interests, as he saw them, of his colleagues in the party to which he belonged.

He filled responsible positions in that organisation with credit to himself and satisfaction to us all. His death was entirely unexpected. On the morning he died he left us full of good cheer and enthusiasm to do another job in his electorate; and no doubt in doing it he died, as he lived, in the service of his constituents. I think that the longer time passes the more will we realise that his work for them was his main object in life. I hope that the sorrow and burden that must have so suddenly fallen upon his wife and family will be relieved to what extent it can by the blessing of divine providence.

MR. MAY (Collie): I should like to associate myself with the motion moved by the Premier. I think the records of Hansard will show that in this Chamber I frequently crossed swords with the late member for Moore; but outside of this Chamber, Hughie Ackland and I were very close friends. I, too, very much regret his passing, and he will be sadly missed in this Chamber.

Question passed; members standing.

FEDERAL SENATE VACANCY.

Message.

The **SPEAKER**: I have received the following Message from His Excellency the Lieut.-Governor and Administrator:—

The Lieut.-Governor and Administrator transmits to the Legislative Assembly a copy of a despatch which

he has received from the Hon. the President of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Australia notifying that a vacancy has occurred in the representation of the State of Western Australia in the said Senate.

I have here a copy of a letter from the President of the Senate to His Excellency the Lieut.-Governor and Administrator, which reads as follows:—

Parliament House, Canberra,
The Senate.

Your Excellency,

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 21 of the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution, I have the honour to notify Your Excellency that a vacancy has happened in the representation of the State of Western Australia in the Senate, through the death of Senator Harrie Stephen Seward which occurred on the 23rd July, 1958.

I have the honour to be,
Your Excellency's obedient servant,
(Sgd.) A. M. McMULLIN,
President of the Senate.

As to Joint Sitting.

The PREMIER: In pursuance of the foregoing letter to His Excellency the Lieut.-Governor, I move—

That Mr. Speaker be requested to confer with the President of the Legislative Council in order to fix a day and place whereon and whereat the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly, sitting and voting together, shall choose a person to hold the place of the Senator whose place has become vacant.

Question put and passed.

Sitting suspended from 4.53 to 4.55 p.m.

The SPEAKER: I have to announce that, in pursuance of the resolution passed by the Assembly, I consulted the President and an agreement has been reached to hold a sitting for the election of a senator in the Council Chamber immediately. The sitting is now suspended till the ringing of the bells.

Sitting suspended from 4.56 to 5.3 p.m.

Vacancy Filled.

The SPEAKER: I have to report that at the joint sitting of members of the two Houses of Parliament held this afternoon, in accordance with the requirements of the Standing Orders, Mr. Thomas Charles Drake-Brockman was duly elected as a Senator in place of the late Senator Harrie Stephen Seward.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

OVERSEAS TRADE MISSION.

Cost of Incentives Offered.

1. The Hon. D. BRAND asked the Premier:

(1) Is it correct that the trade mission led by the Deputy Premier at present overseas is offering incentives for industries to come to Western Australia on the following basis:—

Cash grants in certain conditions of up to 20 per cent. of establishment costs;

interest-free loans up to 10 years and guaranteed additional loans if required;

free factory sites;

essential road, railway, water and power services to factories;

guaranteed housing for workers?

(2) Has any estimate been prepared of the likely cost to the State in the event of all or any of the firms approached deciding to commence activities in Western Australia?

(3) What provision has been made or what funds are available in the event of these incentives having to be met?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The preparation of an estimate covering the likely cost to the State would not be of any worth-while value. In any event, no estimate could be prepared, as sufficient information could not become available until the firms in question had developed at least preliminary estimates of establishing costs and the like.

(3) Some provision will be made in the current year's loan programme. Most of the financial help to be made available by the Government is likely to be required in the financial year 1959-1960, and those years which will succeed 1959-1960.

AGRICULTURAL SCIENTISTS.

Shortage and Contemplated Action.

2. Mr. BOVELL asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Has any move been made in terms of the report of the 23rd April, 1958, to him by the Farmers' Union of W.A. (Inc.) concerning the shortage of agricultural scientists and the need for appropriate action by the Government to alleviate the present shortage?

(2) If so, what are the details?

(3) If not, what action is contemplated, and when?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Vacancies for professional officers are constantly advertised and all suitable applicants appointed. The number offering, however, is insufficient and the number of agricultural science and veterinary

science cadets has therefore been increased. This year, seven agricultural science and three veterinary science cadets were appointed.

In terms of the report mentioned, the programme of improved facilities and amenities in both country and metropolitan areas is within sight of completion.

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

STATE LAND TAX.

Receipts.

3. Mr. BOVELL asked the Treasurer:

What amounts have been received from land tax during the financial year ended the 30th June, 1958, from—

- city and metropolitan area;
- country towns;
- improved agricultural land;
- unimproved rural land?

The TREASURER replied:

In view of the sliding scale now in operation, it has been necessary to compile new statistics. These are in course of preparation and, when available, the information will be supplied.

CROWN LAND.

Project Areas.

4. Mr. BOVELL asked the Minister for Lands:

What are the acreages as at the 30th June, 1958, of Crown land project areas and in what districts are they situated in relation to the following:—

- approved for wheat and sheep or grazing;
- approved for dairying;
- under consideration for dairying;
- under consideration for wheat and sheep or grazing?

The MINISTER replied:

	Crown Land acres
(a) Many Peaks	15,938
North Many Peaks	40,158
South Stirling	62,317
Rocky Gully	66,454
Perillup	35,499
Gairdner River	317,152
Jerramungup	56,910
Corackerup	30,537
Encabba	153,985
Denbarker	43,568
Bokerup	12,124
(b) Narrikup	5,534
Total	840,176
(c) Nil.	
(d) Nil.	

WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT.

Number and Categories of Outstanding Applications.

5. Mr. BOVELL asked the Minister for Lands:

How many applications for war service land settlement farms are still outstanding and what are their categories (i.e., wheat, sheep, dairying, etc.)?

The MINISTER replied:

As at the 30th June, 1958, brochures were being sent to:—

274 applicants for wheat and sheep or grazing farms.

14 applicants for dairy farms.

CROWN LAND.

Number of Applications Received, Approved, etc.

5A. Mr. BOVELL asked the Minister for Lands:

How many applications have been received other than for war service land settlement for Crown land for agricultural development during each of the years 1950 to 1957, and of these applications how many have been approved?

The MINISTER replied:

Applications for land (other than war service land settlement scheme) received and approved for the years 1950-1957 (inclusive):—

Received.		Approved.*	
Year.	No.	Year.	No.
1950	1,760	1950	1,770
1951	2,269	1951	2,308
1952	2,102	1952	2,052
1953	2,289	1953	2,028
1954	2,412	1954	1,804
1955	2,078	1955	1,524
1956	1,965	1956	1,288
1957	2,157	1957	1,157

* These approvals may include applications lodged during the previous year.

In some cases the number of applications received is not as great as the number approved, due to a carry-over from the previous year.

EDUCATION.

Government Policy on Pan System of Sanitation.

6. Mr. BOVELL asked the Minister for Education:

(1) At what centres are schools still to be forced to use the outmoded and unhygienic pan system as sanitary conveniences?

(2) Has the Government any policy concerning conversion to septic tank system?

(3) If so, what are the details?

(4) If not, why not?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The following list shows schools which have no septic installation; but of these, many have not adequate water supplies, so a septic system could not be installed.

Aldersyde.	Malda Vale	Forest Grove	Swan Upper
Allanson	Marribank Native	Forrestfield	Swan West
Alma.	Marvel Loch	Forrest River	Tambellup
Ardath	Meekatharra	Frankland River	Tenterden
Augusta	Menzies	Jigalong	Three Springs
Baldivia	Merredin (old school)	Gabbin	Tingledale
Balkuling	Middlesex	Galena	Tinkurra
Ballaying	Miling	Gillingarra	Trayning
Ballidu	Minnivale	Gleneagle	Treesville
Beacon	Moore River Native	Glenorchy	Vasse
Beermullah	Moorine Rock	Gnowangerup	Walkaway
Benger	Morawa	Greenbushes	Walpole
Bibra Lake	Mornington Mills	Halg	Wannamal
Bilbarin	Moulyinning	Harriamith	Wandering
Bindi Bindi	Mt. Barker	Harvey (old school)	Wanneroo
Boddallin	Mt. Ida	Herne Hill	Warburton Ranges
Bolgart	Mt. Many Peaks	Hoffman Mill	Waterloo
Borden	Mt. Margaret Mission	Holyoake	Wattle Grove
Bornholm	Mt. Monger	Hopeland	Wellington Mills
Boulder South	Mullalyup	Jandakot	Wiaki
Bowes East	Mundaring	Jardee	Wickepin
Boyup Brook (old sch.)	Mundaring Weir	Jarrabdale	Widgiemooltha
Bradleys	Mundijong	Jarrahwood	Wilga
Bridgetown (old sch.)	Muradup	Jingalup	Williams
Broad Arrow	Nabawa (old school)	Kalannie	Willowdale
Broomehill	Nanga Brook	Karlgarin	Wiluna
Brunswick	Needilup	Karragullen	Woodanilling
Burekup	Newdegate	Kendenup	Wubin
Burnbrae	Noggerup	Kentdale	Wuraming
Burracoppin	No. 5 Pumping Stn.	Kerman Rock	Wyalkatchem
Cadoux	Northampton	Kirup	Wyndham
Calibro	Northcliffe	Kojoonup (old sch.)	Yallabatharra
Calingiri	Nyabing	Konnongorring	Yallingup
Canning Mills	Nyamup	Koorda	Yandanooka
Carinyah	Oakford	Kudardup	Yarloop
Carmel	Ogilvie	Kukerin	Yericoin
Carnarvon Mission	Ongerup	Kulin	Yorkrakine
Caron	Onalow	Kununoppin	Yornup
Chadoora	Palgarup	Kweda	Yuna
Chowerup	Pantapin	Kwolyin	Waroona
Clifton	Plawanning	Lake Grace	Manjimup Quarters
Coogee	Pickering Brook	Lake Guelup	Bindoon Quarters
Coolgardie	Pindar	Lake King	Bencubbin
Coomberdale	Pingaring	Lake Varley	Deanmill
Coonana	Pingrup	Lakewood	Huntley
Coorow	Pithara	Latham	Kondinin
Cowaramup	Popanyinning	Laverton	Mt. Helena
Cranbrook	Port Hedland	Leonora	Nannup
Cue	Quindalup	Lesmurdie	Pemberton
Cundeelee	Quindanning		
Dalwallinu	Quinninup		
Dandalup North	Ravensthorpe		
Dardanup	Rawlinna		
Darkan	Reid		
Denmark	East Rockingham		
Doodarding	Rocky Gully		
Dowerin	Roelands Mission		
Dowerin Lakes	Salmon Gums		
Dumbleyung	Salt River		
Duranillin	Sandstone		
Ejanding	Sandy Gully		
Fairbridge	Sawyers Valley		
Ferguson Upper	South Stirling		
Fitzroy Crossing	Stoneville (Special)		

(2) The Government's policy is to convert to septic tank system if an adequate water supply is available and when funds are available.

(3) and (4) Answered by No. (2).

Proposed New School Quarters at Jarrahwood.

7. Mr. BOVELL asked the Minister for Education:

What is the position regarding proposed new school quarters at Jarrahwood, and when will building operations commence?

The MINISTER replied:

The site has now been finalised and it is expected tenders will be called within two months.

BUSSELTON HOSPITAL.*Commencement of Additions.*

8. Mr. BOVELL asked the Minister for Health:

When will the urgently needed additions to the Busselton hospital be commenced?

The MINISTER replied:

Tenders will be called within two or three months.

RAILWAYS.*Duplication of Bunbury-Picton Junction Line.*

9. Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

(1) Has the Government investigated the question of the duplication of the Bunbury-Picton Junction railway line?

(2) If so, is it the Government's intention to set funds aside in the near future to commence such work?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) No. Traffic density does not warrant increasing the capacity of the section.

PRESTON RIVER.*Inspection of Levees.*

10. Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Was a departmental inspection made of the levees along the Preston River at Picton Junction, Glen Iris and Leschenault during the flood peak on the 27th July last?

(2) If so, will he table the report on the inspection?

The MINISTER FOR MINES (for the Minister for Works) replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) A departmental report to the Director of Works, together with associated plans, can be viewed at the director's office.

PORT HEDLAND JETTY.*Adequacy of Extensions.*

11. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister representing the Minister for the North-West:

(1) Is the Government satisfied that extensions to Port Hedland jetty, now in progress, will be sufficient to meet the requirements of future coastal and overseas shipping likely to use that port?

(2) If berthing facilities are deemed to be adequate, is consideration being given to the deepening and widening of the entrance to the port?

The MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE replied:

(1) The work in progress at Port Hedland is mainly the provision of a second berth. There is no specific provision for increased draft or length of vessels.

(2) Soundings and probings will be made in the entrance to the port with a view to assessing the problems involved in further development.

TRAFFIC.*Collection of Fees.*

12. Mr. CROMMELIN asked the Minister for Transport:

(1) Of the metropolitan traffic fees collected by the Police Traffic Branch, what amount was paid to police revenue for—

(a) the year ended the 30th June, 1957;

(b) the year ended the 30th June, 1958?

(2) What was the cost to the Police Traffic Branch for collecting traffic fees for—

(a) the year ended the 30th June, 1957;

(b) the year ended the 30th June, 1958?

(3) How many personnel are employed on the collection staff?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) (a) £85,157.

(b) £117,625.

(2) (a) £85,262

(b) £87,053.

These figures do not include maintenance and cost of buildings, plant and equipment, nor payment for the proportion of time which many police officers are required to give to matters pertaining to licensing of vehicles.

(3) Eighty-two officers are employed on the collection staff.

Fees Allocation.

13. Mr. CROMMELIN asked the Minister for Works:

(1) What amount was received by the Main Roads Department from the metropolitan traffic fees (Traffic Act, section 4, subsection (28)) under the heading "Repairing" for the years ended the 30th June—

(a) 1956;

(b) 1957;

(c) 1958?

(2) Has there been an increase in the amount received in 1958 over that of 1957?

(3) If so, what was the amount, to what purposes was it put, and what were the items and amounts, approximately, on which it was spent?

The MINISTER FOR MINES (for the Minister for Works) replied:

- (1) (a) 1956—£50,000;
(b) 1957—£51,000;
(c) 1958—£95,750.

(2) Yes.

(3) The increase amounted to £44,750; but owing to the manner in which the items of the yearly programmes are grouped, the purposes to which the increased amount was put are more clearly shown by a comparison of the programmes for the years ended the 30th June, 1957 and 1958, as follows:—

TRAFFIC FEES—MAINTENANCE FUNDS

Schedule 1956/57		£	£
Job 3097 Interest and Sinking Fund ...	5,822		
Job 3098 Interest and Sinking Fund ...	973		
Job 3099 Interest and Sinking Fund ...	340		
Job 3100 Interest and Sinking Fund ...	261		
			7,396
Job 3090 Perth-Guildford Road—			
General maintenance and line marking	2,500		
Drag seal surfacing Gordon Street to Garratt Road, 1,900 ft. x 40 ft. wide	3,000		
			5,500
Job 3091 Canning Highway—			
General maintenance, line marking and lighting Canning Bridge	5,000		
Drag seal surfacing Alston Street to Melville Parade, 1 M. x 40 ft. wide	10,000		
			15,000
Job 3092 Belmont-York Road—			
General maintenance and line marking		4,000	
Job 3093 Fremantle Traffic Bridge—			
General maintenance, line marking and lighting			604
Job 3094 Perth-Armadale Road—			
General maintenance, line marking and improvements to shoulders		5,200	
Drainage at Gosnells		1,800	
Job 3095 Perth Causeway—			
General maintenance, line marking, lighting and repairs to western rotary			3,500
Job 3096 Stirling Highway—			
General maintenance and line marking		2,000	
Drag seal surfacing, Fremantle Traffic Bridge to Wellington Street—Additional funds			6,000
Total			£51,000

TRAFFIC FEES—MAINTENANCE FUNDS

Schedule 1957/58		£	£
Job 3097 Interest and Sinking Fund ...	5,822		
Job 3098 Interest and Sinking Fund ...	973		
Job 3099 Interest and Sinking Fund ...	340		
Job 3100 Interest and Sinking Fund ...	261		
			7,396
Job 3090 Perth-Guildford Road—			
General maintenance and line marking			3,000
Job 3091 Canning Highway—			
General maintenance, line marking and lighting of Canning Bridge	5,304		
Drag re-seal—Robert Street to Canning Bridge, 40 ft. wide	3,400		
Drag re-seal—Money Street to Rome Road (Northern carriageway), 24 ft. wide	4,150		
			12,854

Job 3092 Great Eastern Highway—	£	£
General maintenance, line marking and gravel shouldering	7,000	
Drainage	5,400	
Drag re-seal—James Street, Guildford (Northern carriageway), 20 ft. wide	1,100	
Drag re-seal—Mathoura Street to Bushby Street, Midland Junction, 24 ft. wide	3,000	
		16,500
Job 3093 Fremantle Traffic Bridge—		
General maintenance and lighting		2,000
Job 3094 Perth-Armadale Road—		
General maintenance, line marking, gravel shouldering, drainage	7,000	
Renewal of decking of Canning Bridge, Gosnells	4,500	
Drag re-seal—		
Herbert Street-Morley Street, 40 ft. wide	6,100	
Evelyn Street-Vera Street, 24 ft. wide	2,250	
Vera Street-13-85 M., 24 ft. wide	10,950	
		30,800
Job 3095 Perth Causeway—		
General maintenance	2,000	
Painting of girders	2,000	
Drag re-seal—		
Armagh Street-Shepperton Road, 70 ft. wide	2,200	
Section between bridges, 60 ft. wide	2,800	
Western approach, 60 ft. wide	1,700	
Belmont Link road, 40 ft. wide	1,750	
		12,450
Job 3096 Stirling Highway—		
General maintenance and line marking	2,500	
Rehabilitation of drainage at North Fremantle	3,000	
Drag re-seal—Alfred Road to Traffic Bridge	5,250	
		10,750
Total		£95,750

LOAN REVENUE.

