

Mr. Lewis: The Premier would determine that, but in the overall picture what is important is the amount that is spent on the assimilation of natives. That is what the Premier would take into account.

Mr. HARMAN: This completes my contribution to the Address-in-Reply debate. I protest most strongly against a reduction in the size of the native reserve. This is a bad precedent for the Government to set. If mining operations proceed, the Government, through expediency, will whittle away the land reserves of the natives.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. W. A. Manning.

*House adjourned at 9.44 p.m.*

## Legislative Council

Thursday, the 14th August, 1969

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

### QUESTIONS (8): ON NOTICE

1. *This question was postponed.*

#### 2. KEWDALE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

##### *Outstanding Claims*

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE asked the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) Can the Minister advise how many claims are still outstanding as a result of the operations of the Kewdale Development Authority?
- (2) What are the names and addresses of the people concerned?
- (3) Have all such parties received firm offers from the Government?
- (4) Have counter offers been made which differ from the Government valuations?
- (5) What is the next move available to the persons concerned in order to reach finalisation and settlement of their outstanding claims?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

- (1) Five.
- (2) (a) R. J. and Mrs. J. I. Coles, 8 Todd Avenue, Como.
- (b) J. Daljac, 23 La Page Street, Belmont.
- (c) J. V. Reagan, c/o Keall Stables & Brinsden, Solicitors, Perth.
- (d) O. L. and Mrs. O. I. Schruth, M. M. V. Ooran—All of 690 Beaufort Street, Mount Lawley.
- (e) G. Calabrese, 34 Norman Street, Bentley.

(3) Yes.

(4) One counter offer has been made.

(5) Section 47A, Public Works Act, provides for compensation to be determined by agreement between the parties, by an action for compensation by the claimant or by reference of the claim to the Compensation Court.

3.

### TRANSPORT

#### *Carriage of Goods between Perth and Pilbara*

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

Will the Minister advise if the Director General of Transport recommendation that "as-of-right" licences be issued for carriage of goods between Perth and Pilbara terminals, will permit hauliers to pick-up loading both ways along the entire route?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

Yes, if the recommendation is implemented.

4.

### MINES

#### *World Prices for Minerals*

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) What is the latest world price for—
  - (a) nickel;
  - (b) cobalt; and
  - (c) copper?
- (2) What rises, if any, have there been in each of the previous two years?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) There is no accepted world price but the U.S.A. prices may be taken as being representative and are—
  - (a) 91.96 cents per lb.
  - (b) \$1.65 per lb.
  - (c) \$954 per long ton (average in May, 1969).

- (2) The prices during the past two years varied as follows—

Nickel—from 76.12 cents on the 1st August, 1967 to 83.93 cents per lb. on the 1st August, 1968.

Cobalt—from \$1.65 on the 1st August, 1967 to \$1.71 per lb. on the 1st August, 1968.

Copper prices varied from day to day but the average monthly prices ranged from \$820 per long ton in August, 1967 to a peak average of \$1,130 in March, 1968.

These prices are the latest published by the Bureau of Mineral Resources and have been converted to Australian currency.

# 5. CHIROPRACTORS ACT

## *Whether Breaches Committed*

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Health:

- (1) Does the Minister consider that any breaches of the Chiropractors Act have been committed by any person whose name appears on page 82 of the pink pages of the 1969 telephone directory under the heading of "Chiropractors"?
- (2) If the answer to (1) is "Yes", would the Minister indicate—
  - (a) which persons have committed an offence, and what is the offence; and
  - (b) does he intend to instruct the Chiropractors Board to prosecute the offenders?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) and (2). We are advised that the Chiropractors Registration Board is taking action against persons who have advertised in the pink pages of the 1969 telephone directory in breach of the Chiropractors Act.

6. *This question was postponed.*

# 7. RAILWAYS

## *Tonnages between Mullewa and Meekatharra*

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

What was the total tonnage of goods carried each way on the Mullewa-Meekatharra railway during each of the past five years?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITHS replied:

Year ended the 30th June—

Mullewa to Meekatharra—

	Tons
1965	24,628
1966	29,864
1967	28,115
1968	50,427
1969	36,839

Meekatharra to Mullewa—

	Tons
1965	45,009
1966	62,934
1967	109,258
1968	45,795
1969	74,886

# 8. FLAME-PROOF CLOTHING

## *Legislation, Research and Publicity*

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Has there been any agreement among State Ministers to legislate for the production of flame-proof clothing?

- (2) Is the C.S.I.R.O. carrying out any research into the burning behaviour of children's clothing, particularly night-attire fabrics?

- (3) Is it intended to carry out any publicity campaign in Western Australia regarding this matter, with particular emphasis on public education for child safety?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITHS replied:

- (1) No.

- (2) Some research has been carried out but results have not been of a nature to clearly define relative flammability of specific materials. A recent conference of State Ministers for Labour agreed to request the C.S.I.R.O. to carry out further research.

- (3) Yes. Discussions on this matter have already taken place with the Home Safety Division of the National Safety Council.

