

settlement, it loses five settlers who may drift off the land which was developed five, six, seven or ten years ago.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Might not you postpone the expansion of Wundowie to a more favourable time?

The TREASURER: We have not approved any expansion of Wundowie.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: I thought that was referred to in the Governor's Speech.

The TREASURER: The expansion of Wundowie is still under consideration and has to be decided.

I think the member for Albany adopted a very reasonable outlook with regard to the dairying industry. He said that the dairy farmers in his part of the State placed great value on the local market and were attacking the problem of the cost of production. That is a constructive outlook. I am not saying that the whole solution of the total problem lies in that angle of the situation, but at any rate it is a constructive approach and could lead to a substantial improvement in the general situation in the dairying industry in Western Australia. In that regard I should think that legal price control could help that industry considerably, and it could also help other primary industries in this State. I am convinced that all those who trade with the dairying industry make good profit out of it. I am positive that those who manufacture dairy machines and those who handle this machinery and sell it to farmers make substantial profits—much greater profits than they should be making—out of an industry that is struggling for its existence.

The member for Stirling charged the Minister for Education with discourtesy. I am convinced there was no real basis for the charge. The procedure that has been followed by the Minister for Education with regard to the official opening of schools has been to invite, without failure in any instance, the member for the district. In connection with the opening of the Narrogin High School, the Minister invited the member for Narrogin, who was a Minister in the McLarty-Watts Government. In doing that, the Minister for Education felt conscientiously that he was doing the right thing. If he had thought for a moment that the member for Stirling, an ex-Minister for Education, was entitled to an invitation he would, without hesitation, have issued one to him. I think it would have been quite reasonable for the member for Stirling to have been invited to that opening, and I am sure that if the Minister for Education had thought of the situation he would have invited that member to be present.

There have been occasions when not only ex-Ministers have been invited to opening ceremonies of various kinds, but when they have also been given the opportunity in their own districts of declaring the official opening of additions to schools and certain

other functions of that description. That has happened under the control of the present Minister for Education. I suggest that his actions in those directions showed there was no discourtesy intended by him on any occasion to any ex-Minister, or, for that matter, to any private member. Although there were several other matters dealt with by some members, I have tried to cover the major subjects briefly.

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 10.36 p.m.*

## Legislative Council

Wednesday, 10th August, 1955.

### CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : State Housing Commission, discontinuance of land resumptions ....	55
Primary and secondary industries, financial aid ....	58
Charcoal iron industry, (a) tabling of reports ....	56
(b) financial position, 1952-55 ....	56
Building contracts, deferred payment system ....	56
Chairmen (Deputy) of Committees ....	57
Committees for the session ....	57
Bill : Supply (No. 1), £17,000,000, Standing Orders suspension, all stages ....	57

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

### QUESTIONS.

#### STATE HOUSING COMMISSION.

##### *Discontinuance of Land Resumptions.*

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH asked the Chief Secretary:

In connection with the report which appeared in the issue of "The West Australian," dated Thursday, the 4th August, which was headed—

"No more land to be seized by the S.H.C."

and which states that the State Cabinet has decided not to seek parliamentary approval for the continuance of Section 23 of the State Housing Act—

(1) Is this report correct?

(2) If so, upon what authority was the statement made to the Press?

(3) If the report is correct, can land owners be assured that the purport of this report will be strictly adhered to by the Government in the future?; or

(4) Will a similar set of circumstances arise as it did last year when, in spite of assurances given to this House by the Chief Secretary that the Government had no intention of seizing further land, further large tracts of land were in fact seized?

(5) In view of No. (4) can land-owners of the State this time accept without qualification the assurance of the Government?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

The correct report appeared in the "Daily News" on the 3rd August, 1955, the relevant portions of which read as follows:—

#### RESUMPTIONS ARE FINISHED.

No more resumptions of land will be made by the State Housing Commission. Its power to resume land compulsorily, which expires in January, will not be extended.

Housing Minister Graham announced this today.

