

To retire from a position with the goodwill and esteem which has been made evident this afternoon is a greater reward than I would ever have expected when I entered the Parliament 43 years ago. I thank the Premier, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and the Hon. R. C. Old for what they have said on behalf of their parties and the people of this State. I can only trust that I am really worthy of the words which have been spoken.

[Applause.]

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [12.52 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 4.30 p.m. on Tuesday, the 4th May.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 12.53 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 4th May, 1976

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. P. Griffith) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (5): ON NOTICE

1. UNITED NATIONS "Habitat" Conference

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN, to the Minister for Justice representing the Premier:

(1) Is the Government prepared to support the four main objectives of "Habitat", the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements to be held in Vancouver, Canada, from the 31st May to the 11th June, 1976—which objectives read—

(a) To proclaim and ask all nations to subscribe to a commitment pledging that the future human settlements of the world will be places of human dignity and well-being;

(b) To build among the peoples of the world a better understanding of human settlement problems and the challenge they will pose in the years to come;

(c) To demonstrate that the most pressing problems of human settlements can be solved with existing technology and systems if the political will can be marshalled to use them;

(d) To formulate a programme of international activities in support of human settlement improvements which will give priority to the strengthening of financial mechanisms and management institutions dealing with these problems in developing countries?

(2) (a) Has the Government appointed sufficient representatives at "Habitat" to efficiently contribute to the discussions and recommendations and to assist in problem solving in the areas of physical requirements for housing, work, energy supply, transport, communications, water and sanitation; services for education, health and welfare; systems of government, law and economic management and cultural facilities for art, recreation and leisure;

(b) will any such representatives be academically and experientially equipped to offer technical, financial, political and social knowledge including ways of bringing about essential citizen participation in the processes of problem identification and problem solving;

(3) (a) If such representatives have been appointed, did the Premier discuss this appointment with the Australian "Habitat" Advisory Committee composed of prominent and knowledgeable Australians which has been convened to ensure that our contribution to the Conference is highly informed and represents the best thinking of the nation, from Government and non-Government organisations, as well as individuals;

(b) If the Premier did not have such discussions, would he now consult the Committee regarding possible changes or further appointments;

(c) If representatives have not been appointed, will he ensure that the Advisory Committee is consulted before such appointments are made?

- (4) What State action is proposed to highlight "Habitat" during 1976?
- (5) Is the Premier aware that Australia's near neighbours from South-East Asia will account for two-thirds of the expected three thousand five hundred million increase in the global population during the next thirty years, and that Australia has a particular interest in taking part in social programmes to help ease the human misery which can be consequent on this increase so close to our affluent country?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) (a) to (d) Yes.
- (2) (a) The State Government will be represented in the official Australian delegation by the Town Planning Commissioner, Dr David Carr, who was a member of the Australian delegation at a "Habitat" Preparatory Conference held in Teheran in June 1975.

The Australian delegation will comprise 14 members representing Commonwealth, State and local governments. Members of non-Government organisations and individuals will also be present at the Conference.

(b) Yes.

- (3) (a) Dr Carr is the State representative on the Federal/State Liaison "Habitat" Committee and has attended meetings of that Committee in Melbourne in August 1975 and Canberra in February 1976. This Committee works in close co-operation with the Australian "Habitat" Advisory Committee through the "Habitat" Task Force. Dr Carr has had discussions with representatives of the Western Australian Division of the United Nations Association of Australia who are responsible for organising the non-State Government contribution to the Conference.

(b) No.

(c) See (2) (a).

- (4) The "Habitat" Task Force and the United Nations Association of Australia are working with all State Governments regarding Commonwealth and State participation in the "Habitat" Australia programmes during 1976.

The State Government's contribution to the Habitat National Report was a paper entitled "New Settlements in Western Australia".

- (5) Yes.

2.

NEW ART GALLERY

Planner

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

- (1) Has the Minister sought the services of the former Director of the New South Wales Art Gallery, who is now resident in this State, and who was responsible for the planning of the highly regarded new art gallery in New South Wales, to assist in the planning of the proposed new Western Australian Art Gallery?
- (2) If not, will the Minister endeavour to obtain his services?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) The gentleman concerned has had informal discussions with the Director of the W.A. Art Gallery.
- (2) Not applicable.

3.

ABORIGINES

Needs and Opportunities: Report

The Hon. J. C. TOZER, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

Further to the reply to my question 4 of Wednesday, the 7th April, 1976, and having availed myself of the Minister's kind invitation to examine the Scott report titled "Assessment of the Needs and Opportunities for Aborigines in the Kimberley", and finding little which seems to be of a confidential nature—

- (a) will the Minister make a copy of those parts of the report titled Summary, Recommended Programme and Conclusions, available to the four Kimberley Shire Councils, the Kimberley Regional Development Committee and comparable responsible regional groups who request it, with the proviso that—
 - (i) Policy 4, under the heading **Planning and Administration**, be expunged from the copy; and
 - (ii) reference to the same "sensitive" topic be deleted from Table 16A;
- (b) if it is not within the Minister's prerogative to do this, will he arrange with the Commonwealth Minister for Aboriginal Affairs to do so?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (a) and (b) I am not prepared to make copies available as requested as in addition to considering that the report contains confidential matter, it is now somewhat out of date as it was submitted to the then Minister in November 1971 and since that time there has been considerable progress whereby many things contained in the recommendations have been carried out or are being done.

This has entailed considerable funds including amounts approved by Senator Cavanagh the then Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, to be applied to the Kimberley.

The report provided for an extravagant programme of expenditure for approximately 20 per cent of the Aborigines in Western Australia and an overall programme applied to the whole State could not be sustained.

4.

HOUSING

North-west

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS, to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Did the Minister sight the *Hansard* debates concerning the motion of no confidence in the Minister for Housing during 1973, and if so—

- (a) did the Minister note that the motion concerned conflicting public statements and refusal to answer parliamentary questions by the Minister in 1973; and

- (b) has the Minister avoided answering parliamentary questions relating to North-west housing, or made statements to the public which conflict with the facts shown in documents cited by the Minister?

- (2) Of the many proposals put by me to the Minister in 1971 to 1973, would the Minister please confirm that he has attended to these matters after the change of Government in 1974 by showing the 1973 situation and the situation today as per the following questions:

- (a) what was the percentage difference between State Housing Commission rentals in the metropolitan areas and the far north of Western Australia in 1973 and 1976;

- (b) what was the maximum number of fans fitted to SHC houses in the tropics in 1973 and 1976; and

- (c) what special housing study group for tropical house design existed in 1973 and now in 1976?

- (3) (a) Were lower hopper-type windows consistently used in northern SHC homes up to 1973; and

- (b) if so, was the use of lower hopper windows decreased in 1974 as requested by me during the term of the Tonkin Government?

- (4) What experimental housing designed for the tropics was initiated and built in the North Province during the Tonkin Government?

- (5) What experimental housing designs have been commenced during the term of this Government in the North Province?

- (6) (a) Have aluminium building products been studied for use in SHC houses since 1973; and

- (b) is some aluminium framing now used in SHC houses?

- (7) Has the State Housing Commission made changes to the Radburn system of building which was used in South Hedland in 1973?

- (8) In 1975-1976, did the SHC allow the purchase of ceiling fans locally if they could not be obtained from England which was the requirement in 1973?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) (a) Yes.

- (b) Not to my knowledge.

- (2) (a) It is difficult to produce exact meaningful figures as there was no standard rent scale in the North-west in 1973. Using the highest and lowest rents in each housing category the following figures emerge:

	1973 North-west net rents exceeded Metropolitan by	1976 Metropolitan exceeded North- west net rents by
1 bedroom	66.6% to 124.4%	31.4% to 43.2%
2 bedroom	6.05% to 50.0%	13.8% to 40.1%
3 bedroom	17.6% to 37.3%	9.2% to 34.75%
4 bedroom	9.5% to 51.4%	*14.2% to 26.5%

* North-west exceeds Metropolitan.

- (b) In 1973, Commission policy was for the installation of a maximum of two (2) ceiling fans unless medical evidence was provided to show additional fans were essential.

- In 1975, the policy was amended to provide ceiling fans to all habitable rooms.
- (c) A special housing study group for tropical house design was first formed in 1974.
- (3) (a) Yes—lower hopper type windows were consistently used in North-west State Housing Commission homes up to 1973.
- (b) These type windows were still used in 1974 awaiting the findings of the special housing study group.
- Current experimental type houses at South Hedland do not include lower type hopper windows.
- (4) Five (5) new designs incorporating greater thermal efficiency were prepared and a number were built in the North-west after 1972.
- (5) Four (4) experimental house designs are under construction, tenders will be called shortly for a further two (2) designs and designs have also been prepared for a further seven (7) dwellings.
- (6) (a) Aluminium building products have been studied. However, until the aluminium manufacturers are able to satisfy the Commission's consulting engineers no recommendation can be submitted for the use of such framing.
- (b) Aluminium window frames are incorporated to experimental dwellings.
- (7) Yes.
- (8) All fans for tropical use are subject to the approval of the Public Works Department and the State Energy Commission.
- As a consequence a variety of fans has been used over the years by the Commission. Whilst mainly of English origin a number are manufactured under licence in India and Hong Kong.
- No ceiling fans are wholly manufactured in Australia.

5.

PAY-ROLL TAX*Performing Arts Companies*

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

- (1) Is the Minister aware that heavily subsidised State performing arts companies are required to pay State pay-roll tax, and the National Theatre paid \$14 000 last year, and will pay \$17 000 this year?

- (2) Will the Minister undertake to make these organisations exempt from the tax, or have the money refunded?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) As these companies receive in 1976 \$628 000 in subsidy, the question is purely academic.

