

separate areas are provided for vehicles which are to be parked for long periods.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I am not sure whether parking meters will be used, or whether it will be a tollgate system, but it does not really matter very much. In the situation of the honourable member who has raised the query, if he received an infringement notice I am sure that by an arrangement with the Railways Department he could have the fine annulled, as is the case when Ministers or members who are attending to parliamentary duties receive infringement notices for overparking.

The Hon. R. T. LEESON: It is all right to say that a member of Parliament might receive special dispensation but we must have regard for the general public. A member of the public can park at the airport terminal for a considerable time as long as he is prepared to pay the toll when he removes his vehicle. I believe the Railways Department requires some smartening up at the moment in order to encourage people to use the trains. I do not think the proposal now before us will encourage this patronage. We are trying to encourage people to go to Kalgoorlie for a couple of days, and if those people were able to park their vehicles while they were away that would be to the advantage of the Railways Department.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I suggest to Mr Leeson that if a person intended to catch a train to Kalgoorlie, and be away for a couple of days, surely he would go to the authorities at the East Perth terminal and advise them that he would be leaving his vehicle for that period. That is the course of action I would take either as a private individual or as a member of Parliament. This is something which can be overcome and I do not think there will be any worries.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: It may be cheaper to catch the train and abandon the vehicle.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

MOTOR VEHICLE DEALERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 21st October.

THE HON. D. W. COOLEY (North-East Metropolitan) [4.55 p.m.]: The Opposition has no quarrel with the contents of this Bill. We see it as an extension of a very excellent measure introduced by the Tonkin Government during its term of office. The excellence of the Bill is reflected in the

comments by the Minister, during his second reading speech, when he said—

It is interesting to note that the Bureau of Consumer Affairs has reported a fall off in complaints covering secondhand motor vehicle purchases from consumers following the introduction of the Act and its licensing system.

It appears that there was consultation, in respect of amendments, with the Australian Automobile Dealers Association, the Motor Vehicle Dealers Licensing Board, and the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs.

The measure will tighten up some laws in regard to the licensing of salesmen, and premises. The Bill is not controversial, and we have pleasure in supporting it.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central—Minister for Health) [4.56 p.m.]: I thank the honourable member for his comments and his acceptance of the Bill, and I commend the second reading.

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.

House adjourned at 4.59 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 23rd October, 1975

The SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (19): ON NOTICE

1. LAND

Gosnells: Government Acquisition

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) Is it a fact the Government is buying land in the Gosnells area?
- (2) If "Yes", from whom and for what purposes?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The MRPA is buying land in Gosnells and other parts of the metropolitan region as part of its on-going responsibility of implementing the Metropolitan Region Scheme. The Urban Land Council (Interim) has bought land in Gosnells but I understand it is not currently purchasing land in this shire.

2. MINERAL CLAIM 1024

Dedicated Road

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Further to question on notice 13 asked on 7th May, 1975, since section 3 of the Mining Act, 1904 defines "reserve" to include any street or road; section 30 refers to the Governor's ability to authorise mining upon or under any road, street or highway, and refers to the requirement of such applications to be published; and regulation 91 provides for applications for an authority under section 30 to be made on a form 7 in the schedule to the Mining Act and also requires the applicant to publish such application—what is the rationale for the Minister's answer to part (1) of question 13?
- (2) Why was MC 1024 approved to include road No. 4038 when authority by the Governor to occupy and mine upon roads, and inspection of and report on the land involved by a competent person, and a Warden's Court hearing are specifically required under the provisions of the Mining Act?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) I am advised that it has been a standing practice for many years to protect roads by conditions.
- (2) The encroachment of MC 1024H on to 4038 was not detected until after the grant of the claim.
Action is already proceeding to impose appropriate conditions to protect the road.

3. MINING

Little Desert, Mullaloo

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) What is the present status of the mineral tenement at the Little Desert, Mullaloo; what is the name of the applicant, the date of the tenement applied for and the minerals which are the subject of the application?
- (2) Have any objections to the claim been made and, if so, by whom?
- (3) Has the application been heard in the Warden's Court?
- (4) If so, has it been approved and subject to what conditions?
- (5) Has the application been referred to the Environmental Protection Authority pursuant to section 57 (1) of the Environmental Protection Act?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) There are two applications for mineral claims in respect to the same ground at the Little Desert, Mullaloo.

Mineral claim 3343H (Application for authority to occupy reserved and exempted lands No. 70/447) for rutile, zircon, ilmenite, monazite, leucosene, lime sands, limestone applied for by James Drummond Clarkson on the 2nd December, 1969 and mineral claim 70/14424 (Application for authority to occupy reserved and exempted lands No. 70/611) for nickel, lead, zinc, silver, copper, cobalt, asbestos, wolfram, vanadium, limestone, ilmenite, zircon, rutile, platinum, bauxite, monazite, uranium, cassiterite, tantalite, columbite, xenotime and molybdenite applied for by Kaiser Aetna Australia Pty. Ltd. on the 16th July, 1974.

- (2) Yes. Objections against mineral claim 3343H were lodged by the Shire of Wannon, the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority and Kenneth John Sarich and Brigitte Sarich.
An objection against mineral claim 70/14424 was lodged by the Shire of Wannon.
- (3) No. Mineral claim 3343H was listed for hearing on the 23rd April, 1975 and adjourned *sine die*.
- (4) Answered by (3).
- (5) Application for mineral claim 3343H has been referred to the EPA but application for mineral claim 70/14424 has not been referred because it concerns the same ground. It is therefore subject to the same consideration.

4. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY

Status

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Premier:

- (1) Does the answer to question on notice 1 of 9th October, 1975 indicate that it is Government policy that the Environmental Protection Authority is just another Government department?
- (2) If the answer to (1) is in the negative, how does he reconcile this answer with the Minister for the Environment's answer to the abovementioned question?
- (3) Is the power given to the EPA under its Act commensurate with the status of a Government department?

- (4) If the answer to (1) is in the affirmative, is this the reason for the absence from his policy speech of any commitment—
- (a) to allow an independent role for the EPA;
 - (b) to keep his hands off the EPA as a watchdog for the environment?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) I see no inconsistency in the answer to part (1) of today's question and the earlier answer provided on 9th October.
- (3) I invite the Member's attention to sections 28 and 29, *et seq.*, of the Environmental Protection Act No. 63 of 1971.
- (4) The Member is not entitled to make the assumption he suggests in his question.
I have every confidence in the efficacy of the Environmental Protection Authority as an efficient environmental "watchdog".

5. NOXIOUS WEEDS

Onhunga: School Sports Grounds

Mr MAY, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is he aware that school children are being subjected to considerable discomfort when playing on school ovals due to the prevalence of the noxious weed known as onhunga?
- (2) Is he further aware of the successful eradication of onhunga weed at the Manning Primary School by the gardener, Mr P. Maas?
- (3) If not, would he read the article which appeared in the South Suburban section of *The West Australian* dated 21st October, 1975 regarding this matter?
- (4) In view of the excellent results achieved by Mr Maas in his efforts to eradicate this noxious weed, could his endeavours be recognised by the department by way of financial or other assistance to enable Mr Maas to continue his research?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) The interest and endeavours of Mr Maas in this problem are known to the Education Department and are appreciated. I have also read the report referred to with interest and have asked departmental officers to make inquiries.

- (4) Any offer of assistance for Mr Maas will be dependent upon these inquiries. It should, however, be pointed out that similar claims are made by a number of companies who market preparations purported to eradicate this troublesome weed.

6. NOXIOUS WEEDS

Onhunga: School Sports Grounds

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Agriculture:

After perusing the article in the South Suburban section of *The West Australian* dated 21st October, 1975, regarding the eradication of onhunga weed, would he kindly arrange for an officer of the Department of Agriculture to interview Mr P. Maas at the Manning Primary School with a view to determining whether financial or other assistance can be made available to assist with further research?

Mr P. V. Jones (for Mr OLD) replied:

As a result of previous research there is already a reasonably cheap and effective treatment for controlling onhunga in lawns. The nature of Mr Maas' chemical is not known although it is understood to be considerably more expensive than the commercial ones presently used.

The article referred to does not indicate that Mr Maas is seeking financial assistance but does indicate that he is investigating registering the chemical or applying for patent with a view to financial gain. This being so, the offer of financial assistance does not seem an issue worth pursuing.

The Department of Agriculture is quite willing to co-operate in evaluating Mr Maas' treatment should he so desire.

7. HEALTH

Byford Rehabilitation Centre

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

- (1) Who are the members of the Quo Vadis, Byford hospital board?
- (2) Who is chairman of the board?
- (3) What extensions will be provided with the \$306 000 proposed expenditure shown on the 1975-76 General Loan Fund Estimates of Expenditure?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Hon. R. J. L. Williams, M.L.C.,
Mr L. S. Turnbull,
Mr F. G. Farrelly,
Dr W. A. Newnham.

- (2) The Chairman is Hon. R. J. L. Williams, M.L.C.
- (3) Accommodation, counselling and recreational facilities for those undergoing treatment.