Financing Deficit.

14. The Hon. D. BRAND asked the Treasurer:

(1) What amount of last year's loan money was used to finance the revenue deficit of the year before (1956-57)?

(2) How much of that deficit remains to be financed from this year's loan funds?

(3) What part of last year's deficit of £1,123,330 does he intend to meet from 1958-59 loan funds?

(4) What amount of interest has been paid to date on loan funds used to meet the deficits on State budgets?

The TREASURER replied:

(1) and (2) In 1957-58, the 1955-56 adjusted deficit of £1,508,831 was funded from loan funds. The adjusted deficit for 1956-57 will be met from loan funds in 1958-59. The amount required will not be known until the final determination of special grant for 1956-57 is made later this year.

(3) Last year's deficit of £1,123,330 will be funded in 1959-60 after the final determination of special grant for 1957-58 is known.

(4) Owing to substantial changes in financial policy and varying accounting procedures, the total amount of interest paid in earlier years is not readily available and would require extensive investigation. The amount of interest paid on loan funds used for deficit funding during the past ten years is £75,656.

ALBANY REGIONAL HOSPITAL.

System of Construction, etc.

15. The Hon. D. BRAND asked the Minister for Works:

(1) What were the reasons which decided the Government in favour of building the new Albany regional hospital by the day labour system instead of by private contract after the calling of tenders?

(2) Apart from the nurses' quarters what work has been done on the actual hospital building?

(3) How many workmen are at present and will be employed on this work?

(4) How many workmen have been and will be engaged from the Albany district?

(5) What preference is to be given, if any, to local private industry for the supply of equipment and materials required for the new hospital?

The MINISTER FOR MINES (for the Minister for Works) replied:

(1) Government policy.

(2) The footings for the whole hospital have been completed. Construction is proceeding on the main hospital building. Drainage lines are being laid.

(3) At present employed: 93. This will gradually be increased to approximately 130.

(4) Of the 93 men now employed, 62 are from Albany. Further men will be employed from the Albany district when available, and when required.

(5) Local bricks are being used. Local joiners' shops are manufacturing joinery, and it is hoped to use roofing tiles of local manufacture.

STATE SHIPPING SERVICE.

"Koolama's" List to Starboard.

16. The Hon. D. BRAND asked the Premier:

(1) In view of the noticeable list to starboard of the new State ship "Koolama" on arrival at Fremantle last Tuesday, is he satisfied there is a sufficient margin of safety when in a rough sea?

(2) Are any technical reports available to the Government on the ship's handling on her maiden trip north?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) Yes. The list occurred as a result of pumping out ballast tanks, which would not normally be pumped out before arrival at Fremantle.

(2) Yes. Information is available from which to assess the vessel's handling and trimming characteristics under North-West conditions.

GOVERNMENT AND SEMI-GOVERNMENT INSTRUMENTALITIES.

Printing Requirements.

17. The Hon. D. BRAND asked the Premier:

Will he table a copy of the circular sent to Government and semi-Government instrumentalities suggesting that all printing requirements must in future be done at the Government Printing Office and not by the private printing industry?

The PREMIER replied:

Yes.

PENSIONS.

Effect of Amendments to Superannuation Laws.

18. Mr. COURT asked the Premier:

(1) Has the Government completed its consideration of the effect upon some pensioners of the amendments made by Parliament last year to the superannuation laws?

(2) If so, what further amendments are proposed?

(3) If not, when is it expected that a decision will be reached?

The PREMIER replied:

Amendments are now being drafted for consideration by Cabinet.

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF.

Administration and Basis of Payments.

19. Mr. COURT asked the Premier:

(1) Is the Government still paying money by way of State unemployment relief?

(2) If so, what is the basis of payment and entitlement and who administers the relief?

(3) How much was spent for the year ended the 30th June, 1958?

(4) How much is proposed for the year 1958-59?

(5) Has there been a change in entitlements and administration?

(6) Where and how does the State relief fit into or complement the Commonwealth Social Service benefits for unemployment?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The basis of payment is the following scale of monetary assistance:—

Age and Invalid Pensions				Unemployment and Sickness Benefit			"A" Class Widows			"B" Class Widows (Husband in Gaol)			Non-Pension
C.W.D.	Husband	Wife and Child	Total Income	C.W.D.	Unem. Benefit	Total Income	C.W.D.	Widows Pension	Total Income	C.W.D.	Widows Pension	Total Income	
1	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.
2	87 6	87 6	35 0	17 6	65 0	82 6	12 6	75 0	105 0	30 0	75 0	105 0	67 6
3	20 0	87 6	46 6	31 6	122 6	154 0	27 6	102 6	130 0	45 0	75 0	120 0	112 6
4	25 0	97 6	46 6	46 6	169 0	169 0	42 6	112 6	155 0	60 0	75 0	135 0	127 6
5	40 0	107 6	46 6	61 6	122 6	184 0	57 6	122 6	180 0	75 0	75 0	150 0	142 6
6	55 0	117 6	46 6	76 6	122 6	199 0	72 6	132 6	205 0	90 0	75 0	165 0	157 6
7	70 0	127 6	46 6	91 6	122 6	214 0	87 6	142 6	230 0	105 0	75 0	180 0	172 6
8	85 0	137 6	46 6	106 6	122 6	229 0	102 6	152 6	255 0	120 0	75 0	195 0	187 6
9	100 0	147 6	46 6	121 6	122 6	244 0	117 6	162 6	280 0	135 0	75 0	210 0	202 6

Scale to increase by 15s. for each additional child.

Allowable income 60s. p.w. when earned.

Allowable income unearned 40s.

Foster children 35s. p.w.

Lying-in rate—

35s. p.w. before confinement.

45s. p.w. after confinement.

Child earning up to £2 remains a unit with no assessment.

Over £2 p.w. and under £4 p.w. not a unit and not assessed.

£4 p.w. and over not a unit and assessed—

£4 assessed 5s.

£4 10s. assessed 10s.

£5 assessed 15s.

£5 10s. assessed 20s.

£6 assessed 25s.

£6 10s. assessed 30s.

Children away from home not a unit but actual contributions assessed.

The entitlement to relief depends upon the means of the applicant and upon his registration by Commonwealth Social Services for unemployment benefit.

The administration of relief is by the Minister for Child Welfare through the Child Welfare Department.

	£	s.	d.
(3) Married	96,075	14	7
Single	53,608	10	3
Miscellaneous (Rail Fares)	274	19	7
	149,959	4	5

	£
(4) Married	103,000
Single	55,800
Miscellaneous (Rail Fares)	200
	159,000

(5) In January, 1957, the Child Welfare Department commenced to augment Commonwealth Social Services benefits paid to single unemployed persons.

There has been no change in entitlements of married units. There has been no change in administration.

(6) (a) Commonwealth Social Services pays unemployment benefits to qualified persons as follows:—

Adult single persons—
£3 5s. 0d. per week.

Married couples—£5 12s 6d. per week.

Married couples with one or more children—
£6 2s. 6d. per week.

No payment is made for the first week following registration.

(b) The Child Welfare Department augments those payments as follows:—

Adult single persons by 17s. 6d. per week, giving a minimum income of £4 2s. 6d.

Married couples by 7s. 6d. per week, giving a minimum income of £6.

Married couples with one child by 37s. 6d. per week, giving a minimum

income of £14s.; plus 15s. for each additional child under 16 years and attending school.

The Child Welfare Department makes its payments for first week following registration.

Other income, children's earnings and any bank balance are taken into account when assessing Child Welfare assistance.

NARROWS BRIDGE.

Technical Problems, etc.

20. Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Works:

(1) (a) Have all the technical problems of the Narrows bridge construction which have delayed the work been overcome?

(b) If not, what problems remain to be resolved?

(2) What is the revised estimated opening date?

(3) (a) Has an adjustment of the contract price and other contract conditions been necessary because of delays and problems that have been experienced?

(b) If so, what adjustments have been necessary?

(c) Who is responsible for the extra cost, if any, of additional shifts being worked on the bridge?

(4) (a) Have the delays and problems experienced been within the contractors' responsibilities or the responsibility of the Government?

(b) If within Government responsibility what is the estimated extra cost arising therefrom?

The MINISTER FOR MINES (for the Minister for Works) replied:

(1) (a) and (b) Yes.

(2) At this stage the date of opening has not been determined.

(3) (a) and (b) Yes. Adjustments in the contract price will be determined as the contract is being finalised.

(c) The working of a double shift on a very limited part of the contract was suggested by the contractors as a measure to bring this part of the work into balance with the overall progress. The working of double shifts will not add to the cost of the project.

(4) (a) and (b) The degree of responsibility in respect to delays and problems associated with

the construction has not yet been assessed. It is expected that this will be considered when final claims for additions and deductions associated with the work are brought forward to the consultants.

KWINANA.

Erection of Factories by Government.

21. Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) Is it correct that the Government proposes to erect some factories at Kwinana?

(2) If so, how many and of what size and type?

(3) Is it intended that these factories will be operated by private industry or are they to be operated by Government trading concerns?

(4) If they are to be occupied by private industry, what is the nature of the tenancy?

(5) Has all the projected space been let?

(6) If not, how much is yet to be negotiated?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The Government proposes to erect one factory at Kwinana. This is being done in an endeavour to develop an area for light industry. With roads and services available, it is hoped other industry will follow. One application for an adjoining block has been received.

(2) The factory is a small, normal type of 1800 sq. ft.

(2) It is intended the factory will be operated by private industry.

(4) The tenancy proposed is a lease with option of purchase.

(5) and (6) All projected space has been committed, though not yet actually let.

LICENSING ACT.

Amending Legislation.

22. Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON asked the Minister for Justice:

Is amending legislation contemplated this session arising from the parliamentary committee's inquiry into the Licensing Act?

The MINISTER replied:

The committee's report is receiving consideration by Cabinet.

OVERSEAS TRADE MISSION.

Reaction of Unfair Trading Act.

23. Mr. COURT asked the Premier:

(1) Is the trade mission correctly reported in the "Sunday Times" dated the 6th July, 1958, as having told British businessmen that the Unfair Trading Act does not react against overseas firms?

(2) If so, does this mean that the Government proposes to discriminate in the legislation as between local, Eastern States and overseas firms?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) No official information is available on this point.

(2) No.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORT TRUST.

Bus Take-over and Telegram from Federal Treasurer.

1. The Hon. D. BRAND asked the Premier:

No doubt he has seen this evening's issue of the "Daily News" in which there appears a report on the new bus move to the effect that a telegram, which appeared to be favourable in connection with this matter, had been received from the Federal Treasurer. I would like the Premier to define the words "appeared to be favourable."

The PREMIER replied:

The details of the reply received from the Federal Treasurer are being considered by the appropriate officers—including Treasury officers—and the members of the Metropolitan Passenger Transport Trust, and they will report to me in the very near future on the actual meaning of the various portions of the telegram. I was advised by the member for Leederville, before the House met this afternoon, that he would be placing some questions on tomorrow's notice paper in connection with this matter.

Commencement of Bus Take-over.

2. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister for Transport:

In view of the Press report to the effect that the way is now clear for the Metropolitan Passenger Transport Trust to take over private bus companies, will he inform the House when the take-over will commence and, also, which companies will be the first affected?

The MINISTER replied:

In regard to this matter, all I can say is that earlier today I had a discussion with Mr. Adams, the chairman of the trust, and he indicated that next Saturday fortnight, or at midnight on the 30th August, would be the date of the take-over of the first three companies—the Metro, the Beam and the Carlisle bus services—and it is hoped that the take-over of the balance of the companies will be carried out as expeditiously as possible.

Amount of Compensation for Bus Take-over.

3. Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Transport:

In regard to the take-over of the first three bus companies by the Metropolitan Passenger Transport Trust, does the

answer that he has given to the member for Mt. Lawley mean that the compensation figure has been agreed upon between the Government and the three companies; and, if so, what, approximately, is the total figure?

The MINISTER replied:

In reply to this question—and this will apply to many others that will no doubt be asked during the session—it should be emphasised that the trust is not a Government department subject to ministerial control and administration as Government departments normally are.

However, without any direct advice on the matter, and because I do have occasional talks with the chairman of the trust, I think I can say that certain investigations and valuations had taken place in anticipation of the trust being able to commence operations on the 1st of July this year and, accordingly, all that is necessary are a few modifications—based on stocks that have come in and have gone out—making it a comparatively simple matter for the take-over to occur. There would, no doubt, still be some items of negotiation to be entered into after the actual take-over, but no great difficulty is anticipated in connection with this initial move.

Mr. COURT: I take it, from the answer to my previous question, that compensation has been agreed on in principle—I refer to compensation as distinct from the actual take-over—and only minor details have to be finalised in connection with that matter?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: I cannot answer that question with any degree of certainty. I think it might not be a bad idea if members seeking information were to make approaches to the chairman of the trust in connection with it. I want to repeat that, in conformity with the expressed wish of Parliament and all those members who addressed themselves to the measure, this trust was not to be regarded as just another Government department, and for that reason I am not answering correspondence in connection with the trust in the capacity of Minister for Transport, but I shall pass the correspondence on to the chairman of the trust for his reply direct.

Mr. Court: He would be reluctant to answer questions from members of the Opposition.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: He might be. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition or any other member seeks information, I shall submit the inquiry to the chairman of the trust and naturally leave entirely to him the nature and the extent of the information he cares to give. After all, members are aware that the answers given to questions asked in this House become public property. As the trust is a business concern, the chairman—and no doubt the trust itself—may be

reluctant to give certain information. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition cares to place this question on the notice paper, I shall submit it to the chairman of the trust and we can see what comes forth.

PERTH MODERN SCHOOL.

Change of Name.

4. Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON asked the Minister for Education:

Does his release to "The Sunday Times" of the Press notice in regard to the future of the Modern School constitute the considered answer that he promised to give me if I placed on the notice paper my opening-day question on this matter?

The MINISTER replied:

Not necessarily. I might explain that if the member for Cottesloe—I know he did not mean to be discourteous—had taken some ordinary precaution and had given me a little advice in advance, I would have been able to give him more advice than I did.

The hon. member asked me if the name of the school was to be changed. The member for Subiaco, in whose electorate Perth Modern School is situated, and the member for West Perth, whose electorate adjoins the Subiaco electorate, had been in touch with me in regard to this matter. As those hon. members were asking for information, I submitted the Press notice in sufficient time for publication in "The Sunday Times" last Sunday. As I have already said, if the member for Cottesloe had given me some prior information, I would have given him an amplified reply.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You knew all about it!

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I might have done. But just because the hon. member wanted to play to the gallery, I was not prepared to give an impromptu reply to a question asked regarding a matter of this nature.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It was an insult to my electorate.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is not in the hon. member's electorate; and it is not likely to be called Cottesloe High School, either.

IRON ORE.

Availability of Original Market.

5. Mr. HEAL asked the Premier:

In the event of the Commonwealth Government granting this State a licence to export 1,000,000 tons of iron ore to Japan, would he give this House some indication whether the original market is still available for this iron ore?