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SIXTH DAY

### *Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 13th August, on the following motion by The Hon. J. Heitman:—

That the following Address be presented to His Excellency:—

May it please Your Excellency: We, the Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express our loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to deliver to Parliament.

**THE HON. J. G. HISLOP** (Metropolitan) [2.42 p.m.]: I take some degree of risk either to myself or to the gentlemen who may absorb something of my speech, with what I am about to say. The reason I say that is that in the early days of medicine, medical men, after being taught their profession, would obtain a practice for one person only. This was the procedure for a long time, but slowly it has become acceptable for two or three, or more, practitioners to join together to see what the results would be.

Some very useful organisations have been founded, and I am not at all jealous when I say that they have discovered certain things which will help invalids. When we get men of all grades coming together in this manner, willing to say what they think and to disburse their knowledge, then we begin to feel that not one single person—be it man, woman or child—who is ill might be passed by.

This situation was emphasised a few months ago. In April, the Australian Post-graduate Federation in Medicine held its

annual meeting. There were about 50 professors present at the meeting and they discussed the sciences and medicine. In order to give the House some idea of what has been going on in this field, I will mention some of the items discussed. Firstly I will deal with the Australian Medical Association study group on medical education.

As I said previously, there were about 50 professors present and this study group started off considerable discussion which was of great help to most of us. We were very glad to have our Professor W. B. MacDonald in the chair for most of the time. Professor Eric Saint was also present for some time, and so was Dr. C. C. Jungfer, of Adelaide—Censor in Chief of The Australian College of General Practitioners—and we all received a great amount of informal information. I do not want to read lengthy extracts, but I suggest we should have a look at what some of these men said. Let me take Professor MacDonald first of all. He said—

In general terms, this is my submission to the study group. In specific terms related to Australian conditions, one can ask more direct questions. I shall not protract this working paper by asking these questions. I have with me, however, the draft of the new medical curriculum in the University of Western Australia related to the preclinical years. To my mind, the curriculum committee has come forward with an excellent draft which has given a new look to a standard type Australian medical curriculum. The preclinical years are now directed to the study of man in his environment and not to the classification of plants or the Bessemer furnace.

Other medical schools in Australia with members in this study group will also be in the process of making similar adjustments, and some have already done so. The reason for tabling the draft medical curriculum of the University of Western Australia is not to demonstrate it as a model but as a basis for discussion on specific rather than on general grounds for this half-day session. The introduction of human ecology with its component parts into the first year of the medical course, to my mind gives promise of effectively implementing the general thesis of this working paper. Medical students will learn to think of man in his environment from the beginning of their medical careers, will be able to develop a better scale of priorities which can be adjusted according to different conditions, and from this background may well enter upon their clinical years of study with more enthusiasm, eagerness and motivation than did their predecessors.

I would now like to read the remarks of Professor Eric Saint, who is now the Faculty chief at the University of Queensland. He has written several articles on the ill-effects of alcohol, and on alcohol and society. He said—

That alcoholism—or should I say the widespread ill-use of alcohol—is a public health problem of the greatest magnitude is scarcely deniable. Between 10% and 20% of beds in public hospitals are occupied by patients suffering from the medical, neuropsychiatric, or traumatic complications of pathological or ill-advised drinking to excess.

As Dr. Bartholomew has shown us, in about one-half of the inmates of our overcrowded and not too savoury prison houses, alcohol is a principal or an important subsidiary influence in the causation of the outward manifestations of antisocial behaviour.

Professor Saint went on to say—

Dr. K. G. Jamieson's studies show us that 40% of drivers involved in all accidents have blood alcohol levels of about 0.05 gm/100 ml; in fatal accidents, 50% of drivers have levels in excess of 0.1 gm/100 ml; in single vehicle fatal accidents, 80% of drivers have levels in excess of 0.1 gm/100 ml. Furthermore, there is some evidence derived from Californian studies that between one-third and one-half of those involved in fatal accidents in whom high blood levels of alcohol are discovered are in fact confirmed alcoholics, often with personal and clinical histories of past antisocial behaviour.

The following is an original article from *The Medical Journal of Australia* of the 12th July, 1969, and I still quote from Professor Saint:—

In the past 10 years, schools have accepted a limited responsibility in giving instruction designed to protect the innocents against the behavioural problems they are likely to encounter in adolescence. It is thought that sexual promiscuity amongst the young is on the increase, hence sex education in the schools is accepted perhaps grudgingly as desirable. And in regard to the manifest dangers of exposure to alcohol and cannabis, authorities have produced for use in schools excellent pamphlets warning the young of the hazards they face. How effective is this *ad-hoc* propaganda is hard to judge; we may suspect that to children of stable marriages and good families in whatever socio-economic class, the information given merely reinforces attitudes and values that are in any case as stable as a rock.

