

has been very much behind us in this move and he has supported our approaches to the Federal Government.

We took up a petition in Victoria Park and got 7,000 signatures. During a ceremony, I presented it to the Federal member for that district so that it could be handed to the Federal Minister for Health. Ultimately that Minister refused our request. I might say in explanation that the t.b. convalescent home will not be necessary when the chest clinic in West Subiaco, or Shenton Park as it is now called, is completed and all the present t.b. patients will be sent to the clinic.

When the chest hospital is completed, the Edward Millen Home in Victoria Park will become redundant. One doctor told me that the Repatriation Department is a government within the government, and even if the Federal Government were agreeable to the residents of Victoria Park being able to use the hospital, permission might not be granted by the Repatriation Department. I hope that we can achieve some success in that regard.

I wish to refer to another activity which is really an adjunct to hospitalisation. The St. John Ambulance Association is making strenuous efforts to start an ambulance centre in Victoria Park; if successful, it will work very effectively in conjunction with the hospital. I hope that before very long we shall be successful in establishing an ambulance centre in this district, and also a hospital.

The member for Nedlands interjected when I made reference to the tramlines in Victoria Park. That is not the only suburb in which tramlines are not in use. In this regard I am not only speaking for Victoria Park, though my immediate concern is with that suburb. The Government should make every effort to remove tramlines. This is a burning question with the residents of Victoria Park. I hope that the Government can see its way clear to allocate sufficient money to remove the lines without much further delay.

A promise was made that a start would be made on this work in December last or early this year, but later I was told that because of financial stringency, the removal would have to be delayed. I do not know when the Minister responsible will put a definite date for that work to be carried out, although I have spoken to him within the last week on the matter. He said that he was making every effort within his power to allocate the money for the removal of those tramlines. I am hopeful he will get that money because the removal of the lines will actually pay for the carrying out of that work. That is to say, the money which can be derived from the sale of the scrap steel will pay for the work.

It would only be a matter of making available the money for a short time until the lines were lifted and the steel sold.

That is the suggestion which I put forward to the Government. That concludes the remarks I wish to make. I would like to say that quite a number of matters in my electorate have been attended to by the Government, but there are some other urgent ones which need attention. If the Government takes the same action with the latter as it has taken with the former, I shall indeed be happy.

MR. ROBERTS (Bunbury) [7.45]: I would like to pay a tribute to one who is well known throughout the length and breadth of this State; I refer to Sir Ross McLarty, K.B.E., M.M. We must admit that during his tenure of high office in the State, Sir Ross carried out, with great credit to himself, the responsibilities and duties that fell to his lot, and we saw great progress made in the State during his term of office as Premier and Treasurer. It is my privilege now to sit beside Sir Ross on the back bench. I trust that in the years ahead he will enjoy his parliamentary career as a back bencher. I would like through you, Sir, to express to Sir Ross the hope that in the years ahead he will enjoy good health, and that Lady McLarty's health will improve as the months go by.

I would like to offer my congratulations to Hon. David Brand on his appointment as Leader of the Opposition. David Brand, during his term as Minister for Works, made himself known through the length and breadth of this State as a most capable Minister. I hope that he will not have to hold the office of Leader of the Opposition for very many years, and that after the next elections he will occupy the office of Premier of this State. At the rate the present Government is going, there is every possibility of that occurring at the next elections.

The Minister for Transport: You hope!

Mr. ROBERTS: I also take this opportunity to congratulate the member for Nedlands and the member for Harvey on their elevation to the respective positions of Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and party secretary and Whip.

The Minister for Transport: You should have made this speech in the party room.

Mr. ROBERTS: I hope the member for Cottesloe will have every success in his elevation to the front bench of this party. I would like to express my thanks to the Premier of this State in reappointing me to the Joint House Committee. We all know that at present members of that committee have quite a responsibility in view of the extensions and renovations proposed for Parliament House. All members will agree that the accommodation for members is very, very meagre. As private members, we have not sufficient space to carry out the duties that fall to our lot.

Mr. Oldfield: We have not even a party room.

Mr. ROBERTS: I agree that the Independents have not even a party room. I shall make every effort to see that this position is adjusted in the new accommodation which is sought.

Recently the Leader of the Opposition advocated the extension and renovation of the offices which he occupies at Parliament House. I do feel that something should be done in this regard, irrespective of who holds the position of Leader of the Opposition. He holds a responsible office in Parliament; he has to receive deputations and so forth; so the accommodation he occupies should at least be fitting to the position he holds. I think we would all agree that the accommodation of the Leader of the Opposition is very unsatisfactory at present.

It is unfortunate that the Premier is not here, because—although I have mentioned the matter to him—I want to say I do appreciate his action in reappointing or allowing me to remain as a member of the South-West Zone Development Committee. I have been a member of that body since its inception; but owing to various legal technicalities, I recently had to tender my resignation, and the Premier saw fit to allow me to remain as a member. I appreciate that action on his part.

