

What a colossal hide! Especially when we consider the £15,000,000 profit made by General Motors (Holden) Ltd. The Minister may have been speaking for himself, but he does not speak on behalf of the population of Western Australia.

Mr. COURT: We happen to be the Government.

Mr. FLETCHER: Yes, unfortunately.

Mr. W. Hegney: What a Government!

Mr. FLETCHER: A Government with a very slender majority, elected to office, as I said previously, by the second preferences of a party that has no representation in this State or Chamber. The Minister cannot speak for all the people of Western Australia. The Minister demonstrated his attitude in the past when he joined issue with me during the last session at a time when I was taking exception to some of the exorbitant profits which were being made. If industries are to be brought here, I want them to be of a type that will be beneficial to Western Australia and to the population of Western Australia.

On motion by Mr. Watts, debate adjourned.

## COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION

### *Council's Message*

Message from the Council received and read notifying the personnel of sessional committees appointed by that House.

## QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

### RAILWAYS CONCESSIONS

#### *Grants to Private Schools*

Mr. COURT: Earlier in the sitting I promised the honourable member for Guildford-Midland I would obtain information resulting from a Press announcement headed, "Rail Fares Reduced," and which related to Government schools and colleges.

The commissioner has forwarded me a copy of the Press statement as submitted, portion of which reads as follows:—

Reduced rail fares will be granted to pupils from both private and Government schools and colleges travelling during the August school holidays.

*House adjourned at 6.11 p.m.*

# Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 9th August, 1960

## CONTENTS

	Page
<b>SWEARING-IN OF MEMBER</b> .....	200
<b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—</b>	
Abattoirs Act: Yarding fees .....	203
Copper Ore: Export .....	203
Dalwallinu and Moora Dams: Prevention of evaporation of water .....	201
Fremantle Railway Bridge: Tabling of files .....	201
Gascoyne River: Report by Mr. Furphy on water conservation .....	202
Geraldton Harbour: Improvements .....	201
Housing: Commonwealth Grant—	
Allocation to Western Australia .....	200
Distribution .....	200
Iron Ore: Purchases from Crown .....	202
Lot 1852: Transfer to Fremantle City Council .....	202
Metropolitan Railway Passenger Services: Reduction of suburban station staff .....	201
Midland Junction Abattoir: Amounts paid to Consolidated Revenue for 1954, 1959, and 1960 .....	202
<b>BILL—</b>	
Supply Bill, £23,500,000—	
2r. ....	204
Com., report, 3r. ....	226

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

## SWEARING-IN OF MEMBER

THE PRESIDENT: I am prepared to swear in the Honourable L. A. Logan who was returned for the Midland Province at the biennial election.

The Honourable L. A. Logan took and subscribed the oath and signed the roll.

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### HOUSING: COMMONWEALTH GRANT

#### *Allocation to Western Australia*

1. The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON asked the Minister for Mines:

For each of the last three financial years, will the Minister advise—

- (1) the amount made available to Western Australia by the Commonwealth Government for housing?

#### *Distribution*

- (2) the amount retained by the Housing Commission and the amount allocated to building societies?
- (3) the amount spent by the Housing Commission in—
  - (a) the metropolitan area;
  - (b) Albany, Bunbury, Geraldton, Northam, Kalgoorlie, and Busselton?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

	1957-1958	1958-1959	1959-1960
(1)	£	£	£
	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(2)	1957-1958	1958-1959	1959-1960
	£	£	£
Amount retained by Housing Commission	2,400,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
Amount allocated to Building Societies	600,000	900,000	900,000
(3) (a) and (b)	1957-1958	1958-1959	1959-1960
	£	£	£
Metropolitan Area	2,000,662	1,012,656	1,056,480
Albany	633	54,060	61,444
Bunbury	105,914	89,004	93,159
Geraldton	93,622	109,205	130,242
Northam	40,764	43,922	19,613
Kalgoorlie	.....	.....	.....
Busselton	35,045	30,458	7,913
Total	£2,276,640	£1,239,305	£1,368,851

## FREMANTLE RAILWAY BRIDGE

### Tabling of Files

2. The Hon. A. L. LOTON asked the Minister for Mines:

Will the Minister table all files dealing with the proposed Fremantle railway bridge?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

No, but the honourable member may peruse the appropriate files at the offices of the Minister for Railways, the Minister for Works, and the Minister for Town Planning, respectively.

3. This question was postponed.

## GERALDTON HARBOUR

### Improvements

4. The Hon. A. R. JONES asked the Minister for Mines:

In view of the fact that Geraldton port is daily growing in importance for the handling of goods, produce, stock, and metals for the development of that part of the State, and the Government's report for decentralisation, .. Government—

- make a .. start to deepen the port .. sufficient to allow larger .. which is the trend today, .. through the port?
- make handling facilities more adequate for those metals which are now handled with a view to the possible handling of iron ore for which it is hoped an export license can be obtained?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- The proposal to provide increased depth of water in the harbour and in the outer approaches is at present under review.

- The limited shipments of mineral ores do not justify the provision of special handling facilities at present.

## DALWALLINU AND MOORA DAMS

### Prevention of Evaporation of Water

5. The Hon. A. R. JONES asked the Minister for Mines:

As in previous years the quantity of water available to the towns of Morawa and Dalwallinu has been inadequate, will the Government make an early decision to either—

- cover the existing dams to prevent evaporation, or
- take steps to enlarge the dams' capacity by either Crowsnesting them and pumping in water or excavating a further area?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- It is not known at present if funds will be available for roofing the dams at Morawa and Dalwallinu as the loan programme has not been finalised. However provision was included in the draft Loan Estimates for roofing.
- Answered by (a).

## METROPOLITAN RAILWAY PASSENGER SERVICES

### Reduction of Suburban Station Staff

6. The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY asked the Minister for Mines:

Full .. my question on the 2nd August 1960, relating to metropolitan .. passenger services—

- has the Chief .. anager made any recommendations for the reduction of suburban station staff?

- (b) if the answer to (a) is "yes"—  
 (i) what are the details;  
 (ii) where are the men at present employed?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (a) The heads of railway branches are required to make many recommendations to the Commissioner on various phases of their activities. Some of these recommendations are adopted, some are modified, and some are rejected, the final determination being the responsibility of the Commissioner. It is considered injudicious to announce whether or not a head of a branch has made a recommendation on any particular subject.
- (b) Answered by (a).

### LOT 1852

#### *Transfer to Fremantle City Council*

7. The Hon. E. M. DAVIES asked the Minister for Mines:

Will the Minister ascertain and inform the House when Lot 1852 being portion of land with a frontage to South Terrace, Fremantle, will be transferred to the Fremantle City Council?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

Crown Grant of Fremantle Lot 1852 in the name of The Federation of Western Australian Police and Citizens' Boys Clubs (Inc.) issued to the Office of Land Titles on the 16th March, 1960, and was secured from there by the general secretary of the clubs on the 7th April, 1960.

### GASCOYNE RIVER

#### *Report by Mr. Furphy on Water Conservation*

8. The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND asked the Minister for Mines:

Six months ago at Carnarvon the Minister for the North-West announced that H. G. Furphy, a partner in the Melbourne firm of Scott and Furphy, had been engaged to examine and report on the Gascoyne River water supplies. The Minister is requested to advise the results of the examination.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

The examination of the Gascoyne River was deferred following the flood and the cyclone. It is anticipated that an examination will be commenced in about one month's time.

### MIDLAND JUNCTION ABATTOIR

#### *Amounts Paid to Consolidated Revenue for 1954, 1959, and 1960*

9. The Hon. F. J. S. WISE asked the Minister for Mines:

Will the Minister provide to the House information showing the amounts paid into Consolidated Revenue for the years ended the 30th June, 1954, the 30th June, 1959, and the 30th June, 1960, from all receipts obtained from fees charged at Midland Junction Abattoir?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

Revenue received by the Midland Junction Abattoir Board is credited to the bank account of the concern in the Treasury books and not take directly to the Consolidated Revenue Fund. The revenue of the board for the years concerned was:—

	Year ended 30th June		
	1954	1959	1960
	£	£	£
Fees—	89,401	414,873	435,996
Sale of By-Products	117,310	282,099	260,856
Rents, Sundry Revenue, etc.	3,881	10,034	16,501
	210,658	706,506	713,353

### IRON ORE

#### *Purchases from Crown*

10. The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND asked the Minister for Mines:

Now that some considerable time has passed since tenders were received for the purchase of iron ore from the Crown, the Government is requested to advise the House what are—

- (a) the names of all tenderers?  
 (b) the price offered by each tenderer?  
 (c) the particular ore deposits and ports of shipment stated in the tenders?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (a) and (b) The whole question of iron ore export is under consideration and, at present, it is not considered desirable to disclose the information requested in (a) and (b).  
 (c) The deposits concerned were Dowd's Hill, via Southern Cross and Mount Goldsworthy, via Port Hedland. The ports of shipment stated in the tenders were Fremantle and Port Hedland.

**ABATTOIRS ACT***Yarding Fees*

11. The Hon. P. J. S. WISE asked the Minister for Mines:

Will the Minister make available a list of the charges made under the appropriate regulations under the provisions of the Abattoirs Act, 1909-1954, referred to as the principal regulations published in the *Government Gazette* on the 14th March, 1938, in respect to the following as at the 1st March, 1954; the 1st March, 1959; and the 1st July, 1960—

- (a) charges affecting yarding fees of all kinds;
- (b) (i) cattle from 200 lb. dressed weight to over 600 lb. dressed weight in their various categories;

(ii) calves from 100 lb. dressed weight to 200 lb. dressed weight in their various categories;

(iii) sheep;

(iv) lambs;

(v) pigs, from suckers to baconers?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

Abattoir fees for March, 1938, and March, 1954, related to service charges for the use of facilities only. These bear no comparable relationship to present day charges which include full handling and servicing, and which are covered by charges gazetted in March, 1959, and July, 1960. The charges at the times requested are given hereunder—

	14th March, 1938	1st March, 1954	1st March, 1959	1st July, 1960
	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.
(a) <i>Saleyards</i> —				
For every ox, bull, cow, heifer and yearling .....	9	1 3	1 3	1 3
For every calf under the age of one year .....	(Under 6 mths., 6d.)	9	9	9
For every sheep, lamb or goat .....	1½	2½	2½	2½
For every pig of the value of £1 or over .....	3	9	9	9
For every pig under the value of £1 .....	1	6	6	6
Cattle dipping charge per head .....	.....	9	9	9
Sheep dipping charge per head .....	.....	6	6	6
For every horse offered for sale .....	.....	1 0	1 0	1 0
For every vehicle offered for sale .....	.....	1 0	1 0	1 0
(b) <i>Slaughtering</i> —				
(i) Cattle :				
From 201-249 lb. dressed weight .....	4 9	12 6	25 0	32 6
From 250-400 lb. dressed weight .....	4 9	12 6	30 0	39 0
From 401-600 lb. dressed weight .....	4 9	12 6	35 0	45 6
Over 600 lb. dressed weight .....	4 9	12 6	40 0	52 6
(ii) Calves :				
Up to 100 lb. dressed weight .....	1 6	3 0	7 6	8 9
From 101-150 lb. dressed weight .....	2 6	4 6	10 0	11 9
From 151-200 lb. dressed weight .....	2 6	4 6	21 0	24 6
(iii) Sheep .....	8	1 3	4 0	5 0
(iv) Lambs .....	8	1 3	3 6	4 6
(v) Pigs :				
Up to 80 lb. dressed weight .....	2 0	3 0	.....	.....
From 80-150 lb. dressed weight .....	2 6	4 0	.....	.....
Over 150 lb. dressed weight .....	3 0	5 0	.....	.....
Up to 22 lb. suckers .....	.....	.....	3 0	3 0
Up to 110 lb. dressed weight .....	.....	.....	9 0	11 3
From 111-179 lb. dressed weight .....	.....	.....	11 0	13 9
Over 179 lb. dressed weight .....	.....	.....	13 0	16 3

**COPPER ORE***Export*

12. The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND asked the Minister for Mines:

The Minister is asked to advise what progress has been made with the proposed export of copper ore from Whim Creek or from any other deposits in the northern half of the State?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

The Mines Department has been advised by the operators that a test shipment of 4,000 tons of copper ore from Whim Creek will be sent to Japan to enable a decision to be made on the type of leaching plant necessary to be installed at the mine for treatment and shipment of copper.