The PREMIER replied:

Yes, markets are still available in Japan for iron ore. Unfortunately, the price is not as good as it was when the State Government first made application to the Commonwealth Government for an export

licence. However, careful reinvestigation of the total proposals to export 1,000,000 tons of iron ore and to establish large-scale iron-ore industry activities in the South-West have shown that, as a whole, the proposals are still economically sound.

COAL.

Export to Japan.

6. Mr. ROBERTS asked the Premier:

(1) Is he aware that at present there is in Australia a Japanese mission investigating a proposal to expand the export of coal to Japan?

(2) If so, has the Government, as yet, made any approaches to that mission with a view to exporting Collie coal to Japan?

(3) If approaches have been made, through what sources were they made?

(4) What are the present prospects of exporting Collie coal to Japan?

(5) Could he, at this stage, indicate what is to be the f.o.b. price of such exports?

The PREMIER replied:

The hon. member was good enough to supply me with a copy of these questions before the House met, and the answers are as follows:—

(1) Yes.

(2) and (3) Arrangements have been made for one member of the mission to visit Western Australia, but not so much in connection with coal as with regard to other minerals.

(4) I am not in a position to express any opinion as to the prospects of exporting Collie coal to Japan. However, I would think that the prospects would be very small indeed—if not nil—because of the fact that Collie coal does not possess the keeping qualities which are possessed by Newcastle coal.

(5) I am not in a position to know what would be the f.o.b. price of any export Collie coal which might become a practical proposition.

In addition, I can say that several months ago there did appear to be some prospect of exporting Collie coal to Japan. At that time the member for Collie was very active in the picture, and was also actively associated with the efforts that were being made by one of the coal mining companies at Collie to obtain from Japan an order for Collie coal. However, the difficulty which I mentioned a few moments ago regarding the keeping quality of Collie coal caused those negotiations to fall by the way.

DEPUTY CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES.

Appointment.

The SPEAKER: I desire to inform the House that I have appointed Mr. Hearman, Mr. Norton, and Mr. Heal to be Deputy Chairmen of Committees for the session.

SITTING DAYS AND HOURS.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the House, unless otherwise ordered, shall meet for the despatch of business on Tuesdays and Wednesdays at 4.30 p.m., and on Thursdays at 2.15 p.m., and shall sit until 6.15 p.m. if necessary, and, if requisite, from 7.30 p.m. onwards.

These are the same hours as we have operated on during the last two sessions. They have been found to be generally satisfactory and acceptable to members; therefore, on the basis of that satisfactory experience, it is thought that those hours will again be acceptable.

Question put and passed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Precedence.

The PREMIER: I move—

That on Tuesdays and Thursdays, Government business shall take precedence of all motions and Orders of the Day.

For the benefit of new members of this House, I would point out that this means that on the two days mentioned Government business shall have priority of consideration; whereas, on the other sitting day of each week—namely Wednesday—private members' business will have priority of consideration up to certain limited periods.

Question put and passed.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION.

On motion by the Premier, sessional committees were appointed as follows:—

Library.—The Speaker, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Crommelin.

Standing Orders.—The Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, the Hon. J. B. Sleeman, Mr. Nalder and Mr. Hearman.

House.—The Speaker, Mr. May, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Roberts and Mr. W. A. Manning.

Printing.—The Speaker, Mr. Ross Hutchinson and Mr. Lapham.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1), £21,000,000.

Message.

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

Standing Orders Suspension.

On motion by the Treasurer, resolved:

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable resolutions from the Committees of Supply and of Ways and Means to be reported and adopted on the same day on which they shall have passed those committees, and also

the passing of a Supply Bill through all its stages in one day, and to enable the business aforesaid to be entered upon and dealt with before the Address-in-reply is adopted.

In Committee of Supply.

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

THE TREASURER (The Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam) [5.53]: Before proceeding to move the motion which is appropriate at this stage, I would like to offer you, Mr. Chairman, the congratulations of members and supporters of the Government on your appointment to the very important position of Chairman of Committees. We think that you deserve this promotion because of the splendid manner in which in previous sessions you have carried out the duties which fell on you as Deputy Chairman of Committees. We have unbounded faith in your impartiality and also in your ability to carry out the necessary duties with credit and satisfaction to members of the Committee. I move—

That there be granted to Her Majesty on account of the services for the year ending the 30th June, 1959, a sum not exceeding £21,000,000.

This amount of supply is needed to enable the Government, first of all, to pay for the normal services of the Government which are financed during the month of July and also during the expired days of the present month of August; and further, to enable the Government to continue financing the services of the Government until such time as the Budget is presented to the House and approved by the House.

The amount sought on this occasion is exactly the same as the amount which was sought at this time last year. The total of £21,000,000 is made up as follows:—

	£
Consolidated Revenue	15,000,000
General Loan Fund	4,000,000
Advance to Treasurer	2,000,000

I have already made reference to the fact that the Budget Estimates will be brought down later in the session. Every effort is being made to bring the Budget Estimates down early in the session in order that members may have adequate opportunity of considering and debating them. The only limiting factor now in preparing the Budget and bringing it before the House is the fact that the Grants Commission has not yet made a decision as to the amount of grant which it will recommend to the Commonwealth Government to make available to Western Australia for the present financial year. As soon as that decision has been made and communicated to this Government by the Federal Government, the Budget papers will be finalised and introduced into the House without any further delay.

It might be appropriate for me to make a brief reference to the actual financial results of the last financial year in connection with the Consolidated Revenue Fund. The estimated deficit was £2,664,000 and the actual deficit £1,123,000. The major factors in bringing about that financial improvement were, firstly, an increase of £315,000 by way of special Commonwealth assistance and an increase in railway revenue over the estimate of £299,000. There was also a reduction in the estimated expenditure by the Railway Department of £842,000 which, of course, was a very important contribution to the improved financial result as a whole in connection with the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the last financial year.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

In Committee of Ways and Means.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of Ways and Means for raising the Supply granted to Her Majesty. Mr. Sewell in the Chair.

THE TREASURER (The Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam) [6.01]: I move—

That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the services of the year ending the 30th June, 1959, a sum not exceeding £15,000,000 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, £4,000,000 from the General Loan Fund and £2,000,000 from the Public Account.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

Bill Introduced.

In accordance with the foregoing resolutions, Bill introduced and read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE TREASURER (The Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam) [6.11]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. D. BRAND (Greenough) [6.31]: As you know, Mr. Speaker, for many years in this Parliament—particularly during the time when the member for Stirling was Leader of the Opposition here—not a great deal was said on the Supply Bill. Members of the Opposition were always co-operative to that extent. It was not until the McLarty-Watts Government took over that the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Wise, set a precedent by claiming that this was an opportunity for all members to air their grievances, and he proceeded to do so—not that he had so many in those days; not half as many as we have at the present time. Therefore, because the opportunity is afforded us, I hope that all

members in Opposition, and Government members too, will air their grievances before they grant to the Premier the £21,000,000 that he has requested.

This, I suppose, might be considered to be an approval by Parliament of an advance to the Government to cover the cost of the administration, maintenance and operation of Government departments, etc., until the time when the Budget is being debated in this Chamber. I think it is always a matter of relief for a Government, particularly when its margin is narrow, to get supply through, because without supply it is unable to carry on.

Before I proceed further, although we have had two motions of condolence today, I would like to make reference to the passing of the late Harrie Seward who, for many years, represented Pinnelly in the State Parliament, and, as Minister for Railways, was a member of the McLarty-Watts Government. The late Senator conscientiously served his electors and the State, and the Government during the time he held office; and, latterly, he conscientiously discharged his duties as a representative of the Country Party and as a Senator in the Federal House. He was untiring in his work and displayed great energy and interest right up to the time of his passing. On behalf of all the members of my party, and myself, I would like to pay a tribute to the work he did, and to express sympathy to his widow, his family and his relatives.

I also wish to offer my congratulations to the two new members here. The member for Warren is known by a phrase we heard mentioned in the electorate of West Perth at one stage. This phrase seemed to be the election motto of one of the candidates—"Vote for Joe, the Man You Know."

The other new member is the member for Pilbara who was recently elected unopposed. I have been here only 12 years, so who am I to make any suggestions or give advice to new members? There are many people who are probably much better qualified. The member for Fremantle, for instance, as a result of his long experience both in Opposition and on the Government benches, and indeed as Speaker, could probably give the new members sounder advice than I could.

The Hon. J. B. Sleeman: All right! I'll have a word with them.

The Hon. D. BRAND: Whatever advice the member for Fremantle gives, I can assure the two new members it will be right down to earth and will probably be associated with Fremantle or a certain bridge that it is proposed to build over the river.

The Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Haven't you read the papers?

The Hon. D. BRAND: It has been said that most hon. members come into Parliament—I think this was said by Dr.

Earle Page of some members in the Federal House—on a pedestal; and that some of them are wise enough to get down themselves after a little while, but that the others wait to be knocked down. That is a matter that is up to hon. members. I am sure that whatever hopes the new members have in respect to putting forward the affairs of their electorates in this House and of working for them here, they will achieve, because that is a matter for themselves.

The question of their making speeches—this is one of the most difficult things that most of us have to do in this House—is their affair; and just how fairly they present their case is up to them, because it has been said that all members are cut down to size after they have been here a little while. I conclude this phase of my speech by once again offering to those two members the heartiest congratulations on their election; and I hope that though their experience will not be a long one, it will be healthy and happy.

Mr. May: Fair enough.

The Hon. D. BRAND: We meet now for the last session in the second Parliament in the life of this Government, and I should imagine—the Premier has not intimated this—that some time early in the new year—I hope we do not get mixed up with another Federal budget on that occasion—we will be going to the electors. It is a pity we could not go now, because I am sure there would be sweeping changes and we would find ourselves on the other side of the House.

The Minister for Transport: Like Pilbara and Warren!

The Hon. D. BRAND: I had no doubt that members would laugh, because that is all they could do. There is not really any stronger answer to the fact that the State at this time is making very heavy work in respect to the problems which concern us; and it is regrettable indeed that Western Australia is looked on at this stage as again being the Cinderella State of the Commonwealth.

Mr. May: You are starting electioneering early.

The Hon. D. BRAND: Not yet; but along with the hon. member, I will be doing so and I shall find myself in a much happier position than he. I do not know what lies ahead of us in Western Australia, but it can be assumed that many economic problems will face us. I cannot see how the Government can obtain the necessary capital and finance; and it is only capital and finance which will provide the work and employment which are needed to revive the economy of the State and to restore a general state of prosperity.

At this stage I do not want to say a great deal regarding the belated effort of the Government to attract capital to Western Australia, in competition with other States. I say belated because it cannot

be denied that it is certainly a very late effort. However, we on this side hope that the mission will be successful and that it will bring capital to Western Australia. I think I heard the Minister for Education grunt. He of all people—

The Minister for Education: No; I did not grunt!

The Hon. D. BRAND:—should like to see money of some sort, because if we take any notice of the answers he has given of recent years, he has never got any money of any kind; and at one stage he was signing a great number of P.N.'s for work performed for his department.

Mr. Bovell: When funds are available.

The Hon. D. BRAND: That reminds me that, as a matter of fact, he has adopted a policy in respect to the installation of septic tanks in country schools—I do not think he has applied it to the metropolitan area yet—of asking the parents and citizens to share the cost of this work. To this extent I, having one school in particular in mind—Yuna—am grateful for the approval given by the department for work to proceed, on the basis, of course, of the parents and citizens' association doing about 50 per cent. of it.

I notice that reference was made in one of the country papers to Moorine Rock. I do not know in whose electorate that is; but once again we find an arrangement whereby the Government is going to contribute £50 a year, after borrowing £700 or £800, for the repayment of the money required for the capital cost of the installation.

Mr. Nalder: He must have caught the disease from the Minister for Health.

The Hon. D. BRAND: He possibly did. It is unfortunately correct. But I just emphasise at this juncture that if it is absolutely necessary to call upon the efforts—and probably the personal contribution in cash—of the people of the electorates before we can install the modern convenience of a septic tank, then it would appear that the Government situation is a bad one and our economy is in a poor way.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. D. BRAND: Before tea, I referred to the rather insolvent position of the Education Department, inasmuch as it cannot provide country schools with septic tank systems and has called on the local people—in most cases per medium of the Parents and Citizens' Association—to do the work and thus subsidise what people in the metropolitan area receive for nothing. While we would not deny city people any advantage they may have in that regard, I am wondering how long it will be before the Minister for Education extends a similar policy to the city and, if he does so, how successful it will be.

Mr. Johnson: Don't you think the city parents and citizens do anything?

The Hon. D. BRAND: I am mindful of the great work that the parents and citizens do, but I am speaking of the necessity for the Education Department to do something. Of course, it is all a question of finance; and, as I said earlier, Western Australia has not enjoyed any inflow of new capital during the last two or three years and we have depended largely on the taxpayers of the Commonwealth to assist us from time to time. We did have, two years ago, a special grant of about £2,000,000 to help us overcome our unemployment difficulties; but as far as we can see at present, the outlook is not at all hopeful.

On opening day, in another place, the Hon. F. J. S. Wise, an ex-Premier of this State, spoke on the problems of Commonwealth-State relationships, and made mention of the fact that, if we were really to progress in solving this problem, we would have to confer outside the influence and atmosphere of politics. That was not the first occasion on which that has been said; but, nevertheless, it is unfortunately only too true.

If we peruse newspaper cuttings of the last three or four years we will see that the Premier has indulged, on many occasions, in criticism of the Commonwealth for not providing this State with sufficient money and, of course, he is not the only Premier who has done that. In the prosperous State of Victoria, Mr. Bolte has complained, from time to time, that Victoria does not receive a fair allocation of the available money; and surely, since 1946 when the Loan Council Agreement was arrived at, there have been such changes, throughout the Commonwealth, that the time has arrived for a review of the whole situation.

Some attempt has been made to call the States together, in conference with the Commonwealth, in the hope of arriving at a solution; but if we cast our minds back to those occasions, we recall that they got nowhere and, at the last Loan Council meeting, the cut-up of the available finance was on the same basis as had applied for a number of years previously. If we must have more money, it is high time that the Leader of our Government went to the Premiers' Conference and to the Loan Council and really pressed our claims for a review of the formula, on the basis that we are not getting our fair share of the money collected under the uniform taxation scheme.

Mr. Andrew: Doesn't he do that now?

The Hon. D. BRAND: No.

Mr. Andrew: I think you're wrong.

The Hon. D. BRAND: The Premier and others have raised this issue, and we can only gather our information from the Press. I repeat that there has been no

indication that any real effort has been made by the Premier to have a review of the formula under which the moneys are distributed—whether tax reimbursements or loan funds.

The Minister for Housing: Is there anything wrong with the formula or is it just the amount? I think it is the latter.

The Hon. D. BRAND: If the Government is happy with the formula and is dissatisfied only with the amount of money underwritten by the Commonwealth, because loan moneys are not available in sufficient quantity to meet the loan requirements of the Commonwealth, we question whether the Commonwealth is doing the right thing by the States. It claims to be doing the right thing, just as this Government would tell the Opposition and the people of this State that it is doing all it can with the money available; that it is cutting costs; and that the reason for its not having sufficient money to meet the demands of the various departments is that there is a limited amount of cash available and that it will not go around.

There may be criticisms—as I am sure there will be as the session proceeds—showing that the Government has been extravagant in that it might have cut costs, and indicating where, by calling tenders, it might have had jobs done more cheaply. That criticism could possibly be levelled at the Commonwealth also, although it claims it is doing everything possible to keep down costs and that it is distributing as much as it can possibly afford, indicating, of course, that if there is to be more money made available to the States under this formula, heavier taxation will be required.

I was interested to read that during the last Loan Council meeting, the Premier of Victoria made the statement that he was going to set about having a review made of the formula. The statement, dated the 7th June, 1958, as it appeared in "The West Australian," was to the effect that other Premiers have said that they voted against Mr. Bolte, who sought a larger amount for Victoria, because Victoria had financed its budget deficits from loan funds. I do not know whether our Premier voted; but, if he did, he must have done so with his tongue in his cheek.

The Treasurer: Nobody voted against him.

The Hon. D. BRAND: The statement has not been contradicted here, and I am simply going by what I read in the Press, as the Premier often does—

The Treasurer: It is most unreliable.