I would like to mention matters in relation to this State of ours. The wealth of Western Australia, agriculturally, has been untouched to date. We have something like 975,920 square miles of land here; and no matter where one may travel—south, east or north—from this capital, one sees hundreds upon hundreds of acres of land awaiting development.

The Minister for Lands: Over 1,000,000 acres of land are thrown open each year.

Mr. ROBERTS: I realise that in the past there has been a considerable amount of development so far as agriculture is concerned, but the Minister will admit that the potential in regard to agriculture in this State is tremendous.

The Minister for Lands: Very great.

Mr. ROBERTS: I think he will also admit that in recent years the application of minor elements such as zinc, copper, and molybdenum have made a big difference to the productivity of this very rich soil of ours. I feel that our greatest asset, at the present moment, is the fertile soils we have; and with a suitable climate and an adequate rainfall in a big area of the State, we have something to offer people in other parts of Australia—and, indeed, in other parts of the world.

Members will recall that last October and November this State received a great deal of publicity in regard to the possibilities of land development in the Esperance area. The coming of the Chase syndicate brought before people in the Eastern States and other parts of the world the possibilities that are there for the asking

in our light land areas. I feel that the Government should do everything in its power to develop the potential in this State from an agricultural point of view. To my mind, we, as Western Australians, do not sell ourselves enough in the other States and overseas. We should all go out as ambassadors for the State as regards agriculture. I am sure all members will agree that at present our main export income is derived from the products of the soil. However, we must do all we can to see that there is a more balanced economy in this State.

It should be our responsibility to ensure that every encouragement is given to industrialists to establish secondary industries in this State. Secondary industries in Western Australia have been at a standstill for some years, although recently the electorate which I represent has had some prominence in the Press in regard to a certain chemical industry and a charcoal iron industry. But I feel that that is not enough because, if my information is correct, the other States of Australia—especially Victoria and South Australia—are going all out, and are establishing in those States, I understand, at least one new industry every fortnight. I would like to ask the Government to set up a trade mission to go to other countries of the world and encourage industrialists to bring capital into this State. We need the capital, and we need it badly.

Earlier tonight we heard the member for Victoria Park mentioning unemployment. If unemployment is as bad as is suggested by certain members on the opposite side, it can be easily overcome if we are prepared—or if the Government is prepared—to go out and encourage overseas capital to establish industries in this State. We read in the Press the other day that a cigarette-manufacturing company by the name of Rothmans had investigated the possibility of establishing an industry in Western Australia, and they said that they were a bit too far away from the markets, and freight would be too costly.

They have made a thorough investigation; but I would like to point out that—in my opinion, anyway—we are closer than any other State in Australia to a tremendous market in India, Indonesia, Malaya and South-east Asia. If we can produce the goods in this State for export to those countries to the north-east and north of this State, we would have a tremendous market there.

We also read in the Press only the other day that one gentleman—a Western Australian—is setting off overseas as a one-man mission to encourage industry to come to Western Australia. My immediate reaction was that if anybody ought to receive Government assistance, then that one man should, because he is doing a job that this Government should be undertaking as hard as it can. I cannot

help but think that in other parts of Australia—and probably overseas—people are talking about this State in rather derogatory terms, because our publicity has not been good of late. Recently, in the papers we were referred to as the "soup kitchen" State—a shocking description for any State to have tagged on it.

Mr. Potter: Don't you think that is premeditated in the Eastern States' interests?

Mr. ROBERTS: Maybe; but we cannot prove that we are not a soup kitchen State unless we are prepared to go out after industry and encourage it to come here. What is the position? The last big company with overseas capital, established in the State, is the first concern to be charged under the horrible legislation of last year termed the Unfair Trading and Profit Control Act.

The Minister for Health: That sort of legislation exists in all parts of the world—even in England.

Mr. ROBERTS: What will happen if the directors of that company, in England, receive inquiries from people who are interested in establishing industry in this State? What will they tell the inquirers?

The Minister for Health: They will tell those people what happened to their company here.

Mr. ROBERTS: Probably they will; and maybe that is why we are not receiving the additional capital so necessary to the welfare of the State and to every individual in the State. It is most essential that the Government go out after industry as hard as it can.

The Minister for Lands: That company will be able to tell the story that it got a monopoly here.

Mr. ROBERTS: As the member for Victoria Park asked when he was speaking just prior to me: Who is making this speech?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Give it to them!

The Minister for Lands: There is nothing wrong with a State that gives a monopoly to the company you are talking about, surely!

Mr. ROBERTS: All I hope is that in the near future the Government will receive favourable advice from London in regard to the establishment of a certain industry that in all probability will—I certainly hope so—set up its activities in my electorate.

Mr. Potter: There will be plenty more.