TEACHERS' REGISTRATION BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Education), and read a first time.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: TENTH DAY*Motion*

Debate resumed from the 14th April, on the following motion by the Hon. M. McAleer—

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) [4.43 p.m.]: At the outset, I congratulate the Hon. Margaret McAleer in moving this motion. Perhaps I will go a little further than she did on the subject of local government. I think the time has come when local government should be made responsible for a great many State and Federal Government works.

I can envisage the day when local governments, especially those in country areas, have on retainer plumbers, carpenters and other tradesmen to effect repairs to schools, hospitals and other public buildings in their areas. Local government authorities are closer to their own problems, and repairs would be effected quicker, and with a great deal less expenditure of taxpayers' money than presently is the case. I believe the Government should examine this matter.

For instance, it seems strange to me that the State Government will not utilise cash registers in local government areas so that gun licences and drivers' licences may be renewed in the various local government areas. In many towns in my electorate, gun licences must be sent away to be imprinted by a cash register to indicate they are current. A person cannot obtain a receipt from his local police station.

Offers have been made to the Government and I hope in the near future the Government takes advantage of these, and allows local governments to play a more important role in the collection of money. In this way, we could release such people as police officers and officers of the Road Traffic Authority thus enabling them to get on with their jobs of controlling crime and reducing road fatalities.

I am sorry that the Hon. T. O. Perry is not in the Chamber. When browsing through his speech on the Address-in-Reply motion, I noticed that he claims somebody in his area received only 20c each for stunted sheep while his son received \$50 for similar sheep, without their wool. I just hope that Mr Perry can tell me who his buyer is, because I would like to obtain that sort of money for old wethers!

I wish briefly to discuss milk quotas. I am quite worried about the Dairy Industry Authority issuing quotas of 52 gallons. The farmers presently on quotas of 60 gallons are in a bad enough mess as it is without the authority issuing quotas of 52 gallons. Yet people in my electorate are to receive such quotas. I wonder whether the DIA has thought this problem through and related it to the future consumption of milk in Western Australia, and how soon it will be before these quotas can be increased.

In parts of my electorate, farmers on quotas of 60 or 70 gallons are considered borderline cases and, taking into account the expense of establishment of vats and, in many cases, new dairies, 52-gallon quotas seem to be very marginal.

I hope the Minister and the DIA come up with some forward plan so that people who do not receive quotas will be informed that this is the case, thus enabling the authority to have a reserve of people to whom quotas will be issued. It appears there has been no forward planning in the dairy industry, and I believe we should commence now to plan for the future of this industry in Western Australia.

I move now to two matters which concern the Minister for Education and Cultural Affairs. I believe one should not overlook the great success of the pre-primary system of education, which was introduced by this Government, despite Opposition attempts to undermine the proposal. Since its implementation, the system has gone from strength to strength and is now accepted as a part of voluntary education in this State.

While I am handing out bouquets, may I also hand out a brickbat. I should like the Minister to read pages 3267 and 3268 of *Hansard* No. 3 of 1973, where the former member for Blackwood is reported as discussing the administration of the Australian Arts Council. From advertisements I see in the newspapers, I believe the Western Australian Arts Council is

moving in the same direction. I believe it is a waste of money for a council with such a minute budget to appoint a deputy director. The staff of the Arts Council has multiplied dramatically over a short period since Mr John Harper-Nelson left.

Originally, I had intended to discuss superphosphate for the principal part of my speech. However, it will now occupy only two or three minutes of my remarks, not because it is not an important subject but because some other matters have raised their heads in the last few days and these should be mentioned fairly forcibly in this House.

In my opinion no Government has undertaken adequate research into the uses of phosphates and fertilisers. We have reached the situation where over a period of seven or eight years the price of superphosphate has increased five or six times. Whereas formerly the great cost of applying phosphates or fertilisers was the labour cost, now it is the cost of the product itself.

Maybe we should look into greater applications of phosphates and fertilisers per year, and thus economise on the quantity that would be leached out of the soil. It seems to me that any branch of the Department of Agriculture, or any research section in agriculture, that has not undertaken research into the use of fertilisers in Western Australia had better get on with such research. Anyone who desires to look at the real research that has been undertaken in this State will not find very much. There have been many articles written on this subject, but real down-to-earth research has been neglected.

One thing that intrigues me is the lack of use of pasture harrows in the beef cattle industry. Years ago I tried to sell these implements to the farmers. I can assure members that the spread of the dung would prove to be very successful to many farmers.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Did you say it was a harrowing experience?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It was a harrowing experience.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: What about the introduction of the dung beetle?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I do not think the dung beetle has much effect. There is a terrific loss of pasture in the area covered by the dung, and there is a loss in the feed value because the dung is not spread all over the ground. This is just one idea which some practical farmers might wish to take up.

I know that you, Mr President, are interested in cattle production. If you wish to obtain a cheap set of pasture harrows you could make one for yourself by cutting some tyres in half, and using the rough edge to run along the ground, thus doing the job. This is just as effective as commercial pasture harrows.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: What would be the effect of the use of such an implement on horse manure in a paddock?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It would be very suitable, and it could also be used on sheep dung. The pasture harrows have the effect of controlling worms in sheep.

I would now like to turn to another department which I believe is wasting money; I refer to the Bush Fires Board. I draw attention to the expenditure of that department between 1966 and 1976. In the 1966 Estimates we find the expenditure was £27 281 or \$54 600 approximately. In the 1976 Estimates the allocation was \$719 000. The Bush Fires Board claims that some of this money went into the pastoral areas, and that a sum of only \$466 000 should be charged against its vote. I do not mind if the board has its way, but nevertheless the increase in the expenditure in the 10-year period has been ninefold.

I wonder whether the people living in the farming areas, especially those I represent, do not know a great deal more about bushfires than those in charge of the Bush Fires Board. I have no argument against the personnel of the board; but I believe that certain departmental officers, a number of wardens and inspectors, and a number of what I term as hangers-on are not contributing very much to fire prevention in this State.

The money that is spent on paying these people could well be handed over to the shires which have a high bushfire risk to enable them to implement their own schemes. That would be preferable to having a great number of paid officers going around the State and telling the farmers—who often are very professional in their approach to fire-fighting provisions—what they should do. I have been told that we need a liaison officer.

It is very seldom that we see a bushfire spreading from one shire to another. I can think of only two in my area in the last 15 or 16 years, and they were minor fires which broke out on the border of the shire. If the Government really wants to reduce expenditure it could cut costs in that direction.

The major part of my contribution to the Address-in-Reply debate will deal with the wood chipping industry. It surprises me that the Trades and Labor Council is now against the establishment of this industry, and it has entered into the discussions on it. After 11 hours of hearing and a certain number of submissions, the TLC has come out and told the professional foresters of this State how to run the forests and what should be done in regard to the wood chipping industry. This is astonishing!

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What is your attitude to the member for Warren (Mr H. D. Evans) who is now the Deputy Leader of the Opposition?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I intend to deal with that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I will be interested to hear what you have to say.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The TLC seems to have altogether discarded the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in another place, and ignored the fact that he was the Minister who signed the amended wood chipping agreement.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Who has discarded the Deputy Leader of the Opposition?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Obviously the TLC and the Labor Party have. Would the honourable member care to tell me why the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in another place will not discuss the wood chipping industry, and will not now back his judgment as he did when he was in government? Why does not the Deputy Leader of the Opposition say, "I believe in the wood chipping industry, which agreement I signed when in government"?

The Hon. R. Thompson: The TLC is not affiliated with the Labor Party; therefore it cannot do anything to the member for Warren (Mr H. D. Evans).

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is astonishing to hear the honourable member say that. I am glad to learn that he has no association with the TLC. It is a fairly devious excuse; perhaps we can expect that from Mr Thompson. This is like one of the red herrings which he used to draw across the trail when he was Leader of the Opposition.

Let me return to the attitude of the TLC and the Labor Party in respect of the wood chipping industry. As the Government in 1973 the Labor Party signed the amended agreement. Now we have the member for Morley in another place—without even visiting the area—telling us what we should do about this industry. He had not been in the area before he wrote a paper on this subject.

We also have a previous Minister in the Tonkin Government being muzzled or being too scared to say anything for fear of his colleagues in this House. I believe the member for Warren would not have been elected to the position of Deputy Leader of the Opposition if he had come out and supported the wood chipping industry in the way I believe he should have supported it. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition in another place knows the wood chipping industry and is aware of the great benefits of such an industry to his electorate.

Does he support the people of his electorate? In no way does he support them. He allows the Forests Department, which he administered as a Minister in the Tonkin Government, to be sworn at and criticised for what it has done, but in no way has he supported the department. He has sat back in the traces, and allowed the Forests Department to take the blame.

However, as a Minister he was deeply involved with that department. What would the officers of that department think of a Minister who signs the amended agreement, and then two or three years later dissociates himself from it altogether?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Do you think he is frightened of the member for Morley or the TLC?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I think he is frightened of them both.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You had better get back to dealing with cow dung because you are more familiar with that!

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I think Mr Dellar would be more familiar with it because he slings plenty of it.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The honourable member just surprises me. I know that he surprises the forestry officers because they expect support from him at least. He was the person who went on the offensive on their behalf while the Tonkin Government was in office.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Has he made any statement in opposition to the establishment of the wood chipping industry?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: He has made no statement about anything. He has not come out in support of it as one might think he would. The industry will be in his electorate, as well as in mine, and one would think he would support the workers in his district.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: He does.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The workers in his district have supported him fully in the past but they will not support him again because they have been badly let down. It is all very well for Mr Cooley to talk about wood chipping but he does not understand the effect on the forests and on the people who work in the timber mills and in the timber industry. Those people do understand that the foresters and the Conservator of Forests are trying to regenerate the forests so that this country will have hardwoods in the years to come.