The deposits have been recently carefully examined by Japanese interests, and mining operations are in progress.

Some copper ore from the North-West is sent to South Australia for fertiliser purposes, and regular supplies are despatched to the Perth fertiliser companies.

## SUPPLY BILL, £23,500,000

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 4th August.

**THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND** (North) [4.53]: I do not intend to oppose the Bill. I can recall the Minister for Mines (Mr. Griffith) telling me on one occasion that I spent £21,000,000 in 21 seconds. The position today is that Mr. Griffith is now the Minister and he is performing the very same function that I performed on that occasion.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am going £2,500,000 better than you did on that occasion.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The Minister, unfortunately for the taxpayers, is a little bit more extravagant than I was. There are quite a number of items that are due for criticism. One complaint, which I shall take the opportunity to voice now, because I shall not be able to speak again on the Address-in-Reply, is that the Minister, when answering the amendment which I moved as an addendum to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply, gave no reply at all. The Minister resorted to evading an answer to the five points which were raised, by delving into old *Hansards* to see what somebody had said on some occasion, or what had transpired when an addendum had previously been moved, or something to that effect.

I do not know why the Minister should not have spent more time on the addendum, or have received more information from his officers in connection with the five points that were mentioned. I feel he should have given the House much more detailed and comprehensive reasons why the Government had taken the actions it has taken since it has been in office; and the five points raised in my addendum dealt with the Government's actions.

However the Minister will, of course, have an opportunity to say more on these points if he so desires; but I doubt whether he will, because it is very nice for one to be sitting here as Leader of the House with a majority behind one, but it is a different matter to be sitting here as Leader of the House with a minority behind one. Whether the Minister, because of his majority, has taken the opportunity to short-cut his replies to the charges levelled at the Government, I do not know; but I sincerely hope that such is not the case because

even if, in the mind of the Government, the Opposition is not entitled to a reply, the general public is entitled to have the Government's answer to these charges. That is my complaint, and I am taking this opportunity to voice it because I will get no other.

When the Minister occupied this seat and spoke on a Supply Bill, he took the Government of the day to task, in no small measure, because it had increased a number of rates, charges, taxes and so on. In his opinion, the Government was not playing quite fairly and squarely with the people who were supplying those moneys, because the moneys were being spent in some directions of which he did not approve.

Here again we find that the positions are reversed because I now am in a position to level the very same charges, with the very same evidence, and the very same force as the Minister levelled them at the Government which was occupying the Treasury bench in those days. Mr. Griffith, as Leader of the Opposition or a member of the Opposition at that time, said that charges were increased up to 300 per cent., I think, on some small item. But in total, the revenue from all the charges—he presented a comprehensive list of them—was not as great as the total of the charges levied by his own Government during the last session of Parliament when it was estimated that the Government would collect something like £1,120,000. Some of these charges have again been increased this year. It looks as though some of the charges are going to be increased annually by this Government.

When speaking on the Address-in-Reply debate, I said that the Government was guilty of inflating the economy and that, in an indirect way, the Government's raising of charges found its way into the basic wage regime. I did not use those words, but said that the increase had found its way into costs and was helping to increase the basic wage; and this, of course, has meant an increase in prices.

I can recall that Mr. Griffith, when he was a member of the Opposition, claimed the Government of the day was wasting money by not allowing private contractors to undertake Government works. That, of course, was his own opinion. In fact, private contractors were undertaking many Government works, principally housing and other large constructions. The honourable member at that time was very forceful in his charges that whilst the Government, on the one hand, was increasing revenue by imposing extra burdens on the people, it was also, on the other hand, guilty of wasting expenditure on day-labour jobs; and he claimed that private enterprise, if it had been given the work, would have been able to save the Government much money.

I now find that I am able to say, in essence, exactly the same as Mr. Griffith said in those days. However, I can make my statements with some evidence to prove that my claims have substance. For instance, we find that last year the present Government imposed taxation estimated to bring in increased revenue totalling £1,120,000; but I think that estimate will be exceeded, judging by the first six months in which all the increased charges have been imposed.

We then find that the Government is arranging for contracts to be let to private enterprise; for example, the building of railway wagons by firms outside the Midland Junction Workshops, including one firm which, when it built railway wagons several years ago, charged a price which was claimed by all parties—and was substantiated by the report of the Royal Commissioner—to be very excessive indeed.

The contract for the building of 1,000 railway wagons was let to one firm which, in turn, let out portion of the work again on a sub-contract and, on examination, it was found that between them the firms were making a profit of over £250,000. That is on that one contract for the building of 1,000 wagons. If that is not an example of the Government's squandering money, I do not know what is. It proves conclusively that private enterprise does not save the taxpayer's money but, on the contrary, that where large Government works are involved, the work done by private enterprise costs much more than if it were performed by some Government departments; two in particular being the State Engineering Works and the Midland Junction Workshops.

I understand that the Government intends to let out to private contractors the building of two sets of Westland carriages, and I consider it will be paying much more for them than it would if the work were performed at the Midland Junction Workshops. I am not quite clear as to whether tenders will be called, but if and when they are called, the tenders received should be made public.

I have here a reply from the Minister concerning tenders for the sale of iron ore. The Minister states he considers that, at this juncture, it is undesirable to disclose the names of the tenderers and the prices tendered. It seems rather peculiar to me that the Minister for Mines is not prepared to disclose information concerning public business of which he is in charge, whilst the Minister for Works, in calling for tenders for the work to be done on the Ord River development, invited photographers and others interested to witness the actual opening of tenders in public.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is a totally different thing.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I cannot see how it is a totally different thing. They are both public contracts, and the ore belongs to the Crown. Tenders are being called, so what is wrong with disclosing the names of the tenderers and the prices tendered? What is there to hide? Surely the Government would not say, "Now that we have disclosed the tenders, we have found some reason for not accepting them and we are going to call tenders again." Surely the Government would not leave itself open to being charged with playing into someone's hands.

I think the Minister would be very wise to publish, as early as possible, the information concerning the tenders, so that the thoughts which I have voiced may not creep into anybody else's mind. In fact, the publishing of the information will ensure that there is no reason for such thoughts to creep into anybody's mind.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Before you develop this extravagant line of thinking any further, I wish to tell you now that I will endeavour to inform you why we cannot disclose the tenders.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I will be glad if the Minister will tell us; but it is indeed poor policy that the Government, in handling public business, should deny to the public information concerning that business, especially in view of the fact that one Minister has disclosed full information on the tenders for the Ord River development.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am glad you are not in charge of the deliberations in that case.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I would point out to the Minister that I called tenders for sleepers when I was Minister, and I had nothing to hide. I got into trouble because of calling those tenders; not with my own supporters but with the large timber companies because all their tenders were too high and none of them was accepted. If that is not private enterprise in practice, I would like to know what is. Therefore, I am pleased to hear that the Minister is going to tell us, when he replies to the debate this evening, why he cannot disclose the amounts which were offered for the sale of iron ore.

When we were the Government we had no compunction about telling the people the particulars relating to the export of iron ore and the fact that we were being offered upwards of £6 a ton f.o.b. Fremantle for that ore. We certainly did not export any of that ore, but the Minister knows why. Motions in this House were made to condemn the export of iron ore on the ground that the Government proposed to establish a charcoal iron industry in the South-West.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Did you make public the Government's intention to call tenders for the supply of coal when the agreements were made?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The public was told what the final tender was. Further, the final tender for coal was an entirely different proposition; that is, it was a tender for the continual supply of an essential commodity.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: So is the question of iron ore.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: There was a three-cornered bargain between the Collie Miners' Union, the coalmine owners, and the Government, and the Government was successful in reducing the price of coal by something like 12s. or 14s. a ton. In any case, over the period the price of coal has been reduced, the reduction is estimated to have saved the State approximately £1,500,000. That was a different proposition altogether.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: So is the iron ore.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I do not think it is. There is no reason why the Minister should hold out on the information which should be made known to the public; and my advice to the Minister is that he should enlighten the people as quickly as possible.

Whilst I am dealing with a subject which comes within the Minister's own department, members will recall my asking questions this time last year in regard to the oil which was discovered at Rough Range. In reply to the questions I asked, the Minister advised the House that 13,475 gallons of oil flowed daily through a quarter-inch choke valve from that one bore over a test period of six weeks. That represents something like 60 long tons of oil per day.

That oil is supposed to be uneconomical, and for that reason the company holding the leases has abandoned the area and has not bored another hole within 1,000 miles of Rough Range No. 1 borehole.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: When did it abandon the area?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: If I recollect the Minister's reply correctly, the company abandoned the No. 10 borehole at Rough Range in 1957, and the borehole at Cape Range in 1958. It could be the other way round, but that was the substance of the Minister's reply to the question I asked.

I followed that up with another question. But before mentioning it, I would point out that I am not blaming the Minister for this. The next question I asked was: "In view of the replies given to me by the Minister, would the Government consider granting some of this territory to other companies to prospect further the field?" or words to that effect. The Minister replied that as the Shell Company had joined with Wapet in the search for oil, he expected that, after considering the geological knowledge available and so on, those two companies were entitled to hold the land and to further prospect the area.

Twelve months have elapsed and, to my knowledge, there has been no movement in the search for oil in the area, but there are signs that further abandonment of the area is intended because buildings are now being removed. As I believed twelve months ago, I believe now that the Government should look very closely at the position in view of the fact that twelve months have passed since the partnership between the Shell Company and the holders of the lease was made.

Now that the taxpayers of Australia are contributing, by way of subsidy from the Commonwealth Government, in no small measure to private enterprise in order that it might prospect for oil, I feel that no huge areas of land should be tied up and withheld from other prospectors who may desire to see if there is oil in the area. The company's lease covers an area running from the coast at the Leeuwin up to Wyndham. I think the company abandoned one small area north of Wyndham in 1954 in return for an extension of the leases.

I know the Act does not contain enough power to force these oil companies to carry on with their search, but I feel that the Government might get some support from Parliament if it endeavoured to bring the Act to a stage where some pressure could be placed upon the companies, otherwise they will be able to sit on this huge area stretching from Wyndham to the Leeuwin; and no other company will be allowed to see if there is oil in the area.

I have no objection to their holding the lot providing they work it; but I do object to having other companies shut out completely. I was interested to read in *The West Australian* of the 23rd January this year an item which gave some indication of the thoughts of at least one sharebroking firm in America. I would like to quote an extract from the report. The name of this sharebroking firm was Dempsey Tegeler and Co. of Houston, Texas. The extract reads as follows:—

As we see it, the beneficiaries of Australia's oil discovery for the most part will probably not be Australians, but will probably be Americans.

Nearly every acre of basin land in the whole country is already taken.

It is almost too late for newcomers, no matter how large or how rich, to find a seat at the Australian show.

Leases in Australia have been granted in large, unbroken tracts. The larger ones are in hundreds of millions of acres . . . and have been granted at no cost except an obligation to explore.

The Government claims a reasonable royalty of 10 per cent., as compared with the customary 12½ per cent. in the U.S. and far higher percentages in such places as Venezuela and the Arab nations.

The Government spoken of in the article is the Commonwealth Government, as it applies to Commonwealth territory; and perhaps what is contained in the article applies in other States, but in this State it is a different proposition altogether. Our Act provides that the company holding the leases shall take a selection of such an area out of the area at right angles with the site. It must be oblong or square—it cannot be triangular—and the company is entitled to one-quarter of the area, with the other three-quarters being put up for sale. The company can, if it likes, buy the area; but our Act also gives other companies a chance to buy in, and the State receives some remuneration for the land.