Mr. ROBERTS: I was also amazed—that is the wrong word—to learn that the State Government intended to establish a charcoal iron industry. I was most interested until I learned that it was a Government-sponsored show—another Government trading concern.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Don't you want it at Bunbury?

Mr. ROBERTS: Before the industry is established, I want to know a lot more in regard to the facts and figures covering the setting up of another State trading concern—another socialistic enterprise. If this Parliament decides—no doubt it has to, but I am not certain on that point—that there is to be a charcoal iron industry in the State, I can only hope that the industry will go to an electorate which is close to my heart, because in that electorate we have everything that can be offered to the industry.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: But you will prevent it if you can.

Mr. ROBERTS: Bunbury at least has a member who will fight for the establishment of industry and do all he possibly can to get it in his electorate—not like some other people that I know.

The Minister for Lands: Would you fight for a State trading concern in Bunbury?

Mr. ROBERTS: If Parliament decides that another State trading concern is to be established, I hope it will go to Bunbury.

The Minister for Lands: I knew you would.

Mr. ROBERTS: But being a member of a great party, I am keen that any industry established shall be of a free enterprise nature.

The Minister for Transport: A monopoly.

Mr. ROBERTS: No monopoly at all. Does the Minister mean to say that the corner storekeeper is a monopoly?

The Minister for Transport: You are not after him. You are after the big one.

Mr. ROBERTS: Do not worry about the corner storekeeper, I am very interested in him.

The Minister for Transport: The B.H.P. chap.

Mr. ROBERTS: The Minister pretends to be interested in him; but I am interested in him, and I have been all my life, because I happened to be a small storekeeper myself once.

The Minister for Transport: When you are chasing votes.

Mr. ROBERTS: Let me draw attention to an article that rather appealed to me. The heading is, "Free Enterprise Is Hobbled." It states—

Business in Western Australia at the present is being bedevilled by too much Government interference. In addition to the anti-progress legislation, there is an honorary Royal Commission on Unfair Trade Practices. Restrictions are contemplated to limit the trading hours of petrol stations and small suburban stores. The Government also plans to have a look at hire-purchase financing.

A mis-statement, that one.

These are only a few of the obstacles to free enterprise, but they are severe enough and there is no indication this is the last of them.

To say that free enterprise has an absolutely clean bill of health would not be true, but only a few deviate from honest trading and fair dealing and it is wrong that everyone should be penalised.

Despite any Government denials, the restrictive legislation of the last session has done severe harm to Western Australia.

The Minister for Transport: Try proving that.

Mr. ROBERTS: This article continues—

The Government should pause before it launches any further attacks upon a way of life which has brought higher standards of living. Free enterprise needs encouragement, not restrictions.

I whole-heartedly agree with that; because, when it is all boiled down, the majority of the citizens of our State rely on free enterprise; they practise in free enterprise.

Mr. Evans: They did not vote for the party that supports it.

Mr. Toms: Who is the author of the article?

Mr. ROBERTS: This is the editorial in the "Commerce-Industrial and Mining Review" for April, 1957.

The Minister for Transport: Big business giving itself a pat on the back.

Mr. ROBERTS: Let us have a look at what State trading concerns have done. In the Estimates for the year ended the 30th June, 1957, the estimated deficit of the State Engineering Works is £18,000. The State Brick Works has an estimated deficit of £7,746; the State Saw Mills an estimated deficit of £46,730; the State Shipping Service an estimated deficit of £852,392; and the Wyndham Meat and Freezing Works an estimated deficit of £14,195. Now we come to those trading concerns which are contemplating a surplus. For the State Hotels—hotels, mind—the estimated surplus is £3,927.

Mr. Jamieson: Why didn't your party do something about it when in power?

Mr. ROBERTS: When we are next in power, perhaps in 1959, we will do so. To continue, W.A. Meat Exports have an estimated surplus of £2,833. The list is colossal and would take one a long time to go through. The report of the Government Tramways and Ferries shows an estimated deficit—

The Minister for Lands: I suppose you are aware that private enterprise will not take on these things in an endeavour to make a profit.

Mr. ROBERTS: Private enterprise takes on hotels. However, the list is too colossal to go through in full during this debate so I will leave it and deal next with an item of interest to the Minister for Housing—the housing position in this State.

The Minister for Lands: Why do you not get private enterprise to build your houses?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Private enterprise does better anywhere than does the Government.

The SPEAKER: Who is making this speech?

Mr. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker! I was waiting for that. It has been said that the housing position in this State has been practically rectified, but I can only say that in the Bunbury electorate the shortage is still acute. Some time ago I asked the Minister for Housing how many houses were built in Bunbury during the year 1955-56; and he replied that under the Commonwealth-State rental scheme 28 were built; under the war service housing scheme, 10; and under the State Housing Act, 33, making a total of 71 houses.