The Hon. D. BRAND: The Premier should refer that to the boys in the Press gallery. I am quoting from the Press; and, for the purpose of argument, it appears that the Premiers voted against Mr. Bolte because he was doing exactly what we have

been doing in this State for two or three years, as indicated in a reply by the Premier to a question I asked him, because his reply was to the effect that we have indeed been financing the annual deficit of the State from our loan funds, to the extent of over £1,000,000. I raised that question only because it seemed to be rather inconsistent.

The fact remains, however, that because of the great changes that have taken place in respect to industry and population throughout the whole of the Commonwealth, it might be as well, in spite of what the Minister for Transport suggests, for the Premiers to have a heart-to-heart talk and for the whole basis of the distribution of funds to be reviewed. It seems to me that that would be worth while.

But I suggest that one of the reasons why it could not be achieved is the opposing policies of the main political groups in the Federal House. The Labour Party is pledged to unification. It states so in its policy; and, in fact, it has pledged itself towards achieving more control by the central government, ultimately envisaging that system of government, whilst the Liberal and Country Parties are pledged to uphold the Federal system.

The Treasurer: Why don't they practise it?

The Hon. D. BRAND: Whether they are doing it to the extent they should is a matter of opinion. It may be that we are not doing everything possible to uphold the autonomy and independence of the States against the Federal system; but let us remember that while we support, or any State Government supports uniform taxation, there will always be the problem of the intrusion of the Federal authority, and the problem of the great influence the Commonwealth has on everything which is done by the States.

Unless we can get away from the political atmosphere and decide this question purely on a national basis, and in the interests of the welfare and future of all the States, we cannot hope for any reasonable solution, or any change from the present position. I think a suggestion was put forward recently that the Premiers and the Leaders of the Opposition should meet, with the Prime Minister and Leader of the Opposition in the Federal sphere, with a view to arriving at some satisfactory conclusion. However, there would still be the overriding issue of politics and a sparring for political advantage in such a debate or conference.

At present, in the overall, we are a reasonably prosperous nation; but it was not in the same happy circumstances that the present formula and the present financial agreements were arrived at because we in Western Australia, Tasmania and South Australia—the claimant States—were finding that the then existing system was preventing us from obtaining the capital necessary to develop and expand our

States as compared with what we know as the standard States—Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland. Victoria has developed and grown since then. The other States have done the same; and we, too, for our part, have become a greater force in the affairs of the Commonwealth. But we still have a vast Commonwealth problem—an immense problem—which I believe is beyond the capacity of the State Government at present under the existing financial arrangements.

Until the Premiers and the leaders in the Commonwealth sphere are prepared to meet at a round table conference and forget their political allegiance we will not arrive at a satisfactory conclusion with regard to our difficulties. Firstly, we have to decide the question of the continuity of uniform taxation. I believe that under the existing system Western Australia is being reasonably treated. Nevertheless, as has been emphasised even in the Federal sphere, if we are to continue the present system of collecting income taxation, we will always be in danger, as States, of being superseded and overlorded by the Commonwealth.

Mr. Johnson: Doesn't that apply so long as we have the issue of paper money from a single government?

The Hon. D. BRAND: Unlike the member for Leederville, I have not studied economics, and I do not intend to go into the question of paper money. I might add that when the Premier, in answer to a question of mine this evening, suggested that the member for Leederville was going to ask a couple of questions regarding the position of the Metropolitan Passenger Transport Trust, I wondered what he had to do with it.

Nevertheless, he claims to have studied the problem of finance, and perhaps later on he will get up and tell us something about it. I would remind members that each and every department of late—with the exception of the State Housing Commission, whose Minister has been very liberally treated by the Commonwealth, and who, when the Commonwealth did not grant him the funds, took them as an overdraft from the Treasurer—

The Treasurer: He has done a magnificent job.

The Hon. D. BRAND: He received a magnificent sum; and I understand that he was the only Minister who thought it was not magnificent, because the funds made available to other Ministers were cut accordingly—

The Treasurer: He did a magnificent job with the money.

The Hon. D. BRAND: My word he did! He has done a very good job. Recently we had the report of a committee which investigated the native problem in the State. The main recommendation of that committee was that some millions of

pounds should be granted by the Commonwealth for the necessary work. I would also refer members to the Minister for Health who, when receiving a deputation from the people of Victoria Park, said that if the Commonwealth Government would give us more money he would be able to carry out the necessary sewerage and drainage work. So each department is making a claim for more money from the Commonwealth.

I am not opposed to that; but it seems to me that it is just so much talk, and we will go on talking for ever and a day unless we are prepared to arrive at and abide by some decision which is made with respect to the existing situation, and not based on some agreement which was made 12 or 13 years ago.

One other matter to which I desire to refer, in regard to Commonwealth-State relations, is the road grant which we receive from the Commonwealth. It cannot be denied that Western Australia is handsomely treated as a result of the agreement, and the time is fast approaching when there must be a review. When we went out of office, early in 1953, the Commonwealth allocation was £2,900,000; but now it is about £7,225,000, or some colossal sum such as that.

Mr. Potter: And it ought to be double that, seeing what they get from the motorists.

The Hon. D. BRAND: I would have thought that the hon. member would have complained about that to the Minister for Transport before he imposed the increased vehicle tax some time ago.

Mr. Potter: That is only a minute sum.

The Minister for Transport: Chicken feed.

The Hon. D. BRAND: It is the chicken feed for which they make the bags.

The Minister for Transport: It goes to the local authorities.

The Hon. D. BRAND: Nevertheless it is a cost to the motorist. As I have already said, we in this State are faring very well because of the allocation of approximately £7,000,000 to be spent on roads throughout the State. I would merely like to remind the House that as the matter is coming up for review it is vital and essential to see that our case is well aired in Commonwealth circles, and to ensure the continuity of this rather liberal formula which has been so helpful to us over the years.

The Treasurer: I think it is very important that we should not say things which the Premier of Victoria might be able to quote against us when that conference takes place.

The Hon. D. BRAND: He might quote—and indeed he has quoted—a great many things up to date. For instance, he has quoted the Narrows bridge.

The Premier: He should not be able to quote us.

The Hon. D. BRAND: He could quote us; because I would refer the House to the fact that the Premier, as acting Minister for Works, made a statement on what we have been allocated and what a colossal programme we were going to undertake.

The Treasurer: I did not say it was handsome.

The Hon. D. BRAND: The Premier was highlighting the great programme of public works that was to be carried out with it, and therefore it is six of one and half a dozen of the other.

The Treasurer: That was fact.

The Hon. D. BRAND: If it was based on the word "handsome," I will leave it at that. Nevertheless, it is a large sum of money and the Premier might well apply himself to ensuring that this formula and the basis for the agreement is carried on when the Commonwealth Government next decides to legislate.

The Minister for Justice: You would not say that the formula is unfair against the rest of Australia, or that Western Australia is getting too much money out of it?

The Hon. D. BRAND: Of course I do not!

The Minister for Transport: That's better!

The Hon. D. BRAND: I now want to touch on a matter which is of interest to us all; namely, the Metropolitan Passenger Transport Trust. I do not suppose that for many a long day any legislation has aroused such public interest as did the legislation that was introduced by the Minister for Transport last session for the establishment of the Metropolitan Passenger Transport Trust and the taking over by it of the services conducted by the private bus companies.

Without going into the pros and cons of the history of this matter, the fact remains that the legislation passed through both Houses of this Parliament and the Bill became law. However, I feel sure that had this House or another known the facts, or been in any doubt as to the availability of the money that is necessary to carry out this project, the legislation would never have been rushed through Parliament as it was. We passed this legislation last session; and, even now, apart from the appointment of a general manager and members of the trust and—according to what the Minister has told us tonight—apart from some assessment of the assets for compensation purposes, not a great deal has been done—

The Minister for Transport: You'd be surprised!

The Hon. D. BRAND:—and, in fact, the trust does not even own one bus. This is because the Minister for Transport misled the House with respect to the ability of the Government to finance—

The Minister for Transport: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for an unqualified withdrawal of the statement that I misled the House. If the Leader of the Opposition has any doubts on the position, all he has to do is to read the report of the select committee that was made at that time. To suggest that I misled the House is grossly inaccurate.

The Hon. D. BRAND: I am always ready to apologise if I have been unfair in the House, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister for Transport: What are you doing now?

The Hon. D. BRAND: I still feel that the Minister for Transport misled the House when this matter of appointments and compensation and how it would be financed was being discussed, because I will quote from Hansard what the Minister actually said. The member for Vasse, Mr. Bovell, asked the Minister the following question:—

Will permission from the Loan Council be required for this transaction?

The Minister for Transport replied—

I do not think so. In fact, I am certain it will not be required. I do not think there will be any difficulty in that regard. Perhaps the member for Vasse can consult his legal adviser on that point, but I am prepared to back mine.

Mr. Bovell: And I was right!

The Minister for Transport: You were not right!

The Hon. D. BRAND: Mr. Bovell went on to say that it was not the legal adviser but the financial adviser that would be concerned in this case. He also said that it was creating something for nothing. The Minister for Transport then went on to say—

The Minister for Transport: A committee of three was responsible for the preparation of this Bill. They comprised the chairman of the Transport Board, the Chief Parliamentary Draftsman and the Assistant Under Treasurer, the latter having attended Loan Council and Premiers' meetings and who holds a most responsible position. I would therefore suggest that those three men should know where they are going.

Mr. Bovell: Is there any precedent?

The Minister for Transport: I hope there is not. If there is one thing I like about Western Australian politics, it is the fact that we can pioneer a few ventures.

Mr. Bovell: This is not a party political matter; it is a financial proposition.

I say that the Minister did mislead the House because it was not until recently, through a Press statement, that we realised the Premier had discovered that he could not issue debentures and bonds without the approval of the Loan Council; and so he set about obtaining it in the usual way by getting in touch with the Federal Treasurer, and no doubt he also communicated with the State members of the Loan Council. Therefore, it was as a result of his making a statement that the possibility of approval was favourable, that I questioned those words. In his reply the Premier was most guarded; and, at this juncture, I would say that unless something has happened in the meantime we are not certain that this approval is forthcoming. If it is, it is all right, because the House approved of it on that basis.

However, the Minister for Transport assured the member for Vasse and the other members of this House that the issue of debentures as a means of compensating the private bus companies was in order; and he said, "In fact, I am certain that it is." Therefore, I do not feel that I should withdraw my statement in indicating that the Minister misled the House—even if unknowingly he misled it—because the greater part of the debate was centred around the problem as to how we would finance the take-over of the private bus companies. The financial aspect of the whole matter was probed and debated in this House. If the House, at that time, had had any doubt whatsoever on the matter, it would have suggested that it should be held over.

The Treasurer: The assurance that the Minister gave the House was given bona fide on the basis of the information supplied to him by the officer concerned.

The Hon. D. BRAND: I said that he might have unknowingly assured the House in that regard; but unfortunately it behoves the Minister to be careful on such an important matter, because members here knew that such a move was a departure from the principle of the Loan Council agreement and, if every State Government could go on ad lib issuing debentures for millions of pounds—and the Minister himself suggested that from £2,000,000 to £2,500,000 would be involved and I question whether he would do it for £2,000,000—I think this matter would have been given a much closer review.

However, at this juncture, having gone so far, we on this side of the House are justified in questioning what line the Premier will take if, by chance, approval cannot be obtained.

The Treasurer: Nobody is objecting to your doing that.

The Hon. D. BRAND: No; but the Minister is frowning and intimating that I am saying the wrong thing. It is a very clear-cut case—

The Treasurer: You are not looking very happy yourself.

The Hon. D. BRAND: —quite clear enough to make the Treasurer hesitate when he was answering a couple of questions.

The Treasurer: I said you were not looking very happy.

The Hon. D. BRAND: I am quite happy; but seeing we are so near an election, and seeing that there was such a public outcry about the take-over of the private bus companies—

The Minister for Transport: There was not.

The Hon. D. BRAND: Had the Minister travelled in the buses in the metropolitan area at that time he would have discovered, and if he did so even now, he would find a feeling that it is a great pity that the buses are being taken over by the Government, because the people prefer the service given them by privately-owned transport.

The Minister for Transport: Not one bus company protested.

The Hon. D. BRAND: I am not talking about the bus companies, but about the people who ride on the buses.

The Minister for Transport: If it were not for this trust, half of them would be out of business.

The Hon. D. BRAND: I am talking about the people for whom the Minister's heart appears to bleed so much from time to time—the people who must use these buses. In the event of this approval not being forthcoming—

The Minister for Transport: But it has come.

The Hon. D. BRAND: Has it?

The Minister for Transport: Yes; here it is.

The Hon. D. BRAND: The Treasurer should take whatever steps are necessary to keep the private companies going and allow the people of the State to decide whether it was a wise move after all. I feel that tonight the Treasurer did not feel justified in assuring the House that the approval of the Loan Council was forthcoming.

The Minister for Transport: He was kidding you along.

The Hon. D. BRAND: He does not kid unless it suits him to do so. The Treasurer would have liked to give a clear-cut case so that it would appear to his advantage in the Press. I think I have said enough on the problem of the metropolitan bus transport.

Before I sit down might I say that I hope the difficulty that has developed between the two unions concerned will be settled in such a way as to enable the trust, if it is set up, and its members, to run this transport organisation as a business concern. I hope they will not be hampered by unnecessary appeal boards and the like; that they will be given the same opportunities as have the private business companies in the past—opportunities to hire and fire, to reward efficiency and interest in work by promotions. For, no matter how we look at it, if this transport trust has ever to meet its obligations and balance its ledger, it will require, from each and every one of its employees, a fair day's work for a fair day's pay.

I would like to conclude by saying how much we all appreciate the improvements made to this Chamber. Money has been spent on improving its appearance and repairing the seats. This was long overdue. I am pleased to see that at last a Government—

The Minister for Transport: The Government.

The Hon. D. BRAND: A Government.

The Minister for Transport: The Government.

The Hon. D. BRAND: I am pleased to see that a Government has faced up to the problem of doing something towards the completion of Parliament House.

The Minister for Transport: What a Government!

The Hon. D. BRAND: I have heard that sentiment expressed differently by other people. I would also ask the Treasurer to see that the cost of the work is kept to a minimum, and that he have it done by contract as far as possible; because if it is to go on for a number of years, a colossal sum of money will be involved, and the taxpayer would be justified in querying any large expenditure. Nevertheless, it is a good thing to see that Parliament House is to be completed at last, and that ultimately it will have the necessary accommodation and appointments we expect to find in the Houses of Parliament of this State.

MR. PERKINS (Roe) [8.5]: I have no doubt that before many weeks have passed we will hear the Treasurer introducing the Budget to this House. I trust he will give us a more detailed account of the Government's financial activities in the last 12 months, and also what it proposes to do in the immediate future. Because of that I do not desire to say very much at this stage.

But there are a couple of points on which I would like to comment, because I feel they are of some urgency, and that it is desirable that the Treasurer should make some public announcement in connection

with them. There are many indications that for some time now business conditions have been less buoyant in Western Australia.

The Treasurer: And in America and in the United Kingdom.

Mr. PERKINS: Yes; and in other parts of the world. I do not propose to criticise the Government particularly in that respect. I merely wish to suggest some measure which would help alleviate the position in Western Australia. But so long as the House accepts that that is the position, my point will be made.

One of the reasons why Western Australia is particularly affected is that it is mainly dependent on primary production; and the fall in prices in some of our major agricultural products, coupled with difficult seasonal conditions in some parts of the State, have had an adverse effect on business generally. Those of us who represent country areas see the effect of that even more sharply than perhaps some of the members representing metropolitan electorates.

The first point with which I am concerned is the cost of transport in areas which have not been served by railways, and which are dependent on road transport in one form or another. These services have been subsidised by the Government through the Transport Board in the past. The second point that concerns me is the road transport serving those areas formerly served by the railways but where railway services have now been discontinued.

It so happens that the area I represent has a considerable portion of territory coming within that particular category. Ever since the services were discontinued on a number of country lines, I have been pressing both the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Railways to come out and have a look at the conditions in some of these country areas so affected. Unfortunately the Minister for Transport at the last moment was unable to come out, though the Minister for Railways did agree to have a look at the area of country formerly served by the Lake Grace-Hyden railway; and I am most grateful to him for the interest he showed and for the very thorough look he had around that district.

The reason for thinking that that area should be examined first is not because I have more regard for that portion of my electorate than for any other part, or for any other portion of the State. I do consider that as the Hyden area is farthest away from the port and has the highest grain rate in the State, it is more vitally affected by transport costs.

The Minister was very impressed with the amount of development going on in those districts. I hope that whatever reports he makes to his colleagues in Cabinet will give a true picture of both potential

development, as well as the great production in that particular portion of the State.