He said the policy had been decided on by Cabinet at his request.

"The position now is that the Commission has in the metropolitan area and most country centres sufficient land as far as can be seen, to last for a number of years," he said.

#### PRIMARY AND SECONDARY INDUSTRIES.

##### *Financial Aid.*

Hon. A. R. JONES asked the Chief Secretary:

In view of the serious position facing primary producers due to continued rising costs of production and falling prices for produce, and the known attitude of the Government regarding substantial assistance to secondary industry, will the Minister inform the House—

(1) Is the Government yet aware that primary and not secondary industry is the real basis of the earning capacity of this State?

(2) If the answer to No. (1) is "yes," will the Government show more proof of its understanding by—

(a) limiting its financial aid to secondary industry to reasonable proportions; and

(b) making considerable financial aid available to new settlers not yet firmly established in primary production, especially those who are developing light lands?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

The Government is aware of the value of all industries, and will, within the serious limitations imposed upon it by the Liberal Party-Country Party Federal Government, help wherever the need to help is clearly established.

#### CHARCOAL IRON INDUSTRY.

##### *(a) Tabling of Reports.*

Hon. N. E. BAXTER asked the Chief Secretary:

(1) Is he aware that the last report of the Wood Distillation, Charcoal Iron and Steel Industry tabled in the House was in 1952?

(2) Was there any reason why the reports on this industry should not have been tabled during the years 1953 and 1954?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

(1) No. The report for the 12 months ended the 30th June, 1953, was tabled on the 8th April, 1954.

(2) The Auditor General's report for the 12 months ended the 30th June, 1954, was not submitted until the 10th January, 1955, and has been tabled today.

##### *(b) Financial Position, 1952-55.*

Hon. N. E. BAXTER asked the Chief Secretary:

What was the annual loss or profit (if any) of the Wood Distillation, Charcoal-Iron and Steel Industry during the years ended the 30th June, 1952, 1953, 1954 and 1955?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

The annual loss, including interest, was as follows:—

1951-52—£79,411, interest being £45,217.

1952-53—£44,404, interest being £47,936.

1953-54—£66,274, interest being £53,545.

1954-55—not yet known, interest being ..... £54,685.

#### BUILDING CONTRACTS.

##### *Deferred Payment System.*

Hon. J. McI. THOMSON asked the Chief Secretary:

(1) Has the Government let any work to building contractors on the deferred payment system since the 1st July, 1954?

(2) If work has been let, what is the total amount involved; who are the contractors; and what amount of payment has been made to date?

(3) If work is in progress under this system, what are the contracts, and where are they located, in—

(a) the country; and

(b) the metropolitan area?

(4) What is the total amount which it is anticipated will be spent this financial year under the deferred payment system?

(5) Have established building contractors in country areas been invited to carry out any of these works?

(6) If the answer to No. 5 is in the negative, why have they not been invited to tender?

(7) In order to assist country builders in maintaining continuity of work for their employees, will these contractors be given the opportunity of accepting contracts under this system in the current financial year?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) (a) Total amount involved—£211,894.

(b) Contractors—Concrete Industries (W.A.) Pty. Ltd., Jennings Constructions (W.A.) Pty. Ltd.

(c) Amount of payments to date—£86,780 (£77,510 on Bills and £9,270 cash).

(3) Particulars of contracts are as follows:—

School.	Tender.	Contractor.
	£	
M Lathlain Park: New Monocrete School	25,795	Concrete Industries (W.A.) Pty., Ltd.
M Bentley Park-Millen Area: New Monocrete School	38,283	do. do.
M Marmion: New Monocrete School	25,004	do. do.
M Belmay School: Monocrete Additions	20,226	do. do.
C North Dandalup School: Additions	5,394	Jennings Constructions (W.A.) Pty., Ltd.
M Bibra Lake School: Additions	3,461	do. do.
M West Swan School: Additions	3,085	do. do.
M Queen's Park School: Additions	25,656	do. do.
M East Maylands School: Additions	6,557	do. do.
C Waroona School: Additions	5,880	do. do.
C Hyden School: Additions	7,998	do. do.
M Kent Street School: Additions	34,845	do. do.
C Dudlwin: New School	5,412	do. do.
C Harrismith School: Additions	4,258	do. do.
	211,894	

Items marked M are in the Metropolitan Area.

