

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 21st March, 1978

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Leader of the House) [5.04 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Wednesday, the 22nd March, at 3.30 p.m.

Question put and passed.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by the Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Attorney-General) and read a first time.

Second Reading

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Attorney-General) [5.05 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Last year an amendment to the Legal Practitioners Act was passed by Parliament which allowed the Director of Legal Aid to take up to four articulated clerks. It has since been drawn to my attention that that Act did not take into account the possibility that the director would be a legal practitioner from outside the State of Western Australia and who, consequently, could not satisfy the criteria laid down in the existing legislation.

This provides that a practitioner must be a "... person admitted and entitled to practise as a barrister, solicitor, attorney and proctor of the Supreme Court of Western Australia, or in any one or more of these capacities ..." and be of at least two years' standing in Western Australia.

The newly appointed Director of Legal Aid was admitted as a legal practitioner in South Australia and has applied to be admitted to the Supreme Court of Western Australia but he does not, of course, have the requisite standing of two years in this State as required by the Legal Practitioners Act. Nevertheless, he has the requisite standing in South Australia.

Under the existing terms of this legislation, he would not be able to take an articulated clerk, and

members will appreciate that this would defeat the object of the amendment passed last year, and also prevent four articulated clerks from securing positions.

The Legal Aid Commission has indicated that it is prepared to take four articulated clerks, but this decision is, of course, dependent on the passing of this Bill.

The amendment proposed in the Bill now before the House makes provision that the Director of Legal Aid may take up to four articulated clerks provided he is a barrister or solicitor, or both, of the High Court of Australia or of the Supreme Court of another State for a period of not less than two years' standing.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. Grace Vaughan.

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by the Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Attorney-General), and read a first time.

Second Reading

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Attorney-General) [5.09 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The proposal contained in this Bill is simple. It will establish for the purpose of evidence given in court, the time of sunrise and sunset in all parts of Western Australia.

Some difficulty has been encountered when Government officers are required to present as evidence in a prosecution the precise time that the sun has set or risen.

This problem arises in the enforcement of regulations in which the time of sunset or sunrise is an important factor such as the time a boat's navigation lights should be burning and the hours during which a vehicle's lights should be turned on.

Instead of having to call a technical meteorological officer on the occasion of each such court proceeding, it is proposed to publish the relevant times for varying places and dates in the *Government Gazette*. The production of the gazette would, under the provisions of the amending Bill, be accepted as *prima facie* evidence of the relevant times.

There will be a consequent saving in manpower and costs.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. Grace Vaughan.

PUBLIC TRUSTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by the Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Attorney-General), and read a first time.

Second Reading

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF
(Metropolitan—Attorney-General) [5.11 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

There are three basic proposals contained in this Bill. The first of these concerns amendments to sections 10 and 14 of the Act.

Section 10 provides that the Public Trustee may apply for an order for administration of the estate of a deceased person in certain cases.

Subsection (4) of the section applies to estates of which the administration has been left incomplete where the gross value does not exceed \$5 000. In such cases, the Public Trustee can make an election to administer in lieu of applying for an order.

Section 14 enables the Public Trustee, in cases similar to those set out in section 10, instead of applying for an order to administer, to file an election in writing whereupon he shall be deemed to be the administrator of the whole property as if a grant of administration had been made. The gross value of the estate in such cases must be less than \$5 000 as estimated by the Public Trustee.

The purpose of these sections is to save time which would otherwise be spent in the preparation and execution of formal documents through the Supreme Court's probate division.

The two sections involved were last amended in 1968, to the figure of \$5 000. As a result of inflation it is proposed to increase the gross value of estates to which sections 10(4), and 14(1) and (4) apply from \$5 000 to \$10 000.

The second proposal concerns amendments to sections 30 and 31. These are reciprocal sections to allow the Public Trustee to authorise officers in other States to administer the property of incapable persons and to empower the Public Trustee to act on the certificates issued by the proper officers in other jurisdictions.

It has been apparent for some time that these sections were not achieving the purpose for which they were created and have been the subject of discussion at a number of Public Trustee

conferences. Because of the different definitions of mentally ill persons in the Acts in other States and New Zealand, it has not been possible for the Public Trustee to utilise the sections.

To give members an idea of the problems being faced, I would cite the following example: The Public Trustee Act in Victoria gives the Public Trustee in that State, when so requested, the power to manage the Victorian estate of a person who has been certified as a "lunatic patient" in any other State. In Western Australia there is no such person as a "lunatic patient", the description here being an "incapable patient".

The amendment proposed has been made wide enough to encompass all incapable or infirm persons whose affairs are placed in the hands of a Public Trustee in this or one of the other States. The amendment will include New Zealand.

The third proposal of the Bill seeks to increase the Public Trustee's charges, including the minimum charges.

Whilst the Government is conscious of the need, wherever possible, to restrain increases in costs, inquiries have shown that the Public Trustee must receive an increase of revenue commensurate with the higher cost of performing services today, particularly with the amount of work done in relation to relatively small estates. In this regard the present fee of \$10 for estates up to \$200 is quite insufficient for the work involved.

Members will appreciate that many of the small estates placed with the Public Trust Office are those reported through clerks of courts, hospitals and the police where the beneficiaries are either unknown or unavailable. This results in extensive inquiries in tracing beneficiaries and establishing entitlements out of all proportion to the value of the estate.

Difficulties are also experienced in confirming the ownership of assets and their subsequent disposal in isolated areas.

Some small estates are, of course, less time-consuming than others from an administration point of view and to relieve the beneficiaries in those cases, the Public Trustee contemplates that provision will be made in the regulations to give him the power to reduce the rate or amount of the minimum fees prescribed.

In addition, it should be borne in mind that we have recently amended the Administration Act to enable widows or other next of kin who wish to do so to apply with the assistance of officers of the Supreme Court for direct administration, and they may thereby considerably reduce their expenses in administering estates.

Such estates may be attended to by the relatives without the intervention of the Public Trustee at all.

The fees and the percentages detailed in the Bill, including those covering the income from an estate, are still considered to be reasonable by today's standards.

To the extent that they result in an accretion of the receipts of the Public Trust Office they will reduce but by no means extinguish the current loss on expenditure.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. Grace Vaughan.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Standard of Dress: Point of Order

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Referring to my question without notice today, I raise a point of order, Mr President. I have looked at the resolution to which you referred me in respect of members' dress during sittings. It states—

That in the opinion of this House the convention regarding members' dress may be altered from time to time to permit Members, who desire to do so, to remove their coats during sitting hours should the atmospheric conditions, in the House, in the opinion of the President, warrant such modification of this convention.

I seek your ruling whether in your opinion atmospheric conditions in the House today are such as to allow us to remove our coats during the evening sitting.

The PRESIDENT: It is my opinion that the atmospheric conditions do not warrant any modification of the Standing Orders.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: FOURTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 16th March, on the following motion by the Hon. W. M. Piesse—

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. A. A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [5.18 p.m.]: I find myself in a bit of a quandary in respect of supporting this motion. While I congratulate my fellow member, the Hon. W. M. Piesse, on the way in which she so aptly moved the motion, I find I must stand up in this Chamber and agree with the new Leader of the Opposition in the Assembly. However, this is nothing unusual for me; as you know, Sir, I am a fair-minded person and I judge people on their merit.

While on the subject of agreeing with members opposite, I also agree with Mr Leeson and Mr Stubbs in respect of football final telecasts. I hope they and Mr Tom McNeil, who subsequently entered the argument, will continue to help me to obtain football telecasts in the south-west. Now that telecasts of finals are to be made to other areas, I hope those members do not relinquish their efforts. I see the new Leader of the Opposition has said that he wants the WANFL to lift the blackout on telecasts in the south-west and great southern areas.

As I consider this matter I wonder whether the WANFL has decided to bar my electorate because I have the loudest voice, as it has almost completely barred football telecasts in my electorate. However, I am sure the directors of the WANFL would not be that petty minded, because they recruit many good footballers from that area.

I find myself a little in conflict with my parliamentary leader when he says that at last those who live so far away will have football telecasts. I consider many of my electors live far away and should have the benefit of telecasts of football finals.

In this Chamber we hear many schemes and ideas in respect of legislation, most of which I find to be completely inhibiting to business. We seem to be in the situation of wanting more and more regulations to control business people, workers, or other people in the community; and very often we do not realise how far these things can go. Therefore I thought I would quote some examples of this from an organisation which is the ultimate in bureaucracy. I refer to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration of the United States. This small organisation has built itself up to a fair size, and I would like to quote from *Time* magazine of the 2nd January a few instances of what OSHA has cost various businesses in America, and then I will relate this back to the Australian scene. The article states—

Du Pont has to spend \$5 million and 180 man-years of work annually to file 15,000 reports to the Federal Government. Among

many other things, the company is held accountable not only for its own programs for hiring and promoting minorities and women, but also for the affirmative action programs of every supplier that sells it more than \$2 500 worth of goods a year.

The article then states that the company must send out 28 000 letters a year. It continues—

Even in the best of times, there is a high infant mortality rate for business. Today we compound the risk with so much Government intervention that it's a wonder that anyone survives.

Further on it goes on to say—

Eighty-seven federal agencies and offices with 100 000 workers keep the private sector behaving as Big Brother sees fit. The most important 30 of these outfits have combined operating expenses of \$2.9 billion a year.

I will give some examples of the regulations of OSHA. I quote as follows—

Last year OSHA also directed that the Made-Rite Sausage Co. of Sacramento, Calif., place protective guards on its meat-blending machine to keep employees' hands out of it, even though the machine is too high for workers to reach. But such a guard would have violated Agriculture Department regulations because it would have made the machine too difficult to clean. The company did the only sensible thing: nothing.

The article then refers to the steel industry as follows—

Already threatened by low-cost imports, the steel industry has been forced to spend \$3 billion to control air and water pollution; industry leaders estimate that they will have to come up with another \$5.5 billion in the next six to eight years to comply with EPA directives.

I hope the Minister is listening to this.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He is paying attention.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I wonder whether we are not getting into the same sort of situation in this country. Let me continue to quote the article as follows—

OSHA inspectors have turned up in the most unlikely places with the most implausible demands. Michael Armstrong, manager of In-Line Inc., a North Carolina construction firm, recalls the investigator who insisted that he provide a portable toilet for his crew while they were digging a tunnel under a highway. In vain did Armstrong

argue that his men never complained about using the bathroom at a filling station 50 yards away. OSHA was even determined to give cowboys a new kind of home on the range, complete with a portable flush toilet within five minutes walking distance. Ranch hands who felt that nature provided ample resources for their needs hooted the proposal down. "Can you imagine a cowboy carrying his own restroom on the back of his horse?" scoffed Doug Huddleston, president of the Colorado Cattlemen's Association.

These things might appear to be amusing to members; however, I am sure the business sector is definitely not amused. We in this Parliament are not providing the people with the leadership with which we should provide them. I quote again from *Time* magazine of the 30th January, 1978. This issue contains a description by John Maynard Keynes of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, as follows—

The President is like a big fluffy pillow. He bears the imprint of the last person who sat on him.

One wonders whether we in Australia are not governing in the same manner.

My final quotes come from a speech made by Mr J. Paul Lyett, the Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Sperry Rand Corporation, a world-wide organisation. I was privileged to hear this gentleman discussing some problems that we as Australians share with Americans. I quote as follows—

Today in the U.S. economic scene there is what is virtually a new phenomenon

"New" in the sense of the focus and emphasis being placed upon it by not only economists—but by the media—the Government and our new President.

It is "Business Confidence"

The business confidence factor has been around a long time—buried down in the collective psyches of we business people—along with a lot of other things people weren't paying much attention to. We always knew whether it was there or not there—but we never calibrated it with precision or recognised its potential.

NOW—all sorts of things are happening—people no longer inquire about your health but rather the state of your business confidence—and we are finding we have to fine tune it and produce an instant reading on demand.

Later on in his speech he went on to say—

Our country urgently needs strong, concerted and concerned legislative action and leadership in a number of areas—but we haven't, as our youngsters say, been able to "get it all together."

For that reason business confidence is, while improving lately—still quite low in the United States.

One place to take a reading is the stock market where prices have been languishing at incredibly low levels. Sperry Rand is a good example. Hopefully, if this quarter—the last of this fiscal year) turns out as expected—we will have had 24 successive record quarters and six consecutive record years of revenues and profits—having more than doubled our revenues and profits and raised our dividends accordingly.

Yet—today our stock is priced where it was six years ago.

President Carter knows the lack of business confidence is a major problem and lately he and members of his Cabinet have been asking why—and we've been telling them loudly and clearly. Here are just a few items:

Business is concerned about inflation.

You don't contain inflation with big budget deficits or by raising the minimum wage—

You don't contain inflation with wage and price controls or build confidence by moving towards them which business fears.

Business is concerned about unemployment.

Not only for humanitarian reasons—but because the cost of unemployment is eventually borne by business and its customers.

The increase in the minimum wage pleases the unions—but reduces employment opportunities for those who need them most.

I pause there to point out I believe that is one of the things we sometimes forget in this House. The speech continues—

Business is concerned about capital formation

Raising capital via the equity route is available today only to the large

companies and it is more attractive to finance with debt for tax reasons. The answer is to eliminate the double taxation of business.