In the next article the Government appears to receive some praise, and I quote—

Institutions like Karnet in Western Australia and others of this kind are the pioneering models. Unhappily, there are several impediments to rapid progress in this field of reclamation. The numbers are considerable—is it 8,000 a year who go through the gate at Pentridge?—and State Governments understandably find difficulty in financing new capital developments of this nature—schools, hospitals, administrative buildings stand far higher than prisons in order of building priority. Rehabilitation is successful in proportion to the number of psychiatrists and social workers available to do the job, and no State in the country has a sufficiency of personnel with which to tackle the volume of even non-alcoholic psychiatric morbidity.

Finally, I should like to comment on the obvious need for the coordination of all the services in the community which are responsible for the care of the alcoholic and the prevention of alcoholism. The situation at the moment is a trifle chaotic. Almost by chance, the alcoholic may present in the courts and prison, in a medical ward in a hospital, to a psychiatric clinic, or to a hostel run by an order or sect, or he may follow a path from one to another. Within hospitals there is need to set up alcoholic clinics; improved communications between the general and the mental hospitals, including the sharing of professional personnel, are greatly to be desired; the centralized storage of data about diagnosed cases is, with computers, quite feasible. Clearly it is hard to avoid the conclusion that it would be desirable in all States to set up a central coordinating committee, preferably with statutory powers under the Ministries of Health, for only by such an administrative device will it ever be possible to collect and analyse data, to determine priorities on the investment of funds and resources, and to allocate funds wisely and effectively. The creation of strong central administrative organizations has in the past been a secret of success in the overcoming of other public health problems, and alcoholism cannot be an exception to a general rule.

I believe that if our professors give lectures of that character we will soon make an impression on the youth of the country. We may have to work to a date and establish an institution which could really be of tremendous service to the community.

I would like to refer to another matter which was brought to these meetings particularly by the Australian Postgraduate Federation in April of this year. I will explain this from the front page of *The Medical Journal of Australia* dated the 5th July, 1969, which states—

The behavioural sciences theoretically include all sciences bearing on behaviour and the list must surely be large—ranging from biochemistry and genetics to biology, psychology, sociology and anthropology. In general the term is restricted to the latter group—mainly, though not exclusively, social sciences. Last April, the Australian Postgraduate Federation in Medicine organised a symposium on "Behavioural Sciences in Medicine" which was held in Canberra and was well attended by delegates from most States. It was opened by Sir Macfarlane Burnet, and included contributions by speakers representing human biology, psychology, anthropology and social medicine.

Sir Macfarlane Burnet opened on the role of the behavioural sciences in medicine, and the following is his introduction:—

I think that I should like to start by making a point that I have made many times before. But it seems to me that it is so important in relation to the present position of medicine that it will bear repeating. It is simply that about 10 years ago medical science came to the end of the period in which great and effective discoveries could be made by the straightforward use of science at the bedside and on the experimental animal as a model in the laboratory. Disease or disability resulting from the impact of the environment on a genetically normal or near-normal individual can usually be understood on a cause-and-effect basis and can be imitated often with great accuracy on laboratory mammals.

If we look at Sir Macfarlane Burnet's views on this matter we will see that he indicates we must believe before we can really accept the position. He goes on to say—

Perhaps I should say at once that I am desperately pessimistic about our prospects of applying science in any straightforward sense to behavioural disease in man. I do not read the literature of psychiatry, but I do read widely enough to be aware when something important in that field is being commented on in *Nature* or *The Lancet*.

The important discoveries that have interested me have, in fact, come from the laboratories, but none of them have been of any particular help in

the prevention or cure of mental disease. The association of mongolism with trisomy of chromosome 21, the physical and behavioural anomalies of XO, XXY and XYY individuals, have been fascinating to read about, but there has been no practical outcome. In a thousands years, maybe, infants in their first days of life will be karyotyped, and those for whom the hand of the potter shook too clumsily will be excused from further misery—but not in this century.

He goes on to say that he believes it will be a very long time before we make any headway in this direction.

Professor Basil Hetzel, of Monash University, Melbourne, had some very interesting comments to make and one would need to have some time to study what he had to say. He said—

The doctor's field will vary according to his age. Doctors who have graduated from Australian medical schools before the war have a very different background from those who have graduated since, and it is common for more recent graduates to be regarded as incompetent by their elders. The pressures on the curriculum are familiar to all of us, but recent graduates tend to be regarded as well trained in medical science but quite incompetent as practical doctors including incompetence in the field of personal relations.

However, looking beyond this, a doctor's attitude to his patient is very much affected by his membership of the medical profession, with a middle-class professional ethos. It is affected by his involvement with some special medical group, ranging from a specialist College to a subspeciality within medicine.

I think at this stage it would be appropriate to refer to some further remarks by Sir Macfarlane Burnet, and possibly Clifford Jungfer. Some of the remarks are rather difficult to follow but they are certainly evidence of what can be done. I have studied the remarks of Professor MacDonald, Professor Eric Saint, and Professor R. R. Andrew who was the Dean of Medicine at the Monash University. The last named made some extremely good contributions. He said—

I have, I think, given evidence that professionally orientated groups are well suited to their tasks in medical education programmes. But I have barely touched on the other groups who could contribute—politicians, socio-economic constellations, even Royal Commissions and, the least considered, the citizen for whom this complex and remarkable organisation of art and science is designed to serve. I hope that others will discuss this

aspect, because only by team work in the community, as now is necessary for success at bedside or bench, will the maximum progress be made and the delivery gap I have already mentioned, be eliminated.