The Commonwealth Government is subsidising the search for oil throughout Australia, and we find ourselves losing the benefit of having oil companies working in this State—working more drills or being more active in the field—by closing the oil country up and leaving it in the hands of two companies—Wapet and Shell. As we know, a number of oil companies are interested in Wapet. To my mind, that is most unreasonable and unfair to Western Australia.

While the search is accelerated and concentrated throughout the Eastern States of Australia, we find that Western Australia has one oil rig working in one-third of the Australian territory—territory which is considered to have the best prospects, according to the French geologists. So far as we know from Press reports, they were impressed with what they saw at Rough Range and at the Fitzroy Basin. Therefore, I hope the Minister will induce his Government to take a serious look at the oil position so that it will not be necessary for me to stand up in a year's time and say that there is still only one rig, or no rigs, working in Western Australia.

It is hard, indeed, for anyone to presume that the particular hole in which oil was found is the only one to contain oil, or which might contain oil, in that vast area. I am not saying that any other holes did contain oil, but we know that when the company endeavoured to bring the oil again into the original hole after boring a further 12,000 ft. below the oil it was not able to do so. Therefore, it moved its rig in a certain direction some 30 ft. away.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Where was this one?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: At Rough Range. It was able to obtain a flow of oil in a new hole. That bore stands with its Christmas tree on the top of it. Members of this House have seen oil gushing from the valve which was turned on. Therefore, with a flow like that, Western Australia is entitled to have a more intensive search for a further flow,

or further oil deposits; and I hope the Government will, if necessary, introduce appropriate legislation.

Another interesting point in connection with the oil flow at Rough Range is tied up with questions which I asked. I asked if the flow could be increased by mechanical pumping, and the reply given was one which I could not, and still cannot, understand. No doubt it was a reply supplied by the company. It said that if so much oil is taken away, the quantity is the same irrespective of the rate. I cannot understand the answer.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I think they indicated that if you empty a barrel twice as fast, the same quantity of oil would come out of it.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: We do not know how big the barrel is.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: That company said it could not produce on an economic basis. In my case I have a book entitled "Our Industry," which was written and prepared by the B.P. Company. It is about the history of oil; and it contains photographs with descriptions showing great pumps that lift oil from tremendous depths, just as we lift water. It also states some wells never flow, while others cease to flow and then have to be mechanically pumped. I feel that the Government has not been supplied with sufficient information for it to say that oil cannot be found in commercial quantities and that, as a result no other company shall search for oil. Let some other company search for oil—let Western Australia obtain its fair share in this regard.

There are two other matters in regard to the North-West about which I wish to speak. I consider that the Government's estimated expenditure of £170,000 to fence and regrass the Ord River plains in East Kimberley is really giving the taxpayers' money to private enterprise, unless the Government resumes that land from the leaseholders who are responsible for the land being in that condition. Not so long ago I read in the Press that the Government had decided to fence huge areas on Turner River Station, and areas running up through other stations. This land is owned by Vestey's—millionaires—and it has been eroded and eaten out by the neglect of the leaseholders. This land, without exaggeration, is as bare of grass as is the Table of the House, and has been for the past 15 or 18 years.

When I asked one of the blackfellows at Turner River how long it was since he had seen grass there, he said it was about 15 years prior to the time I asked him. He also said, "When the boss used to drive along, you could see the ears of the mules and the boss sitting, but you could not see the buggy." To misuse country like that, and then to use the taxpayers' money to

regenerate it is being too free with the public purse. It is misusing the money unless the Government resumes the land under the Land Act and, after it is fenced and regrassed, calls tenders for it.

The object of fencing and regrassing is to stop the silting of the Ord River as it is said that the wash from these plains will silt the dam. I would not be surprised at that; but that is not the only property, or the only cause of siltation. The natural flow of water, even down the small valleys and creeks, is always muddy as the rains are very heavy. That type of erosion will never be overcome.

The wind-swept plains of Vestey Brothers' properties are a disgrace, and should not be rejuvenated for Vestey's by the use of public funds. After my colleague, Mr. Wise, came to Western Australia in 1924 or 1925, I can remember reading an article he wrote when he was an employee of the State Department of Agriculture. I think he was on loan from Queensland. I can remember his warning about what would happen in the Kimberleys if the Government did not take some action to cause the pastoralists holding leases to use the land properly. The land should be used properly, but no steps have been taken, and the result is miles and miles of country, treeless, grassless, and just mere windswept plains.

So when I recall, as a Minister sitting on the other side of this House, my Government being accused of mis-spending the public purse, I think here is a first-class example of mis-spending of the public purse if it is going to be for the benefit of those who caused the erosion in the first place.

Another matter to which I desire to draw the Minister's attention is in connection with the publicity given to the extension of Perth Airport. While I have no objection at all to Perth Airport being brought up to a modern standard—I think there should never be any argument about it in a capital city, and I raise no objection to any money being spent there—the matter brings to my mind the lack of expenditure on aerodromes in the North.

The North experiences an average of one good season in about four, similar to the good season we have had this year; but we find that aerodromes throughout the North are closed down because of the good rains. We can understand and can accept minor, or station, aerodromes being unusable for a few days a week. That is to be expected, and the Commonwealth Government should not be expected to provide the cost of sealing those aerodromes. But there are aerodromes at places such as Carnarvon, Port Hedland, and Derby—very important aerodromes—which are junctions for the airlines. They are depots for station runs and they are very

important; and the Commonwealth Government has been asked by local government authorities in the area to seal those aerodromes. It is very doubtful whether the Commonwealth Government will do so, but I am hoping it will.

It irks people considerably in the North when they witness huge sums of money being spent on the Learmonth Aerodrome, site of the oilfields, and only three or four miles from the oil well I have been speaking about. Approximately £1,500,000—I am not sure of this, but it is a tremendous figure—has been spent on sealing the Learmonth airstrip to enable it to accommodate some of the biggest aircraft; while perhaps within only 20 minutes' flight for that type of plane, we have the Carnarvon Aerodrome which could be used extensively, but which, while left in its present condition, becomes unserviceable after 50 points of rain.

The same thing applies at Port Hedland. It is irksome to think that so much money can be spent on an aerodrome half way to Carnarvon which, I think, has two or possibly three planes a week. The Department of Civil Aviation has its reasons, no doubt, for sealing the aerodrome at Learmonth; but, Heavens above, with a modern plane it is only a matter of ten minutes or a quarter of an hour to Port Hedland or Carnarvon! It is no distance at all for big jets.

As I said in my opening remarks, I do not intend to oppose this Bill and I am sure none of my colleagues does.

**THE HON. N. E. BAXTER** (Central) [5.35]: In addressing myself to this measure, I would first like to congratulate you, Sir, on your elevation to the high office of President of this House. I know you will be impartial in your control of the House, and I feel sure that you will have the co-operation of every member of this Chamber. I wish you good health to continue in your high office for many years to come.

I would like also to congratulate the members who were returned at the last biennial election, and particularly our new member, Mr. Syd Thompson. I extend my congratulations to Mr. Thompson on his election to this Chamber. I feel his stay will be a long one and his contribution to the debates in this House, and to the future of the State, will be sound and of great advantage to the people of Western Australia.

I would also like to express my appreciation to the electors of the Central Province for returning me with such confidence. At the previous election, in 1958, I was beaten by a small majority; but circumstances then were different from what they were this year when I was returned with a largely increased majority, and it was very heartening to think that the electors of the Central Province had shown their confidence in such a grand manner.

I am going to speak briefly on the Supply Bill, though there are several matters I would like to deal with at this stage. The first of these is tourism. The Government has set up a department of tourism, and the Premier is the Minister for Tourists; and I noted early this year in the Press that the Government planned to spend £250,000 during the next five years on Rottnest Island. That is quite a laudable idea; but will this cater for outside tourists, or will it cater primarily for local tourists? I am inclined to think that the demand for accommodation at places like Rottnest will come mainly from the people of Western Australia.

Overseas visitors would not, I should imagine, wish to come to Western Australia and then go out to an island on a tourist trip. They would wish to see something of the country; they would want to see our mainland where our production is, and where our beauty spots are; not Rottnest Island where there is nothing in the way of production, but only beaches, a little fishing, and perhaps yachting and other activities which they can get anywhere. If we want to establish a good tourist resort, we have all the resources on the mainland: we have the beaches; and we have some fine hills. I can assure members that less than 40 miles from Perth there is what could be one of our major tourist attractions if it were exploited. At the present time it is held by the army and it would be a hard job to get it away from the army. It would make one of the best tourist spots in Western Australia. I believe those sorts of things should be investigated.

While on this subject, I was not very impressed by the appointment of Mr. Miller to take charge of tourism.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: I think you have something there.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Whether I have or have not, Mr. Miller had, over some years, an opportunity of showing what he could do with tourism. The Minister for Local Government and I had personal experience of the Tourist Bureau some three years ago when we were planning a trip to Darwin. Enquiring about accommodation in Darwin and Central Australia, we were told it was unnecessary to book ahead. The Tourist Bureau had no idea of the hotels, tariffs, or the best method of booking. It was a case of "catch-as-catch-can," and we were told to "book up as you go."

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: We hope to improve all that.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: It wants to be improved! When we got to Darwin we were staggered to find that charges at the Darwin Hotel were about £6 5s. a day. Surely the bureau should be aware of those details before visitors leave the State? Otherwise it is failing in its duty. I would say there is not much hope for

tourism in this State if the department is conducted on lines similar to what it was a few years ago. I feel that the £250,000 to be spent over the next five years—laudable though the idea is—on Rottnest Island could be much better spent on mainland attractions—on the hill country or on the beaches. We have good roads right through the hills and some very attractive places for tourists to see.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: Have you seen Esperance?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Esperance could possibly become a tourist attraction were it not so far away. It is a long trip by car and, in the summertime, a trip that is pretty dusty. The average tourist does not like to travel 500 miles or 600 miles before striking a tourist resort. When one is talking of tourist resorts, one wants something within a reasonable distance for visiting tourists. They are the people we want to attract—people who will see our country, take an interest in it, and return to invest some of their money here.

So much for tourism. I want to say something about traffic and the attitude of the present police force towards traffic. I do not know what is wrong with the department, but I wish to stress the fact that today the average motorist is a potential criminal, according to the Police Department. Any petty thing that the department can peg the motorist for, it does so; and I think it is high time something was done about this matter. There seems to be an attitude in the department—and I have this from a reliable source—that it is the duty of police officers to obtain so many charges a week, otherwise they are "on the mat." It is high time something was done about it.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Don't you think you ought to substantiate a charge of that nature?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I know of a person who had a motorcar with one of the old-type number plates on it—one with several sevens. This person touched up the bottom of the number plate with a little bit of white paint. The touched-up portion could not be seen until one was at the distance I am from the Hon. J. M. Thomson. On one occasion the person in question parked the car in the city and, on returning, found he had been given a ticket. On inquiring at the Traffic Office, he was informed it was for touching up his number plate. The offending person had parked the car across the street and asked the officer whether he could see anything wrong with the number plate. The officer went over to the vehicle, and he was as close as I am from Mr. Thomson before he could see that the number plate had been touched up. However, the person concerned was summonsed; and, for touching up his number plate, he had to attend one of the schools.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: They touched him up!

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: That substantiates a petty charge, surely? And there are many others. Another man drove off one night and did what every other member of this House has done in a lighted area—failed to put on his headlights. I have done this myself, and I do not think there is a member in the House who has not done it. He was apprehended, and had to attend a school, apparently to be shown how to turn on his lights; or he was given a lecture and shown a film on traffic matters. Would that teach the person concerned anything about putting on the lights of his motor vehicle when it was just an oversight of which any of us could be guilty? These petty things are not helping the police, because motorists take exception to them. I think speeding and drunken driving charges should be taken seriously; I have no time for the speedster, nor the drunken driver. But I do not believe that the motorist who, after all, pays for the construction of the roads through heavy license fees, should be penalised and treated as a potential criminal when he commits a minor breach.