Time and time again we have heard Mr A. R. Tonkin and the TLC, and other members opposite, criticising the Forests Department for overcutting. However, Mr H. D. Evans was in the Government in 1972 and he signed the agreement. The setting up of the industry was agreed to, and those members who are now sitting on this side of the House agreed to its establishment. We also agreed that there would have to be some overcutting for a number of years until the beginning of the 1980s when the softwood forests would be ready for cutting.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You are not speaking the truth when you say that Mr Evans does not support the industry.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I do not appreciate being told that I do not tell the truth.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You said he does not support the establishment of the industry.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: He signed the agreement, but since then—since members opposite have become the Opposition—he has left it alone. He will not stand up and be counted because he is frightened that the member for Morley might have a piece of him.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What would the unions in your district think of the stand taken by Mr Evans?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The workers who stood solidly behind him will now leave him, to a man.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You would think the TLC would support the establishment of the industry.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: One would think so, but the TLC under its present leadership, and under its past leadership, has done some funny things.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are quite right there.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: We are able to reflect on the past leadership, but we have not yet seen enough of the present leadership.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You could only reflect favourably on the past leadership.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: If one were asleep perhaps one could reflect favourably on it! If Mr Claughton is in his own dream world he may reflect any way he wishes.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: No-one would want to be in the dream world of the member who is on his feet.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I will not reflect on the dream world of the member opposite because it would not be worth while on the standard of the material which has been put forward.

It is interesting to note that the working plan, to which the Forests Department worked, and the amended wood chipping agreement were both signed during the time of the Labor Government. I intend to quote from the editorial which appeared in *The West Australian* of Monday, the 28th July, 1975, because I believe the contents of the article were an appeal to the people of Western Australia—the genuine people of Western Australia—who wanted to support the forestry officers who they believed did a very good job. The article reads—

The State Forests Department has put its reputation on the line in the controversy over the woodchip industry in the South West.

If history showed the department's scientific support for the project to be ill-founded that it endangered a unique forest the forestry advisers would be identified with a catastrophe of world significance. No one is more aware of this than the foresters.

They know that they cannot afford to be wrong. It worries them to think that they have not been able to convince some conservationists that woodchipping is an economic and sensible form of forest management, or that they are being labelled by the project's opponents as a mouth-piece for the WA Chip and Pulp Co. and the State Government.

I interpose to say that anybody who suggests the Forests Department of this State is the mouthpiece for anybody else obviously does not know the workers in that department. These people are dedicated to the preservation of our forests so that Western Australians may enjoy our forests for years to come. To continue the editorial—

Anyone who has stood beneath a 500-year-old karri tree can understand the heart-felt opposition to any form of woodchipping. However, facts have become submerged in a tide of emotionalism. This emotion has not been wasted because it has ensured that every step of the operation will remain under the closest scrutiny.

Woodchipping's opponents have generally ignored the reasoned arguments put forward by the foresters. These have covered sedimentation and salinity, the effects of clear-felling, the rate of cutting, regeneration, controlled burning and fauna protection.

The over-riding question must concern the area of karri forest that the people of WA need for their own enjoyment, and how this need will change in the future. It would seem that the thousands of hectares set aside for reserves will be adequate to meet our needs in the foreseeable future. It must also be remembered that a virgin karri forest imposes its own limits on usage. The undergrowth is so thick that it prohibits random walks and access is virtually limited to established roads and trails.

There is, of course, an undoubted ugliness associated with clear-felling, a method of cutting that is not new to the woodchip licence area. However, there are now many fine stands of karri in areas once put to the axe. They do not inspire the same awe as say the Brockman forest, but they are on the way. This, it seems, meets a happy middle course between commercial needs and environmental considerations.

May I add to those comments and say that some of the forest areas of our reserves and our tourist parks are endangering human life? Some of the timber in those forests will have to be felled in the near future if the tourists who travel through them are to be protected from injury. It appears to me that the conservationists do not realise that there has to be management of our forests.

I intend to leave the subject of woodchipping, and move away from the problems of my electorate.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: We will be most relieved.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Does the member want to be relieved?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You should leave the Chamber in order to relieve yourself.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: In this morning's Press I think I read the nastiest attack I have ever seen made in politics. The attack was by a "gentleman" called Whitlam, and it was levelled at the late Senator Paltridge. I notice that in this afternoon's Press—the *Daily News*—Sir Robert Menzies has bought into the argument.

The late Shane Paltridge was a great friend of mine and I would say, without hesitation, that he never accepted a bribe, and neither did he ever do anything that was not for the benefit of this country.

Mr Frank Davidson in *The Sunday Times* said that Shane Paltridge was one man who always made one feel he was pleased to see one. He was that sort of man. He was a man who served his country with distinction in both the armed forces and in the Parliament. He represented Western Australia and was referred to as "a good bloke" by all political parties. However, we now find the character assassin, Whitlam, decrying this man in order to get himself into the news. The late Shane Paltridge will go down in the history books and will be known for far longer than Whitlam. Yet, we see the late Senator Paltridge being decried by this man—he calls himself a man—this person who cannot even sit at a table without losing his temper and pouring water over a person who subsequently became the Governor-General. Here is a man who does not deserve to be in the forefront of the nation.

I do not believe anyone could derive any pleasure from reading Whitlam's statement, and then reading what the manager of Lockheed said about the late Senator Paltridge. Mr G. Nicholl, who represented Lockheed in Australia during the 1950s, said—

I was present at all the negotiations that led up to the Electra contracts. I was also present at the signing of those contracts.

Now Mr Whitlam, in his letter to Mr Peacock, has specifically named the firm of E. L. Heymanson as having made a payment to a Minister in the Menzies coalition government.

This is untrue. There was never any payment made to anybody.

While Whitlam is carrying on, Mr Len Owen, who was Press secretary for the late Shane Paltridge, has said the allegation is untrue. There are people opposite who have sat here for ages, who have supported this man Whitlam and the sort of accusation he makes.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: It was a cowardly attack.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Yes, it was a cowardly attack because the man is not here to protect himself. That is bad enough.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: No more cowardly than the attack on the two Ministers, recently.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Those two Ministers were alive and well, and were capable of looking after themselves. I wonder how the Labor candidate for Melville—the Rhodes Scholar who applied for nomination by telegram—Mr Kim Beazley Junior, feels about the attack on his late father-in-law. I ask members opposite whether they would feel very well about such an attack, and whether they would feel like supporting Whitlam after the attack he has made.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: And what about his widow?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I ask members opposite whether or not they support Whitlam, because I want to know which of the members opposite would support Whitlam in this type of allegation.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: We support the finding out of the truth.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: There could not be a shred of truth in the accusation.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Not the slightest shred of truth and yet members opposite support the allegation.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: The Government wants to keep it under wraps.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is strange to hear remarks coming from the Labor Party about keeping things under wraps.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You know all about that.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Everything was under wraps for a period of three years and controlled by a cowardly person who could never take the blame. That man is Whitlam. He sacked Minister after Minister in the Labor Government. I will not bore the House further by referring to him.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You could tell the truth.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: As I recall the situation, the Premier of New South Wales and five of the Ministers were sacked.

The Hon. J. Heitman: They were sacked by their own people.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Sacked by their own people, not by the Premier.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I know who sacked them.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is obvious the Opposition wants to change the subject.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is obvious, from the way the Leader of the Opposition is carrying on.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Let me assure members opposite that Mrs Paltridge and her son are personal friends of mine.

The Hon. J. Heitman: They would not be happy with the attack made on the late Senator.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It shocks me that any person, of any political party, should drag up filth such as that dragged up by Mr Whitlam.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: And it was unsubstantiated.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It was not substantiated. The Leader of the Opposition in the Federal Parliament asked a question of Mr Peacock. In answer to that question, Mr Peacock said he had talked to the American Foreign Affairs Department, and he had talked to Lockheed, and there was not a shred of evidence in support of the accusation.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: That is what he said.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr Claughton is now telling me that Mr Peacock is lying; that he will get up in the House and tell lies.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: He was repeating what had been said to him.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is peculiar to the mentality of the man. While in Government he is prepared to tell lies and half-truths but when he is in Opposition he puts forward this sort of thing to the present Commonwealth Government. Mr Claughton is an embarrassment to his leader.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I know who is the embarrassment.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I certainly know who constitutes an embarrassment. I am sure Mr Dans would not support Mr Whitlam in the attack he made. Will Mr Dans say he is quite happy to support Mr Whitlam in the attack he has made?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I am in State Parliament. You have the opportunity for a full inquiry.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Why is it necessary to drag people's names into the mud, particularly when there is not a shred of evidence to substantiate what has been said? Why should this be necessary, and why should somebody like Mr Whitlam—who has been proved to be a character assassin for so long and time after time—make statements without being able to back them up? Why should anybody support him in this?

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Yours is a fair example of a statement without backing.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: When will the honourable member like me to start on this issue? We were told by Mr Whitlam that he knew nothing about the Arab deals—nothing at all—and that he would sack this one or that one. Does the honourable member think I am going to believe what Mr Whitlam has said, particularly after all he did while he was in Government?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: This is the best Address-in-Reply speech I have heard.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am glad of that. Having been a friend of some of these people I thought perhaps members opposite may have got up on the adjournment and supported me. I should hope they would do that. I would not expect such support from many people on that side of the House, but I would expect it from the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You can only speak once on the Address-in-Reply.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: A speech could be made on the adjournment.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the honourable member please address the Chair.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I have said, Mr Whitlam's attack is character assassination at its worst.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You have already said that.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I will say it again and again until it eventually gets through.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: It is tedious repetition.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It reminds me of the old Army adage to the effect that some people take in only one-tenth of what is being said. Mr Cooley seems to be in that category.