Subsequently I asked the Minister how many applications were outstanding from that area for the same period and the reply was that there were still 158 applications outstanding for Commonwealth-State rental homes, 33 for war service homes and 52 for homes under the State Housing Act, or a total of 243 applications outstanding at the 30th June, 1956, as against 71 built in that year.

The Minister for Housing: Lots of those applications would be duplicated or triplicated.

Mr. ROBERTS: I do not agree with the Minister there. If he desires it I will take out an analysis of the approaches made to me by people in Bunbury desiring accommodation under the various schemes. If I do that, I think the Minister will be surprised; and if he requires it, I will give him the names, file numbers and addresses of the people concerned.

The Minister for Housing: I think you had better go to private enterprise to build your houses instead of coming to socialism.

Mr. ROBERTS: I appreciate the interjection, as I was coming to that in a minute.

Mr. Oldfield: Where are they going to house the employees of the new charcoal iron industry?

Mr. ROBERTS: That is what is worrying me. If 200 houses were made available in Bunbury tomorrow morning there would still be a number of people seeking accommodation in that centre. That is no exaggeration, as the position there is acute. As the Minister is well aware, if

new industries are established at Bunbury, his task will be all the more difficult if he does not make a move now to build houses there.

I must, at this stage, admit that over the years the State Housing Commission has made tremendous progress in Bunbury and has built a considerable number of homes there. On a rough estimate, I would say that at least 700 homes have been built in Bunbury, under the various housing schemes, and that is a creditable performance; but I am stressing that the demand is still there, and I hope the Minister will give serious consideration to allocating a larger number of homes to Bunbury this year—

The Minister for Lands: And take them away from someone else.

Mr. ROBERTS: I understand that in certain parts of the State today the housing shortage has been overcome; and if that is so, I would suggest that places still in dire need of housing receive further consideration. Mention has been made of the intention to build flats for the aged in the metropolitan area—for instance, just a little way from here, at the corner of Colin and Hay-sts. I hope and trust that if the State Housing Commission is contemplating the building of flats in the metropolitan area for aged people, it will also give consideration to building similar flats in country centres, because the aged people of those towns desire accommodation in the areas where they have lived for many years. I trust that the Minister for Housing will give consideration to the building of flats for aged people in country areas.

I was surprised to read, at page 5 of His Excellency's Speech, that one-third of the homes erected by the Housing Commission last year were built in country districts. No doubt the Government is well aware that at least 50 per cent. of the population of the State lives in country areas.

The Minister for Housing: It does not.

Mr. ROBERTS: Or so close to 50 per cent. that it makes no difference; at all events it is nothing like 33½ per cent. of the population and I would like to know why the people of the metropolitan area should receive preference over country people in this regard.

The Minister for Housing: The country people get preference and you should know it.

Mr. ROBERTS: Does the Minister suggest that the comment on page 5 of His Excellency's Speech, to which I have referred, is incorrect?

The Minister for Housing: There is a longer waiting period in the metropolitan area than in the country. It is over two years here.

Mr. ROBERTS: It is more than that in Bunbury.

The Minister for Housing: It is February, 1955, in the metropolitan area.

Mr. ROBERTS: The Minister said it was two years.

The Minister for Housing: I said it was over two years in the metropolitan area.

Mr. ROBERTS: I would point out that according to His Excellency's Speech one-third of the homes built in the past year were built for people in the country areas. Let us examine what has happened in regard to the allocation of £600,000 made available to the State Housing Commission under the Commonwealth housing agreement. We find in regard to that sum that only one country society is mentioned, and that happens to be the Bunbury Benefit Investment and Loan Society, which receives an allocation of £20,000 out of £600,000. There we have £20,000 out of £600,000 allocated to country areas—

The Minister for Housing: That is an untruth.

Mr. ROBERTS: I am coming to it—

The Minister for Housing: Then be honest as you proceed.

Mr. ROBERTS: Wait until I have finished what I am saying.

The Minister for Housing: Be honest as you proceed.

Mr. ROBERTS: I am. I am not like the Minister.

The Minister for Housing: Then you are ignorant.

Mr. ROBERTS: I may be. I would at least admit it.

The Minister for Housing: Everyone agrees with you.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Everyone does not.

Mr. ROBERTS: In this list of societies which were allocated money, there are two new ones—the Southern Suburbs Building Society, which received an allocation of £40,000; and the Northern Suburbs Building Society, which also secured £40,000. When I obtained the answers to my questions, I thought I would make inquiries from those two societies, because I did not know a great deal about them. My initial reaction was to go to a telephone book to find out their telephone numbers and addresses. They are not even listed in last year's telephone book. Yet there is a society which has been operating in Bunbury for many years, and which received a total allocation of £20,000; while two new societies between them were allocated £80,000.

