

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 2nd August, 1962

CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Children's Court Cases : Percentage Involving Children of Widows and Deserted Wives	136
Driver's License Suspensions—	
Drivers and Vehicles Involved in Accidents	136
Fatalities Prior to and During General Suspension	136
Total Accidents Notified Prior to and During Suspension	136
Kalgoorlie-Menzies-Leonora Black Road—	
Date of Completion	137
Menzies-Leonora Route	137
Largactil: Removal from Free List—Effect on Psychiatric Out-patients	137
BILL—	
Supply Bill, £25,000,000—	
2r.	137
Com. ; report ; 3r.	151

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 4 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

CHILDREN'S COURT CASES

Percentage Involving Children of Widows and Deserted Wives

1. The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON asked the Minister for Local Government:

Of the total number of cases appearing before the Children's Court, what percentage are the children of widows and deserted wives?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

Percentage of children appearing in Children's Courts who are children of widows—6.62 per cent. Percentage of children appearing in Children's Courts who are from broken homes—20.45 per cent.

The department's statistics refer to "children of widows" and "children from broken homes." If the percentage of children of "deserted wives" is required, this will be obtained, but will take a little time.

Figures given are the average of statistics for the years 1959-60-61.

DRIVER'S LICENSE SUSPENSIONS

Fatalities Prior to and During General Suspension

2. The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON (for The Hon. J. G. Hislop) asked the Minister for Mines:
 - (1) In the three months prior to the more general suspension of driver's licenses as a traffic penalty, how many persons lost their lives in traffic accidents—
 - (a) in the country; and
 - (b) in the metropolitan area?
 - (2) In a period of three months during which the more general suspension of driver's licenses as a traffic penalty was in force, how many persons lost their lives in traffic accidents—
 - (a) in the country; and
 - (b) in the metropolitan area?

Total Accidents Notified Prior to and During Suspension

- (3) How many accidents were notified in the periods and areas relative to Nos. (1) and (2)?
- (4) What months were used for comparison?

Drivers and Vehicles Involved in Accidents

- (5) How many drivers of taxis were involved in accidents during the period relative to Nos. (1) and (2) or lost their licenses for speeding?
- (6) How many drivers of Government transport or business trucks were involved in accidents or lost their licenses for speeding?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) (a) Country, 34.
(b) Metropolitan area, 23.
- (2) (a) Country, 28.
(b) Metropolitan area, 24.
- (3) (a) Country, 745.
(b) Metropolitan area, 4,213.

Second Period:

- (a) Country, 233 for April. No record for May and June.
(b) Metropolitan area, 4,137.
- (4) January, February, and March, v. April, May, and June.
- (5) No segregation record kept of taxis involved in accidents. Thirteen taxi drivers lost licenses for speeding in January, February, and March, and ten during the months April, May, and June.
- (6) These figures are not obtainable.

LARGACTIL: REMOVAL FROM FREE LIST

Effect on Psychiatric Out-patients

3. The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON asked the Minister for Mines:

Will psychiatric out-patients in Western Australia be affected by the Commonwealth Government's decision to take the drug largactil off the free list?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied: Psychiatric out-patients attending a psychiatrist at an approved hospital or clinic will not be affected.

As far as the mental health services are concerned arrangements have been made with the Commonwealth Department of Health in Western Australia to cover the position satisfactorily at all their clinics.

KALGOORLIE-MENZIES-LEONORA BLACK ROAD

Date of Completion

4. The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON (for The Hon. E. M. Heenan) asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) What is the approximate date when the black road running northwards from Kalgoorlie will be completed as far as Menzies?
- (2) What is the approximate date when the same road will be completed as far as Leonora?

Menzies-Leonora Route

- (3) (a) Has a decision yet been made as to whether the section of the road between Menzies and Leonora is to follow the present road or to go via Koobyne?

- (b) If so, what is the decision?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) It is expected that the road will be primed with bitumen as far as Menzies towards the end of the current financial year.
- (2) Next year the sealing of the last 19 miles into Menzies will have to be provided for, and it is proposed, subject to funds being available, to provide a substantial allocation for extension of construction towards Leonora. The estimated cost of construction, priming, and sealing the road from Menzies to Leonora, a distance of 65 miles, is £380,000, and it is probable that funds can be allocated to complete the work over a period of two or three years from June 1963.
- (3) Having regard to many considerations, the better route is deemed to be along the existing road.

SUPPLY BILL, £25,000,000

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 1st August, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North—Leader of the Opposition) [4.7 p.m.]: I noted the comments of the Minister when he introduced this Bill in regard to the opportunity it provides and the latitude it permits, because discussions on Supply Bills are as old as Parliament itself. Indeed, any student of political history will find plenty of references to the words "grievances before Supply" in the *Hansards* of both the British and the Australian Parliaments. That has always been the rule, although not always availed of.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is right.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I can recall occasions when I brought in Supply Bills. I never got away without a discussion, irrespective of whether I gave a full or meagre description of what the Bill contained, what it implied, or what the Government's intentions were. So none of us has to beg anybody's pardon for speaking to a Supply Bill.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I hope you have not taken me wrongly, as that was not my intention.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I thought I would make it quite clear. However, I am not taking the Minister up wrongly. I do not think the Minister made any suggestion that discussion should be curbed or restricted in any way, but I am making it plain that the right is there and that the privilege of airing a grievance or making a speech before supply is granted it as old as Parliament itself.

Before dealing with financial matters I intend to touch upon one or two things which affect the European economic community, or what is commonly known as the European Common Market. I know very well the old adage about somebody or other or some sort of people rushing in where—I could give the exact quote, Sir, if you like—angels do not; but instead of that I would point out there are things which all of us could quite helpfully examine, properly express, and usefully explore.

The situation of the United Kingdom in this matter is the one which is having a far-reaching effect in all discussions, and the one which is creating fears in some places as to the general outcome. All of it, or most of it, emanates from the consolidation of the interests of those who have come to be known as the Big Six—Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg.

After the Treaty of Rome the situation became quite obvious. There had to be a consolidation of interests, as anyone outside that bloc had to be subject to tariffs and all sorts of arrangements which such countries were able to apply in their own defence and in their own interests.

Britain herself very quickly became entangled because of the importance of the market on the Continent for many of Britain's manufactures. Indeed, so serious is the situation today that such instrumentalities as the Imperial Chemical Industries and other large organisations are investing tens of millions of pounds on the Continent so that they will be in, which ever way the decision goes.

All of this has had a serious impact on industries in the United Kingdom, because money for industry which should, and normally would, be spent within the United Kingdom is being invested within the continent of Europe. One of the most magical things in all of the European Common Market arrangements has been the ability of Germany and France to resolve the difficulties of centuries—perhaps the most amazing achievement of all from their point of view.

A close analysis of what the trade means to Great Britain and to the British Commonwealth clearly shows how disadvantageously Canada, Australia, and New Zealand in particular, and also India and other parts of the British Commonwealth will be placed. But the British situation is almost wholly a political one.