Business strongly wants an energy bill—one that is premised on the market system.

Taxing gasoline to raise its price to reduce the demand doesn't square with the American mentality. Americans are going to drive their cars and pay the price whatever. They'll factor the price into their cost of living and expect to get it back in their salaries and wages.

Further on it states—

But things are improving. After not meeting with business people—either formally or informally—the President has changed his approach.

Recently he pleased a group of us at a business council meeting when he said "I realise I can't do my job well if you don't do yours well and you can't do yours well if I don't do mine well."

Now that won't be carved on the front of some marble building—or rank with the Gettysburg address—but believe me—we've been starved for just such an attitude and statement from our President

—and it did help confidence.

What are we doing in Australia? Are we following the American line? Are we going on with this "do-gooder" attitude which says that profits are bad? I have heard some members opposite criticise profits and companies which make profits.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Only excessive profits.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The voice of doom starts again. The honourable member speaks of excessive profits, but what does he call excessive profits?

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: \$158 million by Utah.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: On what capital outlay?

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Foreign capital outlay.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr Cooley fascinates me. He talks about \$158 million in isolation but does not talk about what capital had to be put in to produce that \$158 million. Mr Cooley knocks BHP day after day without appreciating what capital has been put into the venture.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: BHP are babes in the wood.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Of course they are and it is typical of Mr Cooley to start on the

babes; he would not be game to tackle the giants. He does not realise that by attacking companies making profits he is attacking his own workers' jobs. He is denying them jobs because of his limited approach and seems to feel that if profits are made it is a bad thing.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: That is not my philosophy and you can check my industrial record.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr Cooley's industrial record might prove what he says but certainly his speeches in this place do not. His speeches in this place have been a diatribe against so-called big business without thinking of the consequences for the employees of those businesses. BHP is presently losing \$5 million a year on its steel operations but it still continues to employ people because the company believes in the nation and in the future of steel.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: My heart bleeds.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr Cooley's heart does not bleed for BHP. I believe it bleeds for the possibility of some people being put out of work.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: BHP votes for you.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: BHP does not vote for me as that company does not have any plant or subsidiaries in my area.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I mean it votes for your Government.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: There would be more votes coming from the company in the Opposition's areas than in ours. Perhaps the honourable member could accuse the Leader of the Opposition and Mr Thompson of being elected by BHP because they are both elected by employees of BHP.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: What about AIS?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: AIS is or was part of BHP. I have not heard of it being sold.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You should know.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Yes, I make a study of these things.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: From the annual reports?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I study these things from the ground up. I have been a labourer for BHP, not a white-collar worker; I was not sheltered by a union. I do know something about the company. I have worked for the company as a labourer in its shipyards and steel furnaces.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: No wonder they are in trouble!

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: They were not in trouble then, because the ACTU had people like

Albert Monk, not the ratbags it has now. Mr Monk knew the company had to make a profit so it could employ his unionists.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: The good old days!

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It might be a good idea if we could go back to the good old days. These days we get new trendy ideas; new social security programmes; new give-away programmes; welfare and so on. But who pays for them? These programmes are paid for by profitable enterprises because I have never seen a company with a loss paying taxation or continuing for a great number of years to employ people. It fascinates me to think people believe we can pull money out of the air just like plucking an apple from a tree and so pay for welfare or educational programmes.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: That is just as important for the good of society as production at BHP.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is obvious already the Hon. Grace Vaughan cannot see that the bigger the profit made by BHP, the bigger and better social welfare programmes will be made available.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Nonsense!

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition agrees with me.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: No, I do not.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: He has some sort of knowledge of how finances work and how money has to get into the system.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Don't put him on your side.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Perhaps I should pause and congratulate both the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on their promotion to the shadow Cabinet. I did not think the ALP recognised this place. Obviously we have two outstanding members of the Opposition here and they have changed the minds of the ALP Caucus which now recognises that the Council does have its place in the parliamentary system of Western Australia. I congratulate those Caucus members on their decision because there is no way they would appoint shadow Ministers in this place unless they believed it was here to stay.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: It is purely a communications problem.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I have quoted from several magazines and now let us consider Australian business and its needs and just what it is the average worker wants out of his job. Surely it is a chance to build up his own circumstances. We should not necessarily call this a standard of

living, but he wants to buy a home and a car and be able to work when he wants to at whatever he wishes to tackle without being told by a Government or any other body just when he should work and when he should not.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: You should have gone back further into the good old days.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Are you reading your speech?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Here are my notes; Mr Cooley can see them if he likes. I take it as an insult to be accused of reading my speech. I tell the House when I quote from documents, which is not against the Standing Orders, and Mr Cooley has already had his lesson on the Standing Orders today. It is not against the Standing Orders to have notes so as to keep debates running in a logical manner; perhaps that is why Mr Cooley gets into so much trouble when he speaks.

We want a chance to build up our communities. We want a chance to let the volunteer worker do what he wishes to do and not have something imposed on him from above, such as some of the wonderful social welfare schemes spoken of by the Opposition in this House in previous sessions; they were the greatest disasters to hit country areas of Western Australia. The administration of these schemes was so costly there was no money left to do anything else. The impact on the community was nil.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: You are speaking against people in your own area.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I will speak against people in my area when I think they are doing the wrong thing. If I were allowed to bet with the honourable member I would wager that 95 per cent of people in my electorate would rather the idea of voluntarism than something which the ALP imposed on them from the top.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: That is what it was all about.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Imposing it from the top? I remember someone telling me that the people in my community would not get anything because they had done it already for themselves. That seems to be the thing we will have to fight against in the future.

People should do things for themselves. I do not believe we should lead people along by a ring in the nose and tell them what they have to do from some centralised source. A contribution by a volunteer can be either in monetary terms or purely work terms. I give, as an example of this, country areas where no assistance from outside sources is received yet those people get up and do

something. An example is the Boyup Brook Parents and Citizens' Association. The association wanted a hall and originally it was to be a shed covering a play area. The mothers sprang into action and now they have a 60 feet by 40 feet hall which is bricked in, and this was all arranged by themselves. They did receive a dollar-for-dollar subsidy from the Education Department but their contribution was about \$5 000 or \$6 000 money-wise and probably \$10 000 or \$15 000 work-wise. We do not need Governments to tell us how to do things; we can do them more efficiently by ourselves.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: You don't mind the subsidy though.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: We could have done it without the subsidy. Those mothers were more deserving of the subsidy than most. I wish we could return to the old days, when city dwellers would get off their tails and do as much as country dwellers. At the moment they are not given the opportunity because in many instances they are represented by Labor members who want to go crying to the Government instead of getting the communities to work for themselves.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: That is not true.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Unfortunately one does not see as much of this community effort in the city, which is a pity.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: That is a gratuitous insult to every volunteer working in the city.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is not meant to be an insult to anyone. I realise there are a lot of volunteer workers in the city and many do a great deal of good; but there are not nearly enough of them and they do not appear to be showing the results achieved in country communities.

I will leave it at that because I believe there is something meaningful to be gained from country areas in this respect. I know the Hon. Grace Vaughan will disagree because she has shown in the past how she went to the country and told the people there how to run their business.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: What nonsense. You are denigrating the backbone of your own country people. They don't listen to people telling them what to do.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member should proceed with his speech and direct his comments to the Chair.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am doing that, Mr President.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Don't argue with the President.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: When the honourable member is dressed he can take the matter up with me. We do not want knockers.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: You should not be knocking the city people.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I have been saying that this is the sort of response we get when we make constructive suggestions; suggestions that maybe city people can get ideas from country people. We are told we are knocking, but we are merely suggesting we may have methods to put this sort of thing into operation in the city.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: That is one of the ideas of the Australian Assistance Plan.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is one idea that never got off the ground because we had too many administrators.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Too many country members were determined it wouldn't succeed.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I think if the honourable member talks to people such as Mrs Krawtschuk and others that run the ALP in my area they will say all members of Parliament could give support in our area as long as they did not start dictating to the people.

I will leave her to see those people and find out, because I will not argue with her now. Many used to meet me at regular intervals to obtain help in various ways. They realised that some of us had skills which could be used to help them and that we were doing the things we were elected to do.

Another thing we do not want in business is Government red tape. The proportion of businesses which fail in the first five years is enormous, and mainly this is because of the Government Big Brother which thinks it can tell business what it should do all the time with the forms it must fill in. It has the idea that private enterprise knows nothing.

Another thing we do not need is an atmosphere in which it is believed that profit is bad. Profits employ people, and we have discussed this a little earlier. It hurts me greatly that the communication in this place is so limited that members opposite do not realise the more profit a business makes the more opportunity it has to employ people. The harder a Government, a union, a local authority, or any Government department makes it for a person to run a business, the less profitable that business will be and the fewer opportunities that business will have to employ people.

We hear comments being made when a profit of X number of dollars is experienced. I have asked before in this House: What is a fair percentage profit margin? Would a trade union

credit society consider that 8 per cent or 9 per cent on capital invested was a fair thing? I have always been told that it would be. No-one has denied that it is not fair that a credit society should make 8 or 9 per cent profit.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: They do not make a profit. It all goes back into the kitty.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Let us consider where they invest their money and whether they would be getting 8 or 9 per cent.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: They lend it out.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Would they be getting 8 or 9 per cent?

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Six or 7 per cent.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Members opposite will not permit BHP to make that much on its capital.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Rubbish!

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is obvious I will have to run a school in economics here for some members opposite who do not know about writing down depreciation, and so on.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: You would need a good lecturer.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: They do not know how the capital structure of private enterprise companies is made up. It is rather horrifying to consider the situation which exists. Let us consider the education that these people have received. It is rather horrifying to think that they have been let loose on the public to talk nonsense because the public, being fair-minded, may one day believe it.

The Hon. T. Knight: They soon find out.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is so. They soon find out how much the ALP knows about finance and fiscal matters in total.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: That is a nice generalisation. You say that no-one in the ALP knows anything about business.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: As the honourable member opposite knows everything.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: When are you going to start union bashing?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I will not start on the unions. I will try very humbly to obtain a little communication from the other side of the House on how together we could provide jobs, because I have no doubt that in the following speeches on this Address-in-Reply motion unemployment will be mentioned occasionally.

As an individual I am trying to put to the House some of the ways in which I believe

employment could be generated. No small businessman can afford losses over a long period. He must have productivity and he must have workers unfettered by regulations. I am trying again to get across to the Opposition some idea of what small businesses in the main—but big businesses also—are going through today. It is all right for members opposite to knock profits as long as they are prepared to knock jobs as well.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Profits are good.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I hope Mr Cooley has been recorded as saying that profits are good—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Of course they are.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: —and that we will not have any more nonsense about profits unrelated to the capital involved in making those profits. Now we have taken the first step forward.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: It's your Government that is hurting business.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: We have reached the primary school stage with certain members of the Opposition, but Mr Claughton has not yet reached it.

Should we consider how we are educating our youngsters and whether we are placing too much emphasis on tertiary education and not enough on technical education? What are the problems of the unskilled workers, those unskilled labourers like farmers and businessmen? Most farmers and businessmen do not have any qualifications. They have not been apprenticed and have not been to a tertiary institution. Should we, in our education system, begin to look at them and how—

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Perhaps you should have a look at the qualifications of people in business. Many farmers have farming qualifications.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr Claughton is echoing what I said, which was that we should look at their qualifications. He has not followed through to say that we should consider those qualifications in regard to our education system.

Why does someone become a farmer or a businessman and take on the responsibility for other people's employment? Very few small businessmen do not feel very deeply about having to put off a person. They think long and hard before they put on a person. They make the decision and employ a person and, if that person performs satisfactorily, in no way do they want to get rid of that employee. They want to keep steady employment and increase employment opportunities in their businesses.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: They do not need productivity only; they need consumption too.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is quite right. This can be done by marketing, with which I will deal at a later stage. I was referring to the education aspect and, as the Opposition spokesman on education, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition may have an interest in this. I believe we should consider the reasons which motivate people to go on farms and work long hours or to go into business and work long hours, and compare them with the rest of society.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: You are making it tougher for your little businesses by your night trading. I have had letters on that subject.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I have, too, but I disagree with them because I have had the opportunity to go to several other States to discuss the matter with little businessmen, and perhaps the honourable member opposite may not have had that same opportunity.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You did not have any say in night trading. It was a Cabinet decision.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: We must give Mr Cooley a lesson on the Cabinet. In our type of government all decisions are Cabinet decisions. If we were to adopt Mr Cooley's theory, no decisions would be made at all. Someone must lead, and, thank goodness, this Government does lead. It might not always be popular, but it makes a decision which is something which Governments—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The unemployed in Kalgoorlie would like to be led back to work.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I would like to do so. Funnily enough, in my way, I do this.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It is serious, not funny.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Day after day I attempt to find jobs for people and to create an atmosphere for more jobs. I go ahead with that task because I think it is one of my jobs as a member of Parliament. At least this Government makes decisions.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I am very proud about what you have said about emancipating mankind one at a time.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Wonderful words which mean nothing.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Many people have more than one job at a time. One wonders about that, about working women, and about people getting overtime. Quite frankly, if a man's wife wants to go out to work and can find a job, I do not blame her.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I support you too.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: If a man wants to do overtime, I do not blame him. However, I do wish union members would not say that they are being disadvantaged because some people have two jobs.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I have not heard anyone in this Chamber say that.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I have heard it said that some people are disadvantaged because others have two jobs, and I have heard complaints about the tax that those people with the two jobs must pay. Let people arrange their own lives financially. Some of them do so by pure hard work. Let them get on with it, but do not seek to control them in any way, shape, or form.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: All of them are trying to get on with it, but they haven't had a chance.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I thought the honourable member was having a chance. He has had a chance during all the time I have been attempting to make my speech. He probably has more words in *Hansard* than I have.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: I doubt that.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I now come to a very interesting article, again from *The Bulletin* of the 14th March. Over a number of years members have heard me speak on marketing and marketing reforms. The person who wrote the article seemed to get into a lot of trouble with educationists. The writer is Peter Samuel, and educationists do not like him very much. The article reads—

MOUNTAINS OF MEAT MEAN TROUBLE

AUSTRALIA's cattlemen deserve sympathy. For years they were told by the politicians, economic experts and commentators that theirs was the rural industry of the future But now it is one of the great tragedies of Australian rural history that too many farmers put their faith in cattle just before the bottom dropped out of the market.