8. BUSSELTON HOSPITAL

Expenditure

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

Could he advise how the \$400 000 estimated expenditure on the Busselton hospital, as shown under item 12, General Loan Estimates, new hospitals and associated facilities, will be spent?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

\$400 000 is the 1975-76 anticipated expenditure for architects' and consultants' fees and the commencement of the building of a new hospital.

9. ALCOA ALUMINA REFINERY

Mud Lakes: Study

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) As the Department of Industrial Development manages the Alcoa agreement, I ask him what is the specific nature of the studies being carried out by the company in liaison with the State into the neutralisation of waste disposal ("red mud") area?
- (2) Which Government instrumentalities are involved?
- (3) Is a report to the Government expected from the bodies undertaking the studies?
- (4) If so, when is it expected to be presented?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) to (4) The company has undertaken extensive and expensive research and with the State, has developed guidelines for the successful construction, filling, deliquoring, consolidation and revegetation of waste disposal areas. The company is proceeding with implementation of these procedures, keeping the State and local authority informed.

10. MINERAL CLAIMS 1002H AND 1024H

Notification of Approval

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Further to question on notice 1 of 29th August, 1974, and in respect of the Ludlow forest, did the Mines Department inform the Main Roads Department of its intentions to have mineral claims 1002H and 1024H approved for mining?

(2) If not, why not?

(3) Is the Mines Department aware of recommendation 8 of the Australian National Travel Association's report on the South West Travel Region?

(4) If so, what cognisance is it giving to the recommendation?

(5) Was the Mines Department informed of the recommendation of the Environmental Protection Authority that a short section of the Bussell Highway adjacent to Western Titanium's mining area be re-located before the mining of the railway reserve began, as reported at page 30 of the EPA's 1974 report?

(6) If so, what was the date of the receipt of such information?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

I am advised by the Mines Department as follows—

- (1) No.
- (2) It was not considered necessary.
- (3) No.
- (4) Answered by (3).
- (5) Yes.
- (6) 12th November, 1973.

11. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Stormwater Runoff: Examination

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

Adverting to question on notice 30 of 9th October, 1975, what is meant by the term "review", and in particular, what specific and particular assessment is being undertaken to establish the value and future of wetlands?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

As I advised on 9th October, 1975, the matter is under review by the Department of Conservation and Environment. The term "review", is just what any standard dictionary would define.

12. ABORIGINAL ASSISTANT VOCATIONAL OFFICERS

Appointment

Mr WATT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) (a) Is the Minister aware that in a submission dated 20th February, 1975, to the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs, the Department of Labour and Immigration advised that Aboriginal assistant vocational officers would be

appointed at Midland, Albany, Kalgoorlie, Kwinana, Northam and Port Hedland;

(b) if so, has he been advised how many of these appointments have been made?

- (2) If all the appointments are not yet made, would the Minister advise whether negotiations have been held with his department to assist with the selection of suitable personnel to fill the positions?
- (3) If all the appointments are not yet made, would the Minister urge the Federal Minister for Labour to speed up the appointments, especially in the case of Albany-Mt. Barker areas where there is no Aboriginal representation for the 650-odd resident Aborigines, and where there is considerable unemployment among them?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) to (3) This matter is properly one for the Federal Department of Labour and Immigration, but as a representative of that department attends meetings of the Aboriginal Affairs Co-ordinating Committee which functions under the jurisdiction of the Minister for Community Welfare, he has knowledge of the situation.

He has been advised by the representative of the Department of Labour and Immigration that assistant vocational officers have already taken up duty at Midland, Kwinana and Northam. They have been operating in these areas for approximately three months. Selection of assistant vocational officers for Kalgoorlie, Port Hedland and also Geraldton has already taken place and it is anticipated that these officers will shortly take up duty.

As to the Albany-Mt. Barker area, a new position of vocational officer has already been established for the Albany area and the occupant has been headquartered there for several months.

13. MINES DEPARTMENT

Pay-roll Tax and Salaries

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Mines:

As a follow on from his answer to part (1) of question 5 of 22nd October, 1975, why was no payment made by his department for payroll tax in 1973-74?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

Payroll tax for 1973-74 was paid by the Treasury.

14.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Alcoa Alumina Refinery: Mud Lakes

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Premier:

- (1) Does the Premier's reference to "a new concept" as far as conservation is concerned in his 1974 policy speech mean that his Government is not concerned with the "obliteration" by waste disposal ("red mud") areas of the "rather attractive low-lying wooded land" and the consequent inability to create a linear regional park connecting Thompson Lake with the lower Serpentine River, which is the impression given by the answer offered by the Minister for Conservation and the Environment to part (1) of question on notice 25 of 9th October, 1975?
- (2) What hope can he offer to those concerned with the degradation and despoliation of the area referred to, that the Government is genuinely and conscientiously aware of the threat and will take immediate and positive action to investigate the position and remedy the situation?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) The member's question is regarded as being framed in a way intended to create a false impression, and I therefore do not propose to answer it in any detail.
- (2) The Government takes a practical and realistic attitude to matters of this kind, as evidenced by the fact that we are liaising closely with Alcoa in a programme of deliquoring and rehabilitation of the red mud areas. Successful results of the company's rehabilitation programme can already be viewed on areas A and B, and work is in progress on area C.

15.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Alcoa Alumina Refinery: Mud Lakes

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) What stage have the negotiations reached for the use of "Lake G" as a red mud area by Alcoa?
- (2) In the light of present knowledge, to what uses would such an area be able to be put once the discharge of effluent has ceased?
- (3) When would the area be available for other uses after the cessation of effluent discharge?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Area "G" has been programmed for use for some years. Negotiations with State and local authority are finalised except for some points of detail.
- (2) This will depend primarily on zoning requirements. We do not envisage any impediment to the ultimate use of the land for public, urban or light industrial purposes.
- (3) Several years are required to rehabilitate a freshly filled disposal area.
Area "G" will be concurrently filled and rehabilitated in successive sections between about 1985 and 2020.

16. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Alcoa Alumina Refinery: Effluent

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) What has been the role of the Environmental Protection Authority in the negotiations for the discharge of effluent into "Lake G" by Alcoa?
- (2) What guarantees can the EPA provide that the land concerned will be usable for the purposes not connected with the discharge of effluent within a reasonable time?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) The Environmental Protection Authority has conferred with the company, local authorities and involved departments and instrumentalities and undertaken site inspections.
- (2) The Environmental Protection Authority is confident that the company's efforts to rehabilitate the area will be successful. Some evidence in support of this is already apparent in Areas A and B.

17. ROYAL PERTH HOSPITAL

Mt. Lawley Annexe

Dr DADOUR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) What is the average nursing dependency per patient at the Mt. Lawley annexe of the Royal Perth Hospital?
- (2) If figures are not available, why not, because they are aggregating their costs?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Normally, of each 100 patients accommodated at the Mt. Lawley Annexe, the following percentages

of nursing dependency relate to the number of patients shown—

%	No. of Patients
Nursing dependency	
100	15
50	11
33½	18
20	38
13½	18

- (2) Not applicable.

18. KWINANA INDUSTRIAL AREA

Pollution Control

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Premier:

- (1) Adverting to question on notice 5 of 9th October, 1975, and noting the contrast shown in the answer to question on notice 60 of the same date, when did the Government adopt the policy that it would not answer questions relating to the appointment of staff or relating to the methodology adopted to deal with special problems facing an area?
- (2) Is it not the proper function of a Parliament to inquire as to the Government's actions in dealing with a problem?
- (3) Why did the previous Minister for Conservation and the Environment answer part (4) of question on notice 30 of 25th March, 1975, in respect of matters which the present Minister claims are "not one for discussion in the House"?
- (4) Why did the Premier courteously answer part (2) of question on notice 11 of 15th April, 1975, which relates to new staff positions and which his colleague now refuses to discuss in the House?
- (5) Is the Premier prepared to overlook the action of the Minister for Conservation and the Environment in refusing to answer a proper Parliamentary question because of that Minister's inexperience?
- (6) Has a pollution control officer or liaison officer been appointed for the Kwinana-Cockburn area?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) The Government follows the accepted practice of advertising appointments through the *Government Gazette*. We will respond specifically to reasonable questions and provide information to Members which is reasonable and does not involve confidential matters. The reply given to question 5 on 9th October, included an invitation for the Member to be more specific regarding the information being sought.

- (2) Yes, within certain sensible guidelines and principles.
- (3) At the time, 25th March, consideration was being given to total staff growth, with limitations being not so much a matter of policy but rather a simple matter of economic constraints.
- (4) Answered by (3).
- (5) The question is hypothetical and mischievous. I have every confidence in the Minister for Conservation and the Environment, and the Member is not serving the cause of sensible environmental management by derogatory questions of this nature.
- (6) No.

19. CONSERVATION THROUGH RESERVES COMMITTEE REPORT

Submissions: Government Departments

Mr BLAIKIE, to the Premier:

- (1) Has he requested Government departments involved in future State progress to make detailed analysis and present submission to either—
 - (a) Executive Council; or
 - (b) Environmental Protection Authority,
 regarding recommendations contained in the report of the Conservation Through Reserves Committee?
- (2) When were requests made and would he list departments involved?
- (3) Have any departments evaluated the report and submitted proposals and would he give detail?
- (4) When does he expect final recommendations to be considered by Cabinet?
- (5) Is it intended that Parliament will be given the opportunity to assess merits of final recommendation of the Environmental Protection Authority's submission to the Government and, if not, why not?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) All Ministers were asked to have departments under their portfolios study the report of the Conservation Through Reserves Committee and make submissions, if appropriate.
- (2) On 12th June, 1975 to all Ministers.
- (3) Yes. Town Planning Department, Public Works Department, Department of Industrial Development, Forests Department, Department of Agriculture have provided comments.