At a subsequent meeting in Hyden the Minister for Railways made a statement that the Government would be willing to reconsider the annual one-seventh reduction in the amount of subsidy on road transport instituted in lieu of the railway services formerly serving those districts; also the reduced subsidy applying to road services in the other districts which did not have a railway at all, such as the district I represent—the Lakes area and the Ravensthorpe district.

The Hon. D. Brand: The Premier stated during the last session that he would reconsider the matter.

Mr. PERKINS: That is my reason for speaking tonight. I think the Premier should declare his Government's policy in this respect. There is no doubt in my mind that unless the Government does its part in preventing further increases of costs in these agricultural areas we shall see a further reduction in agricultural production in those portions of the State. All members will realise the effect falling prices of agricultural products and a reduction of primary production can have, not only on those districts concerned, but on the economic life of the State in general.

Surely no responsible Government wants to see that drift go further. I tell the Premier quite seriously that settlers—particularly new settlers trying to develop new properties in such areas—cannot stand any further increase of costs.

The position is that when rail services were discontinued, for the first 12 months road transport providing a service in lieu thereof would convey heavy freight—grain and super—at the same cost as had been formerly charged by the Railway Department. That does not apply exactly, because other costs have crept in. Up to date there has not been any very substantial increase in costs, although there have been some. Now that 12 months have elapsed since the discontinuance of those railway services, there has been a one-seventh reduction in the subsidy; therefore, from the 1st July this year settlers in those particular areas have had their subsidies reduced by one-seventh. In the other districts, such as the Lakes and Ravensthorpe, the interpretation of the policy by the Transport Board was that one-seventh reduction should take place from the 1st July last year, and a further one-seventh reduction from the 1st July this year.

I have checked up with the Transport Board and discovered that a further one-seventh reduction has taken place from the 1st July of this year. In districts like the Lakes district and Ravensthorpe there has been a two-sevenths reduction in the

subsidy on road transport which operates a service formerly provided on the same basis as if it were a through service by the Railways.

I cannot stress too strongly how serious the position is to the settlers in those districts. If the Premier, the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Railways have not considered the matter in detail up to this point, I would suggest that urgent thought be given to it as soon as possible because if we get through another harvest with a prospect of still further increases in cost, the developmental and cropping programme in future years will be affected. I hope the Premier, when replying to this debate, will be able to make some firm announcement, preferably that the line is to be reopened or at least the full subsidy retained. If he is unable to do that I very seriously suggest that he make an announcement as soon as possible.

The other point I wish to raise relates to assistance for new settlers developing virgin land in the various agricultural districts of the State. This is a subject on which I have spoken on many occasions in this House. I make no apologies for referring to it again, because I consider that, with the drop in wool prices particularly, and the general increase in costs, the position would be made more and more difficult for the settlers.

The Treasurer will remember that I introduced one or two deputations to him. I have introduced deputations to other Ministers and those deputations have explained in some detail the difficulties associated with the development of new land anywhere in the State on a limited capital at the present time. If the Treasurer and his Ministers make some examination of the costs of the war service land settlement scheme, for instance, they will find, judging by the difficulties which that scheme is finding in developing new land and keeping development within reasonable figures, that settlers trying to develop new land with their own resources are having a very trying time indeed.

It is galling to such settlers developing new land with very limited resources to see the lavish way in which money is spent on some of the war service land settlement projects. I do not say this in any critical vein; but I do feel that possibly there will be a very much bigger write-off of capital expenditure involved in bringing those war service land settlement properties down to the true economic value when the settlers finally take them over, than the public realises. I would seriously suggest to the member for Vasse that he have some second thoughts before he advocates anything in the nature of a civilian land settlement scheme along the lines of the war service land settlement scheme unless the Government has very substantial loan moneys available today to see it through.

Mr. Potter: He has in mind the Commonwealth footing the bill.

Mr. PERKINS: Whether the Commonwealth foots the bill or whether the State does so, it comes out of the same pocket in the long run, and that is the Australian taxpayer's pocket. We have heard it said, from time to time, that irrespective of what money is spent on developing our countryside, very substantial losses are made, but it does not matter, because we have the development, and these substantial losses are justified.

All I can say in regard to that theory—I am not commenting on whether the theory is a good one or whether it is a bad one—is that if the Government has a certain sum of loan moneys to waste, or to write off—perhaps that is the proper term—and that given sum will, by being spent in a certain way, develop double the acreage that could be developed by its being spent another way, surely the former scheme is twice as good as the other. Further, if it is possible for the Government to spend the money without losing any substantial portion of it, that ought to be a still better scheme.

What I have been suggesting to the Government for some considerable time is that it should make use of machinery which is already set up in this State. It was set up by a Bill which was introduced by the Hon. F. J. S. Wise when he was Premier of this State, and it constituted the agency section of the Rural and Industries Bank.

Mr. Bovell: He was Minister for Lands then.

Mr. PERKINS: The member for Vasse has mentioned that he was the Minister for Lands at the time. That measure was supported by members on both sides of this House. As I have told members in this Chamber before, if they will look at that particular measure they will find that the agency section provides exactly the same machinery as did the old Agricultural Bank, which was responsible for the development of a great deal of the wheat belt areas in Western Australia.

I feel at a time like this that the Treasurer should be giving very serious consideration indeed to finding funds from some source in order to make them available to that particular department. As far as I am aware, there had been practically no funds loaned through the agency section of the Rural and Industries Bank for the development of farms.

Mr. Hearman: About £50,000 over 25 years.

Mr. PERKINS: I think they were only moneys repaid from old loan funds.

Mr. Hearman: I understand that about £50,000 new money has been made available since 1935.

Mr. PERKINS: I did not realise it was that much; but it is a very paltry sum.

Mr. Evans: How many farmers patronise the Rural and Industries Bank?

Mr. PERKINS: Most of them. In every district I would say that the patronage of the R. & I. Bank is as strong as for the other trading banks. I do not think there is any doubt about that. The point is, that £50,000—or even £100,000—is a very paltry sum when one compares it with the assistance given by the Government to some branches of secondary industry. For instance, it is a very paltry sum when one compares it with the £3,000,000 with which the Government has backed the firm of Chamberlains.

I believe that in very many instances the use of funds to support some of those settlers who have committed very substantial sums of their own, and who have got so far with their development and are now at a dead end, would be a better investment than some of the other ways in which the Government has allocated the moneys available to it. I think any member representing a rural area will be able to quote numerous instances of settlers who have started off with some thousands of pounds of their own, although in some cases it may have been a lesser amount. However, I do not know of an instance where men have attempted to start with much less than £1,000; and they have had some success up to the present time in regard to the development of their properties.

When conditions were very buoyant several years ago, and wool prices were high, and costs did not increase quite so steeply as they have done in recent times, it was possible for such settlers to take some portion of the current earnings from the property in order to do further capital development. However, I think that most people associated with primary industry will agree with me when I say that it is very difficult for even well established farmers to take very much out of current production at the present time in order to put it into capital development.

I think members can realise, without very much imagination, just how difficult it must be for new settlers who have so much further developmental work to do on their properties, and whose current production is actually rather meagre because of the fact that their properties are not fully developed to find further moneys for that necessary capital development.

In these circumstances, it is very necessary for some financial institution to make these capital moneys available for that necessary development, particularly in the case of fencing and of water supplies. These are probably the two most urgent requirements; but, of course, in some cases further clearing and development of that nature is necessary.

In years gone by it was the policy of the trading banks to advance money on overdraft without the expectation of having

such loans repaid for very considerable periods of time. I think there would be many instances where such loans were outstanding for 20 or 25 years. I think I am right in saying that it is now the policy of the Central Bank that the banking institutions must not make advances which cannot be repaid within a comparatively few years.

I know from my discussions with managers of banks in regard to how things are going in particular districts that they like to see the money coming back within three or four years if possible. In many instances they prefer a shorter period than that. I think it is quite obvious that in these circumstances it is not sound to lend for capital development, such as fencing and water supplies, which we know full well, because with the other development required on the property, it is unlikely that such capital borrowings could be repaid for a period of 10, 15 or 20 or more years.

Of course, the agency section of the R. & I. Bank provides the machinery for just that kind of lending. I well remember that, when the Banking Commission was sitting in the 1930's, evidence was given by the Primary Producers' Association—of which I was an executive member at that time—stressing the need for some alterations to our banking system and the development of something akin to the mortgage bank which, I understand, is used for that sort of lending and borrowing in Europe. I think, from memory, that the banking commission, in its report, made recommendations encouraging that kind of financial set-up.

Be that as it may, we must deal with the situation as it exists and it seems that the agency section of the R. & I. Bank provides the machinery necessary to cover this need, so long as it has sufficient loan funds allocated to it to give it the sinews of war. Once again, I stress that need and tell the Premier that unless considerable assistance is made available to some of these men, who have committed their life savings in developing new land, they will come to a dead stop and, in many instances, may lose their properties altogether.

One man, who approached me recently, had had £5,000, which he put into a partly-developed property. Since then he has done a considerable amount of developmental work and has put back into further development all the money he could take out of current production; yet now he finds himself unable to comply with the terms of the contract of sale, and the mortgagee could foreclose on him at any time. If that happened he would lose the £5,000 that he has put into the property, because it is in an area where the rail service has been discontinued and where there has been a fall in land values. I do not think that at auction the property would bring £5,000

today and so the settler could lose all the capital that he originally put into the place, together with all the hard work he has done since.

I have here a letter, of which the Minister for Lands has no doubt seen the original, from a number of settlers in the King Rock area. They have taken up new ground, some of which was fairly heavily priced, because at that time the railway was operating. Since then there has been a fall in land values in that area, due to uncertain prospects and the uncertainty in relation to transport services and so on, with the result that these settlers are asking for an adjustment of the land rents of their properties. I sincerely hope that the Minister will give serious consideration to their request.

I know, from personal experience, that in a large number of cases the new settlers are in serious difficulties. I could quote a number of instances, also, where men have already walked off their properties. I believe that in certain instances these men started off with too little capital; and if a man has committed himself to only £500 or £600 in regard to a property and then comes to a dead stop, it is easier for him to walk off than if he were committed to a much larger sum. Members might say that such new settlers are taking too great a risk in trying to develop new country without sufficient financial backing.

Perhaps the Premier will forgive me if I recount what happened at one deputation—and I might add that the Premier is never a very easy man to whom to take a deputation. I do not suggest that he is discourteous, or anything of that sort, but he does not hesitate to probe what he may think is any weak point.

Mr. Norton: You should not have weak points in your case.

Mr. PERKINS: I think the Premier will agree that in this instance the case presented was stronger than he thought it was.

The Hon. L. Thorn: The member for Roe said, "if the Premier thought there were weaknesses."

Mr. PERKINS: Thank you! At this deputation there were two settlers who, in reply to the Premier's questions, told him that they had £4,000 when they went on the land—they said they had about 5,000 acres—and after considering the matter for a moment the Premier said "Do you think £4,000 was sufficient money with which to develop 4,000 or 5,000 acres?" One of the partners thought for a moment and then said, "Well, Mr. Premier, I am afraid it was not. I think perhaps I should have had £10,000, but if I had had £10,000 I would not be out there living in the backblocks like a blackfellow. I would have had one of those nice little farms around Northam."

That was a first-class reply, because that is how many of our outer areas have been developed, with the result that what were once outer areas are now some of the soundest farming districts in the State. It is the men who have the initiative and will to work, although perhaps they have too little capital, and who have not the opportunity to settle in the older and better developed districts, who are not afraid to take risks and do a great deal of hard work in order to get established in new areas.

I am endeavouring to make it clear that the Government should give such people the maximum possible support, because one of the worst things that could happen to the State would be to have a large number of abandoned farms, such as we have had at various times in the past. It is necessary to do everything possible to keep down costs and to have a very careful examination of transport costs in particular. I would like the Government to make some announcement, following the statement which the Minister for Railways made at Hyden; and, in conclusion, I repeat that the question of capital moneys for the agency section of the R. & I. Bank is a most important one at this stage of the State's development.

MR. WILD (Dale) [8.38]: I take this opportunity to bring before the Minister for Labour the question of the rostered petrol stations and to ask him to honour the undertaking that he gave this House in 1956, when he first introduced the legislation. On that occasion he said that the roster system would be drawn up, and the Automobile Chamber of Commerce would be asked to submit proposals.

He said, further, "If I happen to be Minister, I will want to see that everybody's interests are being considered." He said the power to create these zones had been given to the Automobile Chamber of Commerce, which had to submit them to him as Minister, for subsequent approval by Executive Council; and I will tell the House this evening that in the zone in which I live—that wherein the electorate of Dale is situated—there are two great anomalies. If the Minister is prepared to honour the undertaking that he gave he will have a look at those two cases and see that something is done to relieve the two petrol station proprietors from what will be absolute extinction if the present position is allowed to continue any longer.

About three years ago, at the southern end of my electorate, just outside of Byford, a man who, due to physical disabilities, was forced to sell a property he had at Moora, purchased a block of land at the corner of Oakland and the Armadale-Bunbury roads. He erected a service station and his good wife decided to operate a tearooms in conjunction with the petrol station.

Mr. Norton: Was it a service station?

Mr. WILD: Yes. Obviously the idea was that he would look after the bowsters and his good lady would look after the inner man when people came there to be supplied with petrol. He has been operating for only three years but I would like to tell the Minister exactly what has happened to that man since the introduction of the amendment to the Factories and Shops Act.

In November of last year he was selling approximately 800 to 1,000 gallons of petrol per week, and his good lady had increased the takings at the teasop to approximately £50 or £60 a week, which gave them a fair sort of living. Because of the introduction of this amending legislation the gallonage has slowly gone down until last week it reached an all-time low of just over 400 gallons; in addition, the takings at the tearooms slipped last week to just £3.

This man is in what is known as zone 5, which extends from the Welshpool turnoff right down to Byford; he is almost at the southern end of that particular zone. A fortnight ago his turn came up as the late rostered station; and in that week his turnover increased to 1,547 gallons, which means that for one week of the year his turnover is approximately 1,000 gallons above his normal gallonage. But what will he do for the other 51 weeks of the year in view of the fact that his gallonage dropped from approximately 1,000 gallons to an all-time low of 400 gallons the week before he was the rostered station?

Mr. Norton: What would that 1,000 gallons return? Would it be £10?

Mr. WILD: I am afraid that I do not know; but I understand that they get 3d. or 3½d. per gallon. If this man was able to make a living on 800 to 1,000 gallons per week, with his good lady taking something in the vicinity of £50 per week in the cafe, the possibilities of being able to make a living by selling 400 gallons per week and taking only £2, £3, or £4 a week in the cafe, are nil; it would be a physical impossibility for him to make a living on those figures.

Some few weeks ago—one Saturday afternoon—he was visited by an inspector of the Factories and Shops Department. It so happened that at that particular moment a man was bringing, on a trailer attached to his car, an engine to be repaired. Not knowing that this gentleman was an inspector from the Factories and Shops Department the service station proprietor opened the large doors of the lubritorium and, with the aid of the man, and the assistant who came with him, they took the engine off the trailer and proceeded to put it in the workshop at the back of the lubritorium.

In the meantime the officer from the department went around and inspected the bowsters and found that both of them were locked. He then went up to the service

station proprietor and warned him that if he found the lubritorium doors open again, outside the rostered hours, he would have to prosecute him; but he added that as on this particular occasion both bowsters were locked securely, he did not intend to take any action.

The Hon. D. Brand: How good of him!

Mr. WILD: The wife of this service station proprietor says that it is impossible to keep the cafe open. Just imagine sitting there all the week wanting to do business and taking only £2 to £5 a week! As she pointed out to me when I went to see her the other day, people come in on a Saturday or Sunday afternoon wanting petrol, but they are not allowed to give it to them. What do these motorists do? Instead of stopping and having a hot pie or a cup of tea they just move on. I suggest to the Minister that he have a look at this particular zone and make the boundaries nearer to Armadale, because exactly the same position is applying to another service station on the Williams-rd.

This station, too, was erected nearly four years ago, approximately five miles from Armadale. Since its inception, the proprietor has been largely dependent for his business on people who travel up from the south, and in particular those men who are carting timber and bringing cattle into the market. Most members who have journeyed on that particular road know that if they travel up from Albany, or some place near there, they are getting short of petrol by the time they reach Armadale.

Prior to the introduction of this amending legislation, this man was able to increase his gallonage to approximately 11,000 gallons per month. I have with me two of his invoices; and one, dated the 22nd October, 1957—approximately six weeks before the provisions of the amending legislation were gazetted—shows the figures I have mentioned. But in July, his gallonage was down to 5,400.