The interest of America is, of course, very easy to see. We had the remarkable situation which America brought about with regard to Marshall Aid. It was a remarkable happening in the late '40's when America's European recovery programme, as it was officially called, involved £5,312,000,000 in Australian currency to be spent in the post-war years in the restoration of Germany and its industries, and in the restoration of the broken European countries, quite outside the foreign aid which has since gone on to assist other undeveloped countries in other parts of the world.

America taxed her people many pounds per head—£37 10s. per head of her population—for two decades in order to afford the assistance she gave to those countries, despite the fact that she was one of the victors while those other countries were supposed to be the vanquished.

The result has been startling. The countries that were supposed to have lost the war have made an extraordinary recovery, to the degree of having thousands of millionaires within their borders. Germany itself has 3,000 listed and known millionaires. We would not find that number in age-old Britain, which was bled white during the war and since.

So we get an almost incongruous situation being faced in Britain because of political circumstances rather than economic ones, but including the latter. Britain is faced with the decision of saying whether she shall enter the European Common Market and, if so, upon what terms. It is no wonder that, with all the inconsistencies which this topsy-turvy world experiences in international relationships, the solution is, even in the exploratory stages between the agents of the different nations, a difficult one to determine.

There are very many imponderables in the situation as it exists today, because if Britain enters the European Common Market—and I am thinking for the moment of one commodity affecting Australia and New Zealand—it is most likely that some of the Scandinavian countries—certainly Denmark—will follow suit. Denmark will find an outlet for much of her dairy products in the European Common Market—produce which now goes to Great Britain.

It might be that room could be found, therefore, for some Commonwealth products because of that one move. I repeat that so many of these things are imponderables and cannot be judged; but, because of the geographical situation, they are most likely to arise.

I have mentioned that if, as at present, Britain remains outside and British manufactures are to be excluded from the European Common Market by a common tariff, we will find a continuing flow of vast sums from Britain into the European scene; and that can only mean a very serious situation for the British population with regard to employment and production.

In addition, we find that the situation is prompting short-term arrangements and short-term agreements between Great Britain and such countries as Russia. At the moment Britain has short-term agreements with Russia to accept wheat in exchange for British manufactures. Britain's entry into the European Common Market will cause a diversion of this trade and enable Britain to buy wheat elsewhere.

I am giving simple illustrations of a very involved subject to show just how many may be the points on which men, dealing with the subject around the conference table, will be at variance.

Dr. Hislop, in the course of his remarks last evening, made some very interesting comments in connection with the potential markets in Asian countries. We must accept the situation that a lot of our trade in Asian countries, in spite of our endeavours to maintain it, has diminished. I live within sight of a very efficiently-run flour mill. I can recall year after year seeing its lights on all night the whole year round. It is now a long time

since three shifts were worked to cater for the export trade. All the talk we hear so glibly from many people, that we can counter what we are going to lose if Britain enters the European Common Market by exploiting the near Asian markets and the markets to the north of us, is not as simple as many people pretend.

The figures with regard to communist China are most interesting—figures which show a trade potential stepped up and exploited by Australia. If we examine the trend from 1959-1960 until the end of April this year—the latest figures I have—we find that the value for all exports to communist China has increased to about £53,000,000 a year. The figure has swelled from £6,438,000 in 1956-57 to over £52,750,000. This is a remarkable increase. The first purchases were, of course, paid for in cash, and others by instalments. Australian taxpayers subsidise some exports to Communist countries.

That sounds very serious; but if we are to consider Asian markets, we have to accept the situation that hundreds of millions of pounds worth of produce from this country will be involved as likely sales—as likely debits to be raised against those countries—and they will have to be paid for. How are they to be paid for? Are they to be paid for by purchases from Asian countries, or by purchases of products of communist countries?

We have not cavilled at Australia having resident Russian wool buyers in past years, because of the vast quantities of wool Russia purchased from Australia. We have not worried very much about the search for markets when we have, within reach, £60,000,000 worth of sales per year to communist China; and sales running into tens of millions to other communist countries.

But there will come a point when trade, and the acceptance of trade under conditions and terms of all kinds, will have to supersede other sorts of terms and conditions. This will affect relationships. I think we must face that one.

No matter how much we abhor the thought of communism anywhere near this country in our time, we have to be prepared to regard it somewhere within the framework of finding markets for so many of our products. I regard it very seriously.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: You can deplore it, but you can't ignore it.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: We can't ignore it; and we must search for markets within those boundaries, little knowing at this stage how our commodities are going to be paid for by them.

If we examine any comparison of trade between communist countries and the United Kingdom, or the European Common Market countries and, say, Japan, we get

a picture which shows that no communist country or group of communist countries is comparable, in exports, to the United Kingdom or Japan. Exports to the United Kingdom over a period of ten months in 1961-1962 totalled approximately £168,000,000. Exports to Japan totalled £157,000,000. Although China is represented in this new trade expansion, the figure represents only 6 per cent. of Australia's trade. Therefore, it does not seem to matter very much. But if we have to consider the matter in terms of hundreds of millions of pounds—I think Mr. McEwen's last figure was £177,000,000, at least, in four or five industries—there is certainly a lot of serious consideration at a very high level to be given to the future of Australia's production.

A serious point, I think, is that Britain in recent years has not been modernising her plant by new investment to the extent that she should, with the result that British industry is lagging. This is aggravated by the fact that whereas before the European Common Market came into existence the annual investment by the United States in the United Kingdom exceeded the annual investment by the United States in the whole of Europe, that is not the position today. By far the larger share is now going to the European Common Market.

I merely raise these points for consideration. I have had an opportunity of studying the very thoughtful presentation of the case by Sir John Crawford and many other eminent thinkers on this subject, including some from abroad. All of us are prone, and must continue to be prone, to consider this matter selfishly. We have no alternative; because our proportion, *pro rata*, of exports is so high that we are dependent upon fruitful markets outside these shores, and we must continue to adopt an Australian national outlook in seeking the preservation of our own future and the extension of our own industries.

I suggest that as several members of this Chamber have given this matter considerable thought and much study, perhaps a little later on in the session a motion on this subject might give us an opportunity to discuss it. It would be not only a healthy exercise, but it could bring about the clarification of a number of points which are likely to be very confusing unless properly ventilated.

I now wish to speak for a few moments on financial matters. The Supply Bill, always brought down as soon as is practicable after Parliament assembles, differs very little from year to year; and it has not differed over a long period of years, except in the amount of money sought to be granted for supply. But I am sorry to say that the trend towards giving as little information as possible in published figures has been ever increasing;

and in this respect I do not mean at the time of the introduction of the Bill, but that so little is presented to Parliament nowadays in respect of financial matters, except once a year.