- (4) For systems 1 and 2, in the south west, the information should be available in November.
- (5) When Cabinet receives the EPA recommendations, and is able to assess the content, it will be practicable to answer the question more explicitly.

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Labour and Industry) [2.30 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR HARMAN (Maylands) [2.31 p.m.]: Last evening when this Bill was being debated several requests were made to the Minister to supply certain information to the House and also to refute allegations made from this side of the House that he had given misleading information to the Chamber. It is obvious the Minister has no intention of supplying that information. In one respect he guaranteed to table information relating to the legislation and the action taken by other States of Australia. After he moved the third reading of the Bill I waited for the Minister to do any of those things; some of which he was requested to do and others he guaranteed to do. It is obvious he does not intend to take any action, will not listen to our requests, and will not attempt to refute the strong allegation that he misled this Parliament.

One would think, after he had some hours this morning to reflect on his second reading speech and to gauge the accuracy of the statements I made last night, the Minister would attempt at least to refute those allegations instead of carrying on with some very nasty aspersions about one's own character. I expected that at the least, because if this sort of attitude is allowed to develop in the House—that is, Ministers coming into the Chamber and telling members anything they feel like telling them without any evidence to back up their statements, and without any statements from other sources—

Mr Bertram: Or tell the Parliament nothing.

Mr HARMAN: Yes, that is true. This seems to be a tendency that is developing among some Ministers. It is like a bad apple among good apples; if we do not remove that bad apple all the other apples become contaminated also and we could see a situation developing where Parliament is discarded like some dirty rag. In other words, Ministers seems to be developing an attitude where they consider that they can push Parliament around when they feel like it and they do not have to hold any respect for it, or that, although it is an important institution in Western

Australia they do not have to worry about it. Apparently they consider they can come here and tell members anything they like; tell lies and make misleading statements without any need to worry about the consequences. They believe they do not have to have any conscience about doing any of these things. That is a tendency which I and other members do not like to see developing.

If an allegation is made that a Minister has misled the House he is entitled to refute that allegation and to do so scientifically at least, and not come out with some general statement asserting that the member for Maylands is splitting hairs or does not know what he is talking about. He has to refute that allegation in such a way that it makes sense. However, last night the Minister was not able to do that and today, although he had the opportunity to do so, he made no attempt to refute the allegation.

The Minister was asked by the member for Collie to table information from other States of Australia. The Minister, in quite an emotional way said, "I will have that information brought here and placed on the Table of the House tomorrow." The table has some papers on it, but I cannot see any papers tabled by the Minister for Labour and Industry. Unfortunately, that is the attitude this Minister is adopting. Not only has he done it with this Bill, but, as other members know, he adopted the same attitude with other Bills that were brought before this Chamber previously. Therefore there has to be some reckoning and it is better to clear up the matter now than allow this practice to continue in the future.

Returning to the Bill itself, I reiterate that the Opposition opposes the measure because it goes a lot further than was intended when it comes to laying down principles of indexation. It will give to the Industrial Commission a power it has never had before; and that is to interfere with agreements made between management and labour in good faith, without threat, and without any imposition by an institution such as the Industrial Commission.

So that technique used in industrial relations in Western Australia, which has given good service for the last 75 years, will now come to an end. From now on management and labour will not be able to negotiate on matters which are inconsistent with decisions made by the Commission in Court Session. Those decisions range over a variety of issues. It could be a decision on long service leave, public holidays, sick leave, absence from work, and on many other issues which the commission, from time to time, if it has not already ruled upon them it will no doubt be called upon to do so in the future. Under this Bill, regardless of what the commission has ruled in the past, if an agreement is made which contains anything

relating to those decisions, the commission can refuse to file it. That is a negation of the principles and techniques which I think have done well for the industrial scene in this State.

Most of the decisions which are arrived at are achieved by negotiation and by consent agreements which, when registered, have the force of awards. As I said last night, even though many agreements now in existence are not registered with the Industrial Commission they are observed because of the integrity of the management and the unions concerned. The best type of agreement that can be made is one made between one group and another; it is not the agreement that is forced upon them by a third party. A forced agreement leads to breaches by either or both parties and eventually to discontent.

Mr Bertram: It kills initiative.

Mr HARMAN: It removes from the negotiating table those techniques which are so necessary in industrial relations. It will be a sad moment for industrial relations in Western Australia to have this sort of legislation imposed on the industrial scene. So I again reiterate the attitude of the Opposition. We are opposed to this measure and we hope the Minister will reconsider his position; reconsider the statements he made to the House in his second reading speech and, because of the misleading information he gave, and because of the whole nature of this Bill, I hope he will do two things.

Firstly, I ask him to withdraw the Bill from the House. If he is not prepared to do that, again I request him to delay the passage of the Bill until he refers it to the Australian Minister for Labor. The Minister for Labour and Industry has told us in this House that he is presenting the Bill at the behest of the Australian Minister. So as the Minister is only an errand boy on this occasion—and probably it will be the last occasion—he is only being fair to himself to make sure that the job he is doing is in line with the request made to him by the Australian Minister.

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Labour and Industry) [2.40 p.m.]: If the honourable member wants additional information I will gladly give it to him. I replied to certain allegations last night. They were false and reprehensible and the member for Maylands has demeaned himself by making them.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GRAYDEN: A kindergarten-aged child should be able to grasp the meaning of the statement I made in the second reading speech which was—

The Western Australian Industrial Commission in its decision of the 1st July, 1975, tied its wage indexation in awards to the decisions and principles of the Commonwealth Conciliation and

Arbitration Commission and reiterated the views "that some form of wage indexation would contribute to a more rational system of wage fixation, to more orderly, more equitable and less inflationary wage increases, and to better industrial relations thus aiding economic recovery".

Mr Harman: That statement is not true.

Mr GRAYDEN: First the member for Maylands makes allegations about me and says I am misleading the House and then he says that the statement I made is not true. Let me quote the actual situation. It is as follows—

There are certain differences in the guidelines set down by the Commonwealth Industrial Commission and those of the Western Australian Industrial Commission but these differences are insignificant.

Mr Skidmore: Rubbish!

Mr GRAYDEN: That is the point which escapes the member for Maylands. It indicates his abysmal ignorance of our Industrial Arbitration Act and industrial relations generally in Western Australia. The same applies to the member for Swan. They are not aware of the situation.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GRAYDEN: Let me enlighten them as follows—

Where the Commonwealth Commission used 'catch-up', Western Australia uses comparative wage justice because many W.A. Awards have a nexus with Commonwealth Awards. Therefore we have different problems to face. The latest decision of the Commonwealth Commission in respect to "anomalies" in fact brings the Commonwealth further into line with the action taken by the Western Australian Commission. Both have the same work value guidelines and I reiterate that the main differences are of detail—the State is on comparative wage justice while the Commonwealth is fixed on internal comparisons. The important point to bear in mind is that both the States and the Commonwealth have agreed that increases outside wage indexation must be kept to a minimum.

Reference was made to the recent decision in respect of the Hospital Employees' Union case. The information in regard to this is as follows—

The decision in the Hospital Employees Union case was based on comparative wage justices when the Commission compared W.A. with the nexus in other States and also between Government and private hospitals in Western Australia. The Union considered it a fair decision.

This is the situation, but obviously members opposite are not aware of it. They do not understand it.

Mr Skidmore: You would not have a clue.

Mr GRAYDEN: Yet they make the sort of allegations they made last night.

Mr Skidmore: You are still misleading the House.

Mr GRAYDEN: The allegations made are false and reprehensible and I repeat that the members who made them have demeaned themselves by doing so.

Mr Skidmore: Your statements are just as reprehensible and false.

Mr GRAYDEN: The member for Swan does not know what he is talking about.

Mr Skidmore: I know better than you do.

Mr GRAYDEN: We have the extraordinary situation that the Commonwealth Government has asked the States to introduce this legislation. The Western Australian State Government in the interests of keeping inflation to a minimum and of keeping unemployment to a minimum has introduced legislation to make wage indexation effective, but here we have the Opposition acting irresponsibly by opposing the Bill which is a means of making wage indexation effective.

Mr Skidmore: Rubbish.

Mr GRAYDEN: "Rubbish" says the member for Swan. Again he emphasises his abysmal ignorance of our Industrial Arbitration Act. With his experience in the industrial scene he should know that unions and employers can reach an agreement which they take to the Industrial Registrar for registration.

Mr Skidmore: It is not registered by the registrar, but by the commission.

Mr GRAYDEN: That agreement then has the force of an award under our Act, and that is why the Commonwealth Government has said that unless this gap or loophole is plugged wage indexation could be defeated. People will not go to the commission to settle agreements. They will come to agreement in the manner I just indicated and such agreements could be right outside the guidelines for indexation. Of course, the Opposition is being two-faced on this question—

Mr Blaikie: As usual.