When this man made representations to the Automobile Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Harry, who went out to see him, blithely said to him, "Why don't you put up a lubritorium?" I think most members here know this particular station and how impossible it would be to make a lubritorium pay. To my certain knowledge only two houses can be seen from the station. Yet this man was told that he would get more business if he put up a lubritorium! That is just too ludicrous!

As I have said, his business has been practically dependent on what we now know as after hours trading. He told me that last Sunday he had to refuse no fewer than 57 people. He lives behind the service station, and he says that he is being continually knocked up by people asking for petrol. I repeat that in this particular zone these two men are suffering great

hardship; and there is no doubt that if it is allowed to continue, only one thing will happen. Inevitably they will both have to go out of business.

I made some play on the matter—and I think some other hon. members on this side of the House did too—when the original Bill was before the House in 1956; and also last year, when the Minister moved his amendments to close the gaps in the legislation to ensure that we were catering for the motoring public. I know that the Leader of the Country Party, and also the member for Wagin on many occasions, when travelling along that road, have wanted to obtain petrol at that service station. Further, I know that at least two hon. members in another place, who represent the province, have found themselves out of petrol whilst travelling along that road, but have still been denied their right to get it from this particular service station.

The Minister for Transport: Have you ever found yourself out of beer at 9 o'clock at night?

Mr. WILD: That is a tragic thing to happen to one, too. I have quoted these two cases, and there is no doubt that the proprietors are suffering great hardship. Apart from that, the motoring public is being denied the facilities it should be afforded. Here are two men who, as a result of the petrol zoning system, are being forced out of business; and I appeal to the Minister, in view of the undertaking he gave when introducing this legislation, to have a good look at the facts. I have in my possession all the facts and figures concerning the businesses conducted by these two men from the date zoning came into operation, and I am sure that unless the Minister does something to assist them, they will be out of business in the very near future.

THE HON. A. F. WATTS (Stirling) [8.52]: When the member for Roe was referring to the Rural & Industries Bank a few minutes ago, hon. members opposite, from the interjections they made, seemed to me to appreciate the fact that the Rural & Industries Bank was the direct successor to the Agricultural Bank and that, as a matter of fact, the Rural & Industries Bank Act repealed the legislation governing the Agricultural Bank.

The Agricultural Bank of Western Australia, from its inception something like 52 or 53 years ago, was for many years primarily responsible for the beginning of agricultural development in the outer areas of Western Australia; and without it—I think you will agree, Sir—it is very questionable whether the agricultural development and the primary production that have been achieved in Western Australia would ever have taken place. It is true that, in later years, the Agricultural Bank deteriorated and ceased to become

the developmental organ that it was originally intended to be—and, in fact for many years was—and in consequence of a variety of amendments that were moved to the statute about that time, it became, in many respects, somewhat unpopular.

However, in its earlier stages it had unquestionably done much to develop Western Australia; and the system by which it developed this State was to advance money to settlers on new land who had no capital resources, provided they did the work which was agreed upon between them and the bank at the time of the advance. For example, if 100 acres of clearing was to cost £100, the bank would make a substantial advance towards the cost of that work which would enable the settler to maintain himself and his family while carrying it out.

Upon that basis the agricultural lands of Western Australia were very largely developed. So, when the Rural & Industries Bank Act was introduced by the Hon P. J. S. Wise when he was Minister for Lands, and it took the place of the Agricultural Bank legislation, it was quite clear that the agency section of the Rural & Industries Bank—as it was so called—was, in its function, to be able to take substantially the place of the Agricultural Bank in the development of further agricultural areas in Western Australia.

It is no doubt true that probably, at that time, it was not contemplated that the cost of development would rise to the extent that it subsequently did. No doubt it made the problem of financing such development—even on a limited scale—much more difficult than was contemplated at the time the Act was passed. Nor is there any doubt in my mind that the opportunities for the Rural & Industries Bank, through that section of its legislation, to assist in the development of virgin country, have been severely hampered because the bank has been called upon to make extraordinary advances to other types of industry which, while they made some contribution towards the development of the State, did not and could not make anything like the contribution to the economy of Australia as a whole that an expansion of rural industry could and must do.

It was for that reason that I raised the question here in 1955 of the excessive advances which appeared to be put through the Rural & Industries Bank to Chamberlain Industries Pty. Ltd. I trust that, as a result of the discussions that were then set in train and following the report which was subsequently made to the Government, advances to that organisation, through the Rural & Industries Bank, have ceased. If they have not, then the problem of that institution, sufficiently great though it was in regard to that organisation, is going to be even greater.

Of course, I am prepared to assume at this stage, that its obligations are not to be increased in that direction. If that is so there should be some opportunity given to the Rural & Industries Bank to expand—to some degree at least—its activities in regard to granting assistance to these settlers who have been referred to by the member for Roe and who are anxious to develop agricultural property from its virgin state.

These people, as I see them, are in an immeasurably better position in most cases—anyway, in the cases in which we are interested—than were the settlers who originally came here and who were assisted by the Agricultural Bank, because these people have capital resources which they have spent in interim development. Their only problem is that they cannot finish the job without some further substantial assistance.

They are in a position to offer security with what has already been done with their own resources; and as it is quite apparent that Western Australia is still crying out for agricultural development, surely it is a matter of great moment that the resources of this great banking institution—which was partly intended for the purpose according to its legislation—should be able to be directed to carry out one of the functions which Parliament understood it was to carry out when it was created. That is the situation as I see it. That is my chief complaint in regard to the Rural & Industries Bank. It has, as a result of circumstances which I hope are now all over, been deprived of the opportunities to encourage sections of industry which it ought to have encouraged.

There does not seem, at the moment, any definite action being taken to reverse that process; and I can only express the hope that it will be, and implore the Government to give serious consideration to such action, so that that reversal of process can take place, and this banking institution can resume the position which I believe it was intended to take and which, to some degree, it has taken, in the development of agriculture in Western Australia.

We have heard much about the financial relationships between the Commonwealth and the State. I read with interest the remarks attributed in another place to the Hon. F. J. S. Wise. I do not think that we have ever really brought this problem of Commonwealth-State financial relationships into proper focus. I do not think we have properly inquired into the actual relationship between the collections, say, by the Commonwealth in Western Australia of taxation derived from the people of Western Australia, and the expenditure by the Commonwealth in Western Australia of the funds so derived.

It is true that there is far more spent in Western Australia by the Commonwealth than is represented by what it pays directly and indirectly to the State Government. We cannot escape from the fact that Western Australia must receive, through the due proportion of its citizens, the benefits that are derived from social benefits of one kind or another; a share which it must have of the services given by the Postmaster General's Department, and in many other ways which, if one looks through the whole gamut of Federal activities, give the expenditure in Western Australia by the Commonwealth of moneys derived by it from the taxpayers.

But it is impossible, so far as I can find out—and I have spent some little time on this—to ascertain, with any degree of accuracy, just what those various expenditures are. What is the figure that is spent in Western Australia on social services and matters of that kind, taking into consideration not only the actual grants to individuals, but the salaries and emoluments which must be paid to those civil servants who administer the laws of this State? And so we could go on.

But in addition to all that which, as I have said, cannot, so far as I am concerned, be accurately assessed, there are two amounts which are directly returned to this State by the Commonwealth Government. As the major item, I suppose, we have the amounts made available through the Grants Commission, because those are made under Section 96 of the Constitution, and there is no drawback. We are not asked to repay any of it, or refund any of it or to pay interest on any of it. It is a free grant to the State. Then there is the very substantial sum, slowly increasing year by year, which comes from uniform taxation. There is also the Commonwealth contribution to the sinking fund on loans and the sundry items, all of which are to be found in the statistical section of the Treasury returns for the year 1956-57, including the items I first mentioned, totalling no less a figure than £23,750,000.

On top of that—those were figures taken into Consolidated Revenue—we have the receipts taken into the Commonwealth on various funds other than Consolidated Revenue which, for the same year, amounted to £18,869,000. So, for the year 1956-57 there was £41,000,000 derived through those two separate sources for expenditure in Western Australia, to which we must add the unknown figures to which I previously referred.

Before we can say either that we do not get a fair return in Western Australia from the Commonwealth collections, or that we do, we must have the figures to which I first referred in my remarks on this subject; namely, those that are expended by the Commonwealth in Western Australia on Western Australians. If we

could add those figures to the figures that we know already are actually paid to Western Australia, and were able at the same time to compare them with the revenue derived by the Commonwealth from Western Australia, we could arrive at a fair answer to this question.

But without those details—and as I say, I have not been able to find sufficient of those details to enable me to work it out—any one who either praises or criticises the present financial returns to Western Australia by the Commonwealth is doing so, in my opinion, without the basic facts which enable him to reach his conclusions. And anybody who does that is, in my opinion, looking for trouble.

Accordingly, I hope somebody will be able to provide those details so that we can arrive at a solution of this problem. In the meantime I am not going to quibble at a suggestion that discussion should take place between the Commonwealth and the States to approve the apportionment of certain moneys, or to decide certain questions, one of them having relation to uniform taxation.

The Hon. D. Brand: They must have those figures referred to, anyway.

The Hon. A. F. WATTS: I have no objection to those discussions taking place, because in the course of them we might get our answer: I do not know. But the situation in my mind regarding uniform taxation is that it would be desirable provided we could achieve a formula, or understanding, which would make it clear where the rights of the Commonwealth begin and end. When one discusses this question with representatives of the Commonwealth, they seem to want a situation where the Commonwealth can assess any tax it likes, and the State takes the difference, or what is left.

That could produce an intolerable position where the taxpayer might be asked to pay 21s. in the £1. So as long as that remains the point of view of certain people in high places in the Commonwealth, it is no wonder to me that State officials do not look kindly on the suggestion for the abolition of uniform taxation.

I think there must be a field of taxation, income, or other if necessary, which could be earmarked for the States and upon which the Commonwealth would have no rights at all. If that could be arrived at on an equitable basis then I believe it would be highly desirable that the States should accept the responsibility for imposing taxation on their own people and for the opprobrium that occasionally results therefrom, because the present system unquestionably connotes, in my mind, sweet unreasonableness. In other words, the State Government has no responsibility. It can criticise the Commonwealth if things go wrong, but there is no one to

criticise the State Government because it has not the responsibility to assess taxation except to a minor degree.

I am, of course, referring to major items of taxation in this matter. It would be better from many aspects if this problem could be solved; but it will not be solved so long as there is no clear field of taxation from which the Commonwealth will withdraw, which the States will undertake, and which will be free to the States to enable them to calculate their annual revenues.

I was very interested to observe in answer to questions by the member for Vasse regarding project areas in Western Australia that of the total of 840,176 acres which were mentioned in reply, 630,000 acres—or something over 75 per cent.—were in the electorate of Stirling. I was not unaware there was a very substantial proportion in that area seeing that I recently pranced over large parts of it, even in the company of the Minister for Lands; but it is amazing to discover that over 75 per cent. is in that particular area, and much of it still in a state of partial development.

It is no wonder that the demand for expenditure on public works in that area has been very considerable in recent times, because one cannot place whole new settlements of hundreds of people in areas which were virtually uninhabited before without making substantial demands for these amenities of at least an essential nature, which are required in these times for the functioning of any such community. Quite obviously that process in those areas is not going to cease.

When I see that the area classed as Jerramungup is 56,910 acres, and the area classed as Gairdner River is 317,000 acres, I realise there will be at least two other town sites wanted in the first; and in the Gairdner area, at least two if not three as soon as the full tally of settlers is reached, and that should not be longer than 15 months hence if my information is correct. That will no doubt involve another three schools and the accompanying quarters for head teachers, because these settlers always succeed in producing at least as many children as there are families of settlers, and sometimes very many more.

So it is no wonder that I am frightfully interested in the availability of funds for essential services for this community; and most concerned when I am continually told—not as an individual, and I am not referring to myself personally, but in the precincts of this House—that so many of these things are held up for lack of funds.

Mention was made, during the evening of the absence of sewerage or septic tank facilities at a great number of country schools. Reference was made by the Minister for Education to the fact that where there were water supplies and money they will be provided. According

to a question he answered in this House last session there were over 60 places where there were satisfactory water supplies, but in none of those could provision be made through lack of funds.

The Hon. D. Brand: He got tired of only mentioning lack of money.

The Hon. A. F. WATTS: As I read it, the question was directed to ascertain from the hon. gentleman those that were approved so far as the water question was concerned but held up for lack of finance, and there were over 60 of them.

At the present time, so far as I am aware, the situation is much the same. This is not something to be looked at lightly. It is quite a serious matter; because, in the hotter districts of this State, in many cases the absence of proper sanitary facilities must make some contribution to ill-health, or at least to the discomfort of the children concerned. The discomfort of children in those areas is just as important to members of this House, I take it, as the discomfort of children here. I am as concerned with the discomfort of children here as I am with the discomfort of children somewhere else. I am going to be quite frank about that. I expect that members of this House hold the same views as I and do not like to see this condition of discomfort or contribution to ill-health anywhere at all.

There can be only one justification for its prevailing elsewhere, and that is the absence of those facilities that are required, such as water, to enable these better systems of sanitation to be put into effect. I think I have already said that in the instance I have in mind there is no such deficiency, so it becomes a question of funds.

I noticed that, in answer to a question today, the Premier referred to cash grants that can be made on certain conditions for industries, interest-free loans up to 10 years, free factory sites, etc. Far be it from me to suggest that industry should not be encouraged in Western Australia. I am not without consideration of the fact that the very people to whom I referred have youngsters who must in many cases be found employment, and that industry is one of the means by which they can be found employment. Therefore I am unprepared to attack any programme which provides reasonable assistance towards better development of industry.

But at the same time I am prepared to criticise that programme, and prepared to criticise it strongly when it says in the same breath, "I have no money at all for these facilities which are essential for the betterment and better health of the children of this State." The two things cannot go together.

Mr. Potter: Have they these facilities in their private homes?

The Hon. A. F. WATTS: What have their private homes to do with it?

Mr. Potter: They live most of the time in their private homes.

The Hon. A. F. WATTS: When the hon. member knows something of what he is talking about I will listen.

Mr. Potter: I know all about it.

The Hon. A. F. WATTS: The hon. member knows nothing at all. Sherlock Holmes would be required to find out.

Mr. Potter: Seventy-five per cent of the private homes have not this facility; so why criticise the Government on this particular issue?

The Hon. A. F. WATTS: I have already referred the hon. gentleman to Sherlock Holmes.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Sherlock George.

The Hon. A. F. WATTS: Despite the member for Subiaco, I think I have made my views plain on the subject, and I shall resume the rest of my grievances on the Address-in-Reply.

MR. CROMMELIN (Claremont) [9.21]: I would like to take the opportunity during the debate on this Bill to speak on behalf of local governments, councils and road boards in the metropolitan area in regard to the results of the passage of legislation. I suppose one could say that over a period of years most of the legislation which has been brought before members, debated, and passed, has been sincerely and honestly considered, and with the expectation that the hoped-for result would be achieved through that legislation.

However, year after year we find that nearly all legislation has to be amended for different reasons, and because times are changing.

The point on which I want to speak concerns the revenue received by local authorities from metropolitan traffic fees. Some members of this House serve on councils and road boards, and I am certain that every member takes an interest in them in the course of his parliamentary duties. In any case, he is a ratepayer of one or other of them; and therefore he must be, to some extent, financially interested.

The revenue of all of these municipalities or road boards is derived from the levying of rates in their districts, through the allocation of traffic fees, and by the raising of loans. It would be fair comment to say that very few road boards could maintain their roads and footpaths out of the revenue they receive from rates. Indeed, most of this financing is done by the raising of loans; and I think that most members of the House would agree with me that, apart from roads and footpaths,

the whole of the metropolitan area is badly neglected, especially the main roads, where there is need for better street lighting.

I know numerous bodies have been aware for some time that their lighting is far below par, but to bring it up to a satisfactory standard—up to present-day standards—is something which is far beyond their finances. It is fairly evident that over the last few years the costs to all local authorities have been rising in ways which are not under their direct control.

Mr. Hearman: It is the ratepayers who have been rising.

Mr. CROMMELIN: That is quite correct. However, a lot of the costs are incurred by automatic adjustments to the basic wage, increased costs of materials, and increased costs in the purchase of road-making machinery, etc. I feel that the time has come when a fairer approach should be made to the question of allocating traffic fees.