However, that has been the attitude of police officers for many years, but it is high time it ceased and they got down to policing our traffic laws properly. What happens today when a motorcar is stolen? Is there an all-out effort by the police to find that car? I know of a case where a motorcar was stolen during the early hours of Friday morning. It was reported to the police by phone at 7 o'clock, and at 8 o'clock the owner reported the matter personally to the C.I.B. At 11 o'clock on the following Sunday morning a police officer came out to the owner's place and left a message—because he was not home—for him to remove his car from a certain part of the city where it was parked on the verge, because someone had complained about it being there.

Should more accent be placed on the fact that the vehicle was stolen, or on the other offence—that the vehicle was parked on a verge? The offence of stealing a car is much more serious than the petty offence to which I have referred, and one which you, Mr. President, I, or Tom Brown, or anybody else could commit. Police these days seem to pay far more attention to petty offences than they do to serious ones. I bring these matters forward because I believe that something should be done about them.

There is one other matter which I have mentioned previously to the Minister for Police, and this concerns the safety angle of motor vehicles. We have one method of testing vehicles on the road as to their safety—police officers will drive a van to some point and then pull up each motorist as he passes and check his vehicle. To my mind that is a rather

antiquated method; and I believe that we should adopt the system which is in operation in New Zealand. There it is necessary for every motorist, before he gets his vehicle licensed, to have it checked at a recommended garage, or some other establishment recommended by the Police Department. The inspection costs 7s. 6d., and the owner, if the vehicle is in order, gets a certificate of road-worthiness which he presents to the Police Department. Then the license is issued.

This procedure is followed each six months, so that before any car is allowed on the road the police can ascertain whether it is safe to drive. I think that is a much more modern method, and a better way of attacking the problem, than by sending out a van and the police apprehending motorists indiscriminately to check the road-worthiness of their cars. A person might have the greatest bomb in the world, but it could be completely road-worthy; whereas another person might have the flashest type of car, and it might not be safe; it all depends on how a car is treated. With our present method of checking for road-worthiness, the modern-looking car might not be stopped; whereas the old bomb, which lacked a decent coat of paint, would almost certainly be pulled up. So I think it would be much better if we adopted the New Zealand system.

There are two other matters to which I would like to refer before I conclude, but I shall deal with them under the one heading. I wish to refer firstly to the publication of several items in the *News Review*, a copy of which paper I believe members receive each month. It is stated in the paper that it is independent and non-party.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: Tell me that again!

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: In the July issue there is one article headed, "Armada and Midland Fuss. 'Red' Interest Suspected." I shall not comment on "The Midland Fuss" but I would like to comment on the "Armada Fuss." There may be some communistic or Red interest in certain matters, but I can assure the House that any actions taken in the Armadale district—and this refers to the disposal of State trading concerns—which is in my Province, were not inspired by any Red interests, or communistic interests.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: That is a very cheap phrase.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I am well aware of what happened at the two meetings which were held; and the deputation which I took to the Minister in charge of State trading concerns was inspired by those who work at the Armadale brick works, and it included business people, and even members, including the chairman, of the Armadale Road Board. None of these people, to my knowledge, is Red, a Communist, or even pink. These

people were concerned with their district, and I believe that publishing articles like that is merely flying a kite without any knowledge of what is going on. In this matter, which dealt with a State instrumentality, the paper threw a smear of Red interests and communism on the people concerned.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Who publishes the paper?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I do not know who publishes it, but I happen to know the sub-editor. He receives the articles in typed form and does not even know who writes them.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: Is it financially sound? Are its interests confidential?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The editor's name is not on the paper.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It must be one of these independent papers like *The Western Sun*.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: It states at the top of the paper—

Published monthly by News Review Publishing Co., 107 Rokeby Road.

But the paper is only sub-edited there; it is printed elsewhere, and the editor does not disclose his name on the paper. Whether he is ashamed to do so, or whether he prefers to keep his name a secret, I suppose is his own business.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison interjected.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: Speak up madam; we cannot hear you.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: In the same paper is an article headed, "Public Ownership of Property Increasing. Trend to Socialisation," which reads—

Some well-meaning people, especially those who have benefitted in a material way under the system of private enterprise which has encouraged them to display their natural talents of enterprise, courage and initiative, are frequently handicapping or retarding their children and/or successors, by contributing to the growth of socialism and bureaucratic control by the gift of property to public bodies by deed or under their wills.

I think that is the height of trash. Why should not anybody, by a deed of gift, or by his will, leave for the benefit of the public property which he might own? It does not benefit anyone in particular, but benefits the public as a whole. The article even refers to money and property left to the University of Western Australia. To what better organisation could money or property be left than the University of Western Australia? Money or property left to such an organisation helps the public as a whole by improving facilities for

the education of our people, particularly professional men and women. The article goes on further to state—

Add to these the dozens of other socialist concerns, co-operatives, community hotels and others which own property and the growth of socialist ownership can be most realistically reckoned.

Would not the directors of Westralian Farmers be pleased to hear themselves called socialists? Would not the shareholders of the Meckering Co-op. be pleased to be called socialists? Would not my own brother, and his fellow directors of the community hotel at Cunderdin—of which hotel Mr. Vic. Halbert, the present Federal Member for Moore was, until recently, chairman of directors—be pleased to know that they are classed as socialists?

I think the mind of the writer of the article is very small, and that his outlook is particularly narrow. Apparently his attitude is to brand anything which is controlled by one or two people, or even a small community of people, as socialism. It is time that sort of tripe was banned from the newspapers. With that final comment I support the Bill.

**THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North)** [5.55]: For a long time the No. 1 Bill of every session of Parliament has been, or has usually been, the Supply Bill. It is interesting in retrospect to look at the long titles of the Supply Bills which have been introduced in recent times. I shall go back to 1947, which is a comparatively short time ago, when the long title of the first Supply Bill read as follows:—

An Act to apply out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund the sum of Two Million Four Hundred Thousand Pounds, and from Moneys to Credit of the General Loan Fund Four Hundred Thousand Pounds, to the Service of the Year ending 30th June, 1948, and to apply out of the Public Account the sum of Three Hundred Thousand Pounds for the purpose of temporary Advances to be made by the Treasurer.

Seven years afterwards, the No. 1 Bill of 1954 was a Bill for—

An Act to apply out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund the sum of Eleven Million Pounds and from Moneys to Credit of the General Loan Fund Four Million Pounds, to the Service of the Year ending 30th June, 1955, and to apply out of the Public Account the sum of One Million Five Hundred Thousand Pounds for the purpose of temporary Advances to be made by the Treasurer.

The long title of the Bill before us is—

An Act to apply out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund the Sum of Seventeen Million Pounds and from Moneys to Credit of the General Loan Fund Four Million Five Hundred

Thousand Pounds, to the Service of the Year ending 30th June, 1961, and to apply out of the Public Account the sum of Two Million Pounds for the purpose of temporary Advances to be made by the Treasurer.

In that short period there has been a considerable stepping-up of money needs for Government, and in the Supply required by the Government through its first Supply Bill to enable it to carry on. I expect there will be another Supply Bill introduced before the Budget is presented, and it is to these matters to which I wish to draw attention this afternoon.

The long titles I have read to the House of the various Supply Bills which have been introduced over that short period indicate the trend; and in that period the public debt of this State has increased *per capita* from £195 to £323. It is true that at a *per capita* rate the divisor is increased tremendously because of our population increase, so that the public debt for our population has increased at a rapid and extraordinary rate.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: Bad administration.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: So long as our progress and sound economy are maintained, there is not much to fear if the investment of public moneys is properly placed. However, we should recall that whenever we borrow loan moneys through Commonwealth sources it costs us, as a State, for every £1,000,000 borrowed, £55,000 per annum for interest and redemption. That is a charge on revenue, and it is obvious that there is a great responsibility on the State to see that our loan funds, particularly, are wisely invested.

I think an analysis of the Budget tables, which show clearly how our State moneys are invested, will give any thinking person cause for great concern; because out of a total loan liability, approaching £233,000,000, in this State at the 30th June last year, only £25,000,000 was fully productive. There was a colossal sum, in my view, of £105,000,000 which was totally unproductive—which was earning nothing—and which showed a deficiency in administration, and its activities, of £8,500,000, plus the capital charges of £3,670,000.

So almost half of our borrowings in this State is a perpetual charge on our revenue with a deficiency of £8,500,000, plus a capital charge of £3,000,000 odd.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Was it not proportionately ever thus?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Yes, to a degree; but I am now talking about the trend. I am not blaming the Government, so the Minister should not be on the defensive too quickly. I am merely stating a fact.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am asking a question which in fact is a fact.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I am drawing attention to the trend which, in my view, year by year is becoming more and more serious. If we look at the partially productive investments of the State we will find that in round figures the amount is £94,500,000, showing a deficiency of £2,398,000. If members will examine the lists of the State assets which are totally unproductive—and in direct answer to the Minister saying it was ever thus to which I will again reply, to a degree—they will see what I mean. I can recall—and my memory is still good—when the railways of this State did not show a deficit. I can recall this well because I was Treasurer at the time.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Those were good years.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: They were very different years.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I think they were war years.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The position obtained in pre-war years. The last year the railway service showed a surplus was 1947. Since then the department has gone to the bad to the extent of £4,436,000 as a cash deficiency; and by over £2,000,000 with capital charges unmet in addition. Very many of our instrumentalities are proportionately in like condition. Nobody can cavil at the circumstances which an expanding economy and an influx of migrants bring to us; because consequent upon a quickly expanding economy, and a lot of people coming to the State, there is call for much public spending on unproductive work such as schools, hospitals, and the like.

In turn, however, if our State Treasury could enjoy the direct and indirect benefits of our increase in population as do the Commonwealth coffers—from invisible tax, and from the pernicious ones such as sales tax, payroll tax, and others—not only would this State be in a more healthy condition, but the Commonwealth too, through the States, would have even a sounder and more progressive economy. The Commonwealth always keeps too much from taxation collections; it has reached a stage almost of alarm. We all know of the niggardliness of the Commonwealth in giving back to the States money collected within the States and belonging to the States.

If we want a few million pounds more than the loan programme has given to us, or reimbursement of tax has provided, the Commonwealth loans us some of the money and forces us to pay interest on it—on moneys collected from income tax. That is a dreadful state of affairs. In the circumstances obtaining today, the prospect of a State Treasurer emerging with a healthy Budget at the end of the year is very remote; very remote indeed. The

trends from circumstances to the magnitude of today's deficits are very clearly presented in our own Budget tables.

In the 1939-40 Budget the revenue was a little over £11,000,000. I recall the comment made by *The West Australian* on the surplus, because in the absence of Mr. Willcock, through illness, I presented that Budget. The comment in *The West Australian* was that the figures were more impressive by their symmetry than by their volume; they were symmetrical because there were five ones—£11,111. From that time the revenue has gone from £11,000,000 to £60,000,000 in 20 years, the deficit has grown from a balanced Budget to a deficit of £1,750,000.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: What is the relative purchasing power?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The purchasing power of Governments and individuals has gone to pot! That is a very helpful question indeed, and there is no better illustration than that to be found in the retail price index in a recent statistical register summary. If we use the retail price index figures covering the "C" series—which provides the index figures relating to food, groceries, rent, clothing, household goods such as drapery and utensils, fuel, and other miscellaneous items—we find that in 1947, using the base figure of 1,000 in 1926, it has grown to 1,104, and that today the figure has gone to 3,262. The slither in the value of money since those days is enormous, and it must be having a terrific impact on the ability to do things, both privately and Governmentally. The basic wage lagged behind the purchasing power of the individual because it is only related to the year before on costs incurred, and all our money, during that period of higher costs and decline in value, has been uploaded.

We suffer not merely because of the internal situation in that connection, but we suffer very seriously as a major exporting country in comparison to other exporting countries, and in comparison to the retail index figures of those who are our customers. One of the greatest disadvantages which we are under in regard to our high costs is the fact that the purchasing power of the countries where there is no inflationary tendency, being what it is, means they do not want high-priced producer-goods, anyway.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: But where their labour costs are a fraction of ours.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The monthly review of business statistics of the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, Canberra, gives complete price index figures of various countries. These retail price figures basically are comparable with our "C" series index; in other words, these figures are the equivalent of the "C" series index figures. In the first year, post-war, the retail price index for Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Canada, the U.S.A.,

and the United Kingdom were almost identical—between 101 and 102. In March, the Australian figure for both "A" and "B" series was 300; New Zealand was 231, Canada 199, America 205 and United Kingdom 169. That is compared with our 300.