Mr GRAYDEN: —to such an extent that its irresponsibility should be made known to the public of Western Australia.

Mr Nanovich: Hear, hear!

Mr GRAYDEN: The Commonwealth Labor Government has told the people of Australia that wage indexation is absolutely necessary—

Mr B. T. Burke: Hear, hear!

Mr GRAYDEN: —thus gaining the approbation of the people of Australia. However, here we have a Labor Opposition in the State Parliament seeking to gain approbation for its stand in respect of indexation, not by supporting indexation, but by pandering to militant unions which are opposed to wage indexation.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GRAYDEN: So we have the Opposition wanting to have it both ways—two bob each way.

Mr Skidmore: You mean 20c each way. You can't even get that right.

Mr GRAYDEN: What kind of irresponsibility is this? Australian people are facing increased inflation and increased unemployment.

Let me repeat what the Prime Minister had to say on this question, as reported in *The West Australian* of the 15th September, as follows—

The Prime Minister, Mr Whitlam, yesterday made his strongest appeal yet to workers to ensure that wage indexation succeeds—and in the process launched a bitter attack on some trade unions.

The militant trade unions, of course. To continue—

He said that indexation had to work.

The alternative was industrial chaos and inflation on a scale Australia had never seen before.

Etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. The Prime Minister of Australia has made statements like that gaining the approbation of the people of Australia because of his support of wage indexation. Every State and the Commonwealth Government realise that unless we have wage indexation we will face increased inflation and unemployment. However, because some militant unions will be affected by wage indexation, the Labor Opposition in this Parliament panders to them by attempting to render wage indexation ineffective.

Mr Blaikie: Shameful!

Mr GRAYDEN: What a disreputable thing to do. If by some mischance the Leader of the Opposition ever became the Treasurer of this State it would be his obligation to ensure that wage indexation worked. What then would be the stand of the Opposition? Would it be able to continue to attempt to gain the approbation of the militant unions at the expense of the people of Western Australia? Of course not. I will not further delay the House—

Mr Harman: What is the attitude—

Mr GRAYDEN: —by answering spurious allegations as a result of which the member for Maylands so demeans himself.

Mr Davies: Where is the information?

Mr GRAYDEN: I will give it before I resume my seat. I wish to quote the following—

As the result of the joint decision of the Commonwealth Minister and the six State Ministers—

Mr Davies: What are you quoting?

Mr GRAYDEN: To continue—

—each is moving towards either legislation or the possibility of legislation. The situation applying in Australia at the moment is as follows—

Mr Davies: What are you quoting?

Mr GRAYDEN: This is the information requested.

Mr Davies: I want to know what you are quoting.

Mr GRAYDEN: This is the information I have obtained for members opposite.

Mr Skidmore: What is it all about?

Mr Davies: What has it to do with the debate?

Mr GRAYDEN: Members asked for information in respect of what is happening in the Commonwealth and the other States, and now they will get it.

Mr B. T. Burke: What is the authority?

Mr GRAYDEN: Members will get the authority. I will obtain the draft Bills and place them on the Table of the House.

Mr Davies: You are always promising things, but never doing them.

Mr GRAYDEN: In the meantime I will tell members what is occurring.

Mr Davies: Will you break that promise also?

Mr GRAYDEN: The member for Victoria Park is making further statements to which I take exception.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GRAYDEN: The honourable member knows perfectly well if he wants the actual draft Bills of the legislation proposed in the Eastern States they will have to be obtained from the Eastern States. I cannot get them overnight but he will get them. I do not think members of the Opposition want the information, and with good reason. Why should they, when it contradicts everything they have been saying during the debate?

Mr Harman: Hurry up.

Mr GRAYDEN: The member for Maylands says, "Hurry up and give us the information." The member for Victoria Park says, "We don't want the information"; and no wonder. The Leader of the Opposition is not in the Chamber today because—

Mr Taylor: He is on inspection. He is with the Minister for Works, as a matter of fact. Would you like to withdraw your statement?

Mr GRAYDEN: He has good reason to be out of the Chamber.

Mr Taylor: He has, too.

Mr GRAYDEN: If ever he became Treasurer of this State he would have the obligation to do precisely what the Government is doing at the moment. According to the information I have received, the situation in the Commonwealth is this—

The Minister has the matter in Caucus and is hopeful of introducing amending legislation in November.

Mr B. T. Burke: Who says?

Mr GRAYDEN: This information was obtained by the Department of Labour and Industry as a result of phone calls today to the various States and the Commonwealth. I repeat—

The Minister has the matter in Caucus and is hopeful of introducing amending legislation in November.

He may not be in office in November, but if he is he will introduce the amending legislation. To continue—

New South Wales: The Bill is currently being drafted and is expected to be introduced within the next fortnight to provide for oversight of registered industrial agreements.

Victoria: The Bill to amend the Labour and Industry (Wages Board Determination Act) was introduced into the Victorian Parliament on the 14th October for the purpose of monitoring decisions of Wages Boards to see that increases are within the principles of Wage Indexation. An adjustment was sought until the 28th October.

Queensland: A Bill was introduced in the Queensland Parliament on the 16th September '75 and provides that agreements filed with the Industrial Registrar shall be referred to the Commission who may approve such agreements. The Queensland Amending Act covers many other amendments to their Arbitration Act but I am advised that there has not been one word of criticism raised against the principle of the particular amendment concerning Industrial Agreements.

South Australia: The South Australian Industrial Commission has still not laid down guidelines in respect to wage indexation. There are currently ten test cases before the Commission and on the outcome of these the Premier announced that the Government stands ready to legislate if there is any deviation from the guidelines. In the meantime, every worker in South Australia is receiving wage indexation in accordance with the decision of the Commonwealth Commission and in accordance with the guidelines laid down.

Mr B. T. Burke: This is socialist legislation.

Mr GRAYDEN: To continue—

Tasmania: At this time it has not been considered necessary to introduce legislation, although the Chairman of the Wages Boards stated that if necessary he would make his own decisions.

Mr Skidmore: You said Tasmania had introduced legislation.

Mr GRAYDEN: I said I did not know what the situation was there. To continue—

So far all decisions have conformed to the guidelines.

There it is—the situation in the Commonwealth, New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, and Tasmania. I will not waste the time of the House—

Point of Order

Mr HARMAN: Could I ask for the paper from which the Minister was quoting to be tabled, please?

Mr GRAYDEN: I am delighted to table the paper, and I will give the honourable member much more information at a later date.

The paper was tabled (see paper No. 488).

Debate Resumed

Mr GRAYDEN: I just want to reiterate that I certainly found there was no point in replying to the debate last night and wasting the time of the House because I had already spoken on the issue. The charges made by the member for Maylands were spurious in the extreme and demeaned the honourable member and others who made them. I take strong exception to them.

Mr Bryce: Before you sit down—

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—20

Mr Blaikie
Sir Charles Court
Mr Cowan
Mr Coyne
Mrs Craig
Mr Crane
Dr Dadour
Mr Grayden
Mr P. V. Jones
Mr Laurance

Mr Mensaros
Mr Nanovich
Mr Rushton
Mr Shalders
Mr Sodeman
Mr Stephens
Mr Thompson
Mr Watt
Mr Young
Mr Clarke

(Teller)

Noes—15

Mr Barnett
Mr Bertram
Mr Bryce
Mr B. T. Burke
Mr Davies
Mr T. D. Evans
Mr Fletcher
Mr Harman

Mr Jamieson
Mr McIver
Mr Skidmore
Mr Taylor
Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr J. T. Tonkin
Mr Moiler

(Teller)

Ayes	Pairs	Noes
Mr O'Connor	Mr Carr	
Mr Silson	Mr Bateman	
Mr Old	Mr May	
Mr Ridge	Mr T. H. Jones	
Mr Grewar	Mr H. D. Evans	
Mr O'Neill	Mr Hartrey	
Mr McPharlin	Mr T. J. Burke	

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Sir Charles Court (Premier), and passed.

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth)—Minister for Labour and Industry [3.00 p.m.] : I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

When introducing the first Bill to amend the Industrial Arbitration Act in this House a week ago I mentioned the reasons which could cause one or more further amending Bills to this Act to follow.

This second amending Bill which I now desire to explain has emanated from a request by the Chief Industrial Commissioner to amend the Act so that some machinery and administrative provisions can be improved which will tend to simplify procedures and reduce paper work as well as expedite certain actions and delete irrelevant matter. The proposals do not affect the rights of employers or workers or advantage one to the disadvantage of the other but should assist parties to proceedings before the commission.

The proposals have been placed before the Confederation of Western Australian Industry and the Western Australian Trades and Labor Council, both of whom have seen merit in the proposals and have been satisfied as to the desirability of amending accordingly.

I shall explain the clauses briefly.

Clause 2: This will amend section 42 of the Act by the addition of a new paragraph (b) to allow the commission to make a relevant order, when all parties to an industrial agreement themselves agree to cancel, amend, or vary any provision in any agreement whilst it is in force.