The PRESIDENT: Will the honourable member please address the Chair?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Very well, Mr President. Here we have Mr Whitlam endeavouring to assassinate the character of somebody who has been dead for 10 years; here we have a man who has been the most incompetent Prime Minister in history trying, as is his habit, to blame everybody else but himself.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: That is your trick.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I think that is the opinion of the general public who certainly expressed their opinion on the 13th December last.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: What about the shameful event in your party's history on the 11th November last?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: That action was overwhelmingly endorsed by the Australian public.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is right. The general public overwhelmingly endorsed the action taken by the Governor-General.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: It was the most disgraceful event in the history of Australia.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: We have one man who was appointed by the Labor Government who has been prepared to stand up for what was right and just. Those who were sacked were never prepared to stand up for what they believed.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: The people in New South Wales have indicated that they now realise the mistake they made.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I do not think so.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Not with a swing of 30 per cent in some electorates?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am not very worried about that. State politics and their implications are very different from the national scene.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I hope you will remember that.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I will.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The leader of Government should sew your mouth up in the recess if he can hold you still!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I know, Mr. President, that you have a great deal of trouble doing many things, because you have very little at your disposal to handle particular situations.

May I conclude by saying that the name of Shane Patridge will stand out in the history of this State and of Australia; it will stand out in the history books of this country and show him to be an honourable man who served his country honourably and with dignity.

I feel it is a great shame for me to have to get up here tonight to protect his name against the outbursts that have been made by a man who, I believe, is unworthy to be in the Queen's Parliament.

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [5.21 p.m.]: I realise that in rising to support the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply I

am following a long-standing custom in this House where the Leader of the House while not exactly replying to the debate does make some comments on matters that have been raised by speakers in the debate.

Members will appreciate that with my speech there will have been some 20 speakers on the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply, quite apart from those who have spoken on the amendment moved to the Address-in-Reply.

Accordingly, it would not be a practical proposition for me to comment on all the matters that have been raised, and I feel it is not necessary for me to speak on matters raised by all members. However I can assure the House that the matters that have been raised will be referred to the Ministers concerned for the consideration of their departments and members may be assured that their remarks have been well and truly noted and will certainly be subject to the necessary research and investigation, so that those matters which can be validly implemented may well have action taken in respect of them.

Having said that I would like first of all to acknowledge the manner in which His Excellency the Governor (Sir Wallace Kyle) opened his first session of Parliament. Other speakers have made reference to the pleasure they have experienced in having a very great Western Australian, acting in his capacity as the Queen's representative—as Governor of this State—perform so tremendously well the opening of this 28th Parliament. I join with other members in the felicitations that have been extended to our new Governor and to Lady Kyle. I would like to think that all Western Australians, without exception, have been tremendously impressed with the manner in which His Excellency has carried out his duties. He has gone to tremendous lengths to make himself known to as many Western Australians as possible and has endeavoured to meet them whenever possible.

I place particular emphasis on this aspect in view of the remarks made by Mr Cooley during his speech on the Address-in-Reply when he referred to the garden party that was held at Government House. I thought Mr Cooley's remarks were a little ill-chosen, because although he may not have meant them to convey what they did, they certainly gave me the impression that he felt the Governor was not taking all the steps that may have been possible to meet the greatest number of Western Australians.

I am sure I reflect the views of all Western Australians in recognising the tremendous manner in which His Excellency and Lady Kyle are carrying out their duties. I feel the Government House garden party was one of the great exercises in which His Excellency has engaged in order to

take advantage of the opportunity to meet as many people as possible. I think, therefore, it is most inappropriate for Mr Cooley to have made such a reflection.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: There was no reflection made on the Governor.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I am glad of that, even though the honourable member did make derogatory remarks about other people to whom he referred as social climbers—I think those were the words he used.

I would like to extend my congratulations to Mr Dans on his election as Leader of the Opposition in this House. I hope he gains a great deal of satisfaction from his new appointment as Leader of the Opposition. I trust—and I feel reasonably confident that this will be so—that he will continue in this House the degree of co-operation which has been present and which will enable the business of the House to be carried out. I say that I hope he will continue the co-operation because this was very evident while his predecessor, Mr Ron Thompson was Leader of the Opposition.

I can sincerely convey, certainly my own personal views, to Mr Thompson for the manner in which he conducted himself as Leader of the Opposition; I think I can even express some regret that he has found it necessary—probably for good and sound reasons—to no longer occupy the position of Leader of the Opposition in this House. However I feel certain that this spirit of co-operation will be continued between the two sides of the House. As you will appreciate, Mr President, if it were not it would be extremely difficult for the business of this House to be conducted in the interests of this State.

Mr Dans was the first speaker for the Opposition and it is probably more appropriate that I make reference to the Hon. Margaret McAleer who moved the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply. The views I have expressed have already been expressed by other members.

I feel Miss McAleer's speech was certainly one of the best speeches we have heard on the Address-in-Reply; it is certainly one of the best we have heard on such an occasion—an occasion which is filled with tension and atmosphere and which contributes in no small degree to nervousness in the person who is delivering the speech on opening day. I am sure we all agree that Miss McAleer performed her duty very well and with great credit to herself and, I am sure, with credit to the Legislative Council.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: You have not said how attractive she looked.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: That remark, by way of interjection, is completely unnecessary. Mr Cooley has already gone to some pains to talk about chivalry towards the lady members of this House, but when it becomes necessary to make such comments

I think one can be accused of protesting too much. It should not be necessary to make these comments. Again I am sure I express the views of the members of this House when I say we welcome the presence in this Chamber of the three lady members we have in our midst.

Miss McAleer raised a matter which has been under consideration and which has certainly been debated from time to time. I refer to the appointment of committees. The honourable member is certainly within her rights in expressing her views and nobody would dispute that. However she will be aware that the matter has had searching examination over a long period of time. I do not propose to express my support or otherwise for what the honourable member has said; nor will I take such action in relation to the remarks made by anybody else in the course of this debate.

The Hon. Des Dans suffered the disability of commencing this debate shortly after assuming office as Leader of the Opposition. I think this placed him at some disadvantage, and I respect that. Nevertheless, I am sure the measure of his speech—and we have been accustomed to hearing some very good speeches from him—was such that it could not be said it was one of his better speeches. That is no reflection upon the personal capacities and abilities of the Leader of the Opposition; I feel reasonably confident that one of the reasons that it was not one of his better speeches is that he found some difficulty in locating material upon which to criticise the Government in the terms of the Governor's Speech. Therefore, he referred to little snippets, which to me conveyed the impression that there was no major opposition or criticism that he could offer in respect of the Governor's address to the Parliament.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Because there was nothing in it.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: That is right.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Those interjections are completely in keeping with the attitude of members of the Opposition. They will continue to try to denigrate any Government activity. If they would spend even a fraction of the time they have devoted to that well-thumbed booklet, the Liberal Party policy, on an examination of the Governor's Speech, and the administrative and legislative performance of the Government, I am sure they would be far more appreciative of what the Court Government has done during the past two years. Nevertheless, I do not expect they will necessarily do that, because their role in Opposition is to divert attention whenever possible from the performance of the Government. I do not dispute their action, because it is a matter of the way they see their role.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: How can you divert attention from something that has not happened?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Mr Dans made some comments about the Ord River and, in particular, the sugar industry in that area. This matter was the subject of a question asked in this place. Nevertheless, I think for the purposes of the record I ought to make some additional remarks about it.

Firstly, I remind the House that the Government has not said there will be a sugar industry in the Ord.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I don't think I said there would be, either.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: No; however I feel Mr Dans created the impression that the Government is proposing a sugar industry. We would like to think there will be such an industry there. The interim report of the CSR feasibility study has given us encouragement to proceed with a pilot farm and further research to check the data on which the cane production side of the study was based. Despite the fact—as Mr Dans said—that there has been sugar grown on the Ord for a great many years, no research of sugar cane on the Ord has been carried out since 1968, and I believe there is reason to think that with modern varieties and techniques consistently high yields of commercial sugar can be achieved; and certainly yields higher than earlier research indicated.

If this could be the case obviously the economics of the industry and of the north would be greatly changed. Preliminary discussions have been held with the Queensland Government concerning possible marketing arrangements in the event of sugar being produced in quantity on the Ord River. It is envisaged that sugar produced in Western Australia would be marketed as part of the total Australian production. A full-size industry on the Ord—and I remind members that it would take several years to develop—would represent about 7 per cent of the present Australian production.

I think Mr Cloughton also questioned the action of the Government in even contemplating the development of an industry there in view of the state of the sugar industry in Queensland and throughout the world at the present time. Therefore, I think it is necessary for me to make some additional comments. Although cane-growing areas are controlled in Queensland there has been a steady increase in production in recent years from existing assigned areas of about 10 per cent per annum. Last year the assigned area was increased by about 13 per cent, and there is an estimated \$220 million being invested in mill expansion to meet this increase in production, and further expansion is anticipated.

Mr Dans also referred to the Government's intention to step up research work and field work in respect of such crops as rice and peanuts. Once again, we

have not said—and nor has Mr Dans—that there will be a rice industry on the Ord. Of course, there is a pest problem experienced with birds up there, but strategies have been recommended to reduce the damage caused by birds. A biologist has been appointed to work in the area to study the various bird species which damage grain crops, with a view to improving the techniques for minimising losses by birds.

Peanuts are already a commercial crop on the restricted areas of lighter soil on Packsaddle Plain.