In the answers I received to the questions I asked, it was pointed out that a certain allocation was made to the Rural & Industries Bank, and part of that allocation would go to country residents. The total allocation to the Rural & Industries Bank was £60,000; and even if

the whole of that sum went to country districts, it would mean that only £80,000 had been allocated to country districts out of the £600,000. In all probability, societies such as the Perth Building Investment and Loan Society lend money for the erection of homes in certain country areas. But I do not think they would lend a great deal of their money for the erection of such homes, because there is a sufficient demand in the metropolitan area—probably the demand far exceeds the sum that these societies could allocate.

As far as the Bunbury Benefit Building Investment Loan Society is concerned, an approach was made to the State Housing Commission, and I should like to read the correspondence. A letter from the society dated the 8th July, to the Under Secretary, State Housing Commission, under the heading of "Commonwealth State Housing Agreement Act, 1956" reads as follows:—

I have your letter of the 2nd inst. advising allocation to this society for 1957-58 is £20,000. This is a very disappointing figure and again gives the metropolitan societies practically the whole of the available moneys. You may remember at the conference our delegates asked for £50,000, substantiating their request on the grounds that this society's operations extend to Collie, Donnybrook, Busselton, Harvey and taking in the intermediate districts. The Press reports that £40,000 is to go to Northern Suburbs Building Society, £40,000 to Southern Suburbs, and a reserve of £40,000 for new societies. I consider £20,000 to an old and established society, when double this amount is allocated to new societies, to the best of my knowledge not represented at the conference, is very unfair. Further, Bunbury is desperately in need of homes proved by the fact that there is a waiting list of 170 applicants for State rental homes.

I do not know from where they got that figure. The letter goes on—

In view of the foregoing this society definitely asks for reconsideration of its allocation to the amount suggested at the conference, viz., £50,000. Will you press direct this request to the authority or authorities governing the allocations if same are not computed entirely by the State Housing Commission?

The letter is signed by the secretary of the society. On the 15th July the Under Secretary of the State Housing Commission replied as follows:—

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 8th July regarding allocation of funds to your society for the year 1957-58. The allocation to the permanent societies was based largely on loans granted by the societies over the previous three years from funds other

than governmental. On this basis your allocation would have been considerably less than the £20,000 made available, but consideration was given to your previous representations that the Bunbury society was the only society operating outside the metropolitan area. In this connection, however, it is pointed out that loans under this scheme are available to country applicants through the country branches of the Rural & Industries Bank. I regret that I am unable to recommend to the Commonwealth Minister for National Development, Canberra, that your allocation be increased at this stage.

I hope the Minister will reconsider the case of the Bunbury society because it is an old-established society and, irrespective of what its previous loans have been, it should at least receive the same consideration as an entirely new society.

The Minister for Housing: It has received about twice as much as it is entitled to receive under the formula approved by the Commonwealth.

Mr. ROBERTS: I have a question on the notice paper for tomorrow in this regard.

The Minister for Housing: Would you like the answer now?

Mr. ROBERTS: Let us have a look at the country-metropolitan basis again. Recently the Minister for Education said that something like £2,084,147 had been and was to be spent in the last two years and this financial year on 10 high schools.

The Minister for Education: Have you one at Bunbury?

Mr. Hearman: Doesn't the Minister know?

Mr. ROBERTS: Let us analyse the Minister's statement.

The Minister for Education: Have you a high school at Bunbury?

Mr. ROBERTS: I might get on to the question of the Bunbury High School in a moment, if time allows me. The schools mentioned by the Minister were at Armadale, Midland Junction, Mt. Lawley, the John Curtin High School, Tuart Hill, Belmont, Applecross and Hollywood.

Mr. Potter: They are most necessary.

Mr. ROBERTS: Agreed, but they are all in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Oldfield: Don't you think that the children of Mt. Lawley are entitled to education?

Mr. ROBERTS: I agree; but let me bring out my point. Every one of the schools mentioned is in the metropolitan area; and when one adds up the sums to be expended on these new high schools, the total is £2,149,690.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Hear, hear!

Mr. ROBERTS: Let us see what happened in the country in the last two financial years and what will happen during this financial year. The expenditure was £63,732 on Manjimup, and £62,504 on Merredin.

Mr. Cornell: You can thank the Country Party for that. If we had not opposed the Minister they would not have had it.

Mr. ROBERTS: I have a note here to draw members' attention to the electorate in which these schools are situated—Manjimup and Merredin.

The Minister for Education: Do you think that is fair?

Mr. ROBERTS: There was a total expenditure on country schools of £126,236.

The Minister for Education: Don't you think that the remark you made just now was unfair?

Mr. ROBERTS: I am merely stating what is factual and what the Minister said in a previous debate in this House. A few moments ago the Minister referred to the Bunbury High School. I can only hope and trust that he, in the next few months, will take the opportunity to visit Bunbury—

The Minister for Education: I have been there already.

Mr. ROBERTS: The Minister does not let the member for the district know.

The Minister for Education: You were not the member at the time.

Mr. ROBERTS: I have been the member for Bunbury a long while now, and the Minister has not visited that centre during my time. Therefore, I would like the Minister to visit Bunbury to inspect the accommodation in the schools, including the high school.