It is not surprising then that in such difficult times the farmers should find attractive the notion of a guaranteed price. The Cattlemen's Union and other lobby groups have been pushing very hard for a scheme which they say will provide "just" or "livable" prices for meat.

We have heard all this before. Further on the article continues—

They are costly to administer and finance, and on any full evaluation of costs and benefits are most unlikely to be the best way of helping the farmer. . . . Still it has to be conceded that they do help the farmer when

demand for his product—and his income—slumps.

Wool and wheat are easily stored but storing meat is far more expensive and difficult. That is what will make it hard to devise a workable price support scheme for helping cattlemen. Their lobbyists are now pressing for a floor price scheme. State laws are proposed which would make it illegal to sell below a certain price at cattle auctions.

The advocates of this scheme have not pointed out its implications. If the minimum price is set above the market price as it must be if it is to improve the realised price, then there will always be a greater quantity of cattle for sale than the quantity bought. The free market auction at least has the virtue of clearing the market.

Under the proposed floor price scheme for meat, sales below a set price will be illegal. What then will happen to the cattle for which buyers cannot be found? That big question is not answered by anyone involved in advocacy of the scheme. . . .

There is no proposal being mentioned for a meat stockpile, so we have to assume that the individual farmer would have to cope with the problem of the surplus that is inevitably produced by governmental intervention in setting minimum prices. He would have to sell it illegally on a black market, risking fines and vilification. Or else he would have to keep his cattle longer, using up feed he could better use for younger beasts. Or finally he would have to shoot his surplus cattle getting nothing at all for them. . . .

The difficulty in enforcing such a legal minimum price without a stockpiling governmental authority seems certain to bring demands for the other technique for suppressing surpluses—production controls and quotas. That introduces the nightmare of political logrolling and the economic inefficiency that always follows governmental decisions as to who shall produce what and how much.

I was very taken with that article. It spells out the matter in very logical terms, and Mr Peter Samuel is extremely logical in dealing with meat marketing as he was in dealing with education. It is remarkable we have journalists of repute writing to national magazines, even if they are considered to be a little on the left.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Do you agree with the lifting of tariffs? Do you think by that means we will sell more meat to Japan?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: We may.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What do you mean by illegal trading in cattle?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: If the honourable member had listened he would have heard that Mr Samuel followed it through, indicating that the selling of cattle below the minimum price would be illegal.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: It is not illegal across the border. That is the general way these things are done.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is right. I do not think the honourable member realises the implications of Mr Samuel's comments on a nationwide basis.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Do you agree with my remark about the lifting of tariffs?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I shall deal with that matter later. I am trying to finish my speech before 6.15 p.m.

Sitting suspended from 6.04 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr President, before the tea suspension I dealt with some matters of a general nature. I would now like to deal with some of the matters affecting my electorate.

The first matter, which is extremely serious, is the outbreak of fruit fly in Bridgetown. When we follow the fruit-fly saga through we find it is a problem which is not insurmountable, but it seems to me no Government will ever grasp the nettle and say to people, "If you want to have fruit trees you should be prepared to keep them clean, and if you do not keep them clean you will pay a \$500 penalty for each of your trees." The whole of the canning industry in the south-west will depend on there being no fruit fly, and it appears to me all Governments have lacked a certain amount of guts in dealing with this problem.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Do you think fines make people do things?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: People must either get rid of their trees or look after them. I would hate to see a compulsory State-wide scheme which forced and bludgeoned people into doing things. If one wants the privilege of growing a fruit tree in one's back garden one must be prepared to look after it. Whether it be lousy sheep, skeleton weed, or anything else, we as a Government have a responsibility to the whole State, not just to the individual. I believe the way to get rid of fruit fly is to make it so expensive for people who do not consider it worth while to trim or poison their own trees, that they will buy their fruit instead of growing fruit trees in their own gardens.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: We had restrictions for many years.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Yes, and certain people thought we had got rid of fruit fly, but we are not keeping on with the battle. It is similar to the battle with the rabbit: once rabbits disappeared from the side of the road people thought there were no rabbits left, but the rabbits always seemed to breed again.

The Government has guaranteed growers who plant fruit trees in the south-west for the Manjimup cannery and we cannot afford to have fruit fly. I believe a very firm hand should be put upon the industry and the people who have the privilege of growing fruit in their own gardens. To be able to grow fruit trees on a quarter-acre block is a privilege which the people of few other countries have, and it carries with it a responsibility to the community. I am urging the Government to do something meaningful in this direction which will save the whole of the stone fruit industry in the south-west.

I hear on the grapevine that the Department of Agriculture does not like the situation where an inspector comes back and says, "This bloke will do nothing about it." The matter is left in the "too-hard" basket and nothing is done about that person because of the problems of taking action against him. I urge the Government to do something about this matter very soon.

I now move on to a subject I hoped I would never have to mention in this House again; that is, the Dumbleyung police quarters.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Haven't they been fixed yet?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: No, they have not been. I am sorry to have to tell the Leader of the Opposition that the Government, in its wisdom, put carpet throughout the old quarters, but lush though it may be it does not stop the washing machine shaking the whole house. It might have a slightly deadening effect, but it is very slight. The baby still has to be put out on the lawn when the policeman's wife runs the spin dryer. We were promised a house but through bad calculations the money was taken away. We are now told this matter is priority No. 4 or No. 5. The numbers on priority lists do not impress me very much; I have been here or in the other place for too long.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: It is No. 5.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Three years ago it was No. 4.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: You just joined Kulin, Wickepin, and a few more places.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I do not have much faith in numbers on priority lists. I will not believe

anything of any Government until I see the new police quarters being built; but I do object to being told the quarters are to be built when they do not materialise. I urge the Government to do something about the Dumbleyung police quarters as a matter of priority. Perhaps the Government thinks a carpet will hold the stumps together and the old building will sit nicely on the ground, but I do not think they will. It is a shocking affair when we look at some of the money being spent on Government buildings while houses of this nature still remain in country areas.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Perhaps the Fremantle police complex is costing more to build than was originally thought.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: It is costing more. That is not my problem. My problem is to look after my electorate; the Leader of the Opposition will look after the Fremantle police complex.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The lock-up at Fremantle was very bad.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: If one were to put a three-year-old in the lock-up at the Dumbleyung police quarters, he would be an adult before he could get out from underneath, because it is partly built of galvanised iron and the whole lot would go.

I would like to mention a few other small matters, one of which concerns the Minister for Transport. Some time ago the Minister for Transport, and the Minister for Education whom he represents in this House, said they were going to have talks about the barracks at Katanning. That must have been nine or 10 months ago, but we are not getting many decisions. I urge the two Ministers to start making some decisions and not to leave the matter in the "too-hard" basket. If they want someone to make decisions, many of us around here will help them.

I would like to congratulate the Government on announcing there will be a hospital at Donnybrook. Again, I would like to know what the priorities are.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It is No. 8.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Leader of the Opposition and Mr Gayfer must have a secret line to all departments in order to find out all the priorities. If it is No. 8, it should be shot up much higher. However, I congratulate the Government on at least making the decision to build a hospital at Donnybrook.

Another great need exists at Donnybrook; that is, classrooms. I believe they should be started immediately. Overcrowding has been occurring

for some time. There has been indecision about what the transportable classroom may be used for. It has been said it can only be used for manual arts, but the manual arts department does not want it and the primary classes do want it. There is no reason that the building cannot be used for primary students. We as a Government do not want this red tape.

I was extremely interested to read about the ALP conference on rural affairs. I quote from an article in *The West Australian* of the 13th March as follows—

Warnings that the Australian Labor Party could not afford to become a city-based party were given by the State's Labor leaders in the weekend.

Further on in the article Mr Bryce, the State President of the ALP, is quoted as having said—

We have become very much a metropolitan-based party and this is very much to our peril . . .

It is very interesting that it has taken the ALP so long to work this out. Perhaps in the survey it could ask some of us who know something about the bush to state a few of the reasons.

Another interesting item appears in the same edition of *The West Australian* under the headline "Live sheep export rise urged". The article reads—

Farmers and meat-industry employees would benefit from the unrestricted export of live sheep, the conference was told.

Mr A. Fewster, of Muchea, said that some Middle East countries had shown an interest in importing live sheep and chilled meat.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I think they are allowing one ship out, aren't they?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It will be interesting to hear from Opposition speakers what they think should be done about the live sheep market.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Send all the sheep to Fremantle and we will load them. There are 15 ships at Fremantle.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is a greedy and selfish attitude of the Leader of the Opposition. They ought to be loaded in the country.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Despite what the president of his party said, the Leader of the Opposition still wants everything done in the city and is ignoring that rural base which the President of the ALP says the party ought to have.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: There is not much activity by the Government in my electorate at the moment.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Another article relating to the conference, in the same edition of *The West Australian*, might affect Mr Leeson; he might be interested in lifetime annuities. The article reads—

The conference called on the State Government to commission a pastoral industry study in an effort to help farmers.

It asked for the study to be carried out with a view to restructuring the industry where necessary on an economically and environmentally sound basis.

The conference will ask for the establishment of a lifetime annuity scheme to help low-income farmers. It said that this would enable them to sell the equity in their properties to a Government administering authority while retaining the right to work the farms for the rest of their lives.

Rather than paying the farmer a lump sum the administering authority would give him an annual income, enabling him to use up his assets during his lifetime and enjoy a reasonable standard of living.

Frankly, if that is not democratic socialism, I have never heard of it. The Australian Labor Party is really sticking to its ideas that Big Brother should run everything, including every farm. They are supposed to be looking after the farmers with their pastoral survey. It is really wonderful to reflect on; however, I think the Australian Labor Party may have to learn a little more about what happens in country areas.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: Obviously you are worried otherwise you would not raise it in this House.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am extremely worried for the future of the Labor Party if the best it can do is to institute surveys to ascertain why its electoral results are so poor.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: That is not true; you know nothing about the surveys.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Now we hear from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the fellow who can always say to his grandchildren, "With the Hon. Des Dans, I was one of the first two people to be made a Shadow Minister in the Legislative Council." I have already congratulated him on his elevation.

To return to the Labor Party's loss of electoral support, I believe it is due to the fact that the Labor Party contains people whose sole aim is to override what the majority of the community

wants because they wish to impose on the whole community what they as the Labor Party want. They forget the people who live, eat and make a living in society in Western Australia. They want to lay their big hand over the top of every person in this State, and the people realise it. Members of the Labor Party never think of asking the ordinary people what they would like the Labor Party to do.

Now they are to conduct a survey on the question of their loss of popularity. They probably will recruit some public relations associates to conduct the survey and compile it into a lovely package and present it to them. But what will happen? The ordinary people will say, "What can be done for us?"

The Hon. D. K. Dans: When will you tell me what you are going to do about the number of unemployed?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: If the Leader of the Opposition had been here before dinner and had been listening constructively he would have heard me trying to go through that matter. I said that the unemployment problem can be solved only by giving private enterprise an unfettered go. If we remove the restrictions placed on private enterprise by unions and Government, we will achieve all the employment we desire in Western Australia. There would be no problem if we allowed private enterprise to go ahead and do the job. The Government does not need to do the job, because if there is a buck in it for private enterprise, it will do the job.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: If private enterprise produces all these goods you will have to get onto the marketing aspect, and tell us how to sell the idea.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I mentioned this matter earlier in my speech.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Are you going to tell us how you will sell it?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I thought I had given sufficient learned advice on marketing to have enabled the Leader of the Opposition to absorb some of it. It reminds me of the old Army adage, "Most troops absorb only 10 per cent at a time"; perhaps I will have to make 10 speeches on marketing before the honourable member understands the situation.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: There is one thing I do know: You have been in government for the last four years, and all these problems are at your feet. It is your Government, not ours.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Yes, and is not Western Australia fortunate that it is our Government?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You are telling us about all the problems.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr President, I am having difficulty in being heard because of all the yapping that comes from over there.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: With your indulgence, Mr President, perhaps I could return to discuss what the Labor Party has done in the way of marketing reforms. I did not want to quote this document because I thought it would be something of an embarrassment to the Opposition. I was going to be kind to them tonight. However, if the Labor Party and the Leader of the Opposition want to know what the Labor Party did—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Tell us what your Government has done over the past four years; I can read that document for myself.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: If the Leader of the Opposition does not mind! What we have done is obvious.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Yes, we have about 37 000 unemployed.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Yes, 37 000 unemployed, which is not bad.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Except if you happen to be one of the unemployed.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: It has nearly reached the depression record level of unemployment.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is very amusing to hear these interjections, because as a part-time employer I cannot get the people I want.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You probably do not pay enough wages.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is very funny. It is fascinating that my staff generally stay with me; they cannot be conned away. That is typical of the silly type of argument used by the Leader of the Opposition. Could we get back to marketing?