Items marked C are in Country Areas.

(4) Estimated expenditure, 1955-1956—£211,894.

(5) No.

(6) The calling of tenders was not possible under the special arrangements being made for deferred payments.

(7) The position is being examined with a view to this being done.

## CHAIRMEN (DEPUTY) OF COMMITTEES.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, resolved:

That, in accordance with Standing Order No. 31a, Hon. E. M. Davies, Hon. L. A. Logan and Hon. A. F. Griffith be elected to act as Deputy Chairmen of Committees during the current session.

## COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION.

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

*Standing Orders*.—Hon. E. M. Davies, Hon. L. A. Logan and Hon. H. K. Watson.

*Library*.—Hon. F. R. H. Lavery and Hon. A. F. Griffith.

*House*.—Hon. W. R. Hall, Hon. H. Hearn, Hon. E. M. Heenan and Hon. A. R. Jones.

*Printing*.—Hon. G. Bennetts and Hon. J. Murray.

## BILL—SUPPLY (No. 1), £17,000,000.

### *Standing Orders Suspension.*

On motion by the Chief Secretary, resolved:

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the Supply Bill to pass through all stages at any one sitting.

### *First Reading.*

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

### *Second Reading.*

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. G. Fraser—West) [4.46] in moving the second reading said: As usual, this is the first Bill to be dealt with during the session. Its early passing is necessary to provide finance for the services of State until such time as the Estimates, which are now being prepared, have been approved.

The sum of £17,000,000 is asked for in the Bill. This is £500,000 more than was requested in last year's Bill, the main reason for the larger amount being the increases in margins for skill which were granted earlier this year, and most of which were retrospective to the 24th December last.

Of the £17,000,000, the sum of £11,500,000 is required for the Consolidated Revenue Fund; £4,000,000, for General Loan Fund; and £1,500,000 for Advance to Treasurer. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**HON. SIR CHARLES LATHAM** (Central) [4.47]: I was rather surprised to hear the reply to a question this afternoon, in which reply the Liberal Party and the Country Party in the Commonwealth Government were blamed for not finding sufficient funds for certain purposes. If any Government has been generous to the Government of this State, it is the present Commonwealth Government; and particularly the Treasurer.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: To the dairy farmer?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Yes, to him, too. As a matter of fact, the finance that has been made available to stabilise industries in this State has always come from the Federal Government. I think that what is required in Western Australia is a little more careful management of the State's finances by our Treasurer. I would not have spoken had it not been for the answer given to the question a little earlier.

In today's paper we find that it is proposed to give a further £2,000,000 for water supplies. In the old days, when first we amalgamated taxation and gave power to the Commonwealth Government to impose it, only small amounts of money were distributed in this State. They were distributed on a population basis. Today it is a question of wants. This State has been very generously served with money, as I shall point out in my speech on the Address-in-reply. Perhaps we do not get all we ask for, but there is no doubt that the Treasurer of Western Australia, like most other State Treasurers, asks for a great deal more than he expects to get.

I did not like the reply given to the question to which I have referred. I thought that, at any rate, it might have been stated that some endeavour would be made to provide the necessary funds sought. I feel that, in defence of a Government that cannot deal with this question, at least someone in this House should express his opinion on the liberal manner in which the State Government has been treated by the Federal Treasurer.

**HON. L. A. LOGAN** (Midland) [4.50]: I, too, would like to have something to say about the answer given to Mr. Jones's question. I was not in the House when the question was asked; but, on reading the reply given, one can only be astounded—and nothing less than astounded—because it came from a responsible Minister in this Chamber. Mr. Jones asked what the Government's intentions were likely to be in regard to a certain matter, and the only answer he received was that because the Government had not been given sufficient money by the Federal Government it could not, or was not likely to, do anything.