The Minister for Education: I have visited all of them.

Mr. ROBERTS: Only yesterday I saw 63 children crowded into a wood and asbestos room at one of the schools in Bunbury, and those children were under the instruction of only one teacher.

Mr. Oldfield: That state of affairs exists all over the metropolitan area.

Mr. ROBERTS: It also exists in country areas; probably more so.

Mr. Oldfield: Oh, yes!

Mr. ROBERTS: I am not saying that the metropolitan area should not get its required number of schools. All I am saying is that there should be a more even distribution of the money spent on education and schools throughout the State. Boys and girls in country areas are just as entitled to decent accommodation in which to receive their education as boys and girls in the metropolitan area. I am certain that 50 per cent. of the members in this House will agree with me on that.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. ROBERTS: Let us have another look at this Government's attitude in regard to the allocation of expenditure on education as between the metropolitan areas and the country areas. Only an hour or so ago we heard the member for Victoria Park referring to unemployment. Some months ago we heard that the Government was to allocate £1,000 to alleviate the unemployment position in this State.

Mr. Potter: How much?

Mr. ROBERTS: A sum of £1,000 per week.

Mr. Potter: That is better.

Mr. ROBERTS: I am sorry; but I have corrected my previous statement. However, what do we find? We find that the average weekly payment on unemployment relief between the 15th January, 1957, and the 5th July, 1957, was £704.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Shame!

Mr. ROBERTS: We will now have a look at where this money was expended. The allocation was as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
Perth	12,960	13	0
Fremantle	4,521	14	0
Midland Junction	112	17	6

Mr. Lapham: What about Bunbury?

Mr. ROBERTS: If the unemployment position in this State was so acute, surely there were some unemployed persons in the country areas! No doubt the member for Kalgoorlie knew of some in his district. The member for Albany must have known of some in his district. The member for Collie and the member for Geraldton must have known of some unemployed persons in their districts, also. I have picked out only the large centres.

Mr. May: There is not one unemployed man in Collie.

Mr. ROBERTS: It is a different story from what it was a few months ago. The district must have a good member.

Mr. May: You have hit the nail on the head!

Mr. ROBERTS: The point is that the allocation of funds spent on education, between the metropolitan area and the country districts is most unfair and the Government must give further consideration to the allocation of more money to the country centres. One must admit that the wealth of the State comes from the country districts.

The Minister for Transport: Not in Bunbury, but outside of your electorate.

Mr. ROBERTS: I could not agree with the Minister more. Bunbury's hinterland is Bunbury's saviour. It is the richest hinterland in the State. It is much richer than the hinterland behind East Perth. I now want to refer to sewerage.

The Minister for Transport: You have been playing round with that for half an hour.

Mr. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport is assuming his real self again. Sewerage! He is in his element on that subject, as the member for Moore said.

The Minister for Transport: You're an expert! You ought to know!

Mr. ROBERTS: Let us have a look at the sewerage problems in country areas. I sincerely trust that when a sewerage scheme is contemplated for Bunbury, the Minister for Works will give a great deal of consideration to tying it up with some sort of irrigation scheme. Among my comments on the Estimates last year I referred to the fact that approximately 300,000 gallons of water per hour, 24 hours per day, 365 days a year, were pumped into the Indian Ocean as effluent from the Subiaco treatment works. If my memory serves me right, I stated, at that time, that the responsibility not only of Parliament, but also of every individual in this State, should be the conservation of every gallon of water possible. At the time the Minister for Health, if I remember correctly, interjected by agreeing with me whole-heartedly.

The Minister for Health: I do! Absolutely!

Mr. ROBERTS: Three hundred thousand gallons of water per hour is a great deal of water, and I consider it should be used for other purposes, such as irrigation. Let us establish a farm such as the Werribee Farm in Victoria which, I understand, has overcome all of the initial difficulties. In any case, even if there were difficulties in regard to the raising of fat stock on farm lands irrigated by sewerage effluent, surely, we could use this effluent for other purposes, such as vegetable growing, pine plantations, or some other type of reforestation. There is no doubt that that water should be conserved and used in some way or other.

Therefore, when a sewerage scheme is being planned for Bunbury, or, in fact, for any country area, I trust that the powers that be—especially the Minister for Works—will give full consideration to a comprehensive scheme which will enable every gallon of water to be used advantageously for some other purpose, whether it be for the irrigation of farm-lands, vegetable plots, reforestation or something else. I do not care what it is; but let us ensure that the water used on any sewerage scheme established in this State will not be wasted.

A friend of mine took out some figures for me in regard to this 300,000 gallons of effluent from the Subiaco treatment works, and he estimated that 12,000 acres could be irrigated by flood irrigation with the water from that plant. That is a tremendous area of land, and a sizable irrigation

area. Accordingly I trust that in the years ahead the responsible Minister will give very serious consideration to the utilisation of effluent waters from the sewerage schemes. Another matter that is very dear to my heart is that of harbours, especially outports.