Mr Dans then spoke on a matter a little nearer home for him; that is, the 3 per cent levy placed on the Fremantle Port Authority.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That is very near home.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: That is right. The Government is very conscious of the fact that if port charges are increased to an unreasonable level certainly there is a likelihood that customers will be lost. It was for this reason that when the charges were adjusted recently following the withdrawal of Associated Steamships Pty. Ltd., no attempt was made to recover the full amount of the deficiency following the cancellation of that service. However, the State Budget for this year has not yet been considered. Therefore, it is quite impracticable for me to give any assurance at all regarding the 3 per cent levy. The Leader of the Opposition can rest assured that every effort will be made to achieve the very desirable situation of having a balanced budget for the port authority without placing an undue burden on the port users. We recognise the great importance of this facility to Western Australia and to the economy of the State.

A matter which disturbed me greatly in Mr Dans' speech was his comment relating to Cockburn Sound. I do not really know what impelled him to say that he had it on good authority that the president and mayor of the shires adjoining Cockburn Sound had been told that nuclear weapons are to be stored at Garden Island.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I did not say, "on good authority"; you had better read that again.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: The Leader of the Opposition said, "on good authority".

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I have read the speech pretty well myself.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Those were the words used. I hope the Leader of the Opposition may reflect on what he called "good authority" because, as he knows, the President of the Shire of Rockingham and the Mayor of the City of Cockburn both denied that they were the source of any such allegation.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I would have to agree with them.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: As members would know, this matter was raised in the Federal Parliament on the 31st March, when the Minister for Defence (Mr Killen) was asked a question. Although these are not his exact words, he replied to the effect that there was no such proposal in prospect.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: We can hope they will give that half of the island back to recreation.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Let us bear in mind another comment made by Mr Killen on that occasion; it needs restating because the matter was mentioned in this debate. He said that of the 114 submarines the United States has in operation, some 105 are nuclear powered. It would be quite inconceivable for the Federal and State Governments, having made clear their views in relation to the use of facilities in Cockburn Sound by friendly nations, including the United States, to say to the United States, "You may only use these facilities if you use conventional type submarines." Those were the views expressed by Mr Killen in the Federal Parliament on the 31st March.

Other speakers have referred to the performance of the Government. Not surprisingly, the Opposition has been very critical of the Government's performance, while in many instances Government speakers have offered congratulations to the Government on its performance and for producing real results.

Throughout the debate the Leader of the Opposition made several interjections referring to the printing of \$300 million-worth of money by the Commonwealth. I think at one stage he interjected and said the Federal Government had been responsible for putting another \$300 million on the printing press.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I said the Reserve Bank had released another \$300 million, which was the same as printing money.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I suggest that if the Leader of the Opposition checks *Hansard* he will find that is not quite right. As he made interjections in that vein several times I thought the matter was worth checking. The check revealed that what occurred is what Mr Dans just said; that the Reserve Bank has agreed to the reduction of the statutory reserve deposit rate from 7.6 per cent to 5.6 per cent, and this would have the effect of freeing liquid assets of banks amounting to approximately \$300 million.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It was reported by the financial seers of the country as releasing another \$300 million in Australia.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: The reason supplied to me for making available this additional liquidity was that it was to meet

a seasonal liquidity tightness which generally occurs in the March-April-May period of each year. This is brought about principally because provisional tax assessments and company tax assessments become payable at this time. After very deep research and examination the release of the \$300 million was designed to help this situation and to enable banks to continue their normal level of trading. The amount of additional credit has been carefully controlled and is not expected to have any inflationary effect.

As I said before, it would be an almost impossible task to try to cover all the remarks made by all speakers during this debate. It would also take far too much time, and I am sure I would be covering a great deal of ground which has been covered by other speakers.

However, I make a brief reference to the words of the Hon. Bill Withers, in some encouragement in respect of his comments. I think members are generally aware that he has great energy in pursuing his projects and making all sorts of inquiries in all sorts of avenues and places throughout Australia; he does this to assist his electorate. He has brought to the attention of this House a large number of matters on this occasion, just as he has on other occasions, for the purpose of protecting the interests of people in the north. His remarks were directed particularly at the cost structures faced by people in that area, and they certainly have been noted.

Mr Leeson spent some little time on talking about the position of the goldmining industry. I thought he was a little vague in his knowledge of just what had been done by the State Government. I admit that during the course of his remarks he acknowledged that the State Government is to be thanked by the people of the goldfields for the financial and moral support that was given to the goldfields; but that seemed to be incidental to his attack on the new Fraser Government and his apology for the inaction of the Whitlam Government in the previous three years in relation to the goldmining industry in Kalgoorlie.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You have to strain very hard to get that meaning from his speech.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I appreciate the difficulties of the honourable Mr Leeson in trying to defend the Whitlam Government during its three years of so-called performance in relation to Kalgoorlie, Lake View and so on. I find it very difficult to see how he could do anything but make an apology. He chose to be critical of the Federal Treasurer (Mr Lynch). I think he also made some comments about the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr Anthony) and his visit to Kalgoorlie. But as we all know, the fact is that the Whitlam Government, under various Ministers, had every opportunity to do something very

real and tangible to support the goldmining industry in Kalgoorlie, and it did not do so.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: It is certainly being done now!

The Hon. N. McNEILL: It is not being done.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Of course it is not.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I know that well.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Kalgoorlie has been dished, diddled, and done in.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: The Fraser Government has been in office since the 13th December. The Whitlam Government had three years to do something about the matter. While Mr Leeson and others were critical of Mr Lynch and Mr Anthony, what do they think about the attendances in Kalgoorlie of people such as the former Ministers Mr R. F. X. Connor and Senator Wriedt?

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: They did not mislead the people like your lot.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: The Labor Government said that it would continue to look at and investigate the matter, and there were all sorts of proposals before the Government. The fact is that it did not make any decision at a time when a decision would have been of tremendous value to it. Despite the fact that it knew it was facing a very dismal prospect in an election in Kalgoorlie, it still could not make a decision.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Because we are not prepared to buy seats.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: That is a strange remark. I am not aware that the Liberal Party bought any seats. The people throughout the entire electorate were in a position to judge the performance and were able to make their assessments. Therefore, it amazes me no end.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Get back to the people of Kalgoorlie.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: We have heard again today from Mr Cooley, from whom I expect it to come with his trade union background, a harping on what happened on the 11th November. I have been rather intrigued by the constant harping on the events of the 11th November by members of the Labor Party and those who will express such views.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Why shouldn't they?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: For one reason only, which is simply to divert attention from a far more important day—of which they do not wish to be reminded and which they hope the Australian electorate will forget—which is the 13th December. That was the day on which the Senate, the Governor-General and the entire structure of parliamentary and executive Government in Australia were well and

truly vindicated. So these people can continue to harp to their hearts' content on the events of the 11th November because surely everyone will see through their ruse, the only purpose of which is to divert people's attention from an absolutely devastating day in the history of the Labor Party in Australia—the 13th December, 1975.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: That could not have come about without the 11th November.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I can understand their purposes and their reasoning in doing this, but it will be acknowledged that in understanding that reason, I can draw attention to it.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Do you agree with what happened on the 11th November?

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Of course he does.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Indeed I do. It was the proper exercise of a proper power when a Prime Minister was refusing to acknowledge the procedure, the traditional practice, the custom and even the law in respect of this matter.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: If you agree with upholding the Constitution, why did not Fraser resign when he lost the confidence of the House on the 11th November?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I am prepared to uphold the Constitution, Mr President. I am not prepared to be backward in facing up and identifying myself on that matter. I could be prompted even to join forces with my colleague the honourable Sandy Lewis.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I would be surprised if you did that and associated yourself with Shane Paltridge.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I shall associate myself to this extent and I say this with some personal feeling inasmuch as the honourable Shane Paltridge personally introduced me into the Federal Parliament: the statements that have been made in recent days by the Federal Leader of the Opposition amount to one of the most despicable and loathsome things I have ever experienced.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Let us have an open inquiry on it.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: The Opposition had its opportunity before Senator Paltridge died. I well remember the sort of campaign the Opposition conducted against Shane Paltridge in the early 1960s. I recall it very well and I have no doubt that you do too, Mr President. The Opposition did not win against Shane Paltridge and it has waited for 10 years after his death to see whether it can beat him now. The allegations come from no other loathsome source than Mr Whitlam. I share the views which have been expressed

by Mr Lewis and I feel for the family of the late Shane Paltridge, Lady Paltridge and his two daughters, in these circumstances.

On many occasions Mr Whitlam has taken refuge in the comments of Sir Robert Menzies; he has held up what Sir Robert Menzies said and the way he did things. Although Shane Paltridge was a great personal friend of mine, I can say, if it has any application, that Sir Robert Menzies regarded Shane Paltridge as one of Western Australia's greatest political representatives. I think his actual expression was that he was the greatest Western Australian member of Parliament since George Pearce. That is praise indeed when it comes from such a person.

I am sure that an Address-in-Reply debate would not be complete unless we had a contribution from the honourable George Berry in relation to the Gascoyne water supplies.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What are you doing about it?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: We have certainly done considerably more than the party which Mr Dans represents. In fact I can recall that one of my first speeches in this House was on the very subject of the Gascoyne water supplies.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I take it that when I get the advice from the department, it will substantiate the figures I gave.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I will not anticipate anything in that respect.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I got them out of your official documents and answers to questions, so they must be right.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I will not enter into a discussion on that; I just do not see the significance at the moment.