The Minister for the North-West: That was not the answer.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: There was no answer. All the Minister was trying to do was to blame the present Federal Government for not being sufficiently generous. The question was not answered, and surely a member is entitled to receive a reply when he asks a reasonable question. As the Minister apparently did not read the answer given I shall quote it for his benefit. It reads as follows:—

The Government is aware of the value of all industries, and will, within the serious limitations imposed upon it by the Liberal Party-Country Party Federal Government, help wherever the need to help is clearly established.

What has the Federal Government to do with this?

The Minister for the North-West: It has the finance.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: The Minister would not like to have the State resume its taxing powers.

The Minister for the North-West: I would like to be handing out the money from Canberra.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The Minister's Government has been given large sums of money by the present Federal Government.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: And has done a lot of good with it, too.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: In parts.

Hon. G. Bennetts: Most of the State has had a fair whack.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: As I said, in parts. Some of the money has been spent wisely and some of it has not. However, I am not dealing with that phase; and probably Mr. Jones, who asked the question, will have something to say about this matter too. I wanted to take this opportunity of protesting because of the futile answer which was given to a question asked in all good faith by a member of this Chamber.

**HON. A. F. GRIFFITH** (Suburban) [4.52]: This might be as good an opportunity as any, because it is early in the session, to make an appeal to the Chief Secretary, particularly on my own account, regarding answers to questions. This afternoon I asked a question about land resumptions. In "The West Australian" of the 4th August, appeared an article headed, "No more land to be seized by the S.H.C." I asked whether that report was correct, and went on to ask a number of other questions in connection with it.

Apparently it suited the Government to give me not an answer to the question I asked concerning the report of the 4th August, but something entirely different, in order to make matters look a little better. The answer was that the correct report appeared in the "Daily News" of the 3rd August, 1955. That completely and entirely ignored the question I asked about the report which appeared in "The

West Australian" on the 4th August. So I ask the Chief Secretary to confer with his colleagues in another place in the hope that we can get direct answers to direct questions, because members are entitled to have their questions answered in the form in which they are asked. We should not be given evasive answers such as the one I received this afternoon. Part 5 of my question read—

In view of No. (4), can land owners of the State this time accept without qualification the assurance of the Government?

The only answer I received implied that the Government did not care, and it seemed to me that it adopted a most evasive attitude.

The Minister for the North-West: It is all in the answer.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Minister might think so, but there are a number of people who are still most concerned about this matter and about the assurances which were given last year. We still have several months to go before the Act expires—there is August, September, October, November and December—and during that time we could have another mighty large land grab such as we had 12 months ago.

Hon. E. M. Davies: We had a big one a few years ago, too.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: People who own land want to be assured that similar action will not be taken this year. That is the reason why I asked the question. I wanted to be able to tell these people that the Government, without qualification, had given an assurance that no more land would be seized, and that they could face the future with some security.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: It has already been given.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Is the hon. member the interjector for the Government?

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I hope that in future we can expect more direct answers to questions that we ask.

HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [4.55]: In dealing with this measure I would like to bring home to the Government the seriousness of the present situation, particularly as it affects Australia, regarding the trend of prices for primary products. During the past 12 to 18 months the price of wool has fallen by 18 per cent.; and that of wheat by 14 per cent., while the overseas prices of other primary products such as butter, eggs and fruit have also fallen.

Hon. E. M. Davies: The price of butter went up yesterday.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The Government is living in the same fool's paradise as that in which people have been living since the end of the last World War. It is wasting money on many secondary industries.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: What industries?

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Wundowie is one I could mention, and there is another which I will not name at the moment. Over the past few years the Government has gone secondary industry mad, and is prepared to pour thousands upon thousands of pounds into doubtful secondary industries in this State.