One can find some information, if one knows where to look for it, which can act as a guide as to the trends of Government expenditure, and as to the sums of money Governments are handling in different funds. But it seems to me that Parliament has before it as a rule the job of extracting this information, and Parliamentarians find a great difficulty in obtaining it. All we know as a general summary on this occasion is that immense riches have fallen into the lap of this Government during the past financial year. No Government in the history of Western Australia has been so blessed with riches; no Government has had so much money to spend from so many sources. In the past three years there has been an increase of over £3,000,000 in loan funds.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The reward of good work.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Nothing of the sort; it is purely through fortuitous circumstances, as I shall show, without any chance of that interjection being a fruitful one. The receipts for the past 12 months overall were £74,925,785, representing an increase of over £12,000,000 in the last three years—more than double the Budget of a few decades ago. An analysis shows that the receipts from the Commonwealth exceeded £36,000,000 from the three normal sources; but, in addition, simply because of the uncomfortable feeling of the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister following the elections, and particularly the Queensland results which had some very serious repercussions and gave much cause for thought, we found this State invited to a conference—and its representative went almost unwillingly—where ultimately the split-up meant a £5,000,000 gift to the State to alleviate the unemployment which the Premier said did not exist.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Why do you say we went unwillingly? Why do you say that?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I said "almost unwillingly"; and that would be right because the Premier said he did not think there would be any results from the conference—and I can quote that from the Press if the Minister would like me to do so. The Premier said he could see no reason for the conference that the other Premiers were trying to have called by the Prime Minister; but £5,000,000 fell into this Government's lap as a result of that conference.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It was purely a political move on the part of some other Premiers to have the conference, and you know that that is so.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I think the Prime Minister went into a tailspin when he lost so many seats, and because there were such repercussions in Queensland.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: He went into a tailspin when he lost his tail, and not before.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: That was the cause of it; there is no doubt about that. A £5,000,000 gift for the unemployed was given to this State early this year; and, in addition, not only were the normal payments of contributions for interest and sinking fund, and the usual grant under section 96—and after all that is still well over £6,000,000—and the assistance under the financial assistance grant of £30,000,000—the old Financial Emergency Tax Reimbursement Act—made, but this Government had in all from Commonwealth sources nearer to £40,000,000 than any other figure.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: And £11,000,000 less than South Australia.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The Minister is still not satisfied.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You were not when you were the Treasurer.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It would not take me long to enumerate some of the good works done in this State when, as Treasurer, even with a balanced Budget in difficult circumstances, and with one-quarter of the revenue of this Government, I was able to see progress made which I could relate to the House; but as I do not want members to become disinterested or to go to sleep, I shall not go into the details.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: But with a compensating cost factor.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Exactly, but even allowing for the compensating cost factor, no Government has been so blessed as this one has. Let us have a look at the loan programme. This Government has £3,000,000 more loan money a year to spend for all public works. That has been the experience of this Government—money showered upon it from every source.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You don't deplore that, do you?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I deplore the fact that a lot of things which are claimed to be such achievements are illusory, although some of them are real; and I deplore the fact that in spite of all the money that has fallen into the lap of this Government the deficit could not be reduced below £964,000. One of the very serious matters which I complain about is that I think that from about the 30th June, until these figures were released, there must have been quite a lot of juggling so that the figure with the adjustment

of loan moneys and revenue, would be down below the £1,000,000 mark. That is a safe anticipation.

We have nothing to guide us at the moment, but I do not think there is any doubt about my statement in that regard. However, I do say that the deficit is far too high if we look at what this Government has enjoyed, and the manner in which some of its money is being spent. If we look at the loan commitments I think we will find, luckily, that one unfortunate item disappears from it this year—I think the last advance to the Cockburn Cement Company has been made. That was a dreadful business; cheap money given to an organisation of a kind that has no consideration whatever for any of the units of population in this country. It received £500,000 to start with and £100,000 a year from our loan funds until last year.

There has been no information in regard to a lot of the matters which I think Parliament should know about, and which many people are entitled to know about, and would like to know about, in the figures which have been presented to us since the end of the financial year. If members have a look at them they will see that all we know about it so far is what appeared in *The West Australian* of the 13th July. Indeed, some of it is like the mystery that surrounds the production of cement by the company I have referred to—this well-conducted monopoly which has the ability to charge far too much for cement and has the ability to disguise and not disclose its production. It shrouds its activities in mystery; and that is the stage we will reach in the affairs of the State unless we are able to get a more complete dissection of the figures at the end of the financial year than we have been able to get so far.

But, for a moment or two, let me get back to the Cockburn Cement Company. I would think that, as sure as the sun rises in the east, one day the happenings of today will be investigated—the generous loan provisions which have been made for the company's use, and the cheap money it has received; and the company's ability to charge pounds more per ton for cement in this State than some of the other States is not a very nice state of affairs, especially when the Government is one of the greatest, if not the greatest, purchaser of that commodity.

I would like to be in a position to know how much more the Ord River project is going to cost for one item alone—cement—because we will be using cement manufactured by the Cockburn Cement Company. It has been possible to import cement into Australia at pounds less per ton than it could be purchased in this State. It is possible to buy cement of Australian manufacture at prices considerably below what is paid for it in

Western Australia; and yet we cannot get any published statement or any review in regard to the position. In the last statistical returns not even the production of cement is available for publication. I suggest that is not a very nice state of affairs.

There is only one other matter to which I should like to refer, and that is the paucity of information available to the general public in connection with the results of drilling for oil by the major companies drilling in Australia. Almost in every day's issue of the Press we find there is a report from some company or other that some well or another has reached a depth of a certain footage; or that since the last published figures certain things have happened—either the core has been of a certain kind or the hole has been reamed, or gas has been encountered, or fluorescence has been seen, or something else has happened. Some wells have gone down to 11,000 feet; others have been called by different names and have gone to shallower depths for the purposes of the company doing the drilling; many drills have been put down in districts within areas held by different companies, and so on.

I hope that all of the information which is necessary for the Government to adduce what is happening geologically, information as to the likely prospects of oil, and a description of the company's anticipations, will be made available to the public. I think there is a lot of information which must of necessity be closely held and kept in confidence. There is no doubt about that.

I also think, however, that the public which is finding some of the money, the Governments which are finding substantial parts of it, and the people whose areas are being controlled should have more confidence placed in them. I do not know how much our Minister for Mines could tell the public. I do not know how much of a positive analysis of the information reaching him and his officers could be made public.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is the point, of course; namely, how much can be made public at this point of time.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I think it is very important that there should be no clouding of the verbiage, or anything mysterious in the geological phrasing. For example, we were told that the Wandagee hole was a certain type of hole, and therefore was only to be taken to 2,000 feet. It is quite interesting terminology, but what does it all mean?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You are referring to the difference between a stratigraphic hole and a wildcat hole?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Yes. But why has not the public been told? Why has not more confidence been placed in the

public? The point will arise ultimately. There will be a time when legislation will come before this Parliament; and I seriously suggest to the Minister that the legislation will be considered a lot more easily, and understood and passed a lot more quickly, if we know where we are heading.

While I am not prepared to accept all the fears that have been expressed by the public, I would say that it would be much better if the public were given a better understanding of the situation. I ask the Minister, within the opportunity he has through his department, and his officers, to pass that information on to us. If he is not getting that information—the information that he should get—then Parliament will certainly help him to get it.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: We are getting all the technical information that can possibly be given. When a stratigraphic hole goes down I usually say so; when a wildcat hole goes down I also say so. I give as much information as I possibly can.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I think that is possibly right.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It is right.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: But I think the company for its part has a more far-reaching responsibility to tell the public some things, even the sort of things which the Minister, because of his obligation to office, is not able to disclose. No one wishes any breach of confidence; and, in my view, the Minister will be the last to break such a confidence.