This matter was raised by the honourable George Berry, and it is important to him, to the State and to the Gascoyne area. Mr Berry raised once again—as he has done many times in the Parliament—a matter which comes within my administration; that is, the subject of pornographic literature and the "R" classification of films and their showing at drive-in theatres. I think members will be aware, but I use this opportunity to say it again, that the Government and I are taking very definite steps to endeavour to do something about this problem. I am sure that not all people realise—of course the honourable Mr Stubbs would realise it—that we as a State Government do not have any control over the classification of films or the screening of them. The State Government has already expressed its intention to endeavour to obtain a measure of control, at least to the extent to which control is exercised by some other States in Australia, whereby we can exercise a prerogative in relation to the screening of certain films.

I am sure that even a former Chief Secretary in the person of the honourable H. C. Stubbs would agree that that is a power we ought to have, but not necessarily to the extent that we set up a censorship body in Western Australia. Nevertheless, I believe we ought to be able to exercise certain prerogatives in relation to the screening of such films. The Government has already given some consideration to this matter and has authorised me to pursue it to the extent where we may be able to prepare and introduce legislation to give us at least that degree of control. I hope that will meet with the approval of not only the honourable George Berry but also a great many other people in Western Australia who have certainly been very concerned judging from the reactions and representations that have been made to me in regard to this matter.

I do not believe we have to be ultra permissive. If audio visual techniques in schools are designed to influence the children of coming generations for good, I do not believe that films of another nature should be available to have on them an influence for bad or evil. In my belief, that is not in the interests of the people of Western Australia. Likewise, I believe a Government has a moral responsibility in respect of this type of matter.

It is not out of any lack of respect for the honourable Mr Dellar that I pass over his contribution to the debate, but the honourable Grace Vaughan referred to a number of matters, some of which ought to be commented upon.

For that reason I will give a little attention to material which has been provided in relation to something which is not my responsibility, but is rather the responsibility of the Minister for Health; that is, day care centres. The Hon. Grace Vaughan referred to the closing down of the centre conducted by King Edward Memorial Hospital and she chided—if I may use that word—my colleague, the Minister for Health, for his answer to a question. He told her he would not encourage the maintenance of that particular centre.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan would know the facts of the case and the reason for the establishment of that day care centre, which was to assist the trained nursing personnel who had children and who had again taken up nursing when there was a particular shortage of nurses. However, that situation has now changed—and only a few children are cared for in the centre, and the cost of the staff far outweighs the necessity for its continuation.

The centre is licensed to accept 20 children between the ages of one and five, but has never had more than 10 children attending over the last year, and five or six children is its present daily average. In any case it is not a function of the hospital, and the cost in regard to it would

be challenged in relation to the State-Commonwealth hospitals agreements concerning funding.

This centre could not be conducted as a general day care centre as the honourable member suggested. The Minister for Health has also advised me that there are four other centres reasonably nearby. There are two in Nedlands and two in Subiaco. The demand for vacancies in day care centres has eased and over the last few months a number of profit-making centres have had vacancies. At funded centres, where needy children are eligible for some subsidy, there are few vacancies, but there are not the waiting lists that once existed.

There are at present 14 centres throughout the State receiving current grants and there are seven projects for building centres which have been approved and which are at various stages of construction. Negotiations are continuing with six committees seeking assistance.

It is relevant that I draw attention to a newspaper article of the 29th April under the dateline of "Canberra". It reads as follows—

The Government is considering ways of filling 12,000 vacancies in commercial child-care centres so that new government centres will not have to be built.

The Minister for Social Security, Senator Guilfoyle, said she had not yet considered paying a subsidy for children attending commercial centres as a way of filling the vacancies.

I might also add that Mr Baxter has advised me that a scheme is under consideration whereby the parents of needy children would be eligible for assistance to place their children in approved family care and day care centres. This would not entail any direct subsidy to private day care centres.

I suppose one ought to be careful in relation to the next comment. The Hon. Grace Vaughan, on the subject of funeral benefits, went to some pains to attack the Federal Government in the hope that some effect of what she said would bounce off onto the State Government. We ought to be grateful that the honourable member is not making her speech now or she would have added material in view of the action taken by the Senate in respect of this subject. In the light of those circumstances I see little point in making any further comment about the subject at this stage.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You ought to, too.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: In a recent Press article reference was made to what might be described as the irony of the situation when the Senate acted against the Fraser Government to, it might be said, the advantage of the Labor Party, in view of those occurrences prior to that date of the 11th November.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The New South Wales State elections had nothing to do with the Senate's actions at all!

The Hon. N. McNEILL: For some time I have known Senator Ian Wood, who was the one who led the action, and I would not be prepared to say that he would be influenced either one way or the other by the result of the NSW elections.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I think the alacrity with which the recommendations were accepted by the Fraser Cabinet proves the point that the pending New South Wales election helped the decision not to proceed.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I wish I could deal with the position in more detail because I understand there is a far different and more correct story pertaining to the funeral benefits concession rather than the one we have heard and the one to which a great deal of publicity has been given. However, I do not have the details with me so I cannot express any further comments on the subject.

Sitting suspended from 6.06 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Prior to the tea suspension I concluded my comments on the contribution to the debate made by the Hon. Grace Vaughan.

I do not think there is any necessity for me to add to the comments I have already made in relation to the speech by the Hon. Don Cooley, except concerning industrial conditions in the Pilbara. I take this opportunity to remind members of the assistance given to the union movement by the State Government, particularly in connection with education and facilities generally. In 1975 the State Government made premises in Port Hedland available for use by the Trades and Labor Council and trade unions at a nominal rental of \$100 a year. The premises are currently occupied by the Australian Workers' Union, the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union, and the Builders' Labourers' Union. In addition, it should not be overlooked that in order to assist in the education programme for members of the trade union movement in Western Australia, the State Government made a grant of \$12 000 to the Trades and Labor Council in 1976. That reminder is quite appropriate in view of the fact that Mr Cooley and some of his colleagues continually make reference to persistent union bashing by members on this side of the House.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: That is no more than you give the Employers' Federation. You give it assistance.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Look at what the others are getting. I am indicating the assistance given to the trade union movement by the State Government.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Do you not want any credit for what you give the other side?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I am prepared to accept credit for what we do for other people; but in view of the claims made by some members on the other side of the House that we devote our time to attempting to destroy the union movement, I am simply making the point that that is far from the truth. Perhaps members of the Opposition do not like to be reminded of the ways in which we recognise the trade union movement.

I pass on to the remarks made by the Hon. Tom Knight. I will not canvass all the matters he raised but I wish to refer to a matter which is of particular concern to him and other members; that is, the wine industry. Mr Knight asked that the Government consider the appointment of a viticulturist to the Mt. Barker area. I am advised that the department recognises the great potential in the Mt. Barker region, which has been established by departmental trials. The region is already producing some high quality table wines which are achieving recognition not only in Western Australia but also throughout Australia and elsewhere. The Minister has advised that, however sympathetic the Government may be towards Mr Knight's request, the appointment of a qualified viticulturist or oenologist in the Albany region cannot be justified, despite the potential of the region.

We should not forget that the wine industry in the Mt. Barker and Margaret River-Cowaramup areas derives almost entirely from a textbook exercise which was the work of Dr Gladstone many years ago. The development of the wine industry in Western Australia is one of our great achievements, and Dr Gladstone's work has been well and truly justified by the results it has produced.

Mr Knight also referred to the problem affecting some shires which comprise large areas of Crown land, "A"-class reserves, forest reserves, and water catchment areas. He particularly mentioned the problem experienced by the Denmark Shire. The Minister for Lands, to whom the matter was referred, has advised that since the 1st January, 1974, 27 parcels of land totalling 2 738 hectares have been released for selection within the Shire of Denmark. Although about 40 per cent of the shire's district comprises State forests and water catchment areas, the council is not required to provide services to those areas. It is possible those areas could attract tourists, which would be of considerable benefit to the towns. It would not be practicable for the Government to pay rates on the areas, and this question has previously been raised on behalf of other councils.

In regard to the matter of reviewing the Land Act, the Minister informs me that senior officers of the Lands Department have had a series of discussions in recent years about possible amendments to the Act. Although no decision has yet been made, it is felt it is now desirable to await the enactment of the Mining Bill and

study the impact of that legislation, should it be passed. In the interim, the Lands Department would be pleased to receive any representations or submissions from members in respect of amendments which might be made to the present legislation.

Mr Knight also raised the matter of McLean's sawmill outside Denmark, which I understand was visited recently by a ministerial party. The Minister for Forests has pointed out that the Government has recognised the need to reduce the level of the State's hardwood cut, and this gives rise to considerable restraints on cutting on Crown land for mills that have previously operated on private property, because there is a need for a reduction in the current intake of existing Crown land mills.

Mr McLean originally held rights to sleeper timber reserved to the Crown on conditional purchase land, and he relinquished those rights in 1969. His present mill at Denmark was established to cut timber from private property, with no guarantee of supply being available from Crown land. I am advised that Mr Knight was incorrect in stating that big companies which were in the right place at the right time were given timber rights in Denmark or any other area. The Forests Act provides that all permits be submitted to public auction or tender.

We heard a long address from the Hon. David Wordsworth on many matters concerning the agricultural industries. I am sure we were all greatly interested in his remarks, which penetrated very deeply into the problems of those industries. His remarks have been noted and referred to the Minister, but I am not in a position to comment on them to any extent. I do not believe it was the kind of speech which called for a subjective reply at this time. It was a very wide-ranging survey of many matters affecting the rural industries. He spoke about indexation of the prices of exported goods, the effects of devaluation, the operation of tariffs, the Industries Assistance Commission, taxation, land and materials, the superphosphate bounty, brucellosis, and the beef industry. It was a contribution which it will be extremely useful to consider in some depth.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott likewise commented on a number of subjects, although she devoted a great deal of her time to criticism of the State Government and the fact that insufficient recognition was given to the amounts of finance which have been made available from Commonwealth Government sources to assist particularly in State welfare programmes and things of that kind. I do not intend to canvass all the matters she raised but I wish to comment on her remarks in relation to housing.