Clause 3: In section 54 of the Act, the commissioners, other than the Chief Industrial Commissioner, have seniority according to the dates of their appointments. It is the statutory responsibility of the commissioner who is first in order of seniority to assume the duties of the Chief Industrial Commissioner when the latter

is unable to perform the duties by reason of absence on periods of leave or for other reasons. It is proposed to give appropriate recognition to the responsibilities of the existing office by calling it "senior commissioner" without creating any expectancy of entitlement to automatic elevation in the event of the senior office becoming vacant.

Clause 4: Corrects a grammatical error only.

Clause 5: Section 92 is amended to provide for retrospective effect to the whole or any part of an award to be taken to a date earlier than when the commission first took cognisance of the matter in respect of which the award or part thereof was made, subject to the parties agreeing upon its application from such earlier date. Orders will then be able to be made beyond the limits presently prescribed but only at the request and with the consent of the parties thereto.

Clause 6: Section 93 at present provides for an award, which has expired by its term, to continue in force until substituted. The amendment to this section will add words which will alter that position only to the extent that the commission, of its own motion, may by order under a new section 98B—clause 8—cancel awards if there are no workers to whom they apply. Provisions are inserted in the new section 98B to safeguard the position of persons likely to be affected.

Clause 7: This clause introduces a new section 94A to enable the commission, of its own motion—alternatively it can be done on the individual application of the Confederation of Western Australian Industry, The Western Australian Trades and Labor Council, or the Attorney-General—to make a general order in relation to all awards and industrial agreements in force. By acting of its own volition, the commission may eliminate much procedure and time-taking activity both to itself and to individual applicants who are otherwise committed to apply for coverage under a general order issued by the commission.

Safeguards will be provided, inasmuch as for matters covering Government workers or State instrumentalities the Attorney-General and the Trades and Labor Council will have to agree to the general order covering such awards or agreements. Similarly in the private section, the Confederation of Western Australian Industry and the Trades and Labor Council will have to agree to the making of the order in respect of an award or agreement. The commission will also allow any other person with a sufficient interest in the proceedings—such as a union not affiliated with the Trades and Labor Council or an employer not a member of the confederation—to appear and be heard before a general order is made. This amendment should assist all parties and reduce time-consuming procedures.

Clause 8: A new section 98B will be added by this clause to enable the commission to cancel awards and industrial agreements which no longer have effect; for example, awards which have been ousted by a Federal award or awards applying to industries which have ceased to operate and which no longer affect any workers. Proposed new subsection (1) covers this aspect.

In effect some "dead wood" will be cleared from the system. The Industrial Registrar is often put to much time and expense in notifying parties to an award of impending action only to find by letters returned to him that a business no longer operates. It is intended in such cases that the commission should have the power to strike out parties to the award who are no longer involved. Proposed new subsection (2) covers this aspect.

Proposed new subsection (3) states that the commission shall not make an order under subsections (1) and (2) until certain procedures are carried out; for example, that the Industrial Registrar has conducted relevant inquiries and reported to the commission and that notice of intention to make an order is advertised in a relevant newspaper, and also that copies of the notice are served on such persons as the commission may specify. A right of objection to the making of an order is given to interested parties and the commission can hear and determine the objection. If cause can be shown why an award or agreement should continue, then the commission will take cognisance of the fact.

If an order is finally made, a copy of it will be served on each party to the agreement or each union of workers or other party to the award.

Clause 9: The Industrial Arbitration Act (Western Australian Industrial Appeal Court) Regulations, 1964, provide in regulation 4 for an appeal to be made within 14 days of the date of the decision appealed against. This amendment to section 103A draws attention to a time limit which is prescribed in the regulations.

Clauses 10, 12, 13, and 14: The amendments to sections 108F, 123, 127, and 127A respectively are caused by the recent change of name of the Western Australian Employers Federation to the Confederation of Western Australian Industry (Incorporated).

Clause 11: This amendment to section 108J is consequential upon the amendment made by clause 5 to section 92.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Skidmore.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Council with amendments.

CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

Second Reading

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [3.09 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to provide for an increase in the number of Ministers in the Government from 12 to 13.

The decision to introduce the Bill has been made after very mature consideration by the Government and in the light of experience since it took office last year.

There is no doubt that the complexities of Government today are vastly different from, and very difficult when compared with those in former years.

These complexities—quite apart from the severe increase in the volume of Ministerial commitments—are further increased because of the very tense and continuing complications between the Commonwealth and the States.

There is always a problem present in trying to apportion the ministerial burden with reasonable evenness over all the portfolios and, at the same time, achieve logical groupings of portfolios.

No-one has found the perfect solution because often the logical groupings bring a serious overload on one particular Minister, or Ministers.

To overcome the position on a trial basis, the Government arranged the appointment of an Honorary Minister. This has been successful so far as an Honorary Minister is able to function.

His work in the specialised field of Federal affairs has been of great value to the Cabinet and to myself, in particular.

However, the constitutional limitations on the role to be played by an Honorary Minister are severe, and it is now sought to create an additional full Ministry.

I am hopeful that within the life of this Parliament we will be able to return to a portfolio of Attorney-General which, as members know, requires a fully qualified legal practitioner, otherwise a Minister for Justice has to be appointed.

There is also a strong suggestion that the duties covered by the Minister for Justice portfolio at present should be more related to the administration of various Statutes, such as electoral, liquor, companies, and other Statutes, than those relating to work calling for the professional qualifications possessed by a legally qualified practitioner.

The implementation of a number of the Government's policies will call for even greater emphasis on legal qualifications and experience. However, this is but one of the reasons that an additional Ministry is required and should not overshadow the real purpose of the Bill; namely, to increase the number of permitted Ministries from 12 to 13.

Members will appreciate that Governments from time to time make their own allocations of portfolios and the change in numbers is not intended in any way to bind the present or future Governments on such allocations.

I thought it wise to provide members with additional information relating to the situation in the Ministries of other States. It is as follows—

	Now	Previously	Increase	Date of Change
N.S.W.	18	16	2	Feb. 1969
VIC.	17	16	1	1973
Q'LD	18	14	4	Mar. 1975
S.A.	12	11	1	Oct. 1975
TAS.	10	9	1	May 1972

I quote those figures only to enable members to have a quick reference, should they want to compare these numbers. However, I emphasise that Western Australia has some peculiarities which make the position here quite different from that applying in other States. For instance, Victoria is less than the size of Kimberley. The commitments of Governments, regardless of which party is in power, are tremendous and increasing, literally stretching from one end of the State to the other; they are increasing even on an east-west basis.

It has been found by the Government that the burdens and complexities of today's type of government are greater than ever before. I know that it is an entirely different ball game today from when we were last in Government between 1959 and 1971; I suppose it will ever change, but it will never get easier.

On the question of an Attorney-General, it may be worth commenting for the benefit of newer members that the position of Attorney-General can be held only by a qualified legal practitioner; hence the portfolio of Minister for Justice in some Governments which do not have a qualified legal practitioner in the Government.

I have always favoured the holding of the office of Attorney-General by a qualified legal practitioner because I believe it improves the work of the office; it is easier for the people in the Crown Law Department and other departments which have legal practitioners on the staff to communicate with the Government through a person who has professional qualifications in this field.

There is yet another reason that I am anxious to see a qualified legal practitioner within the Government; namely, that one part of the Government's policy which is to set up machinery for the vetting of Statutes and regulations before they are presented to the Parliament will call for a considerable amount of legal expertise. I

am of the opinion that the body we propose, and which is set out in our policy, will function best if the type of work involved were carried out by a person who is a qualified legal practitioner—in other words, a person who would hold the portfolio of Attorney-General.

Mr Davies: But does he have to be a Minister?

Sir CHARLES COURT: He does not have to be a Minister to be on this body; in fact, I can see a situation where there would be no Minister on such a body. However, the body would function the better if the Minister in charge of this particular section of the Government's work were in fact a qualified legal practitioner—in other words, he would be the Attorney-General. I refer the honourable member to the relevant part of our policy speech on which I am now commenting.

Mr Davies: In point of fact, that body will do what Parliament really should do; namely, ensure that legislation fits in with an overall plan.

Sir CHARLES COURT: That is very true, but as the honourable member would know, some of his colleagues have been advocating a series of committees in this Parliament for that very purpose.

Mr Davies: But they would be committees of the Parliament, not outside bodies.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We have not accepted this suggestion because we believe our Parliament does not need them. I remind the honourable member that this is not a question of usurping the business of Parliament; rather, this body will be a watchdog for the average member of Parliament and, hopefully, will assist not only this Government but also any future Government to examine legislation from the point of view of assessing whether it impinges upon one's personal liberties.

Mr Davies: I still think that is what Parliament is for.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Of course it is, and I hope that will continue to be the role of Parliament. I am not suggesting for one minute that the mere fact we intend to establish this body in the new year to do this sort of work will absolve members from their responsibilities—far from it.

Mr Davies: Why is it required as an addition?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I have heard it said in this place that no member can possibly have the time to study all the regulations, papers, and by-laws that are made and tabled in this House. I know it is their responsibility, nominally, but I would question whether any member of this Parliament is either able or desires to study in detail every one of the Statutes, regulations, by-laws, and other documents which are tabled.