The Hon. C. R. Abbey: Are they correlated?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Yes. So far as the exchange rate between Australia and the United Kingdom is concerned, it is a small supplement or a bonus in so far as our primary products are concerned. It is there to give to us a payment which may be regarded as an incentive payment to primary production. The "C" series index closely shows the depreciation in money values. It is a very serious drift. The Budget tables show how serious is the investment of our total indebtedness and the drift during the years; and what we are able to get for a like sum of money. Half of our total public debt has been raised during the period of falling values in money; and, because of the nature of our economy in this State, it has been invested continuously in less productive assets. I would draw attention to how serious those components are; and how necessary it is for someone, somewhere, to examine the whole trend. I am not laying the blame on the State Government at any point.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I realise that.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The State Government in its efforts to get more and more loan money is getting less and less.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: In dealing with the trends which show how badly some of our public money is invested, I mentioned that a very great responsibility devolves upon the Commonwealth in making available to us as much money as can be made available, and as cheaply as possible. The responsibility is then on us to invest it as wisely as possible. There is some merit in the thought that loan money could be allocated to the undeveloped and less populous States in a somewhat similar fashion to the distribution of the petrol tax. Whether it has relationship to the area undeveloped or to the population does not matter very much.

It is pertinent to observe that if loan moneys did not have to be bargained for and, indeed, fought for between the States when the Commonwealth decides how much is to be distributed, we should have a very serious examination of what happens to undeveloped States in the apportionment of the loan money that is available on a *per capita* basis.

If some formula of this nature could be evolved we would get, instead of £16,000,000 to £18,000,000 for Western Australia, on a *per capita* basis more than the £22,000,000 which South Australia gets, and more

than the £24,000,000 which Tasmania receives. It would be idle to say that we have not the capacity to invest that money properly. Our responsibility is to ensure that it is properly invested. I am not at all cavilling at the spending of loan money or tax reimbursements. The more we have to spend, provided we get value for it, the better it is for our whole economy. But unless we have regard to some of the trends, which I illustrated earlier, as to the productive capacity of the money invested, the future could be very dangerous.

The Commonwealth Budget is being prepared at the moment, but the Commonwealth Treasurer is at an address unknown. There is much imagining at many places that there will be substantial reductions in respect of some of the taxes. That forecast will prove to be wholly illusory. Some of the taxes which the Commonwealth Government has enjoyed—taxes which are collected and paid in an unnoticed fashion—might well be lifted or eased; but some of the new ones that are projected will not do this country very much good.

As a humble person, I would think that the capital gains tax will not be a very wise rake-off for the Commonwealth, now or in the long run. Take the person who built a humble house some 20 years ago, costing £600 to £700, or I suppose even £1,000. It is conceivable that today the house for very many reasons is worth £8,000 to £10,000. The application of the capital gains tax will compel such a person, if he dared to sell the house for such a figure, to pay a large amount. But he still has to buy another house. If for reasons of family he desires to buy a different house to meet his needs, he will require all the money he receives from the sale of his former house to meet his liabilities.

Some of these things which, in my view, result from very superficial thinking on the part of the advisers, will need a second look very soon, because all forms of taxation of that kind, which are direct taxes, certainly limit any success. There are many signs that the responsibility lies somewhere in the Commonwealth sphere for examining the bad trends in our economy which are being caused by inflationary tendencies—illustrations of which I gave earlier this evening.

The States have certain abilities, within limits, but some of those abilities in this State have been destroyed by the present Government. But there are other forms of control which can be applied through the central banking system, which dictates even the policy of finance of the other banks. It has raised the red flag; it has shown that a policy which is dictated in respect of money for investment is to be followed where interest rates may come down, and where borrowings of any kind for speculative purposes will not be

approved. All these matters are pointers to the thinking of those at the helm of finance in Australia.

So far as the State's limitations affect our finances, one of the worst steps taken in this State for many decades was the lifting of price control. Instead of the much vaunted prosperity and confidence which Ministers glibly talk about, there are reasons for us to be concerned with the very application of the money to be passed by the Bill before us, and with the value we will receive for that money.

During the last session of this Parliament I had a lot to say on the cement works which manufacture the Cockburn brand of cement. What has happened since then is a very serious matter, because the lifting of price control gives to all in that field, and in any other field, an open go so far as charges are concerned. Let us examine, in the spending of this money, what the price of cement may do to some of our major works. To authenticate my remarks I sent a telegram last Friday to the Premier of Queensland, who has known me since my boyhood, to obtain the price of cement for Government works in Queensland. The cost to the Government of cement for Government works in Brisbane, according to the telegram I received this morning, is £8 9s. a ton. Against that, for Government works in Western Australia, for 5-ton lots, the price is £12 15s. a ton in Perth. For North-West works the cement needs to be double-bagged for shipment, and the price at Fremantle is £14 15s. a ton, compared with the price of £8 9s. in Brisbane.

The Hon. A. R. Jones: Is it the same quality?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: All of it has to be about the same quality. The Portland cement analysis for all cement within Australia is within a comparable basis. If we look at what it will cost to do something for the Ord River project, not only will we hand out large largesse to the firms operating in this case with an uncontrolled price, but we will put the cost of these works, in whatever capacity they come as a productive source or as an investment, out of all proportion to what it should be.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: It will be "Reddish."

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It certainly will be in the "reddish." The cost of cement in Cairns, nearly 1,000 miles from Brisbane, is £14 a ton, and in Townsville £12 10s. a ton. But in Perth it is £12 15s. a ton.

Let us look at what it will cost per ton for cement at Wyndham, the port to receive the cement for the Ord River works. The basic price at Fremantle is £14 15s. per ton. These figures were obtained from the Government Stores and are authentic. The shipping charges come to £8 2s. 6d. per ton, and there is a further £3 a ton for handling charges. That makes a total of £25 17s. 6d.

a ton for cement landed at Wyndham for the Ord River project. The cartage to the Ord River works will be, at approximately 8d. per ton mile, another £4, or almost £30 a ton for cement landed at the Ord River works.

In the borrowing of money for works, which at the very best and under the most optimistic estimate, can only be partially productive for all time in a money consideration sense—quite part from a national economy or population sense—surely we are not going to get, in the spending of the money earmarked in the Supply Bill for the Ord River diversion dam, the money properly placed in relation to values. And what of the major works of the Ord River, when that day dawns? The Canning Dam took 80,000 tons of cement.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: What was the price of that?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Very much lower than £8 a ton.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Was it a concessional price to the Government?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It was concessional in two ways—in the initial cost, and because it was bought in bulk. I am using the figure of the Canning Dam to show how many tons of cement are going to be needed at the Ord, and at what cost.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Why does the Government not enjoy a concessional price now?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I think the honourable member should address that question to Sir Halford Reddish.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: And to unfair trading legislation.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You might also address it to the courts of Western Australia.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Of course Mr. Mattiske would be highly ignorant, I am sure, in that regard, he having his finger on the pulse and directing in many spheres certain aspects of the building trade of this State! But I point out that the Commonwealth Government, when it built the enormous airstrip at Darwin, had to avoid using Western Australian cement, or even Australian cement, because of its cost. What did it have to do? It had to import cement from another British colony, and it was landed at Darwin at about £8 a ton. Therefore I suggest that unless we have a look at this matter, which I stressed last year, we will be in trouble. Last year I strongly urged that an inquiry be made into the cost of cement in Western Australia for Government and private works, and if this is not done we will not be doing our duty as citizens, as we have the responsibility of showing how such money as is provided for in this Bill should be spent.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: If the cement was imported to Darwin it must have been too expensive to have come from Queensland.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Yes, but in Queensland they had the differential in price which I quoted. The freights from Brisbane to Darwin are identical with the freights from Fremantle to Darwin although the distance is not quite the same. I happen to know that.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am sure you do!

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: If we used the quantity of 80,000 tons of cement for a dam like the Canning, the Ord River dam will need quantities far in excess of that figure. I raise the point very deliberately that we want to have a look at the cost of the basic requirements of steel and cement for such an investment on behalf of Australia as the Ord River dam will be, otherwise we will find it immediately in the schedule of total unproductive works, where it will remain always—and that is not a fair proposition.

We of the North are very anxious to see that nothing which is a chancy proposition, or a white elephant, will be developed. To do that we must make sure that all commodities are obtained as cheaply as possible. Indeed, I would advocate that all the money which the State obtains from the Commonwealth should be interest-free. Let us look at the situation from the national aspect and tax the wealthy developed parts of Australia to develop the latent resources in the remote places. Until we have a prospectus of that kind, the North will not be advantaged or advanced by developing works which are so costly that for all time they will remain totally unproductive.

**THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH** (Suburban—Minister for Mines—in reply) [7.50]: The addresses that are made by members in this House on the occasions when Supply Bills are introduced and during the course of the Address-in-Reply debate—or even when someone moves an addendum to the Address-in-Reply—are always very interesting to me; we see the difference in the attitude of members in the House. If I may say so, we hear some speeches which are made without, sometimes, much consideration being given to them; and we listen to other speeches like the one we have just heard from Mr. Wise, which we can regard as sage advice. His speech was not like some of the others. His approach to the matter and the approach of Mr. Strickland, too, was of a nature that is not prejudiced; and as a Minister, I am sure I can appreciate that point of view.

During the course of the debate on this Bill, there have been quite a number of questions raised; and, as members know, in the past I have made it a practice to try to seek from the various departments the

information that is required by members. I am not able to reply to all questions that have been raised this evening but I will reply to them during the course of my remarks on the Address-in-Reply debate.

I desire to thank members for their contributions to the debate on this Bill. It is my intention to reply in particular to at least the most important points raised by them during the debate. I have no doubt that the speakers who have just concluded will, as I have said, not expect me to give a lengthy discourse in response to inquiries they have made, except where such have been the subject of an earlier speech, or where the criticism or comments have been made in relation to matters appertaining to my own departments. In most cases I think I will be able to answer the questions raised, particularly those raised by Mr. Strickland on the subjects of iron ore and oil research in Western Australia.

Firstly, I desire to commend Mr. Willesee on his forthright and reasonable approach to the several matters mentioned by him. The honourable member is quite reasonably seeking long-term improvements to the water supply upon which the banana-growing industry depends, and he seeks also a little more latitude in the acreages allowed by the advisory committee to be worked.

Before continuing, I would like to say in regard to that matter that I believe Mr. Wise communicated with the Mines Department some time ago concerning some research of an area from which fertiliser for the members of the Banana Growers' Association in Carnarvon could be obtained. I have sent a number of letters asking them to give me more particulars about their request in this regard, but up to date I have been unable to obtain any replies. I propose to bring the file up here and make it available to the three members for the North Province, and I would be grateful if they could persuade the Banana Growers' Association in Carnarvon to reply to the letter as I am anxious to create this reserve for them.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: That is the gypsum area?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes. This would assist them, but they do not seem to be very anxious to answer the letters I have written to them; and I will be happy if the members to whom I have referred can do something about it.

I appreciate the honourable member's desire for urgency in the construction of the new hospital at Onslow. Following upon inquiries which I have made, I advise that the need for a new hospital at Onslow is appreciated, and it is hoped now to be able to call tenders for the work at the end of January, 1961.

Provided that local employees are competent—and do not take that the wrong way—they should be assured of employment on this project, as it would be very

much to the financial advantage of the contractor to employ local labour rather than to import, at considerable additional expense, labour from elsewhere.

Restrictions to the plantations on the Gascoyne River at Carnarvon were applied at a time when the river had not "run" for some eighteen months. The position was very serious in that some growers had used practically all available fresh supplies. The Gascoyne Research Station had abandoned watering its plots for many weeks. For those with adequate supplies there was the serious tendency to salinity-increase showing up.