The Hon. R. Thompson: Are you a part-time employer or a full-time employer?

The PRESIDENT: Order! Could the honourable member get back to directing his comments to the Chair?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I certainly will, Mr President. However, perhaps I may answer the interjection from the Hon. Ron Thompson; I do not know whether he is a member of the Labor Party. I still have a business, and I will keep

it—not like members of the Labor Party, not like one of their spokesmen in another place who accused me of keeping my business and having two incomes. Many of the Labor Party would prefer me to shut down my business and sack all my employees, thereby creating more unemployment. That is the sort of thing that comes from the other side of the House all the time.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Are you a part-time or a full-time employer?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I employ people full time.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That is what I wanted to know.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Mr Thompson is half on our side; he is an Independent.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: He retains Mr Withers as his adviser on matters financial.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I thought he had a shop steward, but I did not know.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: Do you still have that old bucket of rusty nuts and bolts down there?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: No, I lent it to the Labor Party survey team. Can we get onto marketing?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Get to the nuts and bolts part of your speech and I will listen.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Labor Party, with great screams about serving the agricultural community plans to assist in marketing, wheat stabilisation, wool floor prices—I do not think that is quite accurate—lamb marketing, the Potato Marketing Board, and the Dairy Industry Authority.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Mr Ferry and I once served on a Select Committee which kept the Potato Marketing Board.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I think that was one of the Leader of the Opposition's greatest mistakes.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I agree with you on that one.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: We cannot win them all.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It worries me that in this day and age we are still trying to market in the same manner as our grandparents marketed. The essence of any marketing campaign is what the consumer wants, but, too often, producers produce something and say, "There it is; take it or leave it." The public today are far more intelligent than they used to be and they say, "We will leave it." They are unhappy because they have not been consulted on what they want. Until

we achieve consumer-based marketing, we will not sell. I believe Western Australia will lead Australia in the very near future in consumer-based marketing, and this Government will make decisions on the matter that will lead the way.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Mr Mensaros did not say that the other day. He said that we did not have the consumers.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am getting rather sick of that small voice, twittering in the background.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I will bring you a transcript of his speech.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I appreciate that.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: It is better to hear him than the twit on his feet.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr Cloughton still has not dressed properly.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Even the President is not paying attention to you.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The President will if the honourable member misbehaves. We in this country may have to make some sacrifices and unfortunately at the moment—I say this in all sincerity—it is not only the unemployed who are making sacrifices; businesses are also affected. I believe many more sacrifices will have to be made by farmers, businessmen, tradesmen, and others. I just hope we can obtain a greater supply of tradesmen. On the education side of tradesmen there is a need for technicians, who are not fully qualified tradesmen, to look after only certain aspects of trades. I am thinking particularly of moves that are being made by the Farm Machinery Dealers Association to obtain farm machinery mechanics, who would be totally different from ordinary mechanics.

I have two more matters to raise before I conclude. I believe all members would support my first proposal. It is extremely interesting to look at our salaries tribunal as it relates to other awards. I refer members to an article which appeared in *The West Australian* on Saturday, the 11th March. Under the heading, "Salesmen win more comfort" it states—

... WA's 3 000 commercial travellers have won the right to be provided with air-conditioned cars.

I wonder when our tribunal is going to take into consideration the fact that perhaps a few of us travel, and that an allowance should be made to air-condition the cars of members of Parliament.

Finally, I raise once again the question of an alphabetical set of Statutes. I have discussed this matter in the House before, and I intend to make

only a passing comment and ask the Government why it has still done nothing.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I would agree.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Hon. Frank Wise did nothing and the Hon. Sir Arthur Griffiths did nothing, and still nothing is being done. I think it is about time the Government got off its tail and made some concessions to members in this place and to the authorities who need to use books of Statutes. The Government should make a decision on this matter; there is no excuse. The Government can try to use lack of finance or anything else as an excuse, but there is simply no excuse in this enlightened age for people not being able to obtain up-to-date Statutes. They should be available for all members of Parliament and members of the community who wish to pay for them.

I come back to the point on which I commenced: Give private enterprise an unfettered go, a go where everybody can communicate with each other, worker with boss, boss with worker, and leave the Government out of it and we will solve the unemployment problem. Let the boss also do his own marketing, and leave the Government out of that. Let us get on with developing this country.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Do you not believe in stabilised marketing schemes?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You will have to start your speech all over again.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It weighs too heavily at this hour of the night, having just dealt with the Leader of the Opposition's queries, and helped him through his marketing difficulties. For the benefit of the Hon. Lyla Elliott, the next time I speak in the Address-in-Reply debate I will speak on marketing and commence at "A" and go through to "Z".

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Will you do it by correspondence?

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the honourable member ignore the interjections and get on with his speech?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I support the motion. Leave private enterprise to get on with the job and we will solve many, if not all, of the problems in this State and nation today.

THE HON. D. W. COOLEY (North-East Metropolitan) [8.00 p.m.]: Mr President, the motion calls upon us to express our loyalty to the Queen and to thank His Excellency for the Speech he delivered to the House on opening night; and, of course, we on this side of the House unequivocally support such a motion. We believe

in loyalty to the Queen and we believe that in the person of Sir Wallace Kyle we have a Governor of outstanding ability.

Before I come to the main part of my speech, may I say that there is always something to our credit on this side of the Chamber because if we hear many more of the sort of diatribe lasting an hour-and-a-half in which Mr Lewis engaged, this House will soon be no more. We get sick and tired of hearing such stuff emanating from this almost defunct Chamber.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: What sort of stuff did you take exception to?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I shall tell the member in a minute. Mr Lewis used to occupy the position in your party, Mr President, that you occupied before you were elevated to the position you hold now, and I imagine that if he has reached the position of secretary of the party he would be ministerial material. Recently we heard one of the Liberal Party's own members say that some of the Ministers in the Liberal-National Country Party Government are not fit to clean out his fowl house. It was not a member of the Labor Party saying this but a member of the Liberal Party.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Who said this?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The member for Subiaco, Dr Tom Dadour; and of course we must agree with that. I would not trust some of them to clean out my fowl house. But is this an example of the quality of person who is progressing through the ranks of the Liberal Party?

I should like to touch on a matter I raised earlier this evening; that is, dress in this Chamber. It is high time something was done to correct the almost ludicrous position we have placed ourselves in this evening.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: How would Miss Elliott get over her trouble?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am coming to Miss Elliott in a minute. I do not wish to be personal about this matter, but I should say that Mr Knight is one of the best dressed people in this Chamber without any doubt. However, last week in this Chamber he wore an open neck safari jacket without a tie. I am not a good dresser by any stretch of the imagination compared with Mr Knight, but if I had taken off my coat on that day, left my tie on, and had my sleeves rolled down to my cuffs, I would have been 10 times better dressed than he was; and I say the same thing about some of the members sitting on my side of the Chamber this evening. If I were to take off my coat now I would be better dressed

than they are. Why should we not be able to take off our coats in such humid conditions?

I admire you, Mr President, and when you were elected to your office I said that you were well suited to the job, but if you can sit there this evening wearing that wig and gown and say that you are not oppressed by this heat, you are made of very stern stuff; and I express my sympathy to you and the Clerks in this situation.

I believe we ought to do something about this situation. When we think about it, how ridiculous is it that Mr McKenzie should sit between our two lovely ladies on this side of the Chamber, Miss Elliott and Mrs Vaughan being nicely dressed with no sleeves and have to wear a heavy coat and put up with the humid conditions? I have always said that if people can put up with disabilities, so can I, but I think we ought all to be on the same level.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I am thinking about buying my first dress!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: In another place there is a Standing Order which allows members to remove their coats but not their ties, and in this Chamber we allow people to wear safari jackets without ties. That is not being fair. At dinner tonight somebody said to me, "Why don't you get a safari jacket?" I do not want a safari jacket. I have dressed in this way for most of my life and I prefer to be dressed in this way. There is no reason for this situation. We are all well acquainted with each other. There is nobody in the gallery to see whether we are badly dressed. We are responsible people and we will not come in here badly dressed. I am not saying that any of the people in safari jackets are badly dressed but members wearing slacks and ties are as well dressed as those people wearing safari jackets.

If we are not allowed to dress in a normal manner in a subtropical climate, it is high time some sort of air-conditioning was installed in this place so that we can sit here in a little comfort. Mr President, you know that it is not very pleasant to stand here and make a speech in these sorts of conditions. It is very trying, as all members well know. Of course, it is worse to have to sit here in these conditions listening to the sort of stuff we have just heard in the last hour-and-a-half.

I come back to the Governor's Speech and I say again that I am always delighted to see Sir Wallace Kyle in this place presenting himself in the way that he does. I have had the pleasure of meeting him and while that position remains and we have people of Sir Wallace Kyle's ability holding the office of Governor, we are doing the

right thing; and in that respect the Government should be congratulated for appointing a man of his ability and character.

After the experience we have had during the past two years, the following day after the opening it was very refreshing to meet the new Governor-General. It is a position now which everybody in this nation can respect. There was a void for two years when the person who occupied that position did not have the respect of a large number of people. I do not know Sir Zelman Cowen personally but his record proves that he is not a political person, that he will not side with any political party, and that he will carry out his job in the manner in which it should be carried out. He will hold himself above politics in respect of any decision he makes. I am sure he will not collude with a leader of a minority political party to bring down a Government which has been democratically elected.

The Hon. T. Knight: I thought he was appointed by Mr Whitlam.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Of course he was appointed by Mr Whitlam, but everybody is capable of making mistakes, and this Government—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the honourable member disregard interjections and address his remarks to the Chair?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I suppose that the Government of the day is making up for the mistakes it made in the past in respect of its collusion with the former Governor-General and should be commended for appointing a person such as Sir Zelman Cowen.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Did Kerr bring down the Government?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Kerr brought down the Government all right. For a period in Australian history we had a Government which did not have a majority in the House of Representatives, the people's House. There is no question at all he brought down the Government. The Labor Party was put out of office by one man, not by the people of Australia.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: The Whitlam Government tried to govern without authority from the Parliament.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr President, the best part of the Governor's Speech was the presentation of it by the Governor. Of course, we know that he did not draft the Speech. We know it was drafted by either the Premier of this State—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: If everyone knows, why do you have to say it every year?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am saying it now—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Why have you just got to say it every year? Everybody knows and then you always tell everybody.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am expressing in this Chamber—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Why can't you leave it?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I do not say it every year.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Oh yes you do.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member was making a very good speech and he was directing his comments to me, and suddenly he started a cross-conversation with other members. I recommend that he get back to directing his comments to the Chair.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is the position. The contents of the Speech were so poor that the mover of the motion did not mention them. A number of members on the other side of the Chamber have spoken to the motion and they have not mentioned one word of what is contained in the document which was presented to us as the Government's policy and so-called achievements during the past couple of years. But I shall address myself to the Speech and point to some parts of it.

The Speech contained nothing new. The Leader of the House has said that we did not do anything differently, but this Speech contained nothing new and was completely devoid of ideas and any future planning because only a very small part of the Speech dealt with the Bills which would be presented to the Parliament during this session. It seems to me that a large amount of the Speech was just an excuse for the failure of this Government during its term of office. It does not seem to have any remedies for curing the malaise of unemployment which is besetting our country and this State in particular, and it does not seem to have very many ideas for containing inflation. This Government has done very little in regard to bringing down the rate of inflation. If this document and what the Government has done in the past are examples of what will happen in the future, the Government simply does not seem to have the answer to what is required. This seems to be an example of what I have said previously in this Chamber on many occasions; that is, that majority decisions can be wrong. The people of

this State who gave a majority to this Liberal-National Country Party Government were wrong.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: The majority can be right when they vote Labor?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I will not say that is so all the time, but judging by its actions and attitudes contained in this document the people of Western Australia were wrong to return the Government to office in 1977. If we proceed through the Speech we will find that on the first page the Government spoke about the economy and said that the difficulties persist but lessening inflation and lower interest rates clearly indicate an improvement. That may be right because there has been a reduction in inflation and in interest rates, but what has the Government done in respect of interest rates for those people who are buying homes with building society finance? I well remember that in 1973-74 when the Whitlam Government was under attack for raising interest rates the news had hardly come out from the Treasury offices when the building societies increased their home loan interest rates. But if we ask some of these young people who are buying homes as a consequence of obtaining loans from building societies whether they have received a reduction in their interest rates we will find that they have not received any reduction at all. The best that can be said is that the building societies have offered them a shorter term in some instances. It is a sad thing in my view that when interest rates go up the consumer can be charged straightaway, but when they come down it takes a very long time for them to be adjusted.