But I do think the public is entitled to more explanation—more simple explanation—than it is getting at the moment. If this were done I think that Parliament would find it much easier later to be convinced by the Minister of the necessity for certain legislation, which I am sure he will have to bring to us sooner or later.

THE HON. A. L. LOTON (South) [4.50 p.m.]: Following on what Dr. Hislop had to say last night in regard to the provision of meat for our near-Asian neighbours, I have been concerned for some time over an article I read in an Eastern States paper, regarding something which has been put into practice in Victoria. I will read most of the article to members, because I have followed this up with an approach to the Minister for Agriculture. When one considers the figures I shall make available, as a result of the information provided me by the Minister, one will realise just how huge a market is available for the dairy-ing districts of this State. The article I am about to read is taken from the *Weekly Times* dated the 28th February, 1962. It

is headed "European Countries can Teach us Much on Growing Veal" and reads as follows:—

A dairy farmer at Menzies Creek (Victoria), intends to set up a pilot battery house for veal production this year. It will be based on European lines, each calf being stalled in a separate pen and fed entirely on a special skim milk powder.

The farmer is Mr. Ken Schoeffel, former general manager of Welch Perrin & Co. Pty. Ltd. From what he saw on a recent world tour he claims that Australia is wasting tremendous potential for veal production from her dairy calves.

In a letter to the Editor of *The Weekly Times* Mr. Schoeffel says:

Nearly a year ago I wrote to a newspaper pointing out that 4 million odd dairy calves would be born in the following six months. Of these, 800,000 heifers would be reared, after a fashion, for herd replacements, 1,600,000 would be slaughtered for "veal" at an average dressed weight of under 40 lb. and 1,000,000 would just die of disease or neglect.

This million dairy calves that "disappear" each year is one available means of producing more meat.

Again about half of the 1,600,000 wretched little "vealers," which dress out at about the same weight as a decent sized fat lamb, could be grown into a more valuable meat supply.

Recently I returned from a four-month world tour.

Holland leads the way in producing each year now 450,000 prime veal calves of a type that no Australian farmer has ever seen.

These calves are sold at about 13 weeks. They weigh from 240 to 280 lb. on the hoof and dress out at about 60 per cent.

The meat is of superlative quality and is a delicacy all over Europe. It is a new industry.

The Dutch farmers I spoke to were getting nearly a £40 average for these calves, which makes it a £20 million industry in Holland.

France and Belgium with veal calf production now nearly 300,000 and 200,000 respectively, are in the business, too. Switzerland, Germany, England and Italy are all coming in fast.

There is a big difference between raising heifers for herd replacements and producing this high quality "white" veal.

The feeding and housing of the veal calf is highly scientific. Housing is generally in 40 to 50 calf units. Special attention is paid to insulation and ventilation with a 70 degrees F. constant temperature and freedom from draught as the aim.

The article then goes on to give certain details.

I contacted the Minister for Agriculture, drawing his attention to the article and asking him to make some inquiries. The Minister wrote to me on the 16th May as follows:—

I thank you for bringing to my attention the extract from the Melbourne *Weekly Times* of the 28th February titled "European Countries can teach us much on growing veal." The information therein is indeed interesting and the papers were passed on to interested officers.

A review of the situation in this State was made by the Superintendent of Dairying. He pointed out that although there are 125,000 dairy cows in this State statistical records show that as at the 31st March, 1961, there were 49,500 calves under one year of age. On the basis of calves slaughtered the previous year in registered slaughter houses an allowance of an additional 17,000 calves could be made. This means that on the basis of 95 per cent. of cows calving each year there are something over 50,000 calves which were not accounted for.

One knows where a lot of those go. Some of them are hit on the head and thrown to the pigs; some are hit on the head and buried, and others are hit on the head and burnt. They are just not an economical proposition. The letter continues—

The above figures suggest that within Western Australia a lot more calves might be saved and the possibility that a number of these may be used for the production of veal will receive further attention.

I think that tremendous possibilities exist in this direction. As soon as the man concerned returned he was able to get a permit to manufacture this special dairy food, which he talks about, in Australia. The demand is so keen—and skim milk is the basis of it—that he is not able to meet it. So much so that an article appeared in which the manufacturing firm apologised for the delay in supplying the materials, saying they could only make the product available in hundredweights at a time.

I hope the department has proceeded further with this matter. If some of this specially prepared food could be secured and the department could institute experimental feeding on the scale which this man has described as applying in Holland, I feel sure that the saving to this State would be great, even if the veal only registered half the weight. There is a good market in Western Australia for good veal, because there is practically no waste. There is no fat, and the bone is very small. For that reason I thought I should make the knowledge available to the House, and I trust the Minister will see that something is done.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [4.56 p.m.]: I would first like to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your reelection to the office you hold. I trust you will enjoy good health to carry out your duties as you have done in the past.

It is usually my practice on this Bill to deal with financial matters; although I am by no means an expert. On this occasion I wish to deal with something which is an urgent matter within the State, particularly to farmers and other country people. The matter to which I refer deals with the question of rating by shire councils.

I know that within quite a number of districts in the State there is a practice of accepting taxation valuations, which has caused a great deal of disturbance because of the number of anomalies created by such taxation valuations. I have taken quite an interest in this for some time, and have spoken on the subject in this House before.

Early in the year I received a draft proposal for an alternative system from one of my districts. This draft proposal contains some facts as to what has happened in those districts because of the shire authorities accepting taxation values. It is rather astounding to see from this submission the discrepancies that exist in adjoining shire councils as a result of these valuations.

I shall quote some of these, starting from the Cunderdin district as a basis—as has been done in this submission—where they have taken farms that have been divided by a shire council boundary to show their case in respect to the valuations. I will not quote names, but I would like to quote various properties.

There is one property part of which is in the Shire of Cunderdin, the other part being in the Shire of Quairading. The 2,337 acres in the Shire of Cunderdin are valued at £8,016, this being a little over £3 an acre. The adjoining portion in the Shire of Quairading, being 760 acres, is valued at £1,069 which is about 30s. an acre.

It is all very well for some to say that the two portions are composed of different types of land. On the average these properties would be very similar in type. The quality is either first class or second class as the case may be.

There are about seven or eight of these cases quoted in this particular sheet, and the variations are somewhat similar to the one I have quoted. In some instances they are greater and in others less, but not very much less.

I bring this matter forward principally because I know very well, and I believe other members of this House know too, that it is quite impossible, and has been for some years, for the Taxation Department to provide enough valuers to carry out regular valuations throughout the State. When I say regular, I mean perhaps every five years, which is necessary in order to keep this matter on a reasonable basis because so many anomalies occur.