We hope to establish a body which will not be beholden to the Government but which will have the type of expertise necessary to enable it to examine these Statutes, by-laws, and regulations, and hopefully will be in a position to remind the Government of the day that some of its proposals might unwittingly go further than the Government intended and might be encroaching on personal civil liberties to too great a degree.

I remind the honourable member that earlier this session I was criticised by one of his colleagues for not implementing this part of our policy to establish such a body; I give notice now that the Government intends to establish it in the new year. I do not want to suggest that is the reason for this Bill; however, it is consequential that we should be able to appoint an Attorney-General. I just make the point that we cannot appoint an Honorary Minister as Attorney-General.

Mr Davies: We agree on that.

Sir CHARLES COURT: There was a lot of legal argument as to whether an Attorney-General must actually be a member of Parliament. I know that in Great Britain an Attorney-General does not also have to be an elected member of Parliament. However, that is not what I am suggesting here. I put this forward as a very desirable change.

A suggestion was made in the Press that we might be increasing the number of Ministers beyond this figure, and leaving the number at the option of the Government of the day so that it could decide how many Ministers it wanted.

Governments need not have 12 Ministers, but they can have up to 12. Whilst there might be some attraction to increase the number to 13, 14 or 15, my own practical experience is that if this Government contemplated doing that, then before I introduced the second reading of the relevant Bill I would have members sidling up to me saying, "Which one will I get?" One step at a time is enough, and we will leave the number at 13.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr J. T. Tonkin (Leader of the Opposition).

MEDICAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 2nd September.

MR DAVIES (Victoria Park) [3.21 p.m.]: This simple Bill came to us from another place, and the introduction of the second reading here took place on the 2nd September. Since then this item has cluttered up the notice paper. It has been a matter of mystery to me why this item has not seen the light of day before this. Possibly there was more important legislation to be proceeded with. As the passage of the Bill in this House would take

20 minutes or so there would have been some saving in printing costs, had the debate been dealt with earlier and the Bill passed.

However, I have no objection to the Bill. It merely sets out that the schedule to the Medical Act shall be amended to provide for the recognition of two additional qualifications for medical practitioners. The first is the degree of Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery of the University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne; and the second is a similar degree of the University of Dundee.

From time to time it has been said by the Minister for Health that it is necessary to update the schedule to the Act, because we find in that schedule qualifications of universities throughout the English speaking world which are acceptable to Western Australia.

The question of registration of doctors in this State has been of great concern for a long time, and I believe we in Western Australia are harsher than any other State on the type of qualification we should accept. In some way this is understandable. We wish to ensure that we have medical practitioners with the highest possible qualifications practising in this State. We believe there are some medical practitioners who have qualified in some overseas countries but who fall far below the standard of qualification demanded by the public here.

By the same token we have adopted a rather curious policy, and this is something of a paradox. Although we may not be prepared to accept certain qualifications to enable the holders to practise in the metropolitan area, in teaching hospitals, or other places where registered medical practitioners already practise, we are prepared to permit them to practise in remote areas of the State. Such persons have to practise in the remote areas for two years before they are considered to be suitably qualified—having served a form of apprenticeship in this way—to practise in areas now served by medical practitioners who automatically are permitted to become registered.

The provision of doctors in distant centres of the State has been a long-standing problem. It does not repose merely with this Government or the previous Government, but the ones before that; in fact, since the State was founded.

In many centres attractive residences for doctors and well equipped hospitals have been provided, and there is plenty of scope for practice, but we often find it impossible to obtain suitably qualified medical practitioners to practise in such centres. As a former Minister for Health I endeavoured on a number of occasions to recruit doctors from various places. We had a modicum of success, but by no means the success I had hoped for. We must be careful from where we recruit doctors.

Whilst the qualifications of some medical practitioners—such as those trained in Hong Kong—are accepted, I should point out that if we take doctors from that area we might be depriving the people there of a service which is badly needed. This matter requires very careful research, probing and selection to ensure that no-one is disadvantaged by Western Australia attracting doctors from other parts of the world.

As Minister for Health I felt that the recognition within Western Australia under the Medical Act was too restrictive. From time to time I spoke to the former Commissioner of Public Health (Dr Davidson) on this matter. I have lauded his work in this House, and I will continue to laud his work because he has rendered tremendous service to Western Australia.

Whilst I was Minister for Health I sought information from him as to how the Act could be amended, and what qualifications could reasonably be included which were 'not then covered by the schedule to the Act. Dr Davidson pointed out to me there was and had been for a number of years an Australian committee on qualifications, set up by the previous Australian Government and not the present one, which had been examining the qualifications and the methods by which doctors, who desired to practise in Australia, could be put to some acceptable test to show whether or not their qualifications were sufficient to enable them to practise in this country.

I understand that in the United States of America some standard like this is set. Part of the interview is done with the aid of films. The doctors see on films the manner in which the applicants respond at the interviews. The results that the USA has had with the acceptance of doctors by this method of test and statutory interviews indicate that the type of qualifications we in Australia have been accepting in general come out on top. However, there are still many other qualifications which, although highly acceptable, are not yet acceptable in this State.

One of the anomalies is that the other States have different standards. I believe that if a person holds a degree of Bachelor of Medicine he is permitted to practise in New South Wales. Such a person having practised in New South Wales for one or two years is able to come to Western Australia and be accepted as qualified to practise here. I do not know that this method is availed of very often, or whether it is an acceptable practice. There are conditions under which qualifications, other than those set out in the Medical Act, are acceptable in Western Australia where there is a proven need.

Earlier I mentioned the Australian committee on qualifications. Although it has been operating for four or five years to my knowledge, it has not come up with an answer to the problem. It is time that

committee busied itself and came up with an answer as to what qualifications can be accepted as standard throughout Australia.

No doubt many doctors from other parts of the world would be happy to come here to practise. Their standards might not be readily acceptable, yet they might be qualified to practise. Some of these are as highly qualified as, if not better qualified than some of our general practitioners who are now practising in the metropolitan area.

One of the other methods for a person who is not presently acceptable to become an accepted medical practitioner in Western Australia is for him to go to England and obtain a fellowship at a recognised college. If he gains that fellowship he automatically becomes acceptable in Western Australia. Maybe the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners could do something about this problem.

I have to congratulate that college on its family medicine programme. I think it was in the last year I was Minister for Health that the representative of that body said to me, "We want to encourage people to go into general practice in family medicine. To do this we want to conduct a course, and farm out the trainees to doctors whose standards are acceptable to us, so that those trainees can serve part-time with those doctors"; that is, these trainees would go out after they had finished their university training and hospital training. He further said, "We believe that by putting them into a general practice situation both locally and in the country we may be able to awaken them to the advantages of going into general practice. By that means they would be encouraged to take up these positions."

In order to implement such a scheme the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners wanted some money from the Government. I said that on behalf of the Government I would guarantee about \$5 000 a year to mount this programme. Just after we arrived at this agreement there was a change of Government. However, I am pleased to see that for the first time on a national basis an Australian Government is taking up the question of training for general practice.

Consequently, I hope the training will encourage doctors to go to country areas. This has been tremendously successful. I do not want to take any credit for the Australian Government thinking of it because it was thought of by the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners.

I have with me a pamphlet which sets out the family medicine programme and, I repeat, the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners developed the programme. Several publications have been printed and no doubt copies of them have been made available to members in this place. One, to which I would like to refer, is the "Community Health Bulletin" No. 1. July-September quarter, 1975. The article from which I intend to quote deals with

the training of doctors for the country. The summary consists of only a few lines but I would like to read it to indicate what is going on, and what the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners is doing. It states—

In summary, the Family Medicine Programme, with its graduate education, has been concentrating as part of its efforts, on the rural family doctor scene, and both in study and implementation hopes it can help solve some of the problems facing isolated, rural communities where a great shortage of family doctors exists.

It is pleasing to know that such a programme has been taken up. No doubt members have received also copies of a journal, "Health", put out by the Australian Department of Health, volume 25, No. 3. That journal contains a very interesting article headed, "A new opportunity for the family practitioner".

The article details exactly what I have already mentioned, and points out that not only are doctors being trained in family medicine and general practice, but they are also being retrained in order to bring them back into the community programme. I was rather surprised to learn that a large number of persons who had trained in medicine had dropped the profession almost completely. I must say this is a fine article and I recommend that members read it.

Mr Laurance: Does the training programme cater for country doctors?

Mr DAVIES: The programme is not restricted to either country or metropolitan areas, and arrangements have been made for country doctors to take part.

I may be giving the impression that I am on a publicity drive for the Australian Government, so I want to quote from the annual report of the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners. At pages 34 and 35 appears an article headed, "The Family Medicine Programme". In answer to the interjection from the member for Gascoyne, I think he will observe how the programme works. The article points out that the programme was established by the college council in collaboration with the Australian Government. The article states—

... the Family Medicine Programme has in its first full financial year of operation exceeded all of its initial targets and is well on the way of achieving its long term objectives of—

1. Increasing the number of graduates entering general/family practice.
2. Improving the standard of training for family medicine by developing and introducing comprehensive, learner centred, problem oriented educational programmes.

The four-year vocational training programme based on both hospital and general practice training situations has been well accepted by the majority of the medical profession and the co-operation of hospitals, State and Commonwealth Departments of Health, specialists and general practitioners has been outstanding.