Although the flood flow of the river in early March, 1960, recovered the position for the time being, the 1959 drought-year only served to emphasise once more that the water supply for Carnarvon growers is by no means certain from the viewpoint of quantity. In addition, the general tendency to salting is increasing with every drought season.

Restrictions were imposed to reduce the demand on the limited water resources and, at the same time, to encourage efficiency of water usage. The restrictions have been based on an allocation to provide a reasonable living for a family unit. Each existing river frontage block has been given an allocation. Anomalies have been attended to in accordance with the merits of each case. In view of the absence of controlling legislation, no control over bores and wells on private properties has been possible.

The result of the restrictions as reviewed at the present time has indicated that, although planted areas in vegetables have been reduced, the production per acre has increased. As a result, the total production figures to date are equal to those at this time last year.

At the same time, investigations have been speeded up for the location of other sources of water, both in the river sands and by way of locating dam sites in the river catchment. An amount of £80,000 was listed on the draft loan programme for 1960-61, to pump upstream water to supplement a pilot area of the plantations.

Growers' representation on the Gascoyne River Advisory Committee was determined from nominations jointly submitted by the Gascoyne-Minilya Road Board and the Carnarvon Council. This representation will be reviewed after 12 months, with the assistance of these local authorities.

Turning to Mr. Jones' speech, I thought the matter of most importance brought to the notice of the House was the emphasis which the honourable member again has given to his keen interest in the problems of the Midland Province, particularly in respect to water supplies. I recall his reminder of the very active part taken by him some years ago in his endeavours to obtain some definite action by

the Government of the day in respect to a comprehensive scheme, based on Gingin Brook, to serve the coastal and inland areas northward of Perth. No doubt with a view to obtaining some early relief for several of the towns, the honourable member sought the covering of certain public dams, and he again brought to the notice of the Government his desire for some improvement of the Geraldton Harbour.

Before I go on to deal with the question of the abattoirs, which was raised by the honourable member, I wish to say that a geological survey of the Mendels-Wongondie area was requested by Mr. Jones, Mr. Simpson, and Mr. Logan. That survey will be put into effect in the very near future. This district also comes within the electorate of the Premier, and he, too, played a part in the request.

Mr. Jones also made reference to abattoirs—a subject which I feel is likely to be brought before the House quite a lot this session. I do not propose to reply at the present time, in view of Mr. Jones' indication of his desire to speak on this subject at greater length during the debate on the Address-in-Reply. I would add, however, that it is my desire to make all information available to members in this regard.

The honourable member's proposal to provide increased depth of water in the harbour and in the outer approaches is at present under review, but any proposal to deepen by three feet would be substantially greater in cost than that indicated, as the area treated would be greatly increased.

Regarding the roofing of the dams at Morawa and Dalwallinu, both these works were included in the draft loan estimates. The Government appreciates that roofing is expensive. Nevertheless, as good sites for excavated dams are difficult to find in both localities, and as each dam is comparatively shallow, conservation of water by prevention of evaporation is considered economical.

In respect to the Northern Comprehensive Water Supply Scheme, I would say that further progress has been made in regard to investigations into the use of Gingin Brook waters for use in the northern areas. Stream gauging has continued, and investigations have been carried out regarding possible damsites. Considerable caution must be exercised in planning a dam on the Gingin Brook, because boring has disclosed that there are substantial sections of sand underneath the damsite being tested. Leakage below a dam in such location could be serious. Further drilling will need to be done before a final selection of site is made.

In the planning of extension of the comprehensive scheme from Mundaring Weir, the possible use of Gingin Brook has been taken into account to reinforce

supplies to the far northern portions of the scheme area and, perhaps, to permit of extension northward of the scheme area. Investigations have not proceeded far enough to comment further on this aspect.

It is hoped that other investigations will result in the provision of additional water for Geraldton at less cost than would be entailed by pumping it from Gingin, particularly as that water can be used to advantage elsewhere. The honourable member will appreciate that these views have been obtained from my colleague, the Minister for Water Supplies, and from the department.

I do believe, in making reference to Dr. Hislop's address, I would be expressing the opinion of all members if I said that his discourse on the Westland was most interesting. I read into his speech a desire on his part that the Government would be assured of the very highest standard of design and specification being given to this work. I think we must all concur in that. With respect to his request for the specifications to be made available, I desire to state that the proposed new Westland trains for the Western Australian service are planned to be the most modern in concept and should be second to none in the Commonwealth of Australia. They will have a definite attraction for the tourist trade; and, indeed, they will be designed for this particular purpose.

In the invitation for tenders, wide scope will be allowed for the imagination and architectural capacity of tenderers, so that the trains will not necessarily conform to any preconceived ideas, but rather will employ all the most recent and desirable developments in train-planning techniques.

The specifications, which are designed to give contractors the necessary particulars of our loading, gauges, curve limitations, axle-loading, etc., are approaching completion, and copies will be available for examination by members, should they so desire. In view of this information made available to me by courtesy of the Minister for Railways, members have an assurance that the specifications will be on broad lines in order that the tenderers will have the greatest possible scope for their own design ideas.

Dr. Hislop made reference in his speech to the desirability of modern observation cars, dining cars, twinettes, etc. being provided, and he may be assured that so far as these are regarded as appropriate, provision has been made for them. It must be recognised, however, that whether or not the Western Australian section requires day or night travel will be dictated almost completely by the connecting services to and from the Eastern States; and there appears little prospect of there being any alternative to night running. For this reason, an observation car, or cars, would be of little value, and they are not contemplated at the present time.

Immediately upon the conclusion of Mrs. Hutchison's speech, I put action in train to obtain full information regarding wool manufacture in this State, and I am now in a position to advise the honourable member that it is possible to buy Western Australian-made women's winter apparel in local shops. One of the major deterrents to the greater sales of Western Australian fashion goods is the well-known feminine insistence to buy clothes with an Eastern States or overseas tag.

The Government is aware of the huge imports of footwear, and it is investigating the possibilities of reducing these imports by greater local manufacture. Here I might mention that Western Australia is exporting some types of footwear in, I understand, considerable quantities.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Did you know that certain footwear manufactured in Osborne Park is bought in Melbourne and is stamped with a Melbourne stamp, and is then sent back here and sold?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I did not know.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Frocks and hats are, too.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member will just have to revise her places of shopping. The Department of Industrial Development has recently been reorganised and expanded with a view, amongst other measures, to practical and positive steps being taken to overcome the present serious unbalance of trade with the Eastern States.

Although the Albany Woollen Mills are not manufacturing their own brand-name hand-knitting wool, they are manufacturing hand-knitting wool to special orders.

My recollection of the greater part of the honourable member's speech conjures up in my mind visions of ogres of poverty casting shadows over the workshops. Such expressions as "scandalous," "wrecking," "shameful devastation," and "spectres of unemployment stalking our midst" come readily to mind.

An interesting item on one of the TV stations last night was that called "View-point" where two representatives of unions from the Midland Junction Workshops appeared with the Minister for Railways. Both sides had the opportunity to express their different points of view. What struck me most in watching and listening to the programme, was the question which the chairman asked the two members of the unions when he said, "Have there, in fact, been any retrenchments from the Midland Junction Workshops?" The union representatives, quite truthfully and openly, said, "No."

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison interjected.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If the honourable member wants me to reply to her speech, I shall do so, but if not I will go

on to someone else's comments. I am trying to answer the points she raised. The same question was then put to the Minister for Railways who answered it by saying that there had been no retrenchments, and he promised that there would be no retrenchments and that all that would take its course would be the natural wastage by resignations, and so on.

He also told the viewers—and I dealt with this in the House the other night—that it was his desire to set out a well-balanced plan for the workshops and not to have the work carried out sporadically. He said he wished to have a planned economy laid down in order that the men's employment would be secure rather than that they should be given something to manufacture today and then be in the position tomorrow of having nothing to do. He added that even if the Westland train sets were manufactured in Midland Junction, it would be necessary for the work that is done there now to be sent elsewhere to be done.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: There is a good deal of camouflage about that.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member is a better judge of camouflage than the rest of us. I shall endeavour to reply to one or two of the other matters that the honourable member brought forward, but I am sure that we recognise some of her expressions as her stock-in-trade.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Almost as camouflage.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Almost as camouflage; a truer statement I have not heard. I am not criticising the honourable member but am merely trying to make some constructive criticism of the points which she brought forward in the course of her speech. She alleged that there were many men unemployed by private concerns; that they were engaged only for a few days and were then returned to the labour market.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: That is true.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The unemployment figures prove that there has been increased work in the building industry.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: The rest have gone East.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Nonsense; it is not a bit of use saying that, because the population figures of the State are also up.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Some 200 carpenters have gone East.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Maybe they have, but now that the situation is a lot brighter than it was 12 months ago, they will be starting to return.

The Hon. G. E. Jeffery: What about the number of apprentices in the building trade?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The numbers are not as great as they were in the period that it has been convenient for members to take—1954-55. We all know that was a high peak in the building industry. If we look at the statistics we will see that there were more houses being constructed then than there are now; and there is an inclination to take the number of apprentices at that period and say that that is what should pertain today. But we have to get down to a more realistic figure. We are living in an age when there are different types of building construction. I pose the question to Mr. Jeffery—

The PRESIDENT: The Minister will not pose questions to any members, but will address the Chair.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I beg your pardon, Sir. I pose the question to the honourable member, through you, Sir, that the type of commercial construction we see going on today does not lend itself to bricks and mortar as it used to do, but rather to steel and concrete. There is a different type of construction altogether being built today. However, the Government is not unaware of the fact that this question of apprentices is being brought forward fairly regularly, and I can assure the honourable member that the position is being watched very closely.

Mrs. Hutchison, in the course of her remarks, referred to the New South Wales Legislative Council. She said it was not even a credit to a Labor Government. I can hardly add to that denunciation. It is indeed a great pity that a member of the Legislative Council of Western Australia has to go out of her way to write down our own State in the matter of employment in industry at the expense of the truth. The amazing feature of Mrs. Hutchison's speech is that practically within hours of my being able to place a rosy future and a satisfactory present in the matter of employment before this House—and the figures show it—she was able to come to this Chamber and make mis-statements of facts on employment and unemployment.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: I can bring to the notice of the Minister unemployment figures relating to my province, if he so desires.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If I can interject on the honourable member and continue with my speech, I will be able to finish it in a shorter time. This prompts me to repeat again what I said some days ago in this Chamber; namely, that prosperity and boom conditions are extremely evident in Western Australia and that more people are employed in industry today than there were 12 months ago. This is not mere hearsay; the facts are borne out by the statistician's figures which show the estimated number of wage and salary-earners. Salary-earners in civil

employment, excluding rural areas, numbered 190,400 at the end of May last, compared with 187,000 at the end of June, 1957.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Why do you not go around your province and ask that question and see what answer you will you get?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am not in the same position as the honourable member. As a Minister, I find that, unfortunately, I have not as much time these days to go round my province as I used to have, but I can assure the honourable member, through you, Mr. President, that I still go around my province a great deal.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Do you have time to consult the Minister for Housing?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, I do. Employment in what are termed the larger factories, which represent approximately one third of the total factory establishments, increased to 17,969 at the end of last June, compared with 17,310, at the end of June, 1959. It is natural that unemployment figures show a clear downward trend, there being only 2,293 receiving unemployment benefit at the end of June, 1960, compared with 2,939 at the end of the corresponding month last year.

It is strange that we find a state of affairs today—according to the honourable member—whereby it appears that the Government has done so many things that it has blotted out the sun, compared to the position 18 months ago when everything in Western Australia appeared to be rosy. However, I am glad to say that that is not the approach made by Mr. Wise. One can appreciate the points of view that were expressed by him in his speech tonight. He was not critical of the Government. He read to us the long title of a Bill which was introduced in 1960 which requested Supply, and he also read to us the long title of a Bill that was introduced many years ago asking for Supply and pointed out that the amount requested had jumped from £2,500,000 in 1947 to £17,000,000 in 1960.