Now we come to the work of Clifford Jungfer, who came over here at our request to make a survey of Western Australia. His survey was a very good one, although probably it did not cover the whole of the State. However, from it we learnt what we might be able to achieve. He said—

As long ago as 1926, Frederic Wood Jones first gave warning of what was happening to medical education in this country. In his Listerian Oration in Adelaide, he pointed out in plain terms:

There are two factors underlying the whole of medicine: there is the knowledge of the physical and chemical reactions of the constituent parts of the human body under varying normal and pathological conditions; and there is the knowledge of the patient as a human individual in some phase of ease or disease. The one factor absorbs almost all our activities of research and of teaching; the other is in great danger of complete neglect.

Then he used certain remarks of Ward Darley which were as follows:—

The continuing care of health must replace that of the episodic care of illness; and as a consequence in the education of the physician, emphasis must shift away from the patient on his back to the individual on his feet and from the patient in the hospital to the individual in his home and community. . . . These challenges cannot be fully met unless the teaching activity can be extended beyond the physical limits of the institution—into the places where people work and live—where people stay well and get sick.

The conditions that Dr. Jungfer found all over Australia were rather remarkable and he submitted certain suggestions, as follows:—

Firstly, the practical teaching of community medicine must be based in the community with the focal points in teaching general practices. These practices should be actually serving the community. They should be recognised by the university. Criteria for recognition should include a practice audit as to type and scope. At least one practitioner in the practice should have been given instruction in teaching methods. The standard of service must be acceptable. Evaluation of the teaching given must be built-in.

Secondly, the student must be involved in the day-to-day work of the practice and given supervised responsibility for conducting aspects of patient care peculiar to general practice.

Thirdly, as domiciliary teams become part of the pattern of general practice, the student must be accepted as an integral member of the team.

Fourthly, the student should be given a practical working knowledge of the statutory and voluntary agencies concerned with patient care in the practice area.

Fifthly, the emphasis in teaching must be placed on definite diagnosis, balanced treatment and the possibility of preventing disease or further disability.

My purpose has been to stress that the needs of the community can only be met when proper attention is given to community medicine in the design of curricula.

I think that I have said quite enough on the reconstruction of medical education. However, I would like to ask if there are any members who would anticipate forming themselves into a committee to study documents of this sort at various times?

Unless the alcoholics are prepared to submit themselves for a full examination, this subject will not be placed before the student and the professor. In America a number of places exist where a complete investigation can be made of these individuals. The bill might possibly be \$250 to \$300 for each case. America has the money, of course, and we do not have it. Nevertheless, sooner or later we must establish centres where these people can undergo a full examination.

If anyone requires some assistance on this matter, I would be only too pleased to help. Perhaps four or five of us could band ourselves into a small committee to study exactly what is required. If this could be done, we would possibly be one of the first committees to accept the information which has been supplied in the last few weeks.

**THE HON. N. McNEILL** (Lower West) [3.15 p.m.]: This afternoon I propose to give some thought to and to make some observations on three particular matters, all of which I believe are of real interest to members in this House. The three items to which I will refer and devote some time are, firstly, a particular aspect of Commonwealth and State financial relations; secondly, an examination of one particular aspect, or perhaps more than one particular aspect of the situation in relation to probate, both Commonwealth and State; and, thirdly, it is my intention to make observations on something much closer to

hand and much more prominently in the news at the moment—namely, our own domestic agricultural situation in Western Australia.

To refer to the question of Commonwealth and State financial relations, I have selected one particular topic for some examination, and that is that part in relation to the national or public debt. This in my experience can be a rather fearful sort of subject. It is fearful in the first instance on an examination of the figures to find almost incomprehensible matters mentioned under this heading of the national or public debt in Australia.

I felt it needed some examination firstly because from time to time we hear references to what are loosely called unsatisfactory arrangements between the Commonwealth and the States in relation to finances. Also it is frequently argued that one of the very great difficulties in the operation of government in this State, and of private enterprise, is the relative unavailability of loan funds. We must bear in mind also that members in this House do not have the opportunities members in another place are afforded to examine the financial statements of Western Australia. Therefore, as a Federal Budget has been introduced within the last few days I believe it may not be an inappropriate moment to direct some attention to this aspect.

I have selected the three years of 1966 to 1968 inclusive. I have not done this necessarily because they are the latest years but because I have had to make numerous references to different documents, both Commonwealth and State, and I have selected those years for consistency in the figures I have used in the examination of the national debt. I say the national debt because this is the debt borne by Australia as a whole, and it contains the Commonwealth figure together with a figure for the States collectively.