So I would like to issue a warning, while speaking to the Supply Bill, that we are in much the same stage as that in which we found ourselves in 1928; and, while I hate to be a pessimist, I can see us, within the next two years, in the centre of a large recession. I only hope that whatever Government happens to be in power at that time, and the people of this State and Australia as a whole, will realise what is likely to hit them, and that they cannot live as they have been living since the last World War. I would not be carrying out my duty if I did not attempt to point that out to the Government, and so I ask it to curtail expenditure wherever possible.

Today I asked the Chief Secretary for the annual losses at Wundowie since 1952 and the answer was that they were over £500,000. It may be that the industry has carried some of the smaller industries of the State; but for how long can we continue to incur those losses? For how long is public money to be poured into these sources? That is what we want to know, and that is why I hope the Government will take some heed of my remarks on this debate. It appears that the Government is not impressed when members in this Chamber ask it to pull in its horns when spending public money.

When we in the country areas go to the Government for assistance in an endeavour to boost up our primary production and return to this State an income from overseas, so that we can pay for our imports, we do not get a sympathetic hearing. It is time that the Government woke up to the fact that the lifeblood of this State is supplied by the money we receive from selling our primary products overseas.

There is one other matter to which I would like to refer. Although it does not concern my province, it is a problem which confronts every member. I refer to parking in the City of Perth. Of all amusing things, I think the latest ban on parking in William-st. is the most laughable. If one drives around the city block one finds that the worst street in Perth for parking and for traffic is Barrack-st. Yet the whole day long, on both sides of Barrack-st.—where there is a double tramline with trams operating—parking is tolerated. It makes one wonder if some of the powers that be may not have some interest in Barrack-st.

If one drives up Barrack-st. at any time of the day, one generally has to crawl from St. George's Terrace to Wellington-st. But in William-st. one can quite frequently get through without any difficulty.

There are no trams travelling along William-st. Buses run up and down that street, but they are mobile, and the position is different from that in Barrack-st. I wonder that the Chief Secretary has not had something to say to the Perth City Council about its action with regard to parking.

Whilst I am on the question of parking, I would like to say that it is about time the Chief Secretary, together with the Perth City Council, got down to something practicable in the city block. The only answer is for parking areas to be established on the north, south, east and west sides of the city, with feeder bus services. If that is not done, the problem will never be overcome.

In addition, when the Narrows bridge is completed it will encourage people to bring their cars into the city, and the parking problem will be accentuated. To build another bridge for the convenience of people who work in offices, and to enable them to drive their cars and park them in the city streets all day long, will not only create congestion, but will rob our public transport of revenue. I would far rather see the Narrows bridge not built at all if it is going to deprive our public transport of revenue. I would prefer that these people be forced to leave their cars at home and ride in the public conveyances.

At present the causeway deals adequately with traffic south of the river, but it may not do so in a few years' time. I do not say there is no need for the Narrows bridge; but as I have already indicated, it could accentuate the problem of parking. The sooner the Government and the Perth City Council arrive at some decision about parking areas outside the city block, the sooner will the parking problem be solved. In reaching such a decision, they would also be doing a good job towards providing more revenue for public transport and thus avoiding the huge losses experienced every year by the Government Tramways & Ferries Department. With those few remarks I support the Bill.

**HON. C. W. D. BARKER** (North) [5.4]: I did not intend to speak on this Bill; but after listening to the previous speaker, I must say something. I will not have anybody say that this Government has wasted money. Everyone in my electorate is satisfied and pleased with the achievements of the Government. I do not think we should adopt an attitude of pessimism as far as the future is concerned. Nor can it be said with any truth that this Government has never considered the farmer.

We all realise that the farmer is the backbone of the country. I appreciate that there are difficulties facing the agricultural industry at present as regards overseas markets, but I think the remedy for most of the problems which face the

farmer lies in his own hands. The position of the wheat market today can be remedied to a great extent by the farmers of Western Australia producing a better quality wheat. A way was pointed out whereby wheat could be sold on time payment. But if it is not sold that way, is the farmer of Western Australia prepared to build bins, where the wheat must deteriorate with storage, with a consequent decline in value of at least 2s. a bushel? Let him go out and sell that on the world markets 2s. cheaper.