The bond rate has dropped by approximately 1 per cent. I cannot calculate what that would mean to a home buyer; but I have been told that one-quarter of a per cent drop in the interest rate can mean a reduction of \$10, \$11 or \$12 per month in repayments on a loan extending over 25 years.

I believe the Government should be doing something to control building societies in order that people who have home loans may receive some relief in respect of their repayments.

On page 2 of the Governor's Speech we see the following—

Nationally, this will assist in returning industries to full production, and the work force to full employment.

When the Governor spoke those words he was mouthing a platitude, because we all know that the Liberal-National Country Party coalition does not believe in full employment. This has been demonstrated over the years. The mentor of the Liberal-National Country Party coalition believed

in the philosophy that we must have a pool of unemployed in order to control the work force. That philosophy has been adhered to by Liberal-National Country Party Governments since the Second World War.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: That statement is quite untrue.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is the truth. The father of the Liberal Party, Robert Menzies, in the years after the Second World War, made a statement in that regard at a time when we were enjoying full employment.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: Why then under the Menzies Government did we not have full employment, but over-full employment?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: As the honourable member knows, there was a period of rehabilitation after the war. At the time when Chifley went out of power only 1 800 people were unemployed in Australia.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: In other words, it was not his fault.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It was not his fault; but it was his philosophy. I believe it is the philosophy of the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party talks about all the jobs it has created and all the jobs which are coming up. A few years ago Mr Masters said we were pulsating with excitement. They are simply pies in the sky. We had a situation where 7 527 people were unemployed in Western Australia when the Tonkin Government went out of office. In 1977, after three years of a Liberal-National Country Party Government, we had 26 588 people unemployed, and that is the actual figure and not the jiggery pokery that has been going on in Canberra where people are trying to pull figures out of the air. The people in Canberra have removed the seasonally adjusted figures and they are now trying to jild the jily further.

The situation is even more alarming when one looks at the figures for Western Australia. At the present time 35 100 people are unemployed. That figure represents 6.69 per cent of the work force. In 1974 when the Labor Party went out of office, 1.62 per cent of the work force was unemployed. Government members talk about returning industry to full production and the work force to full employment. The Government simply does not have the answers.

In December of last year Fraser obtained a majority. It is almost beyond my comprehension that such a situation should occur when so many people were unemployed. It is not really beyond my comprehension, because people are wrong in this respect. I believe the people who voted for the

Liberal-National Country Party are taking a very avaricious and greedy attitude towards the situation. A great many of those people do not give a damn about the unemployed. They are secure in their own employment and they do not care how the bloke next door is faring. Who put these people into the situation where they are secure in their own employment? It was the Labor movement which made these people feel secure in their employment.

As an example, one can look at the situation at North-West Cape. Jim Coleman and I worked very hard to secure decent conditions for the people who work there. We obtained first-class conditions for the people who work in the Exmouth Gulf area. What happened then? These people became conservative in their outlook and the majority of them vote Liberal.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: There may be something wrong with what you did.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am not alone in this. One can blame the policy—and it was a good one—that called upon the people of Australia to forgo their tax concessions in order that something could be done for the unemployed. What did the people do? The people turned their backs on that policy. That policy cost the Labor Party 6 per cent of the national vote, according to a comment I read in the paper this morning. I believe that happened because of the attitude of some people towards their own warm, comfortable lives.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You sound a very bitter man, Mr Cooley.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is the warm, comfortable position in which these people find themselves that causes such a situation to arise. Of course these people do not want things to change. The confidence trick which was perpetrated against these people is almost unbelievable. I intend to refer to that in another part of my speech.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You are again trying to tell people what is good for them and what is not. You really insist on it.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We have been told we are creating new jobs faster than any other State, although the unemployment figure remains unacceptable. That is an excuse for failure. The Government says it is creating more jobs. Perhaps that is so, but it cannot control the rising figure of unemployment. It is a bad situation as far as the people of this State are concerned. This Government should not be praising itself in regard to the employment situation until it can control unemployment. The Government is not

doing its job in a proper manner. The Government is not doing its job for the people who elected it so overwhelmingly at the last election. The Government is betraying those people.

What is the Government saying? It is suggesting that we should bring more skilled migrants into this country at a time when there is massive unemployment. It is not my idea. Somebody else said it. But what is wrong with training people who are unemployed, instead of bringing in more migrants? Why should we bring more people into this country when we have these terrible unemployment figures?

During the election campaign we were told that the unemployment figure would go down in February; but the figure has not gone down. We have more people unemployed in this State. The unemployment figure for the end of February has risen.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You tell us the solution.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: There is a solution. It would take a very long time to tell it. The Government in power should be one which has regard for the needs of the people. By that I do not mean the people about whom Mr Lewis was talking—people involved with BHP, the breweries, and the newspapers, insurance companies, banks, etc. These people are dedicated to destroying the Labor Party when it comes into office.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: The breweries have been good to you.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The breweries have been good to me; but conversely I have been good to them over the years.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I think *Hansard* should show a bit of laughter there.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: There is proof of how the breweries prospered, during the strike-free period when I was secretary of the union.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You do not like to say it was because you were secretary. It is only because you are too modest.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Mr Masters said some time ago, "Give us a bit more time and we will produce more jobs". I have in my office the copy of *Hansard* in which those words appear. I will get it out.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The brewing industry was reported as having lost \$3 million a week during a strike in 1976. For the 22 years between 1954 and 1976 there were no strikes in the industry. I will leave members to guess who was secretary during that period.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: And while they did not have a strike were the men badly paid?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: No; they had a very good salary.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I have nothing against profits being made. I do not believe the breweries make excessive profits. I have nothing against a monopoly as such, as long as the employees are well paid, working conditions are good, and a good product is produced. The breweries are a good example in that regard. They have an unsurpassed record in that respect.

It is no good Mr Gayfer saying the breweries were good to me, because I was as good to the breweries as they have been to me. However, I am getting off the track.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Hopping off the hops!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Further on in the Speech made by the Governor the following appears—

The first 200 megawatt generating unit at Kwinana Power Station has been converted to burn either oil or coal and is now in operation.

It is expected that the second unit will be converted to coal-firing and will become operational by March, 1979.

Construction is progressing satisfactorily . . .

I believe approximately \$35 million has been or will be spent on the conversion of this power station from oil to coal. When I was President of the Trades and Labor Council I well remember in 1965, along with the Collie miners, begging a conservative Government not to have an oil-burning operation in Kwinana, but rather to use coal from Collie. What did the Government say? The Government said, "The coalfields are running out." The Government thought it could get oil more cheaply.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We did get oil cheaper.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Government disregarded the wishes of these unions and the wishes of the Australian Labor Party. The Government turned the Kwinana Power Station into an oil-burning unit. When the Tonkin Government came to power a survey was made of the Collie coalfields. It was found that there were unlimited resources of coal in the Collie field.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Not unlimited.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Very large.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: In our lifetime.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The resources were very extensive.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Will you settle for quite extensive?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: There was a possibility later that coalfields could be developed at Eneabba and at other places, but the conservative Government said in 1965, "No coal for Kwinana Power Station." It seems to me there was another motive for doing this, a motive which was not concerned with promoting Collie coal.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Would you be inclined to admit that the whole energy price structure in the world in regard to coal and oil has changed in the last few years?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It has changed.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is nice of you to admit that.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Middle East countries merely want the right price for it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I did not hear you, Mr Dans.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: At that time the unions were asking for a survey to be carried out of the Collie coalfields, but the pleas of the unionists fell on deaf ears.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: If my memory serves me correctly a survey was made.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Everybody makes mistakes, but that was a massive blunder on the part of the Government.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It was not a mistake.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: What was it then—a blunder?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It was not a blunder. It was a proper decision at the time.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It was a decision made without any regard for the people in the industry and it was a decision made without a survey being carried out of the potential of the Collie coalfields. That was the sort of decision made by the Government.

The point I am trying to make is that the \$35 million which is being spent on the Kwinana Power Station at the present time could be used to help those people who are unemployed. That is another example of the attitude of the Government. I certainly would not have included it in the Governor's Speech. It is certainly not something of which the Government should be proud.

We turn to page four of the Speech and learn that the proposed amendments to the Factories

and Shops Act will permit one late shopping night per week.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You have to admit that is a good idea.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I cannot agree with that.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I can imagine the thousands of people flocking to the Fremantle shops on a cold, wintery Thursday night.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You should be in favour of it if your people in Fremantle want it.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Rain, wind, and sleet.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Government had no regard for the wishes of the principal people who are associated with the retail trade. The retail traders do not want late night shopping.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Who are the principal people concerned with late night shopping?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am coming to that matter. The retailers do not want late night shopping. The unions do not want late night shopping. Certainly the people who work in the shops do not want to be out on Thursday night when they could be home enjoying life with their families.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: It is not true to make comments like that, because in fact many of the shop-keepers, shop managers, and shop owners want it. If you took the trouble to go around your electorate and find out, you would discover that is true.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I have taken the trouble to do so in my electorate.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If Mr Masters did that he may think differently.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: There are only four shops in Kalamunda.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: A survey was conducted among the shopkeepers in Western Australia. The survey asked the shopkeepers whether they wanted night shopping. I believe 71 per cent of the people said "Yes"; they did want night shopping.

A correct survey would be to ask how many people would take advantage of night shopping if it were introduced. A weekend newspaper, either *The Sunday Times* or the *Sunday Independent*, hit the nail on the head in a statement which said that the Government knew how many people wanted night shopping, but did not know how many people needed night shopping. I believe the number would not be anything like 71 per cent.

The retail traders are rightly claiming that if

shops are opened at nighttime why should not the SEC, the Metropolitan Water Board, and other Government departments, also be open to provide people with a public service. Of course, the Minister for Labour and Industry and the Government are aware that they could not get away with that. The justification for night shopping, as claimed by this Government, is that it is operating successfully in Sydney. Of course it would operate successfully there because there are more people in Sydney than in the whole of Western Australia. In fact, I would say there are three times as many people in Sydney as in Western Australia. It is no justification at all to claim that night shopping should commence in this State. I believe the people will be faced with higher charges. I made this prediction in a debate here a few years ago when trading hours were extended for small shops in country areas. An examination of prices in these shops would reveal how correct I was then.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Were prices increased in South Australia as a result of night shopping?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I understand that someone said they had gone up by something like 6 per cent.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Who introduced night shopping in South Australia?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It would have been a Labor Government.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: If you had been a member of the South Australian Parliament would you have voted for it?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Being a party man, and if it was the wish of my party, I would have supported it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is a matter of convenience.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Do members on the Government back benches favour night shopping?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They can vote against it if they want to.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The Minister has been in Sydney and Melbourne and observed late night shopping.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The decision to have night shopping was taken without any regard for the wishes of the people in the trade.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: We have regard for the public, and you have already said that 70 per cent of the public support it.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I did not say that at all. I said that 71 per cent of the people said

they wanted night shopping. Of course, they would say that anyway.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Why?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am trying to point out to the member that there is a certain amount of greed in human nature. Some people do not have any regard at all for other people so long as a proposal does not affect them.

A survey of the 6 000 shop assistants would not provide a figure of 71 per cent in favour of night shopping. A survey of the retail traders would not provide a 71 per cent figure either.

The Government has said that if a retailer does not want to open he does not have to. What a lot of hogwash!

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Codswallop is the word you are looking for.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: No, that is not the word.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the member direct his remarks to the Chair?

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Does the honourable member recall what happened when the bakers decided not to bake on Saturday mornings?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Masters is aware that the survey was not reliable. The honourable member is aware of the number of letters on his desk which oppose this proposition. I believe it will fall to the ground in time at the expense of many people.

I believe it could not have been introduced at a worse time. It is the beginning of winter and people will prefer their television sets to walking around Boans and David Jones shopping. We have heard the Minister for Labour and Industry claim that Thursday nights will be wonderful family shopping nights. However, at that hour in the wintertime the children ought to be in their beds, not running around the town. Night shopping will not cater for families at all.

At page 5 of the Governor's Speech it is stated—

To conform with Government policy the Senior Industrial Commissioner is reviewing the Industrial Arbitration Act.

I have a great personal regard for the Senior Industrial Commissioner and I believe he will do a good job in his review of the Act. I hope the Government in considering his recommendations does not act as it did in 1963. Our experience of the amendments to the Industrial Arbitration Act in 1963 was that they were totally unacceptable to the trade union movement because there was no consultation at all.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is simply not true because I had a meeting with people in Bunbury, with trade union representatives. We went through that Bill clause by clause.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Minister may have met the trade union people in Bunbury.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Well, that is consultation.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I was on the executive of the Trades and Labor Council.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: If you refused to consult with Mr Wild, that was your fault.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Wild introduced it without any consultation. Even the employers did not want it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I am telling the honourable member the facts. There were offers to consult, and I consulted with trade union members in Bunbury. We sat down and talked it over, clause by clause.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I am sorry, Mr President, but I have to straighten the record.