I justify this by saying that one particular shire council area in my province is still on its original values; it has never had a valuation; and that particular shire council has been forced this year to raise its rating to one shilling in the £1 to bring in enough finance to cover its estimates. This particular shire adjoins the Shire of Cunderdin but for the purposes of these submissions it was too ridiculous to include it because the discrepancies between that shire and the adjoining one were so startling.

When one looks at the revenue derived by some of the shire councils one wonders how some of them operate in their respective districts. For instance, the total revenue for Armadale-Kelmscott—and these were figures received last year in answer to a question as to the revenue derived to the 30th June, 1961—was over £27,000; the Darling Range, now known as the Kalamunda Shire Council, received £36,000. Then, further out, Beverley received £21,000; Kellerberrin, on the same basis, £21,000. Then Koorda, which is a pretty large area, received a total of £12,562.

It appears to me that some of these shire councils—quite a number of them—are either not getting the revenue they should be getting, or the distribution of the rating throughout their districts is not on a fair and equitable basis.

If we turn to the Act we find that there are only two ways in which a shire council can make up its rates. These are either by accepting taxation values or appointing sworn valuers, and the cost to be borne by the shire council. The last-mentioned method is entirely out of the question as far as the shire council is concerned because of the immense cost to the shire council of having a valuation made. If valuations had to be made every five years with the trend of valuations—

or even every seven or eight years—the cost would be so great that it would make terrific inroads into their revenue.

In answer to a question the other evening, the Minister for Local Government informed me that at present no shire council was using a private qualified valuer under section 533 (2) (c) of the Local Government Act. That means that we have an almost new Local Government Act containing a provision which is already outmoded after a period of only 18 months. It is outmoded because it is not used.

Consequently the shire councils really have no alternative method except the adoption of taxation values; and I believe that the ratepayers within shire councils are entitled to propose to the local authority concerned some alternative method of rating in their districts, particularly when it may be many years before a valuation is made. Even when valuations are made many anomalies are created.

I submit that this matter should be taken up by the Local Government Department to evolve some reasonable alternative method to the acceptance of taxation values. With this object in view I made a submission recently to the Minister for Local Government, not as a complete answer to this problem, but merely as a basis upon which an alternative method could be drafted.

The proposals contained in the alternative suggestion were that shire councils be empowered to strike a rate per acre; that first-class and second-class land be rated at a single value; that third-class land be rated at a percentage of this rate; that non-arable land be at a low rate by comparison provided that its total area be not less than 5 per cent. of the total holding, or be regarded the same as the lowest class of land rated on the holding; and that classification acreages be supplied by the Commonwealth Taxation Department—although I do not think the department could keep up with it. I think these proposals have a lot of merit.

I have heard people ask, "What about the man 20 miles from the siding? He may have the same rate per acre as a man close to the siding." After all is said and done, what are ratepayers getting from the shire councils for their money? They are obtaining the amenities provided; but the main expenditure is on the road system of the particular shire council concerned. Whether a man is 20 miles from a particular town or siding, or whether he is two miles or even one mile away, the cost of those roads per acre probably works out just the same to each property, irrespective of the distance from the town or siding.

Some people say, "The land further out in most instances is second-class land while the land nearer to the towns is first class." Well we get back to modern farming methods when we consider this. What

has happened over the years, particularly since the war? A large amount of second-class country today is producing every bit as much per acre as is the first-class land.

Mention is also made in different circles about the cost of bringing this second-class land into production. Admittedly, a little more super might have to be used. Generally this is necessary with second-class land. On the other hand, there are other advantages with regard to clearing. The actual capital cost of the second-class land is, in the first place, a lot cheaper because of the lighter clearing which has to be done. All in all the actual cost to bring the land into production works out the same when it is compared with the returns.

In respect to the amenities provided, or the assistance granted, by a local authority for such amenities, everyone in the area has the same opportunity to make use of them, whether living 20 miles from the town or two.

Admittedly a man living 20 miles from the town has travelling costs to think of. He is at a disadvantage with regard to transport costs from his farm to the siding or town; but I believe that these balance out when we take into consideration all the factors I have just mentioned.

I had some notes given to me today by the Minister for Local Government on this particular matter and I would say that, naturally, coming from a Government department they signify that the department is going to stick to the principles of valuation, otherwise it would feel it was letting the Government down.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Do you think this Minister is hide bound?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: To a certain degree. The Minister wants to know what I mean by that. I noticed last year—I do not know whether the same situation will exist this year—that the Minister was very diffident about accepting any amendments to the local government legislation, other than those introduced by himself. His reason, submitted every time the occasion arose, was that it was a new Act and he wanted us to leave it alone for a while; he didn't want it amended yet.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I have one this year which you will like.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: But what do we pass legislation for? If we pass a particular piece of legislation and then 12 months later we find there is a need to amend it, there is no reason why we should not do so.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is why we have 100 Bills a year.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I quite agree with the Minister; and it would not matter if we had 150, as long as we could get

through them. That is the reason Parliament meets; and it should amend legislation even if we have to sit until the Christmas after next.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It might be all right for you!

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I would not mind if it were necessary to complete the legislation for the State.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It wouldn't be so bad if we could listen to some speeches that were a little less tedious.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): Order!

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: To return to the matter of valuations: How are these valuations made? A valuer enters a district and goes on to a property, but does not do every property in a particular district. He takes an average by going to certain properties. I do not believe this gives a true valuation of the properties in a district. I do not care what man he is or how good a valuer he may be, he cannot value a whole district unless he goes on every individual property and takes into consideration all the factors of each one; because under the Act he has to take, for a start, the total capital value of the property from which he has to deduct the value of the improvements in order to arrive at the unimproved capital value. The task of trying to assess, on an unimproved basis, the value of the land in just one district is an unending one.

In trying to value land without improvements, the valuer takes into consideration, in most instances, local sales. Very often such sales represent an inflated value; particularly in the country where a farmer purchases an adjoining property in order to enlarge his holding so as to make it an economic proposition for himself and his sons to work. Such a man would pay an inflated value in order to get the property because it adjoins his own farm. As a result, what he pays is not the true market value.

Some of these properties—I mention particularly the Cunderdin district—were valued as high as £6 an acre. I know the Minister will say that this matter has been adjusted, but that does not get over the fact that the valuations are still high; the valuations were based on inflated prices and not on the true valuations of the properties.

The figures I have quoted to the House show the huge anomalies that occur under our present system of valuation. If it were possible to obtain the services of sufficient sworn valuers to carry out this work efficiently, I would not be standing here addressing the House on this subject today. But I do not believe it is possible to obtain the services of enough sworn

valuers in this State, or even from outside the State, to carry out the work involved in valuing land, on the basis of unimproved capital value, for the purpose of rating.

Ours is not the only State that is in trouble over this matter, because of valuations being made irregularly. Only the other day I was talking to a Victorian—a man who moves about quite a bit in farming circles—and he said they had the same trouble in Victoria because of the inability of the department to deal with the valuations regularly.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: They work on annual values there.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Yes; and the authorities in Victoria cannot get the men to carry out the job. Victoria is a State with a bigger population than ours and a much smaller area, but they cannot get sufficient valuers there to do this work at regular periods.