Mr. Lapham: Have you ever been to Albany?

Mr. ROBERTS: I was in Albany only a few months ago—on the 23rd May, to be exact.

Mr. Hall: I heard you were there.

Mr. ROBERTS: I was agreeably surprised at the great developmental work at that port in recent years. The district certainly warrants it. I can only hope that Albany will go from success to success in its effort as an outport for a great hinterland. I hope other industries will establish themselves there, because outports are most important to the correct handling of cargoes and the economic success of this State.

Both Bunbury and Albany have harbour boards. Recently we heard from the member for Geraldton, in his Address-in-reply speech, mention of the fact that the control of the Geraldton harbour had been taken from the Western Australian Government Railways, and was under the jurisdiction of the Harbour and Light Department. While in Esperance recently, I heard comment to the effect that it was contemplated that control of the Esperance harbour would also be relinquished by the Western Australian Government Railways and be taken over by the Harbour and Light Department.

The Minister for Health: That is so.

Mr. ROBERTS: I disagree with that in principle, because it is a form of centralisation; and I would recommend that the Government give very serious consideration to both those ports—namely, Geraldton and Esperance—being granted an autonomous body like the Bunbury and Albany Harbour Boards.

The Minister for Health: It will come ultimately.

Mr. ROBERTS: As long as the Government has that in mind, I feel happy about it; because I am sure that, in time, the outports will benefit from the establishment of their own autonomous boards. The reason for this is that the members of such a board will be made up of people living within the port zone area, and they will naturally be interested in the welfare and increased trade of the port.

As the Minister is aware, at last the well-known transit shed in Bunbury is operating; and recently we had the first major direct shipment from the eastern seaboard come to Bunbury by the s.s. "Koorawatha." It was a great sight to see those goods being sorted and delivered through this transit shed at Bunbury, for which we have waited for so many years.

The Minister for Health: Thanks to the present Government.

The Minister for Housing: What a Government!

Mr. ROBERTS: I must point out that it was the McLarty-Watts Government that brought the structure for the transit shed from Wiluna. That structure of steel rested on the Bunbury foreshore for many years; it rested there until the Bunbury by-election, and from then on things started to move. But now it has been established, and it will become an integral part of the district.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member's time has expired.

On motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson, time extended.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member may proceed.

Mr. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not delay the House much longer. Like many people in the South-West, I was very pleased to see this first major shipment from the eastern seaboard come to Bunbury and be handled at the transit shed. I would recommend to all members representing the South-West, including the Minister for Agriculture, that when they are in their electorates they advocate amongst the traders that they order goods through the port that serves their particular locality. I trust the members on my side of the House will also advocate that in their particular electorates, because it is most important, and it makes for a great deal of saving so far as freight is concerned.

Last year the Minister for Works promised me that a dredge would be made available in Bunbury early in the 1957-58 financial year. Following a question asked by me a week or ten days ago, I am now advised that the dredge will be made available early in 1958. I can only hope that there will be no more procrastination, if I may use that expression. I realise that the dredge is engaged on important work in the Fremantle harbour, but I would point out that recently two new berths were completed in the port of Bunbury, and they cannot be fully utilised until such time as a few sandy knobs are cleared from the approaches to those berths.

The Minister for Works: I have provided money for the job on the Estimates.

Mr. ROBERTS: I am very pleased to hear that; and I hope the dredge will be there to do the necessary job, so that the two new berths can be fully utilised. It is well known that over the years many people have put pen to paper in an endeavour to draw plans for a future port of Bunbury. It has been going on for many years now. I would like to take this opportunity, however, of pointing out that in shipping circles today a land-backed quay is regarded as essential; and the

sooner the port of Bunbury gets a land-backed quay, the more efficient will be its working. I think the member for Albany will agree that a land-backed quay makes for efficient port working, because recently one was completed in the port of Albany and another is nearing completion.

The port of Bunbury badly needs a land-backed quay, and I trust the Minister for Works will give early consideration to a suggestion that one be established on the eastern side of the breakwater. If we provide for a land-backed quay in the port of Bunbury the Tydeman plan will have to be changed. Even though we have heard so much to the effect that this plan was never going to be changed, I consider that warrants alteration. Although the Tydeman plan appears to be a great one on paper I do not feel that we, in this generation, should cut off access to the estuary waters through the harbour. I realise that cutting off of estuarial waters flowing into the harbour of Bunbury has meant a great deal to that port; and that had it not been for the plug placed there, and had we been in difficulty over the shortage of dredges, Bunbury harbour would have pretty well silted up by now, because it was September, 1955, when a dredge was last there. The depth of the water would have decreased considerably in the intervening period.