The PRESIDENT: The Minister will have an opportunity later.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The central body of the Trades and Labor Council was not consulted.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That was because they refused to speak to the Minister.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Mr Wild said that his door was always open.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: And we have been through his door and spoken to him. However, there was no consultation before the amendment was introduced.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Yes, there was; I was here.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: No, there was not. Be that as it may, a lot of good things came out of it.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The Government slipped badly; it selected the wrong man.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I would not turn back the clock. The fact is Mr Kelly is a very good Industrial Commissioner. I hope we do not experience the same trauma we had in 1963 because I believe Mr Kelly was the architect of the 1963 amendments before they became part of the Act, and before he became an industrial commissioner.

For the record, I believe some sections of the Industrial Arbitration Act contravene the ILO

Conventions which this Government has agreed to. I have written to Mr Kelly and pointed out the relevant sections which I believe contravene the ILO Conventions. I have asked him to have regard for those conventions because I believe they override State law. The acceptance of the ILO Conventions is a Federal decision, and these conventions have been ratified.

Section 132 of the Industrial Arbitration Act is in contravention of ILO Conventions 87 and 98.

There is a reference in the Governor's Speech to proposed legislation. It covers less than half a page, but it includes a statement that, to overcome so called defects in the Workers' Compensation Act, Bills will be introduced pending a thorough review of the legislation. The Minister for Labour and Industry has already advertised the intention of the Government in this regard. It is intended to reduce standards in respect of the Workers' Compensation Act. The Minister has talked about reducing the benefits under the Act from 100 per cent to 85 per cent of the award rate.

I know that much will be said in this place when the legislation does eventually come before us. Just as the Minister has given notice of his intentions, I give notice that we will oppose that part of the Bill which seeks to reduce the standard of compensation payable to working people. From what I can understand from the Minister's statement—and I have consulted people on the Trades and Labor Council who have been in conference with him—the amendment will be another hit at the working class people by this Government. It will be at the behest of the Liberal Party's masters in the insurance business and the employers. I will leave it at that, but more will be said in respect of the amendments to the Workers' Compensation Act.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It holds no fears for my unions.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: A summary of the Governor's Speech, as it was presented to him, leaves little doubt in my mind that the Government is bereft of ideas. It also indicates how wrong the people of Western Australia are in placing their confidence in the present Government.

I hope the Government will take notice of this part of my address which will deal with the question of Governments throughout Australia returning to some form of morality, honesty, and truth in the decisions and promises they make. I think Mrs Piesse touched on this subject at the conclusion of her remarks. I realise the

significance of this request coming from a back-bencher in the Legislative Council; I do not suppose it will travel very far. However, it is high time we had some sense of morality, honesty, and truth in respect of government. It seems to me this type of thing has been lacking since the Fraser-Kerr coup in 1975. Now the Government has such an overwhelming majority in the Federal sphere I hope that it will adopt an honest approach. I do not refer to dishonest acts by individual members such as a Treasurer who may look after his own personal interests by doing something which he was telling other people not to do. Those types of people cannot be controlled.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Do you think that big majorities make good governments?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am not saying that. I am saying that now the Government has such a majority it should exhibit some semblance of morality.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I thought you said it had.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We have seen that since 1975 the Government has not been honest by any stretch of the imagination. The Fraser Government said it would increase child endowment, which it did. However, in the same breath it took away concessions under the taxation laws in respect of claims for children which nullified the whole thing. Additional to that, the Government introduced a Medibank levy.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Cut it out; Medibank is Hayden's tragedy.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Fraser Government brought in a different form of Medibank.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Hayden inflicted that on the poor long-suffering people. He is worse than Whitlam, if you ask me.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: We will not ask you.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Most disgraceful of all was the failure to keep the promise to the work force of Australia to continue wage indexation in the form applying when Whitlam was in power. The Fraser Government has repudiated that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Fancy trying to blame us for Medibank!

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The national Press blames you for the rise in medical costs.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: There was no honesty and truth in the Fraser Government's wages policy. Before the last Federal election,

when the Labor Party enunciated its policy in regard to pay-roll tax which asked wage and salary earners to forgo the taxation concession promised by Fraser, the Government accepted that the Labor Party would give BHP another big increase in its concessions and that it would take \$6 a week out of the pockets of the working people. Of course, that was not the position at all. A person on average weekly earnings received about \$1.40 a week by way of taxation concessions in February, and nothing like \$6 a week. I suppose that we could possibly expect something like this happening during an election campaign, because we know politicians make promises that they never keep.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You speak for yourself.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We have kept all our promises.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: That was a disgraceful remark to make.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What about the 100 000 jobs? You only have to make 130 000 now.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We have kept all our promises.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: As I indicated previously, the people accepted the statements made by the Fraser Government because of this selfish attitude that has crept in. I used the word "avaricious" before, but an apt and modern expression really is that our policy would have hit the pocket nerve.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is not a modern expression; I think it was developed by Chifley.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is modern times.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: How many years ago was this? That is when you people had a Prime Minister.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That was about 1949.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: You did not say that about him at the time.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You could hardly call it modern times. People voting today were not born then.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: By no stretch of imagination could we say that had that policy been accepted the Labor Party would have won the election. However, certainly the policy cost us many votes because the people accepted the promise given to them by the Fraser Government that a vote for the Liberal Party would result in

another \$6 a week in their pockets by the 1st February. The people were told that if they voted for the Labor Party they would not get a red cent.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is not fair; you know the people rejected the dishonest statements you made.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The people accepted the promise that they would receive another \$6 a week and that was not the truth. A person on average weekly earnings for a 40-hour week received from 40c to \$1 a week extra. The Fraser Government was elected with a substantial majority because the people accepted that policy. What happened when the Fraser Government was returned to office? Certainly the taxation concessions were applied on the 1st February this year, but midway through that month the Government went to the Industrial Commission of this land and said that there should be no wage indexation in accordance with the movement in the CPI because the people had already received taxation concessions as a consequence of the decision of the 1st February.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What was the decision?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If that was not a fraudulent, dishonest, and immoral act, I do not know what is. That was a confidence trick imposed on the Australian people. It is high time this Government took a look at itself and endeavoured to bring about a situation where it can keep its promises. If the Government cannot keep its promises, it must justify its failure to do so but it should not engage in fraudulent acts.

On every possible occasion the Government goes before the Industrial Commission to say that there should be no movement in wages because it is told that increases in wages are the cause of our high inflation rate. I wish Mr Lewis were present in the Chamber to hear my remarks. The Government wants to control the wages of workers to the extent that a person on average weekly earnings today has been denied approximately \$10 per week which he would have had under the provisions of full wage indexation, as promised by the Fraser Government in 1975.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What would that give them a week?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: In round figures the average weekly earnings would be \$210 or \$212 at present. The same people who have denied the workers full wage indexation will allow a company such as the Utah Development Company to come into this country and to earn approximately \$158 million profit in a year. Most of this money goes out of our country, and the

Government has no control at all over such profits.

Mr Lewis said that all the Opposition wants to do is to oppose the making of profits, but that is a very long way from the truth.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You make an awful lot of fuss about it.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We do not oppose reasonable profits. Of course, we must have profits in the society we live in; we must have profits to keep people employed. For a long time I have told unionists, and particularly unionists in my field of endeavour, that we cannot expect high wages if we keep the firms in penury.

In 1954 the profit rate in the industry which I was interested in was something like £334 000 a year—about \$667 000. In 1976 the profit was about \$7 million. Nobody opposed the firm making reasonable profits, but we do oppose foreign companies making great profits in this country with no Government control at all. So there is no justification for either the State or Federal Government to go before the Industrial Commission to say that there should not be full wage indexation. The Government is virtually taking \$10 a week from the pockets of the workers, and the workers are entitled to profits in the same way that big business is entitled to profits.

When a worker retires he should have a reasonable amount set aside for his old age. However, at the present time a person on \$200 or \$210 a week—the average weekly earnings—could not be expected to keep a wife and two children in reasonable comfort in accordance with modern standards and still finish up with a profit.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What dividend does the brewery pay on its shares; that is, the capital investment?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I have never interested myself in that.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: It would have to make 11½ per cent to pay its bank commitment.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I do not say that the brewery profit is unreasonable. This is a local firm and it is ploughing the money back into local industry and keeping local people employed. There is a great difference between the brewery and foreign-owned companies which come in here and rip people off. Utah's profits are unrestricted.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: What would you consider a fair profit?

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Brewery profits are 20 per cent or thereabouts.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: This sort of situation touches me deeply. In this life we should all be able to gain a reasonable profit from our efforts, and by this I mean not only the big companies and executives, but everyone else who makes a contribution towards the progress of our nation. Unfortunately, in the present circumstances and under the present wage policy of both the State and Federal Governments, it is impossible for the workers to live at a reasonable standard.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is really rubbish. You know you should not say naughty things like that. It is really so stupid.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: It hurts you to hear the truth.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is not the truth. Don't be ridiculous.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mrs Vaughan spoke the other night about the different circles we live in. Obviously Mr MacKinnon does not meet these people in the greatest need.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You have to be joking!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr MacKinnon holds a very important position in the Government.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I go back to Bunbury every weekend.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Like many other people, Mr MacKinnon does not give a damn about the unemployed and those who cannot make their way in the world.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are talking piffle.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Government appears before the Industrial Commission to say that the workers should not be compensated for the rises brought about by others.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We are asking the Industrial Commission to have consideration for the workers and not to put wages up in a ridiculous manner.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: G. J. Coles & Co. Ltd. made a profit of \$36 million.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: What is their investment?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I do not care what the investment is; the Government will do nothing about it. It says that the people who work for G. J. Coles & Co. Ltd. should be under some form of control in respect of their profit.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is total rubbish.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Government does this every time it says there should be no adjustment in respect of wage indexation. It does this every three months of the year and the Leader of the House cannot deny it. However, the Government will do nothing about controlling prices.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We would like to go halfway as far as the system implemented by the Labor Government in Great Britain.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I can go into a Coles supermarket today and buy a pound of butter for \$1. However, if that company put the price up to \$1.50 a pound tomorrow, I would have to pay it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is utter rubbish because Woolworths would probably put it out for 90c, and you would buy it there.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You would have to be joking! You have not done the shopping for a while.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Mr Cooley has led such a protected life, being looked after by the brewery, that he does not even know how the world ticks.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If the Leader of the House had been involved in the world as much as I have, he would appreciate my point.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Mr Cooley, I have news for you: I have been a tradesman and I have worked around as much as you have and as long as you have.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Leader of the House has forgotten all he learnt.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You had a nice little protected job in the brewery.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: If you picked up a hammer you would hit your thumb.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I must refer to the closing stages of the parliamentary session last year when the infamous electoral legislation was before this House. At that time we all knew it was an immoral piece of legislation. It was defeated in the Legislative Assembly, and yet every member of the Liberal Party in this Chamber supported it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Quite right too.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It was an immoral piece of legislation, and quite properly it was thrown out in another place. It is high time this polarisation of our political situation ceased. It is

time the Government had some regard for what we say on this side of the Chamber.

What happened in this place last year? The Hon. Lyla Elliott introduced a motion into this Chamber in respect of the unemployment position. What did we do? We debated it all night, the Minister replied that same night, and that was the end of the matter altogether. The Government did not even have the courtesy to see whether there was any merit in Miss Elliott's proposition. That is the sort of thing I am talking about when I talk about some form of honesty and morality in government.

In his first session of Parliament Mr Hetherington introduced some amendments to the Electoral Act. What did the Government do to the Bill? It passed a ridiculous resolution saying that we would discuss it on Christmas Eve. It is not fair to treat people in such an offhanded manner and to ride roughshod over the things we propose. The problem with this country at present is that there is too much of that sort of thing and the sad part is that it can come from both sides of the Chamber. If we put up something the other side says it is wrong, and if the other side puts up something we say it is wrong.

The saddest part of the situation is that a big organisation, the trade union movement, is aligned to the Labor Party and if it puts forward suggestions to conservative Governments—and members should not tell me that the trade union movement is always wrong—they are cut off in the same manner as Miss Elliott's motion was cut off and Mr Hetherington's amendments were cut off.

The trade union movement has a great contribution to make to the administration of the country. To my knowledge this is the only country in the world, including the Soviet bloc, which simply disregards the trade union movement. The only exception I make is those fascist countries which do not have any regard at all for trade unionism. In most other countries the trade union movement is regarded with a great deal of respect and its viewpoint is respected. When planning is done in respect of a nation's economy the trade union movement and other people are consulted.