The same position exists in the city of Perth in regard to valuations for water rating purposes. Some districts have been valued twice whilst other districts have not been valued at all. In some instances, up until recently, some districts have not been valued for years simply because there has been a lack of valuers to carry out the work.

How far are we going to get in this particular instance if we are going to let it drift in that manner; if we are unable to get valuers? Anomalies will arise from time to time and the ratepayers will be dissatisfied with the local authorities.

I hope the Minister will give serious consideration to this matter and will do something that will give the ratepayers an opportunity to agree to the inclusion of an alternative system in the Local Government Act in place of the useless alternative system which is at present in the legislation.

I would like to mention one factor in the submission I spoke about, and that is the classification of land involved in the proposal to rate the land on a per acre basis. That is quite easily overcome, in my opinion, by the local authority having a form printed. On this form the landowner would show the area of his holding and the classifications of the land. The landowner, of course, would be subject to a penalty if he supplied false information. That sort of thing is provided for in many Acts; and it would simplify the method of arriving at classification.

In regard to the striking of a rate per acre, it is only a matter of taking the total revenue derived from the area of the towns, and the small amount derived from third-class land and non-arable land, and then dividing the total amount required according to the estimates, which would be based each year on a figure estimated to be required, and arriving at a figure which would give the rate per

acre; but limiting that in the Act to a certain figure so that each shire authority that wished to rate under this system would get sufficient money to carry out its works programme over the year.

I ask the Minister for Local Government to go a lot deeper into this matter to see whether some means can be devised of making the matter of rating more equitable to the ratepayers and more satisfactory to the other people concerned.

THE HON. R. F. HUTCHISON (Suburban) [5.22 p.m.]: I have two matters I wish to bring before the House. I had intended to prepare my remarks more fully; I did not know the debate would end today.

The first question I wish to bring forward concerns the alteration I sought when I introduced an amendment to the Education Act so that teachers on bond in Western Australia would, if they married, be in the same position as similar teachers in New South Wales and would suffer no penalty; would be given compassionate leave should they be having a child; and would have two years extra granted to them so that they might fulfil their bond.

I was not asking for a bond teacher to be let off and not have to pay the bond—unless she suffered a very great hardship such as having a child who was afflicted in some way and needed the mother's full-time attention beyond two years. The Minister promised me that if I withdrew my—I forget how I was dealing with the matter at the time—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You tried to put a new clause in the Act.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: Yes. The Minister said that if I withdrew my amendment he would bring forward something that would be comparable with what I was suggesting and that it would please me just as much. So I withdrew my amendment; but this is what I find at page 820 of the *Government Gazette*—

(e) if the course of teacher training of the student is terminated by reason of the student marrying, no claim will be made by the Minister for repayment of more than one-half of the allowances received by the student as a bursar or during her course of teacher training.

That is portion of a new regulation under the Education Act; but that is nothing like what I sought. I wanted a female teacher on bond to be allowed, without penalty, to marry. That is what applies in other States, and I cannot see why it cannot be applied here.

Previously when I spoke on this matter. I asked that a female teacher should, for the time she was on bond, still be on the staff of the Education Department and not be penalised on account of her

marriage. I explained that it was an unfair penalty, and that if it was good enough for other Education Departments to allow their female student teachers to submit to this very natural inclination, there was no reason why we should have to have such a harsh provision here. I was not asking for the teacher to be relieved of her bond; because she enters into the bond quite honourably, and in ordinary circumstances she would be quite ready to pay it. But I think the condition that applies is harsh. A male teacher does not suffer this penalty; but if a female teacher marries she is sacked immediately and straight away becomes responsible for the whole of her bond in cash.

Last year I drew the attention of the House to the many hardships that occur; and I know they occur because I have received appeals in connection with this matter from the parents of some of the teachers. Had I known that the provision which I read from the *Government Gazette* is what the Minister had in mind, I would have tested my amendment in this Chamber. I do not think that the amended regulation does anything to relieve the situation. It is not fair that a woman who marries should, as a result, be immediately sacked. She might teach for many years after being married; and I do not think that for her to have to find the full amount of the bond, just because she marries, is fair.

I was accused here of having read *Lady Chatterly's Lover* when I put forward the human aspect of the case. Well, it takes two people—a man and a woman—to create a family; and, therefore, if it is fair for a man to be able to marry and continue in the department, it is just as fair for a woman, in the same circumstances, to be allowed to continue in her employment.

Our Public Service Act is very partial, in some circumstances, in regard to women. I draw attention to that, and I tell the Minister that I am not at all satisfied with the present amendment of the regulations. I do not think it will alleviate the situation. I will have more to say on this matter later in the session.

In fairness to the Minister. I have to continue with my remarks now. Yesterday I spoke about the Married Persons (Summary Relief) Act. When we were debating the Bill in 1960, I brought forward an amendment, and Mr. Logan had this to say—

I appreciate that the honourable member has been trying to accomplish a solution such as this for some years. Unfortunately, however, her amendment would not achieve what she desires.

He did not say why. Continuing—

It would create so many anomalies that I suggest to her that she withdraw this new clause for the time be-

ing, and I give her my promise, together with that of the Attorney-General, that the whole position will be investigated in readiness for the introduction of another Bill next session. The provision in this new clause means that the money will be paid to the Director of Child Welfare, but there is no provision for him to pay the money to anybody. That is the first obstacle.

If it is the intention of the provision that the director shall pay the amount which is payable under the maintenance—

I will break off there in quoting the Minister's remarks, because I do not wish to quote the whole text of his speech. When I spoke in reply, I said this—

I agree with the Minister that the matter does involve problems. My main concern is for women who have small families, and for women over 40 years of age who cannot find employment of any kind after being placed in the unhappy position of having been deserted by their husbands. I know that marriages these days are approached by the younger people more frivolously than used to be the case, and that anomalies could arise.

I will withdraw this proposed new clause provided the Minister will assure me, through you, Mr. Chairman, that he will bring the matter forward early next session. If he will give me that assurance I feel sure we will be able to do some good for the community at large. In view of the Minister's assurance of co-operation, I ask leave to withdraw this proposed new clause.

If members care to refer to *Hansard* they will see that during the whole of last session I kept asking the Minister whether he intended to bring down a Bill as early as possible. I received letters from him and I also interviewed the Child Welfare Department, but I did not obtain much satisfaction. I felt that the department was stalling. At the close of the session last year I asked the Minister this question in regard to the Married Women's Protection Act—

Will a Bill to amend the Married Women's Protection Act be introduced this session as promised by him last session?

The Hon. L. A. Logan replied, "No." I do not think that is right. One of the amendments I sought to this legislation was to ensure that it would not be obligatory for a wife, after she had proved her case through the court and had been awarded an allowance, to sign a warrant to imprison her husband if he did not pay. I said then that I thought the Child Welfare Department should be the one to handle the matter after the wife had been

through the ordeal of attending the court and proving that she was the wronged person. The Director of Child Welfare should be responsible for finding the payment for the wife by obtaining it from her husband.