The honourable member conveyed to us, of course, that the rise had been gradual over that period; and within the limited time that was available to me during the tea suspension, I made some inquiries and ascertained that the increase was so gradual that it did not matter which Government had been in office from 1940 to 1960, because this rising trend had been evident right through.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Prices have gone up.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That remark is not consistent with the remarks previously made by the honourable member. I consider that this rising trend is due to the fact that we are living in an era totally different from the time when you, Mr. President, cleared your block with an

axe. Today, one does not clear any block with an axe because we are living in different times altogether compared to the time when you first cleared your land, Sir. If we were satisfied to live at the level that existed in years gone by and to take the income that our fathers and mothers took, the picture would be entirely different. However, in these modern times greater expenditure is called for, and we also expect more luxuries; and we are living in a country that provides them for us.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Perhaps your father could have swung an axe more often.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I will let that remark pass. Mrs. Hutchison has had a good deal to say about this matter, and I thought it would be interesting for members to be enlightened with some statistics. For instance, in Western Australia the price of a 2 lb. loaf of bread in the June quarter of 1953 was 12.50 pence as against the Australian average of 12.47 pence, whilst in the September quarter—the latest period for which the statistician has interstate comparison—we find that the price of a 2 lb. loaf in Western Australia is 16.50 pence compared with the Australian average of 16.1 pence.

I have attached to my notes a table which gives some further details in regard to the price of foodstuffs. For example the price of beef sirloin per lb., on the Australian average, is 46.61 pence, but the Western Australian price for beef sirloin is 46.56 pence per lb.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: That does not alter the fact which I stated.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I know that. Nothing that I can say can alter what has been said by the honourable member. I have learned long ago that no matter what I say, it is still not right according to the honourable member. Nevertheless these prices have been taken from the records of the Government Statistician and I will let you, Mr. President, be the judge of whether they are reasonable or not. The Australian average price for rump steak during the September quarter, was 66.81 pence per lb., whilst the price in Western Australia was 64.43 pence per lb.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Where?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member should look around a bit more. Obviously he is not looking in the right places.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: He must have been looking at kangaroo.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is right. The Australian average price for silverside was 44.34 pence per lb. in the September quarter of 1959 and in Western Australia it was 43.30 pence per lb. Therefore, the prices of foodstuffs in Western

Australia compare more than favourably with the prices in other States. I do not think we are living in such a dreadful State, or that it has gone so far back in 12 months.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: The basic wage does not prove your figures to be correct.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Mr. Strickland knows, of course, that the basic wage has risen. As a member of the previous Government he also knows the impact it has on the spending ability of the Government, even when it rises by only 1s. I said something about that the other night.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Do you not often marvel how ministerial responsibility mellow's one's outlook?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It does; and the honourable member has had many more years of ministerial responsibility to mellow him than I have had, but I hope to have many more years yet. I do not think it is necessary for me to pursue that line of thought any further. I can point out that, admittedly, the price of eggs is 5s. 6d. per dozen; and Mrs. Hutchison said that it was ridiculous that the price of eggs should be 5s. per dozen. That may be so, but the price of eggs has remained constant under the control of the Egg Marketing Board, no matter which Government it has served under.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: If the chooks only knew, they would appreciate it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If all members had approached this question in the same manner as it has been approached by Mr. Wise this evening, they would have appreciated that, no matter which Government is in office, eggs represent a controlled commodity and the price of them varies according to the decisions made by the Egg Board from time to time on a seasonal basis. To blame the increased cost of eggs on this Government is just a lot of poppycock. I will now turn to the remarks made by Mr. Wise.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: You have not dealt with the franchise of this House.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If Mrs. Hutchison would like me to give another dissertation on the franchise of the Legislative Council, perhaps it would be better if I let it go until that honourable member introduces a Bill to alter the franchise of this House, because we have heard so much about that subject in the past. I say that the Legislative Council is not as dreadful as it sounds by any manner of means. No matter what Government has been in office, ever since the first days of responsible Government, this Parliament has been passing Bills for the good of the general public of Western Australia; it did so even when the population was much smaller than it is at present.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: And it has rejected some, too.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, I quite agree. By far the greater portion of legislation that is passed through this Chamber is enacted in the best interests of the people of the State. I feel sure of that. Sometimes, even Mrs. Hutchison adopts that view. Mr. Wise directed some remarks to me on the question of the increase in water charges. I have taken the opportunity—

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Those remarks were made in another debate.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, I know, but this is the first chance I have had to reply to what was said by the honourable member. I did reply to the remarks made by Mr. Strickland when he spoke to the motion for an addendum to the Address-in-Reply. Subsequently, Mr. Wise raised the question of increased water charges, and between that time and today I have made some inquiries and I am now going to try to explain to him what has transpired, and to advise him that he accused me of overlooking the basis on which the water rating is made within the limitations prescribed in the Act. The honourable member went further and said that the charges were becoming a burden on the people and should not be levied to be taken into Consolidated Revenue.

Accordingly I have made the closest inquiry into the position as it is at present, and I am advised by the Minister controlling this instrumentality that the charges being levied are in full accord with the provisions of the Act and are necessary to meet the expenses set out under the provisions quoted by Mr. Wise, apart from a small surplus which, because of basic wage increases, may prove to be a deficit. The charges which have been levied do not provide for revenue beyond the requirements of the undertaking, or for purposes of Consolidated Revenue. Nor do the charges include the recovery of any portion of the revenue lost during 1959-60 because of water restrictions.

The honourable member's speech was delivered most impressively and I am sure he meant every word he said, as he usually does; but it is a fact that the financial figures quoted by him were haphazard, inasmuch as the £59,000 stated as profit for the department for 1957-58 represents sewerage operations only. However, the principal error was in his statement that the accumulated profits were now approaching £250,000. The position, of course, is that the net accumulated surplus of £240,000 at the 30th June, 1959, has been converted, due to water restrictions, to a net deficiency of £12,000 on the 30th June, 1960.

It would have been very convincing were it true that the sewerage rate had been raised unnecessarily. That is not so, for

the reason that there is an accumulated deficit on sewerage operations amounting to £142,000. No charge lies against the Government in the taking of the accumulated deficiency on sewerage into consideration when fixing the rates for the department, because this is a procedure carried out by the previous Government.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That will not be the situation as at June, 1961.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am saying that what was done this year was done previously by the former Government. The honourable member went on to say there was every reason why the rates should have been limited and circumscribed as the provisions of the Act demand. The reply I give is that the provisions of the Act have been observed; and it may interest the honourable member to know that even if the rate in the pound had been increased instead of the valuations being adjusted to a uniform level, those rates would have been within the statutory maximum rates provided by the Act.

It was an unfortunate claim on the honourable member's part that his Government found a way to reduce the rate when valuations went up simply to meet the demands of the statute. As we all know, it was not a case of finding a way to reduce the rates. In the period referred to by Mr. Wise, the estimated revenue far exceeded the estimated expenditure and, in order to equalise the position, it was decided to reduce the rate in the pound.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It will not from the next year.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member's reference to the year 1946 should have been 1955-56. I would say, in conclusion, that the present Government is giving effect to the demands of the Act and is not exceeding the requirements of the law.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I do not believe it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: My final point is this: As I said the other day, the increase in the programme of works is a legacy from the previous Government. I am referring to Serpentine Dam and the like.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: The planning of the previous Government.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is not only planning in that instance. The previous Government put it into operation.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Not as a legacy.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Planning then, if Mr. Strickland would prefer that. The department was left in a position where it had to re-assess its income and expenditure for the coming year. The purpose of the Metropolitan Water Supply Department is to provide a service and, in respect of that service, it makes a charge to

the people who use it. Call it a tax if one likes; but to my mind it is not a tax in the true sense of the word.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Some people are paying for water they do not use.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, of course they are; and, to use a certain expression, it was ever thus. If the honourable member put down a bore in his backyard and was not using the amount of water prescribed in his rates, the position, whether the department was administered by this Government or the previous Government, would be ever thus. It would not make a scrap of difference.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: The Government is charging for water it does not supply.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Was it ever any different in the days of the previous Government?

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: No.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Why cavil about it?

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Who was?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The charge is laid that the Government has done something dishonestly.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Do you remember cavilling about it?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: We must refresh your memory.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Do so. My attitude at the time was this, and it has not changed—

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I will impersonate you when I get an opportunity.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It might sound awful.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: It will.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: My approach was this: The more people are charged then the greater amount of water they are permitted to consume so reducing the amount of conservation of water. I do not retract from that, as it is the position today. I know that my water rates will rise and I will be given an opportunity to use more water. However, I am one of those people who put down a well, and I am quite sure I will not use the amount of water with which I am provided.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: You are happy now.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, I am happy about the well; but to say I am overjoyed at being taxed on anything would be ridiculous.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: This is a charge.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: A couple of years ago Mr. Wise said that no Government liked to impose taxes. That is perfectly true. No Government does.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: This is a charge.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: For a service.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: In the Reddish category.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member can call it in the Stricklandish category if he likes.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I do not charge for my services.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Your services are free.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Mr. Strickland made a charge that I endeavoured to take short cuts when replying to his Address-in-Reply speech. I did not. I tried to give the honourable member and other members of this House as lucid an explanation of the points raised as I could; and I have elaborated on some of them tonight. Of course, it would be true to say it would be difficult in any circumstances for me to satisfy the honourable member or to give satisfactory explanations.

I will now turn to the question of iron ore. I have been told by Mr. Strickland that the papers dealing with tenders for iron ore called for by the Government should be laid on the Table of the House. The position is simply this: The Government sought to build up a case to take to the Commonwealth to see if Western Australia could be granted a licence to export X million tons of iron ore from this State. In order to build up a case, we called tenders for the export of iron ore from Mt. Goldsworthy and Koolyanobbing; and we received certain information.

The tender forms were couched in such terms as to leave no doubt in the minds of those people who supplied information in accordance with the tenders that any one tender would be the subject of a license to export iron ore. We did receive tenders from certain persons. If we obtain an export license for iron ore we will undoubtedly have to call tenders again; and I am sure Mr. Strickland will see, at this point of time, that it would be undesirable to make the particulars of the tenders we have available to each company in turn, or to the rest of the world, for that matter.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: For what reason would you call tenders again?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: We will not know the conditions until we are given an export licence. We may not have to call tenders again, but, if we do, it is hardly desirable to place a number of these tenders on the Table of the House at the moment in order that everybody can see them.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Do you think you will ever get an export licence?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You would be giving an unfair advantage.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, as Mr. Logan says, we would be giving an unfair advantage.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: You are, if you are calling again.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There is nothing to hide about this question whatsoever, and if the honourable member cares to visit my office and have a personal talk about this matter I will show him the file.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I do not want to talk; I want it tabled here.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have explained why the Government considers it undesirable at present to table the file. Mr. Strickland may not accept the explanation, but it is the one I give.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It is logical.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I believe it is logical. I will be only too happy to supply any information the honourable member would like on a confidential basis. There are no secrets about the position. However, we do not want anyone to get an advantage in regard to the export of iron ore.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: You are using the tenderers up.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Not at all. That is quite an unfair allegation. As I said previously, the tenderers, when they obtained the form, were left in no uncertain mind that the information they gave would be the subject of an export licence. None of the tenders were accepted, because an export licence did not come to hand. If a licence does come to hand—

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: You are going to call tenderers again.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: —in the light of circumstances at the time we may, or may not, call tenderers.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: It is unfair to those who tendered.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not think so.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: You are using their prices to build up a case, and then dropping them.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have, as a result of questions asked by the Leader of the Opposition in another place, been questioned in respect to some tenders called for houses in Northam. We called tenders for the construction of some houses in Northam and the prices were considered to be too high. Therefore we called tenders again at a later date, with the result that the prices were very close to the estimate and we were able to allot a contract for these houses.