Tangible evidence of this acceptance and co-operation is borne out by the fact that at the end of June, 1975, 76 hospital posts had been accredited for F.M.P. training and 391 general practices had applied for and been accredited by the Accreditation Committee of Council.

Both the acceptance of and the need for this vocational training programme is clearly evident in the response of younger graduates. At June 30th, 727 trainees (170 women) had entered the programme and during the month of June, 229 were undertaking a general practice term.

The article did not answer the question concerning country doctors but I will let the member for Gascoyne have a copy of the report and he can read it for himself and learn what training is available in the country.

I was pleased to note that this proposal has had such splendid support from the medical profession. The profession has not considered the proposal to be a nationalisation or a socialisation of medicine. It has been admitted by the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners that during the financial year, 1974-75, the Australian Government was pleased to allocate \$4.1 million to the family medicine programme. As a result of the successes of the programme the Australian Government has announced that the college will receive a grant of \$5.5 million this financial year. The aim of the committee is to recruit at least 500 trainees.

Although from time to time the Australian Government comes in for a great deal of criticism it is doing many fine things in many directions. The family medicine programme is a long-term project and although it was not instituted by the Australian Government, it is fully supported by it. Under the scheme the doctors themselves are training others, making sure that the appropriate facilities are provided in order to encourage trainees to enter the field of general practice and to go to country areas. I want to applaud the Australian Government for its support.

As the former Minister for Health, I was delighted indeed when I did not have to fork out \$5 000 to the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners as a contribution from the State when the Australian Government accepted the responsibility. Incidentally, the college itself intended to pay some of the money necessary

to encourage doctors to accept trainees, because obviously the doctors who had graduated on their own performances would lose some of their earning capacity while devoting time to their trainees.

It is pleasing to see that the plan which has been so well accepted has been adopted by the Australian Government and is receiving such wonderful support. I seriously hope that the training programme in the future will be greater than it has been in the past.

With reference to doctors not being available for country areas, from the comments of those I have spoken to it is obvious that once a doctor is established in the country he has to accept a great deal more responsibility than his metropolitan counterpart because no specialised staff are available, and there is no ready access to other doctors for referrals. However, I believe that most doctors who do go to the country find it a great challenge, and satisfying indeed. As a result of the family medicine programme other doctors will accept the challenge and find the work very satisfying.

Returning to the contents of the Bill, we are to include two additional classifications only, on what is already a very short list. I do not think the additions will have a great impact on the number of doctors who are available for practice in Western Australia; that is, those people with overseas qualifications who want to practise here. The shortage may be overcome in one or two areas, but the new classification will not completely cover the whole problem.

The Government will have to insist, as I am sure it will do, that the committee on qualifications which is to be set up on a national basis will be formed as soon as possible. I am not certain, but I think it is to be set up under the NHMRC. Recently, I asked a question related to this matter, but I do not have the answer with me today. It is to be a national body and is to have some representation, direct or indirect, from this State. I hope this Government will see that no time is wasted in ensuring the establishment of the committee so it can get on with its deliberations and bring down recommendations in order to achieve a wider spectrum of acceptance not only in this State, but in other States.

We cannot argue with the Bill. I have taken a long time to say we support it.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [3.39 p.m.]: I thank the member for Victoria Park for his support of the Bill and the comments he has made. The honourable member queried the reason for the Bill remaining on the notice paper for so long. It had to take its place because we are inclined to leave Bills, which come from the other place, down on the notice paper a little—unless they are wanted urgently—to enable us to get our business up to the Legislative Council.

However, it is not intended to indicate the Bill is of no importance; on the contrary it is important, particularly now that it has been pointed out that these qualifications were overlooked.

I thoroughly endorse the honourable member's remarks regarding the need for being vigilant and also the need to speed the work necessary in determining, as quickly as possible, the rules that will apply in respect of overseas qualifications.

I find this a vexed question, not only in the medical profession but in all other professions where we get a combination of local resistance which extends beyond normal caution, and where we also get a degree of desirable caution that is very necessary; because some qualifications obtained from abroad can be virtually bought, and we do not want that sort of qualification recognised automatically either in Western Australia or in Australia generally.

The point has been well taken in another place about the medical practitioners who go into the country and who, on the surface, might not appear to have the qualifications we would normally demand. However, I am assured by those concerned that there is a training course for these particular doctors and before they are given a chance to practise in the country, where they gain additional experience under our system, they do, in fact, have to comply with the standards imposed by our current health and medical laws.

Mr Davies: They have a couple of months at a teaching hospital.

Sir CHARLES COURT: That is so. During that time it is very easy for the experienced people to determine whether these doctors are of the right standard to be let loose on the public, either in the metropolitan area or in the country; though I would hate to think that we had two standards—one in connection with areas 300 miles from Perth and another, perhaps a lower standard, for an area 1 000 miles from Perth. But that, of course, does not prevail.

These medical practitioners, whether they be trained locally or overseas, are the better for having a period of service in country areas. We have had a number of wonderful men who have come out of the Flying Doctor Service and who, with their experience, have not only been good administrators—because they have been able to understand the problems of the man at the other end of the communications line—but they have also been the better for it generally because they understand the people in the remote areas; indeed, I would say they understand people, full stop.

I have always been one to encourage this type of practice. The scheme to encourage doctors to go into the country is one which I believe we must encourage further.

I cannot accept that there are not young men and women going through the training course at the present time who are not prepared to play their part if properly approached. As the honourable member pointed out, under this scheme there is no duress or pressure; if I understand it correctly it is a question of responsible people pointing out the advantages of such an experience to some young men and women.

I hope the scheme can be developed even further, because we do badly need an increased number of medical practitioners in some of these rural and remote areas.

I thank the honourable member for his support of the Bill.

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.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.06 p.m.

CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

Message: Appropriations

Message from the Lieutenant-Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the Bill.

APPROPRIATION BILL (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)

Second Reading: Budget Debate

Debate resumed from the 21st October.

MR HARMAN (Maylands) [4.07 p.m.]: Without doubt the political event of this century has been and will be the present constitutional crisis, as it has been termed, in Canberra. Therefore, this afternoon I want to spend a little time making an attempt to analyse the reasons that I believe the Liberal-Country Party Opposition in Canberra has acted in the manner it has. Then later I want to develop some other thoughts I have about some recent statements by the Premier of this State.

Firstly, I refer the House to a remark made by the present Leader of the Liberal Party in Canberra (Mr Fraser). He made this comment soon after being elected to the position of Leader of the Federal Liberal Party—an election which, as it now turns out, he had been organising for some time by using other people to do his dirty work. This is what Mr Fraser said—

The basic principle which I adhere to strongly is that a government that continues to have a majority in the House of Representatives has a right to expect that it will be able to govern.

Mr Thompson: Keep reading.

Mr HARMAN: That is all the quote I have, so I cannot continue to read. If the member likes to obtain the balance of

the quote for me, I will be happy to read it out.

What the Leader of the Opposition in Canberra was saying on that occasion is that if in the people's House—the House of Representatives—a certain party has a majority, then that party should be able to govern. Later Mr Fraser qualified that remark by saying that if some reprehensible situation were brought about by the Government of Australia then, and only then, could he contemplate the Senate refusing to pass either a Supply Bill or an Appropriation Bill. I want to ascertain what is the reprehensible situation which has arisen.

Mr Thompson: Where have you been for the last few months?

Mr HARMAN: I am waiting for members opposite to suggest what this reprehensible situation is. The only situation I can see which could in any way be gauged as being reprehensible—if that is the word we have to use—is the situation of inflation and unemployment.

Mr Thompson: What about the loans deal?

Mr HARMAN: I am sure members of the Government would agree with me on that point.

Mr Clarke: We would not say "only unemployment". You used the word "only"; unemployment is 400 000.

Mr HARMAN: Then I put it another way: the fact is that we do have unemployment and we do have inflation in Australia. If members opposite suggest that is the main reason the Federal Opposition is forcing a delay of the money Bills in the Senate, then I am afraid I cannot agree that is a situation which has been caused solely by the Australian Government.

Mr Clarke: Principally.

Mr HARMAN: A moment ago a member of the Government mentioned the loans affair. During the whole time this matter has been the subject of attention not a single shred of evidence in respect of it has been presented to the Australian Parliament.

Mr Thompson: Two senior Ministers resigned.

Mr HARMAN: They resigned for misleading the House.

Mr Rushton: So should their leader have resigned.

Mr HARMAN: There has not been a single shred of evidence presented to the Australian Parliament by Lynch, Fraser, or Anthony which in any way suggests something untoward occurred in respect of the loans affair. Members opposite may laugh, but they cannot present a single piece of evidence that would involve the Australian Government.

Mr Rushton: Don't you read?

Mr Jamieson: Yes, but obviously you can't.

Mr HARMAN: Therefore it must boil down to the fact that the Opposition in the Australian Parliament feels that inflation and unemployment represent this reprehensible situation.