In the years to come—maybe hundreds or maybe thousands—the estuarial waters of Bunbury will be utilised for shipping purposes. Some of us might have gone down the Clyde in vessels and looked down from the decks of the vessels practically straight down to the banks. I would like to be able to come back here in 2957 to see vessels discharging cargo well up in the Leschenault estuary. The potentials of the South-West, and that of the Bunbury port zone in particular, are colossal. Fremantle has as much hope of coping with the products from the primary and secondary industries in that area as I have of flying. Therefore the port must be expanded and consideration should be given to preserving the Leschenault estuarial waters for harbour development.

In the past derogatory comments on the port of Bunbury have been made. I would like to mention some figures which I have received only a few days ago showing the increased activities of this port. During the year ended the 30th June, 1957, 80 vessels called at Bunbury, and 299,115 tons of cargo were handled. That is a big increase on last year's figures. This year, as we all know, a new product was exported through the port; namely, ilmenite. I hope that through the industrial development of the Bunbury port zone in the future years, we will see the export of other products from that port.

Mr. Oldfield: Such as charcoal iron.

Mr. ROBERTS: Charcoal iron definitely. I did not say who was going to run the charcoal iron industry. I would ask the Government to give more consideration to encouraging secondary industries to be established in this State. It should leave no stone unturned to encourage overseas capital to set up such industries in Western Australia, because I feel confident they would succeed, as they have a tremendous potential market to the north of us in the teeming millions of the Asian countries—Indonesia, India, Burma, etc.

I hope that during this and future sessions of Parliament the Government in office will not enact any other measures of the nature of the unfair trading legislation passed last session, which has done immeasurable harm to this State. We have a great State. Let us do all we can to help it. Let the Government and the private members on both sides of the House act like statesmen and encourage additional industries to be established here so that the volume of trade between primary and secondary industries may become better balanced.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [8.55]: I cannot agree with very much of what the member for Bunbury has put forward. One of the points on which I do agree with him is that far greater emphasis should be placed on trade with the Asiatic countries which are close to us. I suggest that neither this Government nor any other has done all it could to capture the markets that rightfully belong to this State. I drew this matter to the attention of the Government during the Address-in-reply debate last year. I assume that the Government was unable to extend its efforts with the establishment of the suggested trade mission because of its financial difficulties.

The time has come when members of the Liberal Party should prevail upon their Federal masters to readjust the Federal Government policy of trade with Red China because the untold millions living in that country constitute a great potential market for the goods from this State, which is the closest of the Australian States to the Asiatic countries. It must be realised that many other countries, south of China, would and could become good customers for our products. Singapore has been purchasing quite a number of sheep on the hoof from this State; but lately, owing to marketing problems, there has been a slight tapering off in this regard. Singapore is not the only place that requires the products of this State.

In that regard the Minister for Agriculture should emphasise to Cabinet the need to make available the funds to set up some form of trade delegation. Let us bring back the orders to this State, and let not the other States capture markets which rightly belong to us. We have the advantage in shipping and transport of our

produce because of our close proximity, and these markets should be utilised to our greatest advantage.

In the Governor's Speech I noticed, among other things, mention of the university medical school being established and clinical teaching being provided for six-year medical students. I hope that in the teaching of medicine in Western Australia, more business acumen will be stressed to the up and coming medical profession than has been displayed in the past in the other centres from which we have been drawing our medical practitioners. Indeed, their business acumen, and the requirements of the general public outside the normal scope of medical practice being very slight, prompted me to ask a question of the Minister on the 16th July regarding the provision of adequate facilities by the medical fraternity in attending to their patients.

In my opinion, the Minister did, to some degree, sidetrack the issue. He asked me to supply cases where I considered the surgery and waiting room facilities were not as adequate as desired. I might say that most members of this House appreciate the fact that many medicos are practising in very old converted houses; and, indeed they have practised there year after year, even when their work has grown to such an extent that they are able to buy, in some cases, quite expensive x-ray equipment which they install in some other additional room they have found somewhere or other. It is not uncommon to see sick people waiting on verandahs and on improvised seats when, in fact they should be comfortably accommodated. They are generally in a very poor state of mind; and for that reason they need to be made as comfortable as possible.

It is noticeable that the dental fraternity do at least, in nearly all cases I can picture, provide an adequate waiting room and adequate surgery facilities to carry on their profession. However, the medicos to whom I have referred, to some degree are not putting into the profession anything like the return they should be considering what they are getting out of it; and, if they are to enjoy all the privileges of the profession, surely we must expect something from them in the provision of adequate facilities for the public they are treating.

My colleague from Victoria Park made mention to some extent of the necessity for a hospital south of the river. It has been referred to on and off for a number of years now; and several years ago, together with the Minister, the member for Victoria Park and several officers from the Public Health Department, went into the matter and the north-eastern portion of the Collier pine plantation was finally chosen as a hospital site. It looked as though it would be quite a long time before the Minister would agree it was a suitable site,