It is high time we did this sort of thing. What do conservative Australian Governments do? They say that if the trade union movement has put forward a suggestion it must have come from the Labor Party and they will reject it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: When they are put up by the trade union movement directly they are very often accepted, as you well know. It is when your union people handle them through

your political wing and they become twisted that they are not accepted.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: This sort of situation is more pronounced when the conservatives are in office than when the Labor Party is in government. The Labor Party has far more regard for the points of view of employers, manufacturers, insurance companies, and others than conservatives have for the points of view of the trade union movement. It is about time we got a little closer in respect of the nation's problems. If we did, this would be a far better country. We can never expect that situation to prevail when senior Ministers such as Mr MacKinnon are members of a Government. But we are all getting old and moving out and perhaps younger people will have more regard for other people's opinions.

We support the motion, but it is high time something was done in this country to get us out of the rut we are in. My suggestion is that we should be more understanding of each other's points of view and have a bit more morality, truth, and honesty in government.

THE HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [9.05 p.m.]: I have pleasure in supporting the motion before the Chair and in so doing I should like to express my congratulations to the Hon. Win Piesse for the manner in which she moved the motion on opening day. She did it with much graciousness and her timing was perfect.

In the Address-in-Reply debate we traditionally have the opportunity to mention one or two matters, and the first matter I should like to refer to is the role of the State Police Force and Road Traffic Authority officers. May I say at the outset that my observations lead me to believe that we are fortunate indeed to have the type of service we do have from our Western Australian Police Force and our Road Traffic Authority.

Because the nature of the work of these two organisations involves apprehending people on occasions, sometimes in a cautionary way and at other times in a more serious manner, they are not always appreciated by the community, but I am firmly of the view that the majority of the people in this State appreciate the state of law and order which prevails.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Mr Medcalf will tell you that I am appreciating it very much!

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I can fully appreciate the feelings of the Hon. Mick Gayfer and others in this situation. Nevertheless, I still say that by and large we are very fortunate to have the protection we have from these law enforcement officers. The main thrust of my comments may be appreciated by the Hon. Mick Gayfer. The Police

Force and the RTA would have greater co-operation if the public realised just how difficult their job is. It behoves the Police Force and the RTA officers to make every possible effort. I know they do a tremendous job but the aspect of public relations needs to be a constant objective. Similarly, I charge the citizens to make it our business to relate to the Police Force and the RTA officers in recognition of the job they are doing for our well-being.

By and large we get the type of service we have as a direct result of our attitudes as individuals and collectively. Therefore, the responsibility must come back to the citizens because theoretically if we did not commit misdemeanours we would not be apprehended. Consequently, the officers who are charged to do this work to maintain law and order in our community have to do unpopular things from time to time. I urge people generally to accept this challenge to get alongside their law enforcement officers and to understand their problems; and I am sure this will bring a response from the officers themselves. After all, law enforcement officers are just as much citizens as we are. They are doing a job to protect the citizenry and they carry out their duties in accordance with time-honoured practices which have evolved from usage; and the usage again relates back to us.

In a wider context, I believe that hijacking of aircraft and other means of transport should be tackled more rigorously. It is my firm view that the hijacking of aircraft particularly could have been stifled to a very large degree when it first raised its ugly head some years ago. If the authorities in those countries involved with hijacking had adopted firm tactics at the outset we would have had far fewer hijacking attempts on aircraft around the world.

I hold very strong views in regard to hijackers. I regard hijackers of aircraft particularly as being terrorists of the highest order, or the lowest order, whichever way one looks at it. They have absolutely no regard for the safety of innocent people and, therefore, no compassion should be shown to them. If I were in a situation of authority I should have no hesitation in executing them on the spot because they are bandits of the worst possible type. This situation needs to be tackled more seriously in various ways. One of the ways which comes to mind is the establishment of formal conventions between countries to handle the problem.

But the matter goes deeper than that. Just as in the Western Australian situation, people around the world should have regard to the situation and react to it to help their law enforcement officers.

If the people react sufficiently strongly, I am sure the authorities would be strengthened morally and in every other way to take positive action.

I refer to the recent shocking incident in Italy when a prominent public figure was abducted and certain persons around him were murdered in cold blood. From the Press reports I have read and heard, that incident indicates that the people of Italy are today more united on the question of law and order than for a long time. This again reinforces my view that people will stand up and be counted when they know how serious things are. Therefore, in regard to hijacking it behoves Governments and authorities everywhere to take a very firm line with this type of terrorism. We hear of other forms of terrorism such as bombings, kidnapping, and ransom notes, but I refer particularly to the hijacking of passenger aircraft or any form of transport vehicle, because people are entitled to a minimum of reasonable protection to enable them to move around freely without being molested or facing the possibility of losing their lives. We have to take stock and get alongside our law enforcement officers in an effort to understand their point of view, because they are there to help us. Just as that is the situation in Western Australia, so it is internationally.

I turn to another subject and I should like to express my pleasure at the progress being made with the school dental service. This service commenced in March, 1973, following some years of negotiation and examination as to how to bring it in. If I remember correctly, the present Leader of the House, who was then Minister for Health, had a lot to do with the early research as to the best method of implementing this type of scheme. The scheme is now being firmly developed throughout Western Australia.

The basic objective of this scheme is to develop in this State a system of public health dentistry offering a free dental service to pre-school children and school children under 15 years of age. Treatment is given to the children by specially trained dental therapists who work in association with staff dentists and some private practitioners. Private practitioners work on what is known as a sessional basis.

At present I understand that 180 dental therapists are carrying out this work in a number of places throughout the State from the north to the south. About 63 clinics are now in operation and 10 mobile clinics are being operated to bring the dental scheme to those smaller schools which cannot be supplied with a permanent facility.

The programme at its present rate of progress envisages that all pre-primary students will be covered by the end of 1980 and after that time the system will extend into the secondary education field.

This is tremendously heartening because the children receive dental health care which will stand them in good stead throughout their lives. How many of us in this Chamber wish they could have had more efficient dental treatment in their early years? I for one would have welcomed it for a number of reasons and I guess most of us fell short of what would be an ideal dental surveillance during our formative years.

In receiving this sort of dental service the children right throughout this State will have their dental health improved and secured. Naturally the cost factor is benefiting the parents who have enough pay-outs anyway in tending to and educating their children. This scheme will save the parents, on an average, hundreds of dollars and perhaps thousands of dollars. I am sure this scheme is appreciated by parents.

I have followed the scheme closely in its formative years and since it has been in operation. I was speaking to a group of parents last Saturday and they certainly appreciate this facility which is benefiting their families.

In my province dental facilities are made available by the school dental service at Carey Park Primary School at Bunbury and the South Bunbury Primary School; and a third is programmed to be built at the Adam Road Primary School, Bunbury. In addition, there are two mobile units in the area. Another dental service has been established on a permanent basis at the Busselton Primary School. I am grateful this scheme has been implemented and I am sure the children will learn to appreciate dental treatment rather than be frightened of it.

The dental therapists who carry out this work are well trained young ladies who take tremendous pride in their work. They operate with great efficiency; it has been my privilege to see some of them under training and in their work in the field; and it is my view children gain a lot of confidence from the work and attention that these female dental therapists administer to them.

I believe one of the greatest factors in human relationships is the overcoming of fear and I referred earlier to the role of the Police Force and the citizens of this community. It is fear which stops a greater interaction between us and authority, and so it is in the dental field. If we can break down that fear, as is happening under this scheme, I am certain that dentistry and its patients will profit.

I again wish to indicate my support of the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply and I look forward to a fairly heavy legislative session ahead of us this year. Mention has been made of legislation as listed in the Governor's Speech and some people have suggested that that is the only legislation to be forthcoming. I believe those who commented in this way perhaps spoke with tongue in cheek, because practice has it that Parliament deals with a great number of Bills of which only a few are mentioned in the Governor's Speech. Therefore I believe we can look forward to an active Parliament, and I for one welcome that. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. T. Knight.

House adjourned at 9.20 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

MINING

Diamond Exploration in the Kimberley

9. The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Leader of the House:

Further to my question without notice of the 15th November, 1977, concerning an amendment to the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority Act to permit diamond exploration in the Kimberley, and the Minister's written reply dated the 9th March, 1978, stating—

- (a) that the government intended to amend Regulation 8 under that Act to give the Minister power to issue permits to enter Aboriginal reserves; and
- (b) that it is then proposed to issue permits to Stockdale and Dampier to explore for diamonds in a portion of the Forrest River Aboriginal Reserve—

will the Minister advise—

- (1) Which Department it was whose officers provided him with the information in his written reply to my question?
- (2) Is it a fact that—
 - (a) the Oombulgurri Community agreed to a permit for exploration being issued to Conzinc Rio Tinto Aust. but not to Stockdale and Dampier;
 - (b) after consultation with them, the Aboriginal Lands Trust endorsed the wishes of the Oombulgurri people;

- (c) the Aboriginal Lands Trust, at its meeting of the 24th October, 1977, decided to send a telex to the Premier informing him that if the regulations were amended to enable the wishes of the Aboriginal people concerned and the Commissioner of Aboriginal Planning to be overridden, the members of the Trust would resign;
- (d) no consultation has taken place with the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs concerning the proposed amendment to Regulation 8; and
- (e) no consultation has taken place with the Aboriginal Lands Trust concerning the amendment to Regulation 8?

- (3) What stage has the proposed amendment to Regulation 8 reached, and when will Parliament be given an opportunity to consider it?
- (4) Have the three companies concerned been given any timetable for the commencement of exploration?
- (5) What negotiations, if any, have taken place to ensure the Aboriginal people concerned will receive royalties or other financial compensation for exploration rights or mining operations on the reserve?
- (6) What are the comprehensive conditions to be imposed on the mining companies to protect the welfare and way of life of the Oombulgurri people who live 30 kilometres south of the exploration area referred to by the Leader in his letter of the 9th March, 1978?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) Ministers answer questions, not departments or officers.
- (2) (a) Yes.
- (b) Yes.
- (c) Yes.
- (d) No.

(e) No consultation is required under the Act or Regulations but the Premier said when he met with the Aboriginal Lands Trust on 11th January, 1978, that he will have further discussions with the Trust.

(3) The matter is under consideration.

(4) No.

(5) The whole question of the royalties from mining activity on Aboriginal reserves has been examined by a Cabinet Sub-Committee. Its findings will be discussed with the Aboriginal Lands Trust in the near future.

(6) These will be discussed with the Aboriginal Lands Trust in the near future.

EDUCATION

Midland Technical School

17. The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Education:

Further to my question of the 25th November, 1976, in respect to the Government's intention to build a new Midland Technical School, and the Minister's reply that a new one would be built at O'Connor Road, Wexcombe as soon as finances became available—will the Minister advise what plans the Government now has for a new Technical College in that area in view of the announcement in the Governor's speech in respect to technical colleges in other suburbs?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

Present plans for the development of Midland Technical College include:—

- (i) retention of existing site;
- (ii) upgrading of the present facilities;
- (iii) additional special purpose facilities for electrical, automotive technical training and general purpose classrooms.

Construction for the items (ii) and (iii) is expected to be undertaken during 1981.

POLICE

Special Branch

18. The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

(1) Is the Minister aware that the Premier's statement that the only people who fear the existence of files on themselves would be those with guilty consciences, pre-supposes that information in the files to be not only justified but also correct?

(2) Is the Minister aware that in South Australia, Acting Justice White's finding with reference to some files were that they were scandalously inaccurate?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

(1) I am aware of the Premier's statement but do not necessarily draw the same conclusion as the honourable member.

(2) I am aware that Acting Justice White formed that opinion. I am unaware of any facts that led that gentleman to form such an opinion.

TEACHERS

Education and Recruiting

19. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Education:

(1) Is it correct that the Commonwealth intends to proceed with an enquiry into teacher education and recruiting which was outlined to State Ministers at a Commonwealth/State Ministers' meeting in Auckland at the end of January?

(2) If so, what are the terms of reference?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

(1) and (2) The form of the proposed enquiry has not been finalised, and whether the Commonwealth intends to proceed as originally intended has not yet been announced. All States have raised objections to the original proposal, while still agreeing to the need for such an enquiry.

POLICE

Special Branch

20. The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

- (1) In view of previous statements by the Premier and the Minister for Police that they do not know how the W.A. Special Branch of the Police Force operates, and they don't want to know, how is it possible for them to give assurances that the system in Western Australia is working well?
- (2) Is the Premier aware that if the South Australian Government had adopted the same attitude as he has done in respect of the Special Branch files, that none of the dangerous excesses which occurred in South Australia would have been discovered?
- (3) If the Government is so sure that the activities of the W.A. Police Force Special Branch are completely above board, will the Government hold an enquiry by the Chief Justice to examine the files so the matter can be put to test?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) The total absence of specific complaints in respect of these operations is sufficient evidence.
- (2) I am unaware that any "dangerous excesses" have been discovered.
- (3) No.

MINISTER FOR HEALTH

Accommodation

21. The Hon. N. E. BAXTER, to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Health and Community Welfare:
 - (1) What was the cost of furnishings etc. of the new office of the Minister for Health and Community Welfare in Allendale Square?
 - (2) What is the annual rental on such an office?
 - (3) Why was it necessary for the Minister to transfer from the office at 57 Murray Street, Perth, which has been used continuously by the previous four successive Ministers for Health?
 - (4) As an alternative, why wasn't the transfer made to Curtin House where no extra rental cost would have been incurred?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) \$47 779.
- (2) \$18 000.