Firstly, I would like to explain to the House by what process the traffic fees received in the metropolitan area are dealt with before they get to the local authorities, and then come back to comment on some of the effects of recent legislation. According to the report of a committee appointed by the Local Government Association to inquire into the allocation of motor vehicle licence fees, the metropolitan traffic fees are collected by the Traffic Branch and there is a charge of 10 per cent. taken by the Traffic Department. A small amount is charged annually by the Public Works Department for administration costs, and 22½ per cent. of the balance, up to a maximum of £70,000, is paid to the Treasury as miscellaneous revenue in part recoup of servicing charges of loan funds expended on roads; that is, interest, sinking fund and exchanges.

It should be pointed out that although it appears that the Treasury is receiving only £70,000 from traffic fees this is not the maximum amount which is payable from those funds; for a further section of the Main Roads (Funds Appropriation) Act authorises the Treasury to pay this £70,000 to the Main Roads Contribution Trust Account to be expended in the manner outlined in that report, and that section of the Act also sets out anything in excess of £70,000 is to be paid into the Main Roads Contribution Trust for the cost of and improvement of main roads and bridges.

Furthermore, the Main Roads Department can also expend funds received under the section referring to the disbursement of the 22½ per cent. and also those moneys allotted for the provision, construction, reconstruction, improvement and maintenance of any other road or bridge in the metropolitan area.

The next item deducted is an amount of £40,000, which can be spent in any one year and can be authorised by the Minister for Local Government for the provision and maintenance of traffic lights in the metropolitan area. The next amount taken out is the cost of repairing certain roads. These are specified as the Fremantle traffic bridge, and Perth Causeway, Stirling Highway, Guildford-rd., Great Eastern Highway, Canning Highway (between the eastern boundary of East Fremantle Municipality and the Causeway) and Albany Highway.

Also charged against this item is an amount of £7,396, being interest and sinking fund on one half of the original cost of constructing main roads financed by general loan funds. These loans commence to expire in six years and will all be cleared in eight years. The amount unexpended from this first half is then added to the second half and is in total to be paid to the metropolitan local authorities and to the King's Park Board, with the following exceptions: That a sum of half the figure by which the total expenditure exceeds this amount distributed to the local authorities for the year ending previously for a period of 10 years will be paid to the Main Roads Department, for defraying costs in connection with the taking and preparation of land and providing and developing roads connected with the Narrows bridge, or other roads associated with the metropolitan regional plan. That, briefly, is the method of distribution of traffic fees in the metropolitan area.

Let us go back and see what happens. Firstly, it could be assumed that some years ago, when they were endeavouring to seek a fairly simple formula for the Police Department, they considered that the amount of 10 per cent. for collecting the traffic fees was fair and reasonable. In the year ended June the 30th, 1956, the amount collected for traffic fees was £636,464, and as commission for collecting that sum the Police Department received £68,919. In 1957 the traffic fees collected amounted to £801,235 and the Police Department received £73,992, plus £11,000 commission which they had not collected. In the figures given to me today, as to the end of June last, the amount of traffic fees collected had risen to £1,247,565.

In other words, the amount collected in traffic fees has risen, in the last two years, from £636,000 to nearly £1,250,000. The reason for this terrific increase, of course, is the increase in licence fees. Out of this amount, for the year 1958 the Police Department received £128,990 as the fee for collecting the money. Now let us see what happened to the local authorities.

In 1956, out of £636,464 of traffic fees, the net amount received by the local authorities was £368,410, representing 58 per cent. of the total collection of traffic fees. In 1957, out of £801,235 collected, the local authorities received £404,221, or 50 per

cent; so from 1956 to 1957 the percentage received by the local authorities dropped from 58 per cent. to 50 per cent. This year, until the end of June, with traffic fees amounting to £1,247,565, the local authorities are to receive £478,559, which represents 38 per cent., so in the short period of two years the percentage allocated to them has dropped by 20 per cent., from 58 per cent. to 38 per cent.

It is admitted that the amount of money that they have received is going up fairly considerably. From 1957 to 1958 the allocation has risen by £74,000, but what has happened to the Police Department? Its allocation in the same period of one year has risen by 50 per cent. from £73,000 to £128,000—practically as much as the local authorities received in total—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Have the local government authorities represented the percentage loss to the Government?

Mr. CROMMELIN: No, not yet; but I believe it is their intention to have a deputation, in order to see whether something can be done to put the allocation of funds on a more reasonable basis. At present I am quoting figures from the results they achieved after a great deal of study.

Reverting to the Police Department, we find that the cost of running the traffic branch administration for 1956 was £281,000 and for 1957 it was £288,500. What did the Police Department get for that? In 1956, from drivers' licences alone, that department received £101,000, from traffic fines £121,000, and as commission for their collections, £80,000 or £300,000 from traffic fees, fines and drivers' and vehicle licences alone. That is nearly the entire cost of running that branch.

In reply to a question by the member for Beeloo in 1956, the Minister indicated that, in addition to receiving these amounts of money, the traffic branch received weighbridge fees, sums from the heavy haulage section from the Main Roads Department, and fines and costs received by the Crown Law Department, together with the commissions from the metropolitan traffic fees which I have just quoted.

It will be realised that this tremendous increase in revenue to the Police Department has been brought about principally by the increase in vehicle licence fees, and I feel that the local authorities are suffering great loss because of these anomalies. If the local governing bodies seek a deputation, I hope the Government will appreciate the fairness of the arguments put forward.

Another tremendous item which affects the distribution is that clause which states that out of the first half, as I previously said, the money can be used for repairing these specified roads. It is very difficult to differentiate between the cost of repairing and the cost of improving. In reply to a question asked today I was told

that the sum spent on repairing over the last two years was £51,000 in 1957 and £95,750 in 1958, an increase of approximately £45,000. This money has been utilised under the heading of "Repairing" and on looking down the list in the schedule, which was forwarded with the reply to the question, the big increase appears to me to be attributable to the Perth-Armadale road. In 1957, £7,000 was spent on this road and this year £30,000 was spent on it.

Among the items enumerated was general maintenance, line marking, etc., £7,000 and renewal of the decking of the Canning Bridge. I think it is drawing a very fine line to say that the redecking of a bridge is the repairing of a road. I would have thought that there would be a difference between a bridge and a road.

Mr. Hearman: They widened that bridge quite appreciably.

Mr. CROMMELIN: But I do not think that widening a bridge is the same as repairing a road; I would say that the widening of a bridge would come under the heading of "Improving." Those are things which are difficult to reconcile, and it is hard to differentiate between improving and repairing. As regards resealing I would say that that is a repair job. I shall not weary hon. members by reading all the items, but I want to point out how difficult it is to understand.

Getting back to the cost of collections carried out by the Police Department, I would remind hon. members that third party vehicle insurance is also collected in conjunction with licence fees, and last year a question was asked in the House as to the cost of collecting third party insurance. The reply was that for the year 1956 the cost was £2,100 and for the year 1957 it was £2,200. For this fee of £2,100 the department collected a sum of £688,000 in third party insurance, whereas on a sum of £801,000, which was collected in traffic fees, the charge by the Police Department was £74,000 in round figures; therefore in the collection of a somewhat similar amount of money there was an increase in fees of £72,000 approximately. That surely indicates that the whole system requires revision and some consideration should be given to adopting a simpler method of collection.

I feel certain that the local authorities would be satisfied if consideration were given, after the traffic fees had been collected by the Police Department and 10 per cent. allocated to that department for the collection, to dividing the remainder into two, the Government taking 50 per cent. and the local authorities the other 50 per cent. In that way a great deal of unnecessary accounting work would be cut out, with benefit to the Government, and the amount received by the local authorities, although it would be a little greater than they are getting at the moment,

would make little difference to the Government. I feel certain that that point is worthy of serious consideration when and if a deputation approaches the Government in regard to it.

One other matter I would like to mention is in regard to Transport Board fees. Now that the Metropolitan Passenger Transport Trust is in operation omnibus proprietors who used to pay 6 per cent. of their receipts to the Transport Board, are relieved from paying these fees, and this is depriving the local authorities of Transport Board fees which last year totalled £21,000. Although this is only a small item it is a further sum that is being lost by the local authorities.

I thought that this was an opportunity to inform hon. members of what is happening; it is something brought about by the fact that times have changed. Vehicle licence fees have been increased, and surely something could be done to make the distribution to local authorities a little more equitable.

MR. BOVELL (Vasse) [9.47]: A supply Bill such as this is introduced in the first part of the session and it is vital to the Government that it be passed; I have no doubt that the Government, by virtue of its majority, will be able to accomplish that some time this evening. But I feel that in discussing a Supply Bill of this nature, which virtually gives the Government £21,000,000, consideration should be given to a general indication of how the money has been spent up to date—because the Government has received warrants from His Excellency the Governor since the beginning of the financial year to enable it to carry on—and how the remainder will be spent. This money will also allow the Government to carry on until the Treasurer brings down his Budget.

We appreciate the position in regard to the Grants Commission, and the delay which may be caused in allowing the Treasurer to finalise his Budget; but I feel that he should introduce it as soon as possible.

The Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Do not worry; there will not be any new taxes introduced this session.

Mr. BOVELL: There is one thing that I do appreciate and that is the fact that a Supply Bill such as this gives hon. members an opportunity to discuss important matters after such a long recess of Parliament. Before proceeding with the two matters which are vital to the economy of my electorate, I wish to state that in my opinion eight months is too long for Parliament to be in recess. At times I have advocated two shorter sessions which would give hon. members an opportunity of bringing to Parliament matters of vital interest to the State in general and to their own electorates in particular.

We have been in recess since the 29th November, 1957, and I feel that the period which has elapsed since that date until today, when we deal with the business of the State, is too long. An opportunity should be given to members of Parliament to meet at more frequent intervals.

The first matter I wish to deal with is the position which has arisen in country districts because of the increased cost of transport where country rail services have been terminated. We were, I think, given an assurance by the Government that there would be no economic imposition on residents of areas where rail services were to be terminated. Since the 1st July, 1957, approximately one-quarter of the mileage of our railway system in Western Australia has ceased to operate, and it has had an adverse economic effect on a number of farmers and on those areas which were previously served by a railway. With falling costs in primary production—

The Premier: Falling prices.

Mr. BOVELL: Yes, falling prices. I thank the Premier for his interjection. I think the Government should realise its responsibility and make an endeavour to keep the costs of primary production down to an absolute minimum. Some few weeks ago, Mr. A. W. Dempster, a farmer, of Cowaramup—he has given me permission to use his name—called to see me in regard to the road and rail freight charged on 176 bags of oats consigned from Williams. He purchased these oats through the agency of Westralian Farmers Co-operative Ltd. and duly received them. These 176 bags of oats were carted by Government transport from Williams to Cowaramup. The rail system operates from Williams to Busselton which is approximately 147 miles via Collie. The distance from Busselton to Cowaramup by road, which was previously served by a railway, is 23 miles. The freight charge which was made by Westralian Farmers Co-operative Ltd.—this was on the 17th March, 1958—was £47 7s. 4d.

This charge appeared to Mr. Dempster to be exorbitant, and he wrote to Westralian Farmers Co-operative Ltd.; and, as a result, on the 22nd March, 1958, the branch manager of the Westralian Farmers Co-operative Ltd. at Narrogin forwarded the following letter to Mr. Dempster:—

Dear Sir,

We have been advised by our officer at Williams that you are querying railrage on 176 bags oats, charged as £47 7s. 4d. We have checked this charge with the Williams Station Master, and have been advised of the following:

I want you to take particular notice of the following figures, Mr. Speaker, keeping in mind that the distance from Williams to Busselton is approximately 147 miles: and

that the distance, by road, from Busselton to Cowaramup is 23 miles. These are the charges which were set out in the letter—

	£ s. d.		
Railage	19 3 1
Road	26 13 2
Sheet	6 3
	<hr/>		
	£46	2	6

The writer added—

This makes an overcharge of £1 4s. 10d., and we will write Head Office and advise them to pass this credit on to you.

I am assured by Mr. Dempster that the 176 bags of oats were transported by Government rail and road services and not by private transport. For the 23 miles by road the transport charge was £26 13s. 2d. as against a rail charge of £19 3s. 1d.

Mr. May: You want to check those figures with the commercial agent of the Railway Department and you will find the truth about them.

Mr. BOVELL: I have the truth here. The truth of the matter is that Mr. Dempster—who, by the way, is known to the Minister for Health, because he was farming in the Esperance district before he went to Cowaramup—has assured me of these facts; and if the member for Collie is patient—as I am sure he is—I will read to him the letter I wrote to the Minister for Railways on the matter. My letter was forwarded to the Minister in July, 1958, and Mr. Dempster called to see me in July last.

After continuing the negotiations, the Bunbury Branch Manager of Westralian Farmers Co-operative Ltd., Mr. M. K. Lee, wrote to Mr. Dempster on the 30th April as follows:—

Dear Sir,

We have heard further from our Williams representative regarding the railrage on the oats and he advised as follows:—

Firstly, the W.A.G.R. charged £44 14s. 4d., found out that they had made an error and credited £1 4s. 10d. and since our recent contact with them, the Railways have issued a further credit for £3 8s. 10d., making the railrage in all £42 13s. 8d.

It is not yet clear whether these small deductions were taken off the rail freight or the road freight. The letter continues—

Apparently the credit note will come from our head office and will show in your account in due course.

I am just giving members some idea of the difficulties that are facing producers in these areas in regard to excessive transport charges. Also, farmers do not have a

secretary at their disposal to take up correspondence on these matters. Therefore, not only are they excessively charged for transport, but also they have to spend many hours in the evening writing letters in an endeavour to get some clarification of the circumstances surrounding these freight charges.

The Premier: Have you worked out the cost per bag per mile?

Mr. BOVELL: No; I have not done that yet.

The Premier: It is very interesting.

Mr. BOVELL: I am referring to the overall position. I am merely comparing the cost to farmers of the normal rail freight which would have applied had the railway been still running as far as Cowaramup on the basis of the telescopic freights that were charged and the freights that have been charged in this particular instance.

The Premier: You should work out the cost per bag per mile.

Mr. BOVELL: It is no use the Premier drawing a red herring across the trail in respect to this important matter. The fact remains that the charges for transport by rail were £19 3s. 1d. and £26 13s. 2d. for transport by road; and I wish to emphasise that the whole of this transport was not done by private enterprise or by the farmer himself—who assured me that he would have gone to Busselton to pick up these bags of oats from the Busselton rail head if he had been permitted to do so—but it was transported by Government rail and road services.

A further rebate eventually came along. This was in connection with the Class "M" freight. The following letter is dated the 16th July, 1958, and was signed by the Accountant of the W.A. Transport Board. It is addressed to Mr. A. W. Dempster of Cowaramup and it reads—

Dear Sir,

Re Busselton-Flinder's Bay subsidised Road Transport.

I enclose herewith my Board's cheque No. A98730 for the sum of £3 13s. 10d. being (net) payment of "M" class subsidy approved by Board.

A deduction of 1d. has been made to cover the cost of Revenue Stamp payable.

So even reducing the total amount by the overcharge of £1 4s. 10d., the subsequent refund of £3 8s. 10d. and the rebate of the "M" class subsidy of £3 13s. 10d., making a total of £8 7s. 6d. from the cost of the road transport charge, the freight for 147 miles by rail and the freight for 23 miles by road would be approximately the same. Therefore, I think there is an anomaly there.

I was so convinced that, on the 21st July, I addressed this communication to the Hon. H. C. Strickland, M.L.C., the Minister for Railways, Perth—

Mr. A. W. Dempster of Cowaramup called on me today in connection with excessive railway road services charges on 176 bags oats consigned to him from Williams, in February last.

Original Freight Account submitted to Mr. Dempster was as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
Railage—Williams to Busselton—(147 miles approx.)	19	3	1
Railway road service— Road haulage Bus- selton to Cowaramup (23 miles)	26	13	2
Sheet	6	3	
	£46	2	6

Overcharges subsequently refunded were £1 4s. 10d. and £3 8s. 10d. and Transport Board subsidy of £3 13s. 10d. in payment of "M" class goods. If all these refunds were deducted from railway road service road haulage costs, the amount for 23 miles would be £18 5s. 8d. as compared with £19 3s. 1d. for 147 miles for rail haulage. This is a typical example of increased freight costs being imposed on primary producers south of Busselton due to the closure of the Busselton-Flinders Bay railway.

I am sure you will agree that an adjustment of railway road service freight costs is necessary. The dairy industry cannot stand the impost of exorbitant transport costs such as quoted above.

In view of the alarming position that has arisen through the closure of the Busselton-Flinders Bay railway I shall be grateful if you will please make a full investigation of the case referred to herein.

I have not yet received a reply from the Minister, though I feel sure he will live up to the reputation he has earned for being courteous and considerate. The fact remains, however, that this correspondence has extended from February to August, and we have received no satisfaction in the matter at all.