The figure for 1966 was \$10,500,000,000 increasing to \$11,900,000,000 in 1968. These might sound very frightening figures, but they do not frighten me and need not necessarily frighten anyone else just because they are large or represent a debt. It must be remembered that the greater part of the debt is carried within Australia. In other words, it is an Australian debt, borne by Australians, and carried by Australia, and of which Australians are the recipients in terms of redemption and interest payments.

To break this figure down into the Federal figure, the figure for the States collectively, and the figure for Western Australia, we get the following:—

	1966	1967	1968
	\$	\$	\$
Federal	3,100,000,000	3,300,000,000	3,600,000,000
States collectively	7,400,000,000	7,900,000,000	8,300,000,000
Western Australia	705,500,000	748,600,000	792,900,000

As members will see, over that two-year period from the 30th June, 1966, to the 30th June, 1968, the increase in the Federal amount was \$450,000,000; the increase for the States collectively was \$840,000,000; and the increase for Western Australia was \$87,000,000.

Perhaps I should say that the figures I am using are taken, in the main, from the appropriate pages of *Australia in Facts and Figures* as issued by the Australian News and Information Bureau under the auspices of the Department of the Interior. The booklet numbers in question are Nos. 91, 95, and 99. Also, I am making some reference to the *Western Australian Year Book* for 1969 issued by the Commonwealth Statistician, and the Auditor-General's report for Western Australia for the year ended the 30th June, 1968.

I would like to break down the figures I gave to the House a moment ago. I think it is advisable to break down the increase in the public debt for the various authorities into the public debt per head of population.

In 1966, the national figure, which is the overall total, was \$919. The average figure for the States was \$655, and that for Western Australia was \$831. In 1968 these amounts had increased to a national figure of \$990 per head; the average for the States had increased to \$701 per head; and the figure for Western Australia had increased to \$886. Over that period the national increase was \$72 per head; the increase for the States collectively was \$46 per head; and the increase for Western Australia was \$55 per head.

It may be of interest to indicate that I have compared the Western Australian figures for 1966, 1967, and 1968 of \$831, \$854, and \$886 respectively with the equivalent figures for Victoria over the same period and they were \$543, \$553, and \$600 respectively per head of population.

I have referred to the national figures being the total of all. What I think is perhaps more appropriate to my examination is the Commonwealth's share of the public debt and its per head of population rate. The Commonwealth's share in 1966 was \$3,100,000,000 which increased in 1968 to \$3,600,000,000. Incidentally, I have referred to these figures previously. These amounts actually represent \$272 per head of population in 1966 compared with \$655 for the States collectively, and \$831 for Western Australia. In 1967 they represent \$277 per head of population compared with \$683 for the States collectively, and \$854 for Western Australia. In 1968 they represent \$300 per head of population compared with \$701 for the States collectively, and \$886 for Western Australia. In that period the Commonwealth's share per head of population had increased by \$28 per head; the share of the States

collectively had increased by \$46 per head; and the share for Western Australia had increased by \$55 per head.

These figures, in themselves, indicate a fair trend in this matter of Commonwealth and State finance. However, it is logical to extend this one step further and to look at the annual charges in this respect; namely, the interest bill. Members may have noticed that I have made no reference to the sinking fund contribution or to particular loan redemptions that may take place within any annual period. I consider that this omission does not spoil the essence of the argument. In fact, had they been included, I feel they would probably have added to, or further garnished, the story I am endeavouring to tell.

I point out that interest payments are made over an annual period; for example, 1965-66, 1966-67, and 1967-68 and are not something which are just paid on the 30th June of each year. I am sure this fact is well appreciated by members of this House.

If we look at the interest burden we see that in 1966 nationally it represented \$474,200,000; in 1967, \$509,100,000; and in 1968, \$546,500,000. Consequently it will be seen that there is an increase in actual interest charges of \$72,000,000 in those three years.

Although it may appear to complicate the situation further, I think it is relevant to break these figures down into something which is more appropriate to each individual person in the community; namely, to a per head of population rate. Further, I think it is relevant to break the national figure down into the categories of the Commonwealth's share, the share of the States collectively, and the share of Western Australia. On such a breakdown we see that in 1966 the Commonwealth's share of interest burden was \$122,000,000; the share of the States collectively was \$352,000,000; and the share of Western Australia was \$32,000,000. These figures increased through 1967 and again in 1968 to \$144,000,000 for the Commonwealth's share; \$402,200,000 for the States collectively; and \$36,000,000 for Western Australia. They represent increases in the relevant categories of \$22,000,000 for the Commonwealth; \$50,000,000 for the States; and \$4,000,000 for Western Australia.

Once again, this particular interest bill appears to be heavy in relation to the States. However, in line with my comments a few moments ago, let us bring the calculations back to an individual basis to see what the figures mean to each one of us in this country, and particularly in this State. Remembering that the figure for 1966 was \$122,000,000, we find that the Commonwealth's share represents \$10.60 per head of population; for

the States collectively it represents \$30.78, and for Western Australia, \$36. In 1967 the Commonwealth's share was \$10.90 per head of population; the share of the States collectively was \$32.70; and the share of Western Australia was \$38. In 1968 the Commonwealth's share was \$12 per head of population; the share for the States collectively was \$33.90; and that for Western Australia was \$40.40. These figures represent increases of \$1.40 in the Commonwealth's share per head of population; \$3.20 in the share of the States collectively; and \$4 per head of population in Western Australia.