The honourable member should know that the condition of tendering can alter from time to time. It alters according to the demand. At the particular time tenders were called in Northam, apparently those tendering had

some reason for tendering at a high level; but the next time they tendered they did so at a better level. It is not uncommon in any business practice to re-call tenders when not satisfied with the first tender.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: You are going to use the first ones.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I did not say I used the first lot. One must make a decision in the light of circumstances.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: You are using them to bolster the case for Canberra.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Of course we are. We now have some knowledge as to what it will cost to rail iron ore from point A to point B. We obtained this information from the tenderers we called.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: That was on the files when we left office.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The information now revealed will either be different or the same.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: The transport cost from point A to point B was investigated.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not think I will satisfy the honourable member on this point, but I have tried to.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I want you to satisfy the public, not only me.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Government is very anxious to satisfy the public and it has done what it considers to be the right thing. As Mr. Logan very rightly said, there is a lot more to this question than just transporting the iron ore from point A to point B. If it is Port Hedland, there is the question of harbour facilities that we have to have regard for—a very great regard for. At the moment, Port Hedland limits itself to ships of approximately 5,000 tons.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: The price received is based on that.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member's lack of knowledge on this point is lamentable. It would not necessarily be based on that for the simple reason that if iron ore is to be shipped in 5,000-ton ships as against 25,000-ton ships, it would reflect a totally different price.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: But doesn't a tenderer base his tender on a knowledge of the price and facilities available?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, but not on his knowledge of 5,000-ton ships.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have been very tolerant, but I think these interjections are getting out of hand.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have been trying to tell the honourable member the Government's approach to this matter and it is quite conscientious, I assure the House. In my own case, as Minister for

Mines, I would like to assure the honourable member that I have a conscientious approach to this matter, and the Government is doing the best it can in the circumstances.

The honourable member raised the question of oil. He did, it is true, ask me a number of questions last year, and I provided the answers. I cannot remember offhand what the number of barrels per day was or what the circumstances were, but that can be easily looked up in *Hansard*. But it is not quite right to say that this company has abandoned the area. I visited Broome last November and I officially spudded in Thangoo No. 1 well.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: That is not in the area.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is not in the area the honourable member was talking about; but it is in the area that Wapet holed. They then shifted their attention to another hole at Thangoo, and they are now doing a seismographic survey in the Perth basin. It is also true that some French experts have been here. They were here for something like three days; and they did, in the three days, provide a good deal of information of a geological nature which they will make available to the Commonwealth Bureau of Mineralogical Resources; and I will receive a copy of the report.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: They were engaged by the bureau.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, they were. The Commonwealth Resources Bureau has its own drill hole going down. The second hole that Wapet drilled at Thangoo went down to something like 7,500 ft. until it struck bottom. They pulled out because there was no sign of oil. This company, as I have related, has spent a terrific amount of money in Western Australia.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: About £10,000,000.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: More than £15,000,000; and the fear I have—and I hope it will not eventuate—is that Wapet will pull out of Western Australia altogether.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Do you think nobody will follow?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I cannot make any comment about that. The fact remains that this company has carried out oil prospecting over a long period of time; and, may I say to the honourable member, I was not responsible for letting the leases to the Wapet company. The Government, of which the honourable member was a member, let the leases.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I explained that.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes; and so far as I am aware, the negotiations and the dealings between the companies

and the previous Minister for Mines, were always of a satisfactory nature. Mr. Kelly did not mistrust them and Mr. Moir did not mistrust them; or, if either of them did, nobody said anything about it. I do not mistrust them. I think we have to be thankful for the fact that they have spent so much of their money in the State. Admittedly, some of these holes have been subsidised by the Government, which is another good thing.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: It is good if it is going to private enterprise, but no good if it is a State facility.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: This matter of subsidies in the search for oil is a question on its own, and it has been implemented to give financial assistance to those people who are spending their money on the search for oil not only in Western Australia but throughout the country. They have to put up their case for a subsidy on a particular hole and they then refer to it as a subsidised hole from the Commonwealth.

I believe and hope that Wapet will drill another hole, or series of holes, in the Perth basin when the seismographic survey carried out in the area has been completed. I have questioned the managing director of Wapet, here in Western Australia, and he appears to me to be a forthright and honest man. He has told me that the oil they have discovered in the North-West is not in satisfactory commercial quantities for it to be of practical value to them, yet they intend to carry on with their search. I sincerely hope they do not become so downhearted they will pull out.

As to the other areas, it is not right to say there is only one company prospecting for oil. There are more. In the last couple of days I gave permission, under the Petroleum Act, for some leases to be transferred, when one company was joining with another to bring in further financial assistance in another part of the State; and together they hope to be able to do some work which will result in exploratory work for the drilling for oil. I am talking about the whole State, because it is not a problem just for the North; it is a problem for Western Australia.

I think the honourable member made some comment about the Perth Airport extensions. We would all like to see more money spent on airport extensions throughout the State, for that matter, but it is important that the Commonwealth Government expend its money on the extensions to Perth Airport because Perth Airport is an international airport; and in order to take the type of aircraft in use today, the extensions must go on.

As members read in the Press, the Premier has been, to the best of his ability, exhorting the Commonwealth Government to extend the runways at Perth Airport

sufficiently to take the Boeing 707 which, I understand, they will not do at the present time.

I turn briefly to some of the comments made by Mr. Baxter. I know that some of those things he pointed out about the Police Department can be pinpricking. It is extremely so, when driving one mile over the speed limit, to be committed on a technical breach and fined for it. I do not think he is justified—and I would be disappointed indeed if he were justified—in saying that a policeman has to convict so many people in order that he can maintain his position in the Police Force. I think that is a very unfair charge to make. Nevertheless, that is what the honourable member thinks and I do not want to think for one moment that it is true; and I do not think it is. The only other comment I can make in that respect is that the police—and the Police Department generally—have a great responsibility to the State, and I think that in the main they perform their task admirably and loyally. They are probably like some of us members of Parliament: they do not always do the right thing, but nevertheless it is human to err.

I have commented quite considerably on the statements made by Mr. Wise in his observations on the titles of various Supply Bills that have been introduced from time to time. But to repeat again, it was ever thus. I believe—and the honourable member could tell us about this better than I could—that at a Loan Council meeting, the desire of every Premier of every State is to get more, and more, and more from the Commonwealth; and when each Premier goes back to his own State with a bag half full, or full, or with whatever quantity of money there is in it, the next procedure is that his Ministers get around the Cabinet table and try to get for their particular portfolios as much as they can of that money.

After that, we see it reflected in this House; we see it reflected in the Legislative Assembly, if we listen down there; and it is reflected in the questions by honourable members who say, in so many words, "When am I going to get this in my electorate?" and, "When am I going to get that in my electorate?" The demands from the Commonwealth Government right back to the personal desires of the average member of Parliament to improve the facilities, educational, hospital, roads, and what-have-you, in his own electorate are everlasting demands upon the purse of the particular State of which he happens to be a member. If members want the Government to start to cut down; if they want the Government to start to put the lid on and say that from now on we are not going to exhort the Commonwealth Government to give us more and more, but we are going to clamp down then and there, they will have to realise and appreciate that we will have

to clamp down on the spending in their electorates. They cannot have their cake and eat it too.

It is not the desire of any Government to do that. It is the desire of this Government, as it was the last, to carry out as much in the way of public works as it can; to do as much as it can to provide for schools, hospitals, houses and all the other things we need.

And that is the situation. To pick out Western Australia and say that it is a poor State, and it is only in Western Australia that this state of affairs is going on is, of course, ridiculous; and it is unrealistic in approach, and in truth.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: What all Premiers in all States are complaining about is the interest being charged on their money.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member is taking a point well made by Mr. Wise. It is the Premiers themselves who determine the amount of money that will go to the States. That is the basis on which they meet each year when they decide what the loan programme for the States of the Commonwealth will be from time to time.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: The Federal Treasurer does have a say.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes; a big say. It would be unrealistic to say he did not have a substantial say; but the point I was making is that we are accepting the belief that this state of affairs pertains in Western Australia only and not anywhere else.

I would say, in conclusion to this debate, that Australia generally—all the States—is on the verge of prosperity. We are beginning to make a name for ourselves among the industrial interests of the world. There is an everlasting clamour overseas for information concerning our investments; and we want to do all we possibly can, not to discourage ourselves, not to say how black things are, but to extend the hand of encouragement to Western Australia so that we can see it take its place in line with all the other States—Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia, Queensland, and Tasmania.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: How you have changed in 18 months!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No. I have never had a different approach to this question. I could go on talking in these terms, but I do not propose to do so. Western Australia has to be given a chance and, as regards the question of price-fixing, which comes up from time to time, experience has shown us that it is not the answer. Some States, which are controlled by other than Liberal Governments, have proved that price-fixing is not the answer, and they do not apply it.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: Playford is doing a good job in South Australia.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Although some of them do apply it, most of the States have found that it is not the answer to the problem. I repeat: if we want to call a halt, we will call a halt to prosperity. A growing country like this is bound to have its troubles; where we have a progressive country we are bound to have problems; we will have growing pains, but the way to prevent them is not to clamp down and stop the child from growing. Rather than criticise us, help us to get on with the job.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee*

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

### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time and passed.

House adjourned at 9.7 p.m.

## Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 9th August, 1960

### CONTENTS

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—		Page
Agricultural Department Officers : Number north of 26th parallel	236	
Air Strips : All-weather type for North-West	229	
Banking Facilities : Establishment at Wyndham	236	
Bicycles : License fees	238	
Breeding Stock : Rate of slaughter	237	
Centre Ride Boggles : Tenders and contract for construction	228	
Cloverdale School : Inspection of site prior to commencement of building	237	
Coal Deposits : Locality and quality	230	
Crosswalks—		
Maintenance of zigzag lines	227	
“ No standing ” rule	227	
Dairying Industry : Commonwealth committee's survey in Western Australia	236	
Electoral Districts Act : Proclamation and redistribution	231	
Five-Year High School : Establishment at Harvey	237	
F.R.V. “Peron”—		
Effect of breakdown on research	227	
Number of Crew, and Expense involved in breakdown	228	
Period of disablement	235	

CONTENTS—continued		Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—continued		
Geraldton Harbour : Improvements	230	
Geraldton Water Supplies : Additional storage	230	
“ Highlights of Parliament ” : Discontinuance of broadcast	232	
Iron Ore : Operation of ore leases at Koolyanobbing	227	
J. & E. Ledger Pty. Ltd. : Shareholders	228	
Lower King Bridge—		
Method of construction	231	
Plans and specifications	231	
Merredin Sewerage Installation—		
Proposals under Hawke Government	234	
Proposals under present Government	234	
Midland Junction Workshops—		
Manufacture of spare parts	229	
Purchase of bar steel	228	
Substitution of axle steel for bar steel	228	
Transfer of tools and materials to Tomlinson Ltd.	229	
Mother-of-Pearl Shell—		
Prospects for industry	235	
Tonnage, split-up, and price	235	
Motor Vehicles : Title ownership certificate	237	
Mt. Lawley High School : Availability of classroom accommodation	238	
Natives—		
Construction of homes at Allawah Grove	236	
Construction of new hostel	236	
Pemberton Sawmill Workers : Future employment	232	
Perth Airport Extensions : Resumptions from State Housing Commission	232	
Perth Girls' High School : Completion of tennis courts	239	
Radio School of the Air : Establishment at Meekatharra and Kalgoorlie	237	
Railway Boggles : Contract and tenders	239	
Salmon Heads : Importation into Western Australia	230	
Spencer Park School, Albany : Connection to electricity supply	230	
State Shipping Service : Cost of fleet repairs	228	
Stirling Highway : Traffic prosecutions and accident rate	288	
Veterinary Surgeon : Location in North-West	229	
Violet Valley : Standard of maintenance by lessee	235	
Water Catchments in Norpa Area : Investigations	234	
Water Supply Department—		
Increased revenue from sewerage rates	231	
Interest and sinking fund charges	231	
Wilson : Postal mail	234	
Wool Promotion : Contributions to and results of scheme	235	
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—		
Closed Railway Lines—		
Government policy	241	
Promises made by Ministers	241	
Reopening and operating costs, etc.	243	
Reopening of Katanning line	240	
Report of public meeting	241	
Commonwealth Disposal Sale : Cartage of goods without permit	239	