The Minister for Transport has asked me on occasions, when I have been speaking on increased costs, to give him some concrete examples. This is a concrete example which I produce for consideration by the Government, in regard to the way the farmers are being penalised by Government transport costs in areas where the railway services have been suspended.

The second matter to which I desire to refer, is the work on the Busselton wharf which is necessary to the livelihood of 91 families. There are 91 registered waterside workers employed at the port of Busselton; and for the financial year ended the 30th June, 1958, the average earning of those men was a little in excess of £10 per man.

Mr. Heal: Is that the only job they have?

Mr. BOVELL: That, of course, is far short of the basic wage. The member for West Perth asked if that was the only job they had. As we know, it is not possible for these men to exist on £10 per week on an average, over 12 months; and it is therefore necessary for them to seek other employment, but at the same time for them to be available when their services are required to load timber or other commodities that might be available for shipment from Busselton.

I feel that, with very little expenditure, the Government could improve the berth at Busselton in order to allow ships to load to a greater depth. Correspondence has passed between the Minister for Supply and Shipping, the Busselton Port Committee and myself; and the Minister estimated that dredging operations in the port of Busselton, sufficient to enable a ship to load to an additional 2 ft. to 2 ft. 6 in. would cost approximately £50,000. In my recollection there have been no dredging operations at Busselton. There is no silting at that port. The depth of water at the No. 4 Jetty is the same today as it was 40 or 50 years ago.

With a reasonable expenditure of £50,000, enough additional shipping could be provided at Busselton to permit those 91 men to at least earn the basic wage. Seeing that there are 91 families dependent on a certain industry for their livelihood, I feel it is the responsibility of the Government, in the interests of the economy of the State, to see that extra expenditure is made available to enable those families to be provided with at least a bare income. It should not be necessary for them to seek other avenues of employment which, in any case, are only temporary; because these men must be available when a ship comes in.

At this stage of the State's difficult economic situation we cannot afford to allow 91 families in a small area to have their employment placed in jeopardy. Accordingly I ask the Treasurer to give serious consideration to the provision of the money which would constitute a great economic uplift to the 91 families to whom I have referred. A deputation comprising the members of the Busselton Chamber of Commerce, the Busselton Road Board and the waterside union itself, waited on the Minister in May of

this year. The Minister was most sympathetic and he gave most thoughtful consideration to the submissions made to him. We are, however, still awaiting a reply to that deputation; but with some collaboration from the Treasurer, I feel it might be possible to provide the necessary finance to give these men an assured income.

In conclusion I would say that, in the long history of the port of Busselton, the services of the waterside workers have always been available when they were required. At no time, to my knowledge, has there ever been any local industrial trouble. Of course, like every other place, we have our little difficulties, from time to time; but a position has never arisen through local conditions and circumstances, where the men have ceased to work when their services were required. Accordingly I would ask the Premier to give careful and earnest consideration to the following points:—

- (1) The economic difficulties that are facing the settlers in areas where railway services have been terminated; and
- (2) A proposal to at least allow ships to load to a greater depth at Busselton which, according to the estimate made by the Minister for Supply and Shipping, would cost approximately £50,000.

MR. ROBERTS (Bunbury) [10.9]: In bringing down this important Supply Bill the Treasurer has given me my first opportunity to place before the Government a matter which to me is very important indeed. I am sure that every member of this House heard the call go out on the 27th of July last for volunteers to assist in the building up of the levees along the Preston River. Had those levees failed, a tragedy could have resulted. There would have been a considerable loss to the people in close proximity, and there would have been a considerable amount of expense to which the Government would be put at a later date because the water in the Preston River where the banks were built up was 6 ft. to 7 ft.—I would say as a layman—above the floor boards of nearby houses. One can imagine the feelings of the people who live in close proximity to those levee banks where the water was much higher than the floor boards.

Mr. Hearman: It was not even a record flood.

Mr. ROBERTS: It was not a record flood. Again I say this as a layman; and I stress this point because I have not had the opportunity of studying the report in the possession of the Director of Works, but it was indicated to me in answer to a question today that the report is available.

I think the flood waters were occasioned by the fact that the channel which had been dug at the mouth of the Preston River had silted up owing to sand flowing down the river. As we are aware, the levees do not extend to the actual mouth; so when flood waters flow to the end levees they spread out, and a considerable amount of land at the mouth is covered in water.

There was a banking up in the estuary itself at this time, brought about by the prevailing winds. I understand that at the plug at the mouth of the Leschenault Estuary the waters within the estuary were some 3 ft. above the water level in Bunbury Harbour. When the original cut was put through at the mouth of the estuary, it was made from the estuary to the Indian Ocean. The Preston and the Collie Rivers flow out, opposing each other, if I might use that term. The Preston flows in an easterly direction, while the Collie River flows in a westerly direction.

It is amazing when one goes to the mouth of the Preston River to see the damage that has been caused to pasture land by these flood waters. At a rough estimate, I would say there are some 50 acres of land, formerly good pasture land, which are now covered with up to 2 ft. of sand. At this stage there are still approximately 130 acres covered in water.

If the Government could, from the moneys it is asking for, expend immediately a certain sum on the raising of the levees and their extension to the estuary banks, the position would be relieved considerably. Unfortunately some increased expenditure would be required for bridges; because at Picton Bridge, where the levees really commence, the bridge will have to be raised. Moonshine Bridge at Jeffrey-rd. will also have to be raised, and likewise the bridge over the Australind Road at Leschenault. If this work is not done in the very near future, and in subsequent seasons we experience real floods, some tragedy will occur.

If the banks break, thousands of acres of pasture land and home sites will be under water, and the Collie and Preston Rivers will join forces in their devastation. The Premier is no doubt aware that the State Electricity Commission was very concerned when some of the poles carrying the very high tension wires, 132,000 volts, collapsed in those flood waters. I do not know what would happen if live wires fell into flood waters whilst personnel were working nearby. I do think there is a danger in this regard; and the matter to which I referred is of extreme urgency, and one to which the Government should give serious consideration.

One point which struck me more than anything else was that, when the call went out for volunteers to assist in sandbagging the levees, no provision was made in the

south-western portion of the State for the issue of sandbags. I suggest to the Premier that in centres where there is danger of flood through the levees failing, a supply of sandbags be made available in future years. In this instance the workers who answered the call had to fill bran, flour, potato or any other bags they could get. It was very difficult work, and work performed under very trying conditions.

I do not want to labour this point now, but I hope and trust that the Government will, prior to the next winter rains, rectify the position that could bring about a catastrophe if not attended to in the very near future.

MR. HEARMAN (Blackwood) [10.19]: I desire to speak very briefly, dealing largely with matters which have already been referred to extensively by the member for Roe and the Leader of the Country Party, although not fully. Generally the remarks they had to make in connection with difficulties which face new settlers establishing themselves and of existing settlers getting the necessary finance to carry on apply not only in their particular districts, but I should think in other agriculture areas in this State; they most certainly apply in mine.

I consider that the result of Government policy has not made the lot of the man starting out an easy one. There are various cases which come to mind. One which I would like to mention is the case of a man who, for various reasons, was ineligible for a war service land settlement farm, although he had six years' overseas service; and who finally decided to purchase from the Lands Department a property which had previously been bought under the war service land settlement scheme and with the development of which the Land Settlement Board decided not to continue. Of course, had it gone to a war service land settler, a very considerable sum of money would have been spent on this property. Various buildings and other improvements would have been carried out, and the settler would either have been given a 99-year lease, or at least would have been given a very long period over which to pay the land off.

Mr. Nalder: Was it a single unit property or subdivided?

MR. HEARMAN: I think it was intended to be subdivided into three properties; and this is the only one the department has been able to quit. My point is that it was recognised by the Land Settlement Board that a considerable expenditure of money would be necessary to make it into an economical farm unit; and because this man took it on and was ineligible for assistance as a war service land settler, he was given five years in which to pay the farm off, and no assistance—or very little—to develop it.

He did, by dint of putting in what capital he had—which was not a great amount—by working very hard, and by taking jobs on timber mills, get a certain amount of development done. He established some excellent pasture, which I saw for myself, and reached the stage where he was ready to stock the property. He had no money with which to erect a cowshed; and the Rural and Industries Bank, peculiarly enough, advanced enough money for him to do this, but would not advance him anything further. Therefore, he could not purchase any cattle. He had pasture, the necessary water and development, but could not stock the property.

This man was a good type, who had worked hard; and despite the fact that he had reached the stage where he could purchase something, assistance completely dried off; and at present, he is getting demanding letters from the Lands Department. This settler had a strong case, and ultimately he did get another farmer—an orchardist—to actually advance him the necessary money—a sum of £1,000—with which to buy the nucleus of a dairy herd. That is how that farmer has obtained his start as a dairy farmer.

I think that when we get to the stage where a man is allowed to build a cowshed but cannot get money with which to buy stock, we have reached a rather ridiculous point. It rather indicates to me that some reappraisal of the Government's approach to this whole problem is needed. My own view is that the Government has three distinct responsibilities in this matter. It must make land available for new settlers; and it must make advances available under some realistic terms which meet the situation and problems that arise as a result of land development.

I might mention in passing that the rate of development in the heavily timbered areas is very much slower than in some of the areas mentioned by the member for Roe and the Leader of the Country Party. I believe that the third responsibility of the Government is to provide the necessary technical assistance and advice through the Department of Agriculture, which I think is generally forthcoming in a reasonably adequate manner.

Beyond that, I believe that a settler should, as far as is possible, be left to his own devices to solve his own problem in his own way. To attempt to press him into any blueprint plan is very often irksome to the settler and financially wasteful. For instance, there is no reason why, if a man can build his own house, sheds or other improvements, he should be forced to accept some plan that is laid down under some Government scheme for which he will have to pay an excessive cost.

Mr. Lawrence: You think we should socialise.

Mr. HEARMAN: I am not suggesting socialism. I am suggesting that we should get away from that and leave the settler free to solve his own problems in his own way. However, there are certain problems which he cannot solve without Governmental assistance, and that is where the Government should assist him.

A further difference between the problems which exist in my particular area and those that the members to whom I have referred represent is that there is extreme difficulty in getting any Government land at all. Whenever anybody asks for Crown land we are immediately confronted with the fact that the Conservator of Forests says it contains marketable timber which must be removed before the land can be released. He simply refuses to release that land for agriculture at all and wants to keep it for the production of timber, either native hardwoods or pine.

There is a case in the Greenbushes area in which a farm that had been taken up under conditional purchase conditions had been abandoned. It was applied for by another man and he was told that the Conservator of Forests wanted that land and it would not be available for further agricultural development.

Mr. Jamieson: The member for Collie had a bit of that trouble, didn't he?

Mr. HEARMAN: He has a further trouble which does not affect me to any great extent; but nonetheless it is a very serious one in connection with the water catchment area. However, there are large areas not on a water catchment which carry very little millable timber. They are not regarded as good timber areas, but the Conservator of Forests seems to have a blanket control over them. It is a complete impasse as regards getting any progress.

Last year, towards the end of the session, I asked a series of questions in regard to an application for land by the Mitchell brothers, which had gone on since 1946. At that time, I was promised by the Minister that the matter would be finalised reasonably expeditiously. I do not know what the opinion of the Government is as far as "reasonably expeditiously" is concerned, but it went to the Land Utilisation Committee in May last.

I do not know what its final determination was, although I have some reason to suppose that it was not very favourable from the applicant's point of view. The last time I spoke to the Mitchells, a month ago, they had heard nothing further. I still do not know, nor do they, the result of that application for land. I think the negotiations have been going on for a period of 12 years or so.

It seems to me that a Government department—it is a pair of departments in this particular dispute—should be able to arrive at a decision and be able to make up its mind in less than 12 years if it is

not going to allot the land to the man. If it is going to allot the land to him, surely to goodness 12 years is a long time out of a farmer's effective working life, and he should be given a decision much quicker than that!

This is having an adverse effect on further rural development in my electorate, because possibly the best types of potential settler that we can get—the sons of farmers living in the district, who know the area and its problems and who are willing to take on and develop virgin land—are being completely frustrated. In many instances these men would not require a great deal of financial assistance from the Government; particularly if they could get land within reasonable distance of their parents' properties, because in such circumstances a new farm can be developed in the initial stages comparatively easily and cheaply, as there is not the same need for new plant, buildings and so on. I can think of no better potential settler than men of that type, yet in my area they are being given no encouragement at all. We hear a great deal about the drift to the city, and so on, but what can one expect when men who are willing and anxious to take up land are frustrated in this way?

Mr. Lawrence: You are very parochial.

Mr. HEARMAN: In the Tone River area, where land was surveyed for agricultural purposes in 1954, several men have been waiting since that time for blocks, yet the number of blocks made available has been very small. Up till a month or so ago only three or four blocks had been made available there. It is most important that there should be a review of Government policy in this regard. The member for South Fremantle has suggested that my view is parochial. That may be so, but if we were to get in touch with the member for Warren I think the story would be the same in that area.

Mr. Lawrence: But I am not parochial and never have been.

Mr. HEARMAN: That, perhaps, is one difference between the member for South Fremantle and me.

The Premier: The member for South Fremantle does barrack for the South Fremantle Football Club.

Mr. HEARMAN: I think he is a bit one-eyed about that. This Bill is to make available to the Government £21,000,000 and we are constantly being told that the Government has no money. I realise that perhaps, superficially, there is a bit of a paradox about that; but, nevertheless, if the Government cannot make new money available for the agency section of the Rural & Industries Bank I think it should examine seriously the proposals that have come forward in large numbers from the area I represent—and adjoining areas—for establishment of the sons and other

relatives of farmers, who would be assisted by the already-established men and who could develop their properties, in the majority of cases, with very little Government assistance.

However, they cannot farm without land, and if the Government is unable to make money available to the agency section of the Rural and Industries Bank, I again point out that it would not cost the Government much to make land available to these people. If the Government had the money to put into the agency section of the Rural and Industries Bank the position would be easier, but surely consideration could be given to these people, who are willing to develop land and who do not require any great degree of Government assistance.

An impasse appears to exist between the Lands Department and the Forests Department and it does not matter to which of those departments one goes, the story is always the same. There is something wrong with the whole relationship between those departments and the set-up of the Land Utilisation Committee. I think the Government should examine the position; because, when the Conservator of Forests objects to an application, he refers it to that committee, of which he is a member and the applicant is not represented there and cannot even argue his case before the committee. He has to rely on the Director of Agriculture, who is a member of that committee, on which the Lands Department is also represented.

In my experience, individual applicants who join issue with the Conservator of Forests in this matter get very little consideration. I do know of cases in which the individual has had a win, as it were, but the Conservator—it seems to me—carries far too much weight for the individual applicant to have any chance before that committee.

A study of certain instances will indicate that the applicant is constantly fobbed off. He is told that they want the land because the timber has not been cut. When it has been cut, he applies again and is then told the land is wanted because there are still some poles left on it. Then the S.E.C. or somebody cuts the poles, after which the applicant applies again, only to be told that it is now a regeneration area. If that story is untenable, perhaps, he is told that it is required for the planting of pines or something of that nature. The answer from the Forests Department is always "No".

If it is Government policy not to have any further rural development in the South-West, why does the Government not say so? If further rural development in that part of the State is considered necessary, obviously these problems which arise as between the

Lands Department, the Conservator of Forests and the applicant for land, must be overcome. I have discussed the matter with the Minister and he stretched a point in order to look at a particular case for me. I have no doubt as to his private opinion about it, although he may not be able to express it in this House; but I say that unless a realistic approach is made to this problem of the availability of land for rural development in the heavily timbered areas, the State will lose many good settlers and there will be a further drift to the city and the State will be all the poorer for it.

THE TREASURER (The Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam—in reply) [10.39]: I thank members for the reception given to the Bill. I will have careful consideration given to the ideas and suggestions that have been put forward and will advise the hon. members concerned in due course.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

House adjourned at 10.42 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, 13th August, 1958.

CONTENTS

	Page
Questions on Notice :	
Playgrounds, erection on or near hotel sites	66
Water supplies, Mt. Yokine high level water tank	66
Forests Act, amendments regarding Crown land	66
Bacon, reason for present price	66
Leave of absence	66
Deputy Chairmen of Committees	66
Committees for the session	67
Bill :	
Supply Bill (No. 1), £21,000,000, Standing Orders suspension, 1r., 2r.	67
Address-in-reply, third day	67
Speakers on Address—	
The Hon. C. R. Abbey	67
The Hon. L. A. Logan	69
Adjournment, special	76

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