Miss Elliott said that the 1975-76 programme indicates that 757 houses and flats are to be constructed, and she asked why this figure has been dropping each year,

when in 1970-71 the programme was for 3 499 units. By way of interjection during the course of her remarks attention was drawn to the increased contribution to the building programme from private sources, and that is the subject of my comments.

I have been advised that in relation to the activities of the State Housing Commission and the number of units which will be constructed in the current financial year, there has been a steady decline in the percentage of housing constructed by the commission in Western Australia, as evidenced by the information provided to Miss Elliott, which is freely available in the annual reports of the State Housing Commission.

The steady decline in the percentage of housing provided by the State Housing Commission has been balanced by an increase in activities in the home-building sector of building societies and savings banks and the change in the lending provisions which have enabled an increasing number of Western Australians to own their own homes. Most important among these has been the introduction of "no fixed term" loans by building societies, and a general increase in wages which has meant that fewer people now qualify for assistance from a welfare housing authority such as the State Housing Commission.

It is significant that although the percentage of the State's housing effort constructed by the State Housing Commission has declined to a figure of approximately 9 per cent of all construction in the current financial year, the waiting lists for both rental and purchase accommodation provided by the commission have not increased. In other words, the State Housing Commission still provides housing according to the demand which is evident and there has been no increase in the waiting lists of persons requiring accommodation from the State.

It is worth noting also that the commission will increase its building efforts should more finance become available. In the current financial year the allocation from the previous Commonwealth Labor Government was \$4 million less than in 1974-75, and so during that year \$37.4 million was made available to Western Australia under the Commonwealth and State housing agreement, and in the current financial year an allocation of \$33.4 million was received.

While there are a great many other matters that are deserving of comment, I hope that members will not misinterpret my action in deciding not to elaborate any further. I would like to emphasise again that all the contributions made by the 19 members who have spoken have been noted and they will be considered further in greater detail. I can add nothing more, except to acknowledge the contributions made. Some very useful remarks have been

made and I believe the Address-in-Reply debate has provided material which is well worth considering and which is certainly worth the time that has been devoted to it. So with some apology to the other members who have spoken and whose comments I am not in a position to discuss at any length at the moment, I feel I can do no more now than support the motion moved by Miss McAleer. I say to all members who have spoken that I will undertake to reply to them in due course in regard to matters to which replies are desirable. In the case of the later speakers, some information has not yet come back to me from other departments. However, as that information comes to hand, I will make it available to them over the ensuing weeks or months. I support the motion.

THE HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [7.48 p.m.]: I apologise to the House for interrupting the time-honoured procedure of the closing of the debate after the summing up by the Leader of the House. There are many reasons for my not having spoken up to date, and while I inform members that I will not talk at length, I would be remiss if I did not congratulate the Hon. Des Dans on his elevation to the position of Leader of the Opposition in this House; and I congratulate also the Hon. Ron Thompson for his sterling work which saw him rise to the position of leader of his party in this House.

Likewise, I congratulate the Hon. Don Cooley—I am not sure now, whether he is a rose between two thorns or a thorn between two roses! I know he was always a happy man with the ladies, and he will spend many happy days sitting between the two honourable members. It rather amused me when the Hon. Lyla Elliott moved to the Hon. Don Cooley's left-hand side, and the Hon. Grace Vaughan moved to take his right hand. No doubt there was method in this madness—possibly it was to ensure that this block of six people could look the Leader of the House fair in the eye and give him all the blast that is possible from strength! I hope that whatever the reason for the manoeuvre, there was some justification for it. Nevertheless, the Hon. Ron Thompson is certainly relegated to the back bench or the cross bench and he is now sitting between two moderates, the Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs and the Hon. R. T. Leeson—the last-named gentleman represents in this House the area in which I live. Many changes have taken place both in another place and in this place. Time marches on, and we must accept the changes that have occurred in the Labor Party. I am sure its new leaders have a great deal in front of them in the way of new experiences.

I had intended to speak at some length about the Road Traffic Authority but I will now content myself with saying that I am rather surprised at the remarks we

have heard about this matter. We still hear it said that the Police Force should have complete control of traffic. I read somewhere over the weekend—I think in *The Sunday Times*—that politicians were warned to keep their noses out of the affairs of the Police Force and the Road Traffic Authority as these organisations were operating satisfactorily.

I do not appreciate comments of this type. It appears to me that a politician should be able to say what he thinks and certainly I will not bow down to Mr Fraser or any other union member. When this matter was discussed previously in this Chamber, I did not support the takeover of traffic by the Police Force, nor did I support the establishment of the Road Traffic Authority. I believe my views were fairly well known—I was quite happy for the control of traffic to remain where it was. As yet no details have been supplied to show any great advantage in this area. Indeed, it appears that the public has suffered more inconvenience for very little benefit. Certain members have disclaimed the actions of the Road Traffic Authority and have said that traffic control is no different now from what it would have been under the Police Force. The only idea being promoted is that traffic control should be handled by the Police Force and I do not agree with that suggestion.

My main concern in rising tonight is to make a plea in respect of a town in my electorate—and I refer to the town of York. For many years this town has been working towards the preservation of its historical assets so that it can become a notable historical town. To this end it has the backing of all organisations set up to preserve old buildings and towns. Indeed, there is only one other town in Australia which can boast of similar antiquity. The Royal Western Australian Historical Society, the Museum Trust, the National Trust, the York Society, and others, have spent a great deal of time and effort in restoring the old buildings of York. However, if someone does not hurry up in regard to one building in York, we will have great difficulty in preserving it. I am talking about the old York police station, and more importantly, the cells attached to it. These cells are in their original state, just as they were built in the 1830s and the 1840s. The warder's cottage at the back of the police station is a magnificent old building, but unfortunately the walls are fretting and it looks as though one of them will collapse. If this happens, I am afraid the whole building will fall down and there is no way it can ever be replaced.

At the present moment it would be a simple problem to fix. An "S" clamp could be used to pin this wall to one of the back walls, thus holding it in place. At the present time the police station is being upgraded in order to give the three police officers some decent accommodation. Certainly their present facilities

cannot be described as decent, and the renovations will at least be a small improvement, but it would be a great pity if the warder's cottage were lost in the interests of this upgrading. Although it is not perhaps high on the list of priorities of the Government, it is most important that a new police station be built immediately at York, so that the old police station can be vacated rather than modernised. These old cells are very high and narrow, and they are really quite remarkable. If general repairs and renovations were attempted, we would spoil something that has no equal anywhere in the State. It is a crying shame that through lack of the necessary finance—and I appreciate this fact—for a new police station, we will lose some of our history.

The warder's cottage is in a courtyard, and here the troopers used to harness their horses in the morning before muster. This was a daily occurrence in the town many years ago, when York was an outpost of civilisation.

York is a remarkable town and it is developing a remarkable industry—tourism. We are all interested in development, and especially development in country areas. York has history all around it, but unfortunately the old adage of "a stitch in time saves nine" is not being applied and many fine old buildings are falling into disrepair, and they will be beyond anyone's help in the near future. I implore the Government to reassess the position in regard to the police station at York. I ask the Minister for Health, in his capacity of representing the Minister for Police in this Chamber, and also because York is in his electorate, to take up this matter with the Minister.

During the York Fair the Minister for Tourism visited York. He looked at the buildings there and was in favour of doing something about their preservation. However, when he returned to Perth he found there was not sufficient money even to put in these "S" clamps to stop the building falling down.

I am sure Mr Baxter knows the warden's cottage to which I am referring.

I make this plea on behalf of the people who wish to preserve the history of this old town, and the Clerk at the Table is one of those who is vitally interested in it. He knows the work of the late Marshall Clifton, Miss Feldman, Sir Thomas Meagher, and many other celebrities who have played a great part already in planning the future of York as a notable town. I hope that their wishes will be met. It is imperative that the police officers be given decent accommodation and then work can begin on the preservation of the old buildings. I felt I had to rise tonight to make this comment in the hope that we can save the building.

Question put and passed; the Address-in-Reply thus adopted.

Presentation to Governor

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [8.00 p.m.]: I move—

That the Address-in-Reply be presented to His Excellency the Governor by the President and such members as may desire to accompany him.

Question put and passed.

COMPANIES (CO-OPERATIVE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 6th April.

THE HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [8.01 p.m.]: The Opposition has no objection to this Bill and agrees with its intention. However, I should like to refer one small item to the Minister. I refer to the provision for the destruction of documents, which was mentioned during the Minister's second reading speech.

I know this is not a very important matter, but it seems to me that the intention of this Bill is to close certain loopholes which have occurred. Rather than documents of this nature being destroyed, it may be of some value if the Government were to examine the possibility of micro-filming them and storing them away. No harm will be done if my suggestion cannot be acceded to, but I believe the Government should have a look at this point.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I understand that in a great many instances, that practice is being followed.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The Opposition supports the Bill in principle and detail.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

THE CONFEDERATION OF WESTERN AUSTRALIAN INDUSTRY (INCORPORATED) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 6th April.

THE HON. D. W. COOLEY (North-East Metropolitan) [8.05 p.m.]: The Opposition has no option but to oppose this Bill, unless we can obtain some assurances from the Government that action will be taken to amend other Acts to give to the Trades and Labor Council the same representation on the various other boards and instrumentalities as will be conferred upon this new body.