Putting a man in prison because he had failed to pay a maintenance order is of no benefit to anybody. In my opinion it severs the last link between any married couple; and the last link might be the means of bringing them together and of their starting life anew for the sake of their children.

If the Child Welfare Department has been established for the protection of women and children I cannot see any reason why it cannot take the necessary steps to enforce the law to ensure that a husband meets his commitments after a maintenance order has been awarded against him. After all is said and done, a police officer has to serve a judgment summons on any person, so why cannot he serve a judgment summons on a husband if he does not fulfil his obligations which have been set down by a court of law? Further, once a person is put in gaol and has to be maintained he becomes a charge upon the Crown. I do not think that that system works out very well.

The psychology I use is this: If a man knew he was dealing with the police and the law after he had been ordered to meet a maintenance order, nine times out of 10 he would fulfil his obligation. However, under the existing practice he is fully aware of his wife's fears and failings and he plays upon them. I know men who have threatened their wives if they dare to suggest that they are going to take action against them. I know of other men who have smashed the household furniture for the purpose of intimidating their wives so that they will not take steps to imprison them; and in most cases the wives are absolutely helpless.

However, if a husband knew he had to deal with the law—and it can easily reach out its long arm to find him no matter where he is—the position would be entirely different and he would meet his commitments; whereas, at the present time, a wife is put to the expense and trouble of ascertaining his whereabouts before she can take action against him. If an amendment were made to the Act along those lines it would be found that the husband would pay the maintenance for which he was responsible. In any case, I feel quite sure that he would meet his commitments more often than he does at the present time, and all parties would be better off.

I know of women who suffer untold hardships; and I know some of them who, for the sake of their children, refuse to take action against their husbands in order to obtain maintenance. However, if the payment of maintenance was brought

under the jurisdiction of the Child Welfare Department it would be a different matter. I know how technical the department can get in these matters, but I think it is entirely wrong that there should exist a law which provides that a wife must sign a warrant to imprison her husband before she can be granted the assistance she deserves. I give the department credit for all it is doing, but I still cannot agree that the present system is right.

As a woman, I have tried to explain to the members of this House what miseries a woman suffers in these circumstances. I have seen some women who became so worried that they could not sleep and who eventually had nervous breakdowns. I am well aware of their miseries. When a wife is deserted by her husband the children still have to be fed, but she cannot leave them to fend for themselves and go out to work. In past years, and particularly in recent times, we have seen the problem of child delinquency highlighted in the Press; and, in my opinion, it is these circumstances in family life which bring about child delinquency. It is not always the fault of the wife that she is deserted. Whatever the cause is of the broken marriage, it is something that is between husband and wife, and the children should not suffer.

The wife must find three meals a day both for herself and her children and she has to wait to find out whether the husband is going to pay the maintenance order which has been issued out of the court. It is a harassing experience for a woman to attend the court to ask for charity for herself and her children. It was not for that that she started out on married life. I want the Minister to reconsider the matter this year, because I intend to do something about bringing in an amendment to the legislation. I am not satisfied with the treatment that has been meted out to me by the Minister; because I was very earnest in my endeavours and went to much trouble over the matter last year.

I do not want to make a long speech now, but I will raise the matter again during the session. When I brought the amending Bill before the House I was never more earnest in my life. I want the Minister to take proper cognisance of this matter to see whether he can do something about amending the Act. The provision is a stupid one and whoever initiated it did not show much commonsense. It is too bad that the matter should be again dragged through this House, but it is an abrogation of the truth for me to be told that something would be done about it and yet nothing has been done. I have had it put over me well and truly, and I do not intend to sit down and take it.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [5.41 p.m.]: First of all, I would like to thank those members

who have spoken for their contributions to the debate on the Supply Bill. No one would ever expect Mrs. Hutchison to sit down and suffer anything she did not like. What the honourable member did in regard to the provisions of the Education Act was to move to disallow a regulation that was laid on the Table of the House, but the House did not agree with the honourable member's motion. She asked me questions on the 9th November, 1961, as to whether amendments to the Education Act regulations were being prepared and I told her that at that time they were in the course of preparation. If my memory serves me correctly they were laid on the Table of the House during the last two or three days, if not opening day.

I do not want to encourage the honourable member—she does not need any encouragement—but if she desires to move to amend those regulations it is quite within her province to do so. However, I would suggest that the honourable member might follow the course which so many other members have followed from time to time, and that is to interview the head of the department and have a talk with him about the matter—

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: I have done all that.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: —and if satisfaction is not obtained the Minister himself can be approached. However, those regulations are now on the Table of the House.

I was most interested in the comments made by Mr. Wise. He entered a field about which I do not have as much understanding as I would like for my own information and edification. The question of the European Common Market is indeed most complex, and exactly what the effect on our country is going to be as a result of England joining or not joining the European Common Market is something upon which I would like to obtain a great deal more information than I have at present. However, the remarks of Mr. Wise on this subject were extremely interesting.

He commenced his speech by saying that it was unfortunate that more information was not given to Parliament when Supply Bills were introduced. It has ever been thus. I have had a look at the last Bill which the honourable member introduced in 1946 when he was Premier and Treasurer of the State. On that occasion the speech he made occupied one page of *Hansard*. The only other contribution was made by Mr. McDonald, the member for West Perth; when he sat down the question was put and the Bill passed through all stages.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It was a very good Government and the members were satisfied with it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is the sort of statement one would expect to hear.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: If I might correct the Minister, I was not complaining about the paucity of information during the introduction of the Supply Bill. I would like the Minister to read what I did say.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Neither was I endeavouring to do more than say that it was ever thus. I want to say that to a large extent I agree with the honourable member. As I told the House last night we do not get the Estimates here, and we do not have the opportunity to debate them vote by vote. Mr. Wise said that his was a good Government, but I shall not make any comment on that remark. It is interesting to notice the amount of money which the honourable member, as Treasurer, asked Parliament to vote in 1946. The amount was £2,700,000. That was the amount on which the State got along.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: In those days we had other Supply Bills introduced. You will find at least two for that year.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Bill asked that there be granted to His Majesty for the year ending the 30th June, 1947, a sum not exceeding £2,700,000.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That was the first Supply Bill introduced, to tide the Government over to the 1st August.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Would not that Bill be similar in complexion to the one before us?

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You will find another Supply Bill introduced after that one.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: This Government will also introduce two Supply Bills. I am not endeavouring to become argumentative; I want merely to say that it was a very meagre amount of money which was made available to the Government at that time. On this occasion the Government has come to Parliament and has asked for £25,000,000.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You know there is a different relationship in respect of payments to the States.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Many things were different in 1946. At a pure guess the basic wage was about £3, but in 1962 it is something in the order of £15.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I thought the last Budget I introduced was for about £16,000,000.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That may be so. I am dealing now with the statement made by the honourable member that the present Government has been blessed with loan funds rich beyond the dreams of all. I venture to say that the loan funds next year will be greater than those for this year. I hope that for the

years to come the loan funds allocated to Western Australia will continue to increase, because if they do not this State will not be able to continue developing. We are in that position; and, unfortunately, we have to stick with it unless some change is made between the Commonwealth and the States.