I consider these figures are quite significant and surely indicate to us just what is, in fact, happening. This is more apparent if we relate the figures to the taxing powers of the relevant Governments in Australia.

It is quite true, as I have said and as is frequently claimed, that there is a shortage of loan funds. In fact, loan funds are one of the things of which we are most in need. There is not only a shortage in the actual total of loan funds, which, after all, are apportioned by the Loan Council of the Commonwealth and the States, but they are also becoming increasingly expensive to the various States. They are becoming expensive both in total and, in fact, in the individual charges on the population.

If nothing else, I am sure that this kind of examination would provide some basis for a rearrangement or a review of the present financial arrangements between the Commonwealth and the State. Certainly it would seem to indicate that the Commonwealth, with its far greater taxing power, would have the best opportunity of all the Governments in Australia to finance so many of its projects simply from its own revenue.

It occurs to me that because of the influences which Governments are virtually forced to accept—and this points up the influence that has been applied to previous Premiers—the States are placed in the position of having insufficient taxing power which denies them the opportunity to finance their own projects from revenue. There is no doubt that the States do not have available to them the same amount of funds that are available to the Commonwealth.

I believe the States are burdened with a responsibility that is too heavy; that is, the responsibility of having to finance public projects, and this necessitates the States making an increase in loan raisings. It is clear, too, that the burden of the contributions that must be made to the interest and sinking fund falls very unevenly on the various States, and not only does it fall unevenly on the States themselves, but it also falls unevenly on

the people within those States, with emphasis on the people in the smaller States.

It is apparent from literature and records that Tasmania—the smallest State of all—and Western Australia bear a much greater share of this burden than do the other States or the Commonwealth. In saying that, we all appreciate that although Western Australia is one of the smaller States in terms of population, and taxing population particularly, it is the State that has the greatest basic developmental needs, and it is on these developmental sectors that the great burden of the loan raisings has fallen.

Another point I wish to make is in regard to the practice of the Commonwealth at various times of applying the matching principle. That is, the Commonwealth, at various times, requires the States to match any money it advances with a similar amount. Quite frequently, of course, the States do not have the revenue available adequately to match the money advanced by the Commonwealth and they have been forced into a situation where it is necessary for them to make loan raisings to match these contributions by the Commonwealth. Once again this is throwing an additional burden on the loan fund raisings by the respective States.

I consider it is necessary to make some examination of this practice, because it has been my experience that it is an aspect of the country's finances that is given insufficient examination, especially when we take some pride in the fact that the Government of Western Australia in recent times so often makes announcements pointing out that Western Australia is the greatest or the best. Recently, of course, we have had the greatest increase in population, the greatest intake of migrants, the greatest mineral development, and so on. However, the fact that interests me is that Western Australia is also increasing its loan commitments and thus increasing the burden on every individual within this State as a result of such loan commitments. I think this is one development we could well do without.

Whilst I am not opposed to loan raisings—I think it is the only logical way to raise money—I think a better balance could be effected in respect of the Commonwealth contributions to the loan fund. In other words, surely there is a case for Western Australia to obtain a greater share of the taxing powers which are at present available to the Commonwealth in order that its commitments, in terms of loans, may not reach what may be regarded as a dangerous level. I am sure some people subscribe to the view that it is quite in order to take on large and onerous loan commitments, but can we always be sure that that kind of money is available to us in Australia? If it is not, we may have to make approaches outside Australia for the purpose of making



loan raisings. Would this also be in our favour? These are some of the questions that need to be answered and which need further examination.

I submit those points simply for examination by members of this House and hope that my suggestions will make some sort of contribution towards taking steps to have more finance made available to Western Australia, and also to the other States of the Commonwealth. Some States have had considerable trouble with their financing arrangements and in estimating the demands of the public in respect of Government works and Government undertakings.

I pass now to the subject of probate. In doing so, I am very pleased to note that in the Budget presented in the House of Representatives by the Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr. McMahon) reference was made in the speech to the fact that, when enabling legislation is introduced, there will be a lessening of some of the burden carried by a particular group in our community. I refer firstly to the intention of the Commonwealth Government to increase by 20 per cent. the exemption limit on rural property where the probate values do not exceed \$250,000. Another important consideration referred to in the Budget speech was the removal of the statutory limit of two years; that is, what I might call, "the time to pay." In other words, I understand from a reading of the Budget speech that the period of two years will now be lifted and in the future will no longer apply.

All these factors have been the subject of very strong and detailed representations by the Liberal Party, and more particularly by the rural division of the Liberal Party. Therefore, for obvious reasons, it gives me much satisfaction to learn that the Commonwealth Treasurer has recognised his promise. This announcement has also served the purpose of illustrating that some views expressed in regard to the Liberal Party having contrary ideas are completely unfounded, because the Liberal Party has a very real interest in the reduction of probate duties wherever possible.