This Bill provides for the representation to continue from two bodies known as the West Australian Chamber of Manufactures

(Incorporated) and the Western Australian Employers' Federation (Incorporated). Clause 4 of the Bill states—

A reference in a law of the State to any one of the former bodies, or to the former bodies acting jointly, shall be read and construed as a reference to the new body.

We see nothing very wrong with that provision. I should like to refer to several Acts to illustrate my point, the first of which is the Construction Safety Act, which provides for a Construction Safety Advisory Board. Section 19 (2) (b) states—

one shall be a person willing to act as a member of the Board appointed upon the joint written nomination of the bodies known as the Western Australian Employers' Federation (Incorporated), The West Australian Chamber of Manufactures (Incorporated), Master Builders Association of W.A. and W.A. Branch of the Australian Federation of Construction Contractors, to represent employers engaged in the work to which this Act applies;

Section 19 (2) (c) states—

one shall be a person willing to act as a member of the Board appointed upon the written nomination of the body known as The Trades and Labor Council of Western Australia to represent employees engaged in work to which this Act applies.

That provides for equal representation between the employers and the TLC, as it does under the Factories and Shops Act, section 45 (2) (b) of which states—

one shall be a person willing to act as member appointed upon the joint written nomination of the bodies known as Western Australian Employers' Federation (Incorporated) and the West Australian Chamber of Manufactures (Incorporated) to represent the occupiers of factories;

This provides for joint representation, and includes a representative of the Trades and Labor Council; that is how it should be. However, clause 5 of the Bill now before us proposes that in the case of an Act where the Chamber of Manufactures is entitled to representation, the former Employers' Federation also is entitled to a representative.

I submit that because this new body—the Confederation of Western Australian Industry—is an employers' organisation, the employers in some cases will have a representation ratio of 2:1 on these boards and bodies, and will be placed in an advantageous position.

I made this very point when debating the Acts Amendment (State Energy Commission) Bill, where the Government provided for the appointment of a number

of permanent members to the newly constituted Energy Advisory Council. New section 22E of that Act states—

(1) Each of the bodies following, that is to say—

- (a) the body known as The West Australian Chamber of Manufactures (Incorporated); and
- (b) the body known as The Chamber of Mines of Western Australia (Incorporated),

has the right to submit to the Minister a panel of names from which a person shall be selected by the Minister for recommendation to the Governor and appointment by the Governor as a permanent member of the Council to represent the interests of the body by whom he was nominated.

But there is no provision in this Act for representation from the body known as the Trades and Labor Council of Western Australia. Therefore, we will have a situation where the former Employers' Federation will be represented, but where the Trades and Labor Council will not. That is not a fair situation.

I have researched only a few Acts in relation to this matter, but further investigation should be carried out by the Government. As this matter was not referred to in the Minister's second reading speech one can only assume such investigation was not carried out.

In the past, we have found that the workers' representatives on boards and instrumentalities have done their job and have had a contribution to make in their own way, and it does not seem fair that on this new body which, to all intents and purposes is an employers' organisation, the employers should be placed in an advantageous position in relation to the Trades and Labor Council.

I ask the Government to delay the passing of the second reading of this Bill until such time as these investigations have been carried out in order to ensure that no injustice is done in regard to worker representation on the various boards and instrumentalities. The Opposition cannot support the Bill until such time as these assurances are given.

My party is not suggesting we should reduce the representation on these bodies. Where the representation is 2:1, we might be able to increase the number on the board by an Act of Parliament, and provide for an extra workers' representative to maintain a proper balance.

As I have indicated, there is no escaping the fact that the new body is an employer organisation in every sense of the phrase, and I ask the Minister to look into the matter to ensure that there will be fair representation on the boards and bodies referred to in this Bill.

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [8.13 p.m.]: I cannot understand the import of what the Hon. D. W. Cooley is saying. The Opposition is not necessarily asking for a reduction in representation on these bodies. All this Bill is doing is simply maintaining the present representation; it is not changing anything. The operative part of the Bill is clause 5 which, in part, states—

... each of the former bodies would, by virtue of references in a law of the State, have been entitled, by nomination or otherwise, to representation on another body, the new body is likewise entitled to such representation thereon as is equivalent to the total of the representations the former bodies would have been entitled to thereon.

In other words, it is simply changing the title. Instead of there being two representatives from organisations of different names we will now have a situation in which the name will be changed to The Confederation of Western Australian Industry. It will not advantage or disadvantage anybody, least of all the Trades and Labor Council.

The alternative, of course, is that in the absence of any Statute, the bodies which, presumably, will go out of existence once The Confederation of Western Australian Industry is recognised would not be entitled to any representation.

If this can be accepted as any sort of assurance, I give the assurance to Mr Cooley that the Bill seeks to change nothing except the name of the organisation. The number will continue to be as is was previously, and nobody will be advantaged or disadvantaged as a consequence of the passage of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (the Hon. J. Heitman) in the Chair; the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3 put and passed.

Clause 4: References to former bodies to be construed as references to the new body—

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We do not oppose the clause. I want to make clear the point I was making in the second reading debate. If there has been an amalgamation it is necessary for this Bill to be introduced. However, if, for instance, the Trades and Labor Council amalgamated with another body and it had representation under certain Statutes, we would expect the same representation.

In these circumstances where there is only one representative on a board by an employer organisation we would not

expect that under the new proposal the trade union movement should be given two representatives. As I indicated earlier, under the Clean Air Act where there is a joint representative of the Chamber of Manufacturers and the Employers' Federation, those bodies would forward one nomination to the Minister to represent the two bodies. The Trades and Labor Council has the same representation, and so the situation would not be altered.

We do not oppose the Bill. All that we are suggesting is the Government should look at the situation to ensure that the Trades and Labor Council will not be disadvantaged. Under the State Energy Commission Act the Chamber of Manufacturers as an employer group has representation; similarly the Chamber of Mines as an employer group also has representation. However the TLC has no representation at all.

When I raised this matter in debate that the amalgamation into The Confederation of Western Australian Industry was imminent it was said by the Minister that he would wait until that happened, and the Government would look at the situation as it affected the Trades and Labor Council.

If the Bill before us is passed, under the State Energy Commission Act the former Employers' Federation will have representation, but the Trades and Labor Council will have no representation. We think this situation should be corrected.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: What Mr Cooley is seeking is outside the scope of the Bill. He has made reference to the State Energy Commission Act which he says does not provide for representation of the TLC at all. In other words, he wants to bring in other Statutes to obtain TLC representation. I repeat that what he seeks has nothing to do with the Bill before us, and it is an entirely different subject.

Under the Bill before us we are not seeking to alter the State Energy Commission representation, because in the Bill before us there is provision for representation of one of the bodies named. So, there is to be no additional representation.

Mr Cooley contends that because The Confederation of Western Australian Industry happens to be an amalgamation of two bodies, one of which is the Employers' Federation, an employer organisation, there ought to be equivalent representation from the TLC. Even if the Government is agreeable what Mr Cooley seeks cannot be provided in the Bill before us.

In those circumstances I see no reason for holding up the progress of the Bill. I note the remarks of Mr Cooley to the effect that he is not opposed to the principles contained in the Bill. I repeat that

the point he is making is the subject of representation of the Trades and Labor Council under other pieces of legislation.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We simply want the Bill to be deferred until such time as the Government is able to make an examination of the position. My research into this matter has been very limited. I have gone into only three or four Acts, but I can see some anomalies arising.

If the Government is agreeable to making an examination of the situation to ascertain there will be no anomalies with the passing of the Bill, we will be happy to let it go through without opposition.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I have a list of some of the Statutes that are affected, but none of these comes under my jurisdiction. Mr Cooley wants some assurance from me that the Government will look into the situation. I will certainly convey his views to the Minister concerned with the administration of the particular legislation, but beyond that I cannot make any commitment whatsoever relating to possible changes of the Statutes affected.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

PERTH MEDICAL CENTRE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central—Minister for Health) [8.25 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

In introducing this Bill I wish to advise members that only one amendment is proposed by the Bill; this is to extend the power provided under section 5 so as to make possible the excision of land on the Perth Medical Centre site for the purposes of roads in addition to the present power for excision of land for purposes of drainage.

Studies of traffic flow and estimates of future increases in traffic by the Subiaco and Nedlands City Councils show that it is necessary for Aberdare Road to be widened.

There is already a traffic hazard at the junction of Winthrop Avenue and Aberdare Road which cannot be rectified until existing Perth Medical Centre land is made available for roadworks.

Planning of buildings on the Perth Medical Centre site made provision for adequate land to be made available and the Perth Medical Centre Trust has agreed to the release of land for this purpose.

Both Subiaco and Nedlands City Councils have funds available to enable them to commence work immediately and the passage of this Bill will enable this to occur.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. R. F. Cloughton.

House adjourned at 8.27 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 4th May, 1976

The SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (19): ON NOTICE

1. MENTAL HEALTH

Retarded Children: Accommodation

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) How many of the 15 profoundly retarded physically handicapped persons under the age of 18 years listed as being on the urgent waiting list at MHS in answer to part (4) of question 44 on 12th August, 1975, have since been accommodated?
- (2) How many of that number were taken off the list for other reasons?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Five with Mental Health Services; one with another agency.
- (2) One deceased. There are still 15 on the urgent waiting list.

2.

EXPLOSIVES

Storage

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) With respect to the explosives area at Woodman Point what alternative areas are available to receive, store and redirect explosives and associated materials?
- (2) Has the Government any areas of land which may be suitable for the development of an alternative explosives area?
- (3) If "Yes" where?
- (4) If "No" has it any investigations in train at present in an endeavour to locate such a site?
- (5) What is the estimated cost of resiting the explosives area?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr MENSAROS) replied:

- (1) No suitable areas are available.
- (2) No.