Under the existing arrangement, South Australia, which has a population not much more than that of Western Australia, receives £11,000,000 more than Western Australia.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: There has to be some amount to balance the fact that South Australia is a non-claimant State at the present time.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: But how long has it been a non-claimant State?

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That is why this situation has arisen.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Nobody knows more about that than the Premier of South Australia. Those facts do not alter the fact that Western Australia has to go along under a great disability.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I think you can hobble along with £75,000,000.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: We will hobble along as the honourable member says. In the years to come the amount of money which will be required by the State will become greater, because the demands will be greater, just as the demands today are so much greater than they were in 1946.

A terrific amount of money is required to be spent on merely two departments—Education and Health—in a growing State like ours. I wonder how many high schools there were in Western Australia in 1946. Today with the growth of the population and the necessity to build high schools, we have to think in terms of £350,000 and upwards for each. Naturally the expenditure is a lot greater than in 1946.

I do not propose to say any more about that matter except to make this comment: If I can be of any assistance to members—and I am sure this goes for my colleague, Mr. Logan—in obtaining information in respect of the finances of the State I shall be only too happy to obtain it for them if it is possible. I shall make a study of the speech made by Mr. Wise to see whether at a later stage I may be able to give him more information or make further comments on the points he raised.

The honourable member also referred to oil search. The situation in regard to legislation governing oil in Western Australia is that we have a fair Act covering petroleum. I was not responsible for its introduction; it was introduced in 1936 by a Labor Government. By all standards it is a pretty good piece of legislation. When we attended the conference of Ministers called by the Prime

Minister on the subject of oil we were able to demonstrate that in many respects the Western Australian Act was as well forward as much of the legislation in the rest of the world in respect of oil search.

There is no doubt that the time will come when amendments will have to be made. In some respects the areas that have been given to companies drilling for oil are too large; but this happens to be a legacy from the past when permits to explore for oil were granted. The search for oil in Western Australia has depended largely upon the efforts of one company, and I have always hoped that it would not get tired of searching.

This year the company is to spend more money in this connection, and it has already reached an expenditure of £18,000,000 in the search for oil in Western Australia. When I last granted oil areas I let it be known that the conditions were to be tougher than they were in the past because the accent on the search for oil in Australia has become quite obvious.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Keep up that attitude.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Despite the fact that there is commercial production of oil in Queensland, all the people in the know still regard Western Australia as the best bet.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Of course this is a very small volume of money spent in the search for oil when we think in terms of world figures.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is so. It is also a small volume of money when we take into consideration the huge areas the company holds in Western Australia. An appreciation of the situation is good for everybody, including the public of this State, especially when we realise that the company—after searching over a huge area—ultimately arrives at a small point in the ground and starts a drill, 9 to 10 inches in diameter.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I hope you will have more luck when you next kiss the bit.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I hope the company will find oil whether or not I do that. At least its efforts have produced some interesting signs. I would not like any comment of mine reported in the Press or made in this House to mislead the public in any shape or form to the point where they might be sorry for their investments. I am conscious of that, because a lot of people made money and a lot of people lost money when West Australian Petroleum Ltd. was able to find oil in the first hole drilled at Rough Range. We all know that people—

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: They mortgaged their homes to invest.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: They did; and it is not easy to stop that sort of thing. Nevertheless, I think we can help

by not giving information to the public which leads them to the point where they think they can invest their socks in the hope that they will get much more back.

Under the Petroleum Act these companies are bound to give the department all the geophysical and geological information it asks for. A lot of this is highly technical data and I do not profess to understand it. However, I do try to understand the rudimentary things, as it is my job to try to promote the search for oil by giving the particulars to people with the money and the willingness to come to Western Australia to see whether they can find oil here. What a wonderful thing it would be if oil were to be found in Western Australia!

This State is rich in many things. Therefore the statements made regarding our progress are not merely flamboyant ones; they are statements to the effect that Western Australia, by anybody's standards, is on the march. When one goes to the Eastern States today, and when one reads some of the world's financial papers, one finds that Western Australia has a better place in the scheme of things than it has had for a long time.

I did not make a statement like that to give the impression that the Brand Government did certain things in comparison with what was done in 1958. Be that as it may, I merely say that Western Australia has a much better place in the scheme of things than it has ever had. We have found that the State has many natural resources—particularly minerals—and this will help us develop along the lines we wish.

One could go on talking about this sort of thing for a long time, but it is not my intention to do so this evening. I am grateful that the House has allowed the Supply Bill to go through this afternoon. Without making any particular reference to an occurrence in about three weeks' time—something happens in the first week in September—I wish to state that I am anxious to fulfil that arrangement once again; and I feel sure that with the continued co-operation which members of this House give to Ministers in regard to the debates on legislation, we will, no doubt, have a pleasant session.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), and passed.

House adjourned at 6.4 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 2nd August, 1962

CONTENTS

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	Page
Albany Prison : Commencement, Construction, and Cost	156
Bentley Hospital : Size, Location, and Plans	157
Bottled Oxygen : Supply to Heart Cases	154
Collie Railway Facilities—	
Enlargement and Renovation of Goods Shed	159
Modernisation of Station	159
East Guildford-Midland Road : Median Strip	153
Government and Semi-Government Employees : Salaries	159
Hawker Siddeley Building Supplies Pty. Ltd.—	
Enforcement of Terms of Agreement	154
Rebate on Royalties, and Other Concessions	160
Houses for Natives : Number for Geraldton and Wonthella	159
Housing Commission Homes—	
Formula for Computing Rentals	156
Number Completed, Applications, and Allocations for 1959-1962	156
Housing in Swan Electorate : Applications for and Location of Homes	153
Inner Ring Highway : Purchase of Resumed Properties	157
Kindergartens : Government Assistance	157
Maddington Area : Suitability for Industrial Development	152
Medical Treatment in Metropolitan Area : Travel Concessions to Country Residents	156
Middle Swan General Hospital : Completion Date, Number of Beds, and Staff Housing	153
North-West Ports : Tonnages Shipped in 1960-1961 and 1961-1962	155
Ora Banda Water Supply : Effect of Shortage, and Repairs to Pipeline	159
Pearling in Western Australia : Value of Shell, Men Employed, and Tonnage Produced	159
Pemberton Timber Concessions—Permissible Intake : Restriction, etc.	153
Port Hedland : Provision of High School Hostel	155
Rail Transportation—	
Annual Tonnage of Freight	158
Distance and Freight Rate between Perth and Sydney	158
Safety Belts for Cars : Installation in Government Vehicles	160
Standard Gauge Railway : Linking Transcontinental Line to Broken Hill	158
Third Party Insurance : Application to Children Within Schoolgrounds	154
Water Supplies—	
Excess Consumption Accounts	152
Midland-Swan Area : Improvement in Supplies	153
Quota Increase and Excess Charges Reduction	153
Use of Fluoride	157
Western Australian Timbers : Use in Construction of United States Radar Station	155