There are some other points I would like to put forward which have been, and still are being, discussed by the rural division of the Liberal Party. Firstly, there is a case for the Commonwealth to vacate completely the field of estate duty. I have made reference to this in my remarks in relation to the national debt and the taxing powers of the Commonwealth. I wish to make the point that surely the collection of estate duty does not represent a significant tax to the Commonwealth. In regard to this I make some reference again to the booklet titled, *Australia In Facts and Figures*. On page 12 of that booklet it indicates that in 1966-67 the

Commonwealth estate duty totalled \$41,500,000 out of a total taxation revenue of \$4,413,000,000. This represents approximately 1 per cent. of the total taxation.

Of the total Federal tax collections in Western Australia for 1966-67—which amounted to \$279,700,000—estate duty yielded only \$2,600,000. One might assume that, with the concession intended to be allowed as a result of the last Budget statement, these collections could, perhaps, be less in the future.

I now compare those figures with the situation domestically in Western Australia in respect of our own probate, death, and succession duties. In 1966-67 these duties in Western Australia amounted to \$4,800,000 out of a total State taxation revenue of \$27,800,000. Of the moneys paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, probate and succession duties were second only to stamp duty in terms of the amount per head of population. So I claim there is a very strong and a very compelling reason why, firstly, the Commonwealth should be prepared to vacate this field of taxation and transfer it to the State—in other words, to yield a portion of its taxation powers to the State—and, secondly, that the State Treasurer—perhaps this is not my main point, but it is an important one—should be prepared to follow the lead which has been given by the Federal Treasurer by allowing similar or extended concessions.

There are some compelling reasons, and I would like to indicate what I believe to be several of them. The first is in respect of land values and the very rapidly increasing valuations which have been applied not only to rural land, although at this stage I elect to deal with rural land. These high land values are established by purchasers who are not necessarily concerned with productivity or yield; and they are therefore not necessarily values which are determined by productivity or yield.

Often we find—perhaps not in the main, and I cannot support what I am saying with statistical facts—these land values are established by purchasers who wish to take advantage of certain concessions under the income tax laws.

The second reason is that the avoidance and the mitigation of probate duties on properties are not infrequently—and not without difficulty—arranged domestically within the family situation. Inasmuch as these duties may be arranged domestically, and certainly inasmuch as the arrangements may be costly to implement, they certainly add an additional cost burden on the farming operation.

The third reason is that, as I see it, the death duties—in whatever form they might be—undoubtedly contribute to a breaking down of the family farm situation. In so doing an adjustment can be

made in two ways, or perhaps in more than two ways; but both of the first two ways I consider to be undesirable.

Firstly, there may well be a reduction in the farm size—a reduction which may reduce a property to an uneconomic level, or to such a size that it can no longer support a family unit. It has an effect of, perhaps, driving the people concerned from the property and even out of the rural areas completely.

Secondly, such a situation may well facilitate the incorporation of these properties into much larger enterprises. Surely if that were to happen it would be in complete opposition and quite contrary to what I have always understood to be the fundamental purpose of probate and succession duties.

There is a third possibility; that is, the beneficiaries of such properties may be able to keep their heads above the water and retain the properties by virtue of obtaining greater financial accommodation from the banks and financial institutions. This might be effective if the financial accommodation was available; but even if it was effective it would certainly add a greatly increased burden to those properties, and would once again contribute to the features I have mentioned—what I regard to be an unnecessary cost burden on the properties, and ultimately this may be the cause of the families being split up and the properties passing into other hands, and frequently into larger units.

*Sitting suspended from 3.46 to 4.1 p.m.*

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I would now like to refer, for just a few moments, to the situation as I have seen it in recent times of some of the agricultural areas in Western Australia. During the month of July some members of the Liberal Party's rural committee, together with myself, toured some of the agricultural areas from Northampton to Esperance. We did this mainly to give us an ample opportunity to observe and discuss the situation which is arising in relation to two particular problems; namely, seasonal conditions, and the wheat situation which has arisen as a result of the introduction of a quota scheme.

As a general comment, I would say that this tour or trip did, in fact, give us the opportunity to gain a very valuable experience indeed. I am pleased that having made the trip and having conveyed some observations to the Government, I have been able to note that the Government has been prepared to anticipate, or certainly to make some genuine endeavours to anticipate what might well be a serious situation in some of our livestock and wheatgrowing areas.

This matter has been well aired in the Press—and certainly appropriate comments have been made and descriptions

have been given in this House—so I will confine myself to just some passing references to the situation which I consider to be the more serious; and that is in relation to water supplies.

We have been very fortunate indeed for a good number of years in Western Australia as we have been blessed, generally speaking, with good seasons. This is not the position overall, because there are some places which have suffered either through unduly wet conditions or as a result of disease in various parts of our crop growing areas. However, in the main, they have been good years.

I suppose one can be led into a belief and thus tend to forget that in this country—and I understand it to be the driest continent in the world—a drought could be just around the corner.