- (3) The premises at 57 Murray Street were no longer up to standard and there were space restrictions on structural improvements. (Traffic noise was also a problem and there was an increase in size of Ministerial staff.)
- (4) The space available was inadequate and, in any event, is required for Medical and Health Services staff.

MTT

Finance

22. The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Transport:

Would the Minister confirm or deny that the MTT services are being quoted as having a loss of \$15 000 on Wednesday, the 21st December, 1977, because of the additional services they had to provide on that date?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

The correct figure is \$1 500. The \$15 000 is a misprint for which the Trust is responsible.

ROAD TRANSPORT

Grain

23. The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE, to the Minister for Transport:
 - (1) Would the Minister advise whether Bindoon Transport and other road transport operators are conveying grain from farms to C.B.H. installations in the metropolitan area of Perth which previously was received at Mogumber for rail?
 - (2) If so, could the Minister advise reasons for the change, and whether it is of a permanent or temporary nature?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) Bindoon Transport Service is licensed for the transport of grain from within that portion of the Shire District of Victoria Plains situated west of Great Northern Highway and south of a line running east and west through the townsite of Gillingarra to the Metropolitan Area.

- (2) This licence was issued as receival facilities for grain at Mogumber are not considered entirely satisfactory for today's transport equipment. Co-Operative Bulk Handling Ltd. is in agreement with the road transport of grain from this area and have no plans at present for upgrading receival facilities at Mogumber.
The road transport of grain from the area outlined in (1) above is of a permanent nature.

EDUCATION

Amenities Fees

24. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Will the Government abolish amenities fees for students in Government schools?
- (2) If not, why not?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) The Government is not prepared to prevent parents making voluntary contributions to schools or supporting school amenities.
- (2) School amenities such as book hire schemes, book shops and school funds are operated for the benefit of students and parents.

HOUSING

Homeless Young People

25. The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of a recent A.B.C. television documentary which revealed there were a large number of homeless young people in this State and the financial problems being encountered by voluntary groups endeavouring to provide accommodation for them?
- (2) If so, will he advise what plans the Government has to either—
 - (a) subsidise voluntary groups providing this essential service; or
 - (b) build hostels to overcome the problem as it is able to do under section 69 of the State Housing Act?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) No.

- (2) None at present. It is considered that limited public sector housing funds should be directed to those least able to find alternate shelter. Hence our energies are directed to families and aged people.

RAILWAYS

Road Transport

26. The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Did Westrail, on behalf of its Road Services section, submit a tender for the carrying of goods by road from Perth to Meekatharra when the railway line ceases to operate?
- (2) If not, why not?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) and (2) Because Westrail was not equipped to handle refrigerated traffic by road, no tender was submitted.

ELECTORAL

Legislative Council

27. The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) In view of the fact that reforms were recently achieved in South Australia and agreed upon by both Labor and Liberal Parties in New South Wales for the election of the Legislative Councils in those States by proportional voting thereby introducing the principle of one vote-one value, will the Western Australian Government take similar action to introduce a more equitable system of election for the Legislative Council in this State and thereby remove the imbalance in electorates which gives some Western Australian electors a vote 14 times more powerful than others, as authenticated by the following enrolments as at the 13th March, 1978—

North	East	Metropolitan
Province—84 954		

Lower North Province—5 899?

- (2) If not, why not?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) No. The honourable member is advised that no changes have yet been made in New South Wales. I understand that a proposal for change is to be subject to referendum on 17th June, 1978.
- (2) The reasons have been stated many times during debates in this Parliament as a study of the appropriate Hansard reports will reveal.

POLICE

Inspector Markham

28. The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Police:

Will the Minister table a list of duties for Inspector Markham of the Western Australian Police Force?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

Inspector Markham's duties are—

- (1) Responsibility for assessing extent of security required for visiting VIPs and supervising and assisting in that security.
- (2) Investigating and recording matters concerning State and Commonwealth Security in relation to organisations and individuals who may be considered to have unlawful or subversive potential.
- (3) Liaison with other States and Commonwealth Security organisations for this common purpose.
- (4) Reporting to the Commissioner of Police on matters of security.

RAILWAYS

Parcels Depot

29. The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) On what date will the railway receiving and delivery parcels depot at Roe Street, Perth, cease to operate?
- (2) Will an alternative depot be provided close to the City centre when the closure is effected?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) and (2) No date has been set for the parcels depot to cease to operate, nor has an alternative depot close to the city been considered for use after the closure.

As at this stage, it is not intended that the depot at Roe Street will cease to receive parcels.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AND VEHICLES

Kununurra

30. The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Leader of the House:

Will the Minister advise—

- (a) the number of State Government employees stationed at Kununurra;
- (b) the names of the Government departments or instrumentalities employing them, and the number in each department; and
- (c) the number of State Government vehicles there?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (a) 312.
- (b) Agriculture Department—41.

Agriculture Board—7 4 in dry season.

Community Department—6.

Crown Law Department—2.

Education Department—42.

Lands and Surveys Department—2.

Main Roads Department—48.

Medical Department (including Hospital)—26.

Police Department—5.

Public Health Department—6.

Public Works Department—109.

Road Traffic Authority—2.

State Energy Commission—9.

State Housing Commission—4.

Office of Regional Administrator—3.

- (c) 147 (This figure includes cars, utilities, vans, trucks, 4 wheel drive vehicles and two motor cycles, but excludes construction and maintenance plant).

STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Premises and Fixed Charge

31. The Hon. N. E. BAXTER, to the Attorney-General representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) What was the cost of revamping the State Energy Commission premises at 132 Murray Street, Perth?
- (2) Was this expenditure justified in view of increased charges for electricity and increase of the fixed charge from Two Dollars Four Cents (\$2.04) to Six Dollars (\$6.00)?
- (3) What was the total amount raised from the increase in the fixed charge for six months ending the 31st December, 1977?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) \$380 000.
- (2) Yes. If the honourable member so desires I am informed that the Minister for Fuel and Energy would be glad to arrange for the Commission to provide him with detailed photographs or an inspection of the facilities if this would be helpful.
- (3) \$2 169 000.

MOTOR VEHICLES

Licence Plates

32. The Hon. D. W. COOLEY, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Police and Traffic:
 - (1) Is it an offence under the Road Traffic Act to remove or obliterate the words "W.A.—State of Excitement" from motor vehicle number plates?
 - (2) If so, do motorists have an option to have different plates other than personalised plates fitted to their vehicles?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) Yes, under Regulation 27 of the Road Traffic (Licensing) Regulations, 1975.
- (2) In the metropolitan area the motorist has the option of retaining his old plates providing they are legible, or having them re-made with the same number but in the new colour with the slogan.
In country areas where the local authority has elected not to include the slogan on the district number plates, the motorist has the option of taking the State plate or the local district plate.

FISHERIES

Crabbing Restrictions

33. The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) With reference to the Minister's statement which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 21st January, 1978, concerning the lifting of restrictions on crabbing in rivers and estuaries—

"If restrictions were lifted it would not endanger the species because crabs were ocean going.

But it would mean that supplies in rivers and estuaries would dry up if people continued to be irresponsible in their catching habits."

will the Minister advise whether these two statements are supported by research?

- (2) If so, will he supply the details of that research?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

The statements referred to appeared in *The West Australian* of the 28th January not the 21st January, 1978.

- (1) Yes, the statements were based on research undertaken.
- (2) A research reference is "A study of the ecology of the crab *Portunas pelagicus Portunidae* in south Western Australia" by T. D. Meagher available at University of W.A. library.

TOWN PLANNING

Subdivisions: Shire Council Recommendations

34. The Hon. H. W. GAYFER, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Town Planning:
 - (1) Is it customary to approve of a private land subdivision in a country town without consulting the shire council concerned?
 - (2) If this be the case, why is such action taken?
 - (3) If this is not the case, what notice is taken of the local shire council recommendations?
 - (4) In the case of H. V. Greenhill's subdivision of York (41392 T.P.B.) why wasn't the correspondence of the York Shire Council taken notice of?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) The Board considers all factors, including the recommendation of the Local Authority and other consultees, the submission of the subdivider and the Board's policies relative to the matter in hand before making a determination.
- (4) The Board did have regard to the correspondence of York Shire Council when considering the application of Mr H. V. Greenhill.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION

Rates

35. The Hon. D. W. COOLEY, to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Labour and Industry:

What weekly workers' compensation rates are payable under the respective Acts in other States of the Commonwealth and the Federal Act?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

This information is published in a booklet entitled "Conspectus of Workers' Compensation Legislation in Australia as at 1st January 1977". The booklet is published by the Commonwealth Department of Social Security.

Telephone enquiries to other States have elicited that since 1st January 1977 amendments to weekly payments have been made as follows:

New South Wales now pay the first 26 weeks of compensation at the basic award rate of pay and after this period the amount of compensation becomes:

\$83.00 per week for adult worker.

\$19.00 per week for dependent spouse.

\$9.50 per week for each dependent child.

Queensland have not altered the method of payments but the rates have increased as follows:

Male Basic Wage—\$76.40 per week.

Spouse—\$19.15 per week.

Each Dependent Child—\$7.65 per week.

South Australia—the "Conspectus" refers to WAVE (workers average weekly earnings) over the period of 12

months immediately preceding the incapacity. The telephone advice I received was that the weekly payment could be either that amount or the weekly wage under the award at the time of the incapacity, whichever is the greater.

STREET PERFORMERS

Hay Street Mall

36. The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

As the question No. 15 I asked relating to performances by artists in the Hay Street Mall sought information on action to be taken by the Government which is unrelated to opinions expressed by individual members of the Opposition, will the Minister answer the question as asked?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

The Police Department will not take action against any performer, providing he does not breach section 65, subsection 3 of the Police Act (begging or gathering alms), or the provisions of the Road Traffic Code (Obstructing Pedestrian Traffic).

In addition, the Street Collection (Regulation) Act prohibits the collection of money in public streets within the metropolitan area—unless authorised in writing by the Chief Secretary.

Permits may be issued for only 50 days in the year and these are usually allocated to Charitable Organisations.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

MINING

Temporary Reserves

1. The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Leader of the House:

Will the Minister advise—

- (1) what is a "temporary reserve" as referred to in section 276 of the Mining Act;
- (2) what steps must be taken to obtain one, and to what does it entitle the holder;
- (3) how long has the Government or the Minister concerned been aware of the fact that Stockdale Prospecting had

breached the conditions under which temporary reserves were granted to it by entering the Forrest River Aboriginal Reserve without a permit;

- (4) is the Government prepared to consider a further application from Stockdale for temporary reserves in the area concerned;
- (5) which companies have been granted temporary mining reserves on Aboriginal reserves in the Kimberleys;
- (6) which Aboriginal reserves are involved?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

I thank the member for having given me some prior notice of this question.

- (1) An area of ground temporarily reserved pursuant to section 276 of the Mining Act, 1904.
- (2) (a) A right of occupancy over a temporary reserve may be obtained on written application to the Mines Department.
(b) A right of occupancy entitles the grantee to prospect for the minerals nominated in the right of occupancy.
- (3) The Minister for Mines became aware on the 16th March, 1978.
- (4) Future applications would have to be considered at that time in accordance with the statutory and customary practice.
- (5) Occupancy rights have been granted to CRA Exploration Pty. Ltd., Stockdale Prospecting Pty. Ltd.—cancelled on the 16th March, 1978 when the Minister became aware of the breach—and Dampier Mining Company Limited.
- (6) Aboriginal Reserve No. 13873.

MINING

Diamond Exploration in the Kimberley

2. The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Leader of the House:

Is the Leader of the House in a position to advise me on what date the Mines Department became aware of the fact that Stockdale Prospecting had breached the conditions under which the temporary reserves were granted to it by entering the Forrest River Aboriginal Reserve without a permit?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

As in my opinion the Minister and the department are one, the answer would be on the 16th March, 1978.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Standard of Dress

3. The Hon. D. W. COOLEY, to the Leader of the House:

I apologise for not giving prior notice of this question. Having regard to the increasing number of members who are not wearing safari jackets in the Chamber—

- (1) Does the Leader of the House consider a member wearing a shirt with the sleeves down, a tie, but no coat, to be dressed equally presentably as members wearing safari jackets?
- (2) If the answer to (1) is "Yes", will he prevail upon the President to allow members, who normally wear lounge suits in the Chamber, the discretion to remove their coats during abnormally hot and oppressive weather?

The PRESIDENT: I would remind the honourable member that a motion was carried by this House on Tuesday, the 27th March, 1973, in relation to the dress of members. I would refer the honourable member to that motion which has been inserted in the front of the book of Standing Orders. I am not sure that his question should be addressed to the Leader of the House.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I am quite sure it should not have been.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Standard of Dress

4. The Hon. D. W. COOLEY, to the President:

I am fully conversant with the motion that has been passed by this House. As I understand the position the matter was left to your discretion. Is it within the Standing Orders that I direct the question to you?

The PRESIDENT replied:

The Standing Orders provide the method by which questions should be addressed to the President. If the honourable member reads the Standing Orders he will find the proper method for doing so.