As far as the meat market and other things are concerned, there is a grave danger that if we do not do something about them we will be in difficulties. I think that the remedy for most of these ills lies in the hands of the farmer himself. The one man who is suffering today is the dairy farmer, who has the Federal Government to thank for taking off the subsidy.

**Hon. N. E. Baxter:** It has not taken off anything.

**The PRESIDENT:** I would ask the hon. member to address the Chair.

**Hon. C. W. D. BARKER:** I am addressing the Chair.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The hon. member may proceed.

**Hon. C. W. D. BARKER:** The dairy farmer has to thank the Federal Government for the difficulty in which he finds himself today. If that Government had done the right thing he would not be in that difficulty. I do not think the State Government has anything against the farmer. I think it has done a lot for the farmer, and it realises the part he plays in the economy of Australia. I know I certainly do. I do not think we should be pessimistic.

The worst feature of our Australian products is that we do not advertise them enough. One would not know that Australia House existed, or that Western Australia was represented in it, if it were not for a black swan which hangs outside. Outside that building there is a picture of a few sheep on one side and of a few broken-down bullocks on the other. If we advertised our products and put them on the market in a better form we would be able to sell them.

I am also told that when emigrants approach the powers that be they are told first about New South Wales, then about Victoria, then about Queensland and South Australia, and lastly about Western Australia. They do not even know that we exist. As I have said, we should advertise our State and our goods, and we would then find a better market for them. To say that we are facing a recession, and that we are almost back to a state of affairs such as existed in 1929, when we had one of the worst depressions in history, is a lot of tommyrot.

It is quite wrong to say that we should not spend money on Wundowie. Why should we not spend money on Wundowie if it has proved itself a successful venture? If the plant is too small it ought to be improved so that its production can be increased. I support the Bill.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. G. Fraser—West—in reply) [5.10]: It appears that all this row has been caused by replies that have been given to questions. I would suggest to members that if they had studied the answers before rising to speak they would not have spoken in the manner they have. Sir Charles Latham started by querying the answer given to a question asked by Mr. Jones. He rushed into the matter without thinking. When he got to his feet Mr. Logan said, "I do not know what the answer was, but so and so is the case." And so he started criticising the answer given which, incidentally, he did not know.

Hon. L. A. Logan: I did not.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY**: I ask members whether or not that was the statement Mr. Logan made.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: He said he was not in the House when the question was asked.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY**: Is not that the same as saying he did not know what it was?

**THE PRESIDENT**: I would ask the Chief Secretary to address his arguments to the Chair.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY**: I have no argument with you, Mr. President. That is the type of thing we have to contend with. What was the answer given to the question to which exception was taken? It was as follows:—

The Government is aware of the value of all industries and will, within the serious limitations imposed upon it by the Liberal Party-Country Party Federal Government help wherever the need to help is clearly established.

Is not that a fact?

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: No, it is a Commonwealth Government and you know it.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY**: Is not that a fact?

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: No.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY**: Let us examine the position. Together with other States, Western Australia submitted to the Loan Council the minimum requirements of the State.

Hon. L. Craig: In their opinion.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY**: All right! Let the hon. member have it his own way. That was the minimum amount required to carry on efficiently in this State.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Theoretically.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY**: That was submitted to the Loan Council. Did Western Australia cut that amount itself or did the Federal Treasurer say, "You cannot get that amount of money; you can only get so much"?

Hon. L. A. Logan: Why?

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY**: So the States were compelled to cut down their programme. Are not those facts?

Hon. L. Craig: Is there anything wrong with that?

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY**: What was wrong with my answer to the question, particularly when it said that because of the fact that the Federal Government has cut down the amount required to run this State we are not able to give all the assistance asked for?