Whilst we appreciate that a comprehensive water supply scheme, with its modifications, is a wonderful one, we must realise that in the drier and inland areas the comprehensive scheme, inasmuch as it is a reticulation scheme, could in times of severe drought, perhaps dwindle away to nothing more than a trickle of water. This is something we hope will never happen, but this season does give us an indication that we must not forget it is something that could happen. I would say that the present situation must remind us that there is a need for the individual, as well as for Governments, to conserve water wherever it falls. Certainly this would apply in the populated livestock areas. In other words, just because we have a comprehensive water scheme is not a reason in itself for us to discontinue water conservation.

I instance the key dam scheme, for which I believe my colleague, Jack Heitman, can take a great deal of credit. However, in my view, this is worthy of far greater extension both in and outside the comprehensive water supply scheme area.

Despite the drought and semi-drought conditions which prevail at this moment in some of our areas, I did form one strong impression from the trip we made which is useful to me on this occasion, because we visited areas that we had not seen for a number of years. One was able to obtain a picture of the areas as a whole; and the first impression I gained was of the very high standard of farming operations which are being conducted throughout our agricultural districts. I think it is a standard or level of which the farmers themselves can be very proud, and also something of which the State as a whole can be proud.

In addition, one is left with a very convincing impression as to the efficiency of the farming operations which are being

conducted despite problems and difficulties. I say that quite deliberately, as one with knowledge and experience of the farming areas; and I say it also because all too frequently we hear the charge made, or the question asked as to whether our farmers are efficient to a point where they can maintain their position in this highly competitive world—in this world where produce surpluses seem to be heaping upon us, left, right, and centre. There is this great efficiency; and it is an efficiency which I believe we should extol rather than decry.

This leads me to express great confidence in Western Australia's agricultural industries; and it is my belief they are basically sound, despite the difficulties and despite the fact that there is a necessity, as well as a desirability, to provide assistance in one form or another at Government level. However, our agricultural industries are essentially sound.

In my view the agricultural industry is so mature that with a degree of understanding on the part of people, and on the part of the Government, and without the elements of panic and despair which do arise from time to time, it can adjust itself despite all of its present-day problems. It cannot do this alone, but it can play a great part in adjusting to some of these problems and still manage to survive in a most satisfactory fashion and at a satisfactory level. I realise it may not be easy to achieve this. To these problems we must all devote a great deal of study. I say this not only from the point of view of the good of the individual; I am talking in terms of the good of the economy of Western Australia and Australia—that part of it which gains its subscription from the enterprise of our farming industries.

The problem is not an easy one. We have, firstly, the implications of seasonal conditions; and, secondly, the situation which has arisen in relation to wheat and produce surpluses. I do not refer simply to the effect this will have on a farmer today, or how he will arrange his own domestic requirements, but more particularly to the fact that it has implications in it which must be watched.

By way of example, there is the impact these conditions will have on financial institutions, machinery firms, and more particularly, I suppose, on the entire social life of the country towns—the centres of these areas. On the introduction of a wheat quota scheme, a person may be given a quota of, say, 5,000 or 10,000 bushels of wheat. This may or may not be adequate for his purposes, but whatever it does to him, it will certainly have its repercussions on the local community, and right down the line. Its effects will even be felt in the industrial world, and in the metropolitan industrial world, too.

So I would like to think that in any examination of the implications of seasonal conditions and the situation which may arise over restricted deliveries, it will be borne in mind there is going to be a greatly reduced income in our farming areas. There is a need for a special group to examine these implications. I would not go so far as to nominate what the special group should be, but it should certainly be expert in its contacts and its affiliations with all related institutions, not the least of which would be the financial and banking institutions. A great deal of tolerance must be exercised and a great deal more understanding exercised and implemented in dealing with these problems.

We have not simply got the case of the new-land farmer—the person who will suffer in particular as a result of a reduction of wheat quotas. We must go further than this in the examination of the problem. As members of Parliament we certainly cannot write these people off because they are individuals and, to us, everyone is an important person. So we must be prepared to take note of the need for a proper examination of the situation to see whether the effects of these related conditions can be minimised or, in some cases, mitigated.

I conclude on the note that I believe there is a responsibility on government in this sphere. While I do not mean to minimise or to suggest there is any lessened responsibility on the part of individuals or lessened responsibility on the part of industry as a whole, the fact is there is still a responsibility on government to bring together all those people who have an interest—in some cases, a vested interest—in the continuation of a profitable industry at a satisfactory level of operation.

It is my hope that the Government will give attention to the problems I have mentioned. I regret to say that at this stage of our history of development, it is tragic that we in Western Australia are faced with a curtailment or restriction of anything at all.

The effects are felt in so many diverse directions. The fact is this is the situation we are faced with and this is the situation which, I believe, we can overcome. It will need the right sort of attitude because it is a situation which must be faced with nothing but the best. I would like to conclude with the hope that the industry, as well as the Government, will devote some thought to these suggestions.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery.

*House adjourned at 4.16 p.m.*