Hon. L. Craig: You did not say "Federal Government," you said, "Liberal Party-Country Party Federal Government."

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY**: What is wrong with that? The facts were there, and no member can argue that they are not facts.

Hon. L. A. Logan: It was not an answer to the question, and you know it.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY**: The Federal Government cut down the money required, and the answer was correct.

Hon. H. Hearn: It is a pre-election session though.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY**: That leads me to another complaint made by Mr. Griffith about the answer given to his question.

Hon. L. Craig: It was futile.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY**: The hon. member says it was futile. It is all right for everybody to say it was futile.

Hon. L. Craig: I am not talking about the Chief Secretary.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY**: Then I agree with the hon. member that it was futile. The hon. member was given an answer that was true in fact.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Can the Chief Secretary tell me where, in the answer, "The West Australian" of the 4th August, was mentioned?

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY**: The hon. member quoted "The West Australian," but the statement given by the Minister was given to another paper. The hon. member asked whether that statement was correct.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: In "The West Australian."

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY**: I told him that the statement that appeared in a certain paper was the official statement, but the hon. member wanted to make this matter political.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Oh, no!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He takes a heading out of another paper which had something in it.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: On a point of order, Mr. President, I object to the Chief Secretary asserting that I was endeavouring to make this a political issue. I had a cutting from a particular paper, and I asked the Government whether the statement in that particular paper was correct. I asserted that his answer pertained to another paper. I object to the Chief Secretary saying I am endeavouring to make this matter political. That seems to be his only defence.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am not at all attempting to make it political but am trying to give the true story. I refer the hon. member to the official statement that appeared in the Press. The hon. member did not quote from the paper in which that appeared but quoted from another paper, and in his question used the word "seizing." Could any interpretation be put upon that other than that it was used for political purposes? The hon. member quoted from the paper that used that word, and it was not the official paper.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: I think, Mr. President, you should call a halt to this sort of thing. I saw the cutting of "The West Australian" on the 4th August, and it happened that I did not see any other report; and I object to the Chief Secretary's saying that the question I asked in this House, and had a perfect right to ask, was political.

The PRESIDENT: The Chief Secretary need not pursue that line of argument.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Then shall I not find myself in the position of being unable to reply to such statements?

The PRESIDENT: I think the Minister has replied very fully.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Very well. I wish to make an appeal to members. We as a Government are out to give them all the information they require regarding matters affecting their electorates. If members play ball with us, we will play ball with them; but if the intention is to put up questions with the idea of securing political advantage, members can only expect the same type of answer. Consequently I ask them to frame their questions in such a manner as to indicate their desire for information, and we will meet them. I do not think I can say fairer than that. On the other hand, if members seek by way of questions to gain political advantage, they must expect me to hit back.

Reference was made by Mr. Baxter to parking. Everyone knows that parking in the city is chaotic. As a Minister connected with traffic matters, I tell members

that there need be no difficulty at all in making the city quite safe. We could eliminate parking in the city entirely, but we do not do so because we consider the interests of everybody. That is the reason why we are acting as we are doing. We have to consider the business person, the person who comes from the outer areas to do business in the city; we have to consider all angles.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: You differentiate between two streets.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member has not considered the matter fully. In one street there are traffic lights and in the other street there are not, and that does not permit of the two streets being compared. We could make the streets of Perth quite safe, but then we would be doing an injustice to a large section of the community. We are doing our best in the existing circumstances; and until such time as provision can be made elsewhere, we shall have to handle the situation as it exists. Negotiations have been going on between the Perth City Council and myself in connection with the provision of parks. Until something definite along those lines is achieved, it will not be possible to do much to improve the position. I repeat that we could improve it, but such improvement would be to the detriment of other sections of the community.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: That is all hooey.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If the hon. member wants this matter cleared up, I repeat that we can clear it up; but if we adopt that course, he must not come along crying to us afterwards.

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 passed.

*House adjourned at 5.24 p.m.*