I want to show the House that is not really the reason the Opposition in the Australian Parliament is acting in this manner; because it is unable to defend itself against that proposition. The fact is—and I will demonstrate this to the House; no doubt I have demonstrated it under different circumstances on previous occasions—that the Whitlam Australian Labor Party Government cannot be held responsible for inflation and unemployment in Australia. The whole matter of unemployment and inflation is a problem experienced all over the world for the past two or three years. We have always had inflation with us; certainly we have had inflation ever since the depression in the 1930s, after which the economy started to pick up and prices and wages began to increase. We had inflation with us before 1934, and we have certainly had it since then.

One of the simple reasons given for inflation is that there is too much money in the community chasing too few goods. If one cares to study the situation in Australia in the financial years 1971-72 and 1972-73 one finds a record inflow of capital into Australia in those two years. There was also a record inflow of money as a result of Australian exports—notably beef—and at the same time the Australian banking system made available more money to be used by the community. So in those two years, and particularly in the year 1972-73, we had a rapid increase in the amount of money available in Australia, and we had insufficient goods for that money to purchase.

So, obviously, inflation was the only result that could occur.

Mr Clarko: Are you suggesting there is no cost push?

Mr HARMAN: If we look around the world we can see that inflation and unemployment, at the same time, are occurring in every western country that has the same type of economy we have. I agree that the rate of inflation varied between one country and another, and so also did the rate of unemployment in those countries all of which have their individual reasons for the cause of inflation. However, generally, all around the world, it seems to be the consensus that inflation has stemmed largely from the United States of America.

As members here would probably know, in the last eight or nine years, the United States of America has introduced and passed eight deficit Budgets out of 10. This deficit budgeting which was carried on by the Government of the United States of

America has contributed largely to inflation in the other countries that deal with the USA. Also it has been suggested that the expansion of money by the United States of America through deficit budgeting was responsible for inflation flowing on to other countries around the world.

Mr Young: What was the deficit budgeting?

Mr HARMAN: I am not sure what it was. So it was found that inflation and unemployment were present not only in Australia but in every major western country in the world. We cannot blame the Whitlam Government for inflation in Germany. We cannot blame the Whitlam Government for inflation in the United States of America, and we cannot blame it for inflation in the United Kingdom. Nor can we blame the Whitlam Government for inflation in Australia, because as soon as the Whitlam Government came to office in December, 1972, at the time money expansion in Australia was on the increase and we had a situation—as I have already mentioned—where there was far too much money in the community chasing insufficient goods.

Mr Clarko: Cut it out!

Mr HARMAN: What action did the Whitlam Government take? It took action to stem the flow of capital funds into Australia by imposing the variable deposit scheme, and at that time 33½ per cent of all money coming into Australia had to be lodged with the Reserve Bank. The second move the Whitlam Government made was to appreciate the dollar, and its third move was to reduce tariffs. As a result of the reduction of tariffs a large quantity of goods was allowed to come into Australia which the Australian consumer was eager to purchase. So that was the action taken by the Whitlam Government.

Since it took that action it must also be borne in mind that the Australian Government had no power over wages and prices. In 1973, the Australian Government endeavoured to obtain that power but, following the holding of a referendum, it failed. So when we consider the action taken by the Whitlam Government, members must, if they are honest, at least appreciate that the Whitlam Government was acting under some handicaps, and its most formidable handicap was that it had no power over wages or prices.

Mr Mensaros: All the Premiers of the States offered the Federal Government this power, but it would not accept it.

Mr HARMAN: I would like to hear about that from the Minister for Mines at some later stage.

Mr Clarko: The prime cause of inflation is the Australian Government; there is no question about that.

Mr HARMAN: I have just spent the last 10 minutes trying to demonstrate to

some members the reason for inflation in Australia. Obviously I have not been able to convince the member for Karrinyup, nor do I think I ever will, because unfortunately some people will never listen to another point of view, or, if they do, they reject it out of hand and will not even consider it. I am prepared to listen to any point of view the member for Karrinyup cares to advance, but he never does so. All he wants to do, like some other members on that side of the Chamber, is to emulate the Minister for Labour and Industry by casting aspersions on people. The Minister for Lands did that yesterday very successfully.

As I have said on two or three occasions in the House, this sort of conduct does not do this Parliament any good. I would not mind if the member for Karrinyup rose to his feet and made a reasoned speech, but on the last occasion he got up even you, Mr Speaker, had to draw attention to his conduct to make sure that such reprehensible action by the member would never occur again in this Chamber. So that is our member for Karrinyup!

Mr Clarko: At least what I said was accurate.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Make your own speech!

Mr Clarko: What about yourself?

Mr A. R. Tonkin: I am trying to listen to the member for Maylands.

Mr Clarko: No, you are trying to help him.

Mr HARMAN: Following that large inflow of money into Australia in 1971-72 and 1972-73, the McMahon Government, which was in office at that time, made no effort to curb it. It let the situation continue, knowing full well that inflation would result from this large inflow of money into the Commonwealth. However, an election was looming and the McMahon Government did not intend to take any kind of action that would dampen down the demand for goods in Australia. But it knew full well that the result of its inaction would be inflation, and that was the result.

In March, 1973, because of increases in the prices of goods and services there also came the demand for rises in wages. In fact, the rises in wages very soon outstripped the rises in prices. That then led to a situation where private employers found that their profits were being squeezed and they were unable, through productivity, to absorb the increase in wages and, as a result, men started to become unemployed.

That is a situation about which none of us is very happy, but it is a direct result of inflation; it is the result of neglect by Snedden and McMahon in 1972, when McMahon was Treasurer and later became Prime Minister. How on earth can

Fraser and Anthony now say that inflation and unemployment are the cause of a reprehensible situation, because it was not due to the Whitlam Government? We are suffering from the result of it, and if the member for Karrinyup talks about the expansion of money he must know that is not the cause, but the result of inflation.

Mr Clarko: You used that as an argument for the situation in 1972.

Mr HARMAN: It was the result of capital flowing into this country for investment, and money coming into the country from the sale of exports.

I now must ask: What is the real reason the Liberal-Country Party Opposition is advancing to prevent the Whitlam Government from continuing to govern by trying to stop the Budget Bills in the Senate? Obviously it cannot be inflation and unemployment because they have been evident in Australia since March, 1973. If one looks at tonight's issue of the *Daily News* one would, I think, be most happy to read the headlines. I think even the Premier would be delighted to learn that, for the first time for some time prices rose less than 1 per cent in the three months to the end of September. It means, virtually that inflation, at least for this quarter, has not been a significant issue in Australia.

We still have our problems with unemployment. However, most problems of unemployment will increase only as a result of the action taken by the Liberals and by members of the Country Party in the Senate. The action those members take will not decrease unemployment; it will only add to the problems we already have. Once the business sector realises that the very rapid inflation rates have now been reduced as a result of action taken by the Australian Government, they will gain more confidence and will demonstrate this by investing in their firms to increase production. In turn, that will mean more men will be employed; people will continue their purchases—although I do not think there has been any real reduction in the purchasing power of the Australian community—in the knowledge that the inflation spiral has been arrested and so confidence will spread throughout the nation.

I do not think any of the members on the other side of the Chamber will try to negate that proposition, because quite normally and naturally they should be encouraging the private sector to invest and develop so that, as the Premier always keeps saying, we can get the economy moving.

So I think we can forget about inflation and unemployment being the cause of the reprehensible situation though, of course, those factors are used by members of the Liberal and Country Parties as an excuse, but they would not be able to advance the real reason themselves.

So what we now have to ask is: What was the real reason for the members of both those parties trying to prevent the passage of the Budget Bills through the Senate? I think the real reason was the decision handed down by the High Court to allow the appointment of two senators in the ACT and two senators in the Northern Territory. This did not suit the very elite and vested group in Australia which dominates the Liberal Party and the Country Party. I feel sorry for some of the members in this House and in other Chambers throughout Australia who are really the handmaidens of this dominating group. There is no other way to explain it. They are the pawns of the big wealthy group that dominates the scene in Australia.

Mr Young: You do not even believe that. You know it is rubbish.

Mr HARMAN: Of course I believe it. I have plenty of evidence to show that that is correct; that is actually happening in Australia.

So here we have a situation that if a half-Senate election is held—one has to be held by June of next year—it is quite conceivable that the Whitlam Government would win a majority in the Senate. This would mean that there would be no need for an election in the House of Representatives and so these 25-odd Bills that have already been rejected twice by the Senate could be passed. Many other Bills which have been rejected only once would all be returned to the Senate and, with a majority of Labor senators in that House, they could be passed.

When that happens some of the inequalities which exist in Australia today will be removed—inequalities fostered by the Liberal Party and the wealthy elite group which controls it. When those inequalities are removed this wealthy elite group in Australia will lose most of its power.

Why was this action taken in the Senate? It was taken because it was obvious that if it was not some of the inequalities would be removed and some of the power these people have would be taken away from them. The Liberal and Country Parties did not have the patience or the desire to wait for an election in 1977. They had to ensure that an election was held before then so that there would be no opportunity for these Bills to be passed by the Senate.

That is the real reason Fraser is instructed to forget principles; and that is what he has done on this occasion. If the Liberal and Country Parties do not win now they can see that not for many years hence and probably never again would they have an opportunity to govern in Australia because they know very well that the electoral legislation which was rejected by the Senate would have effected a fairer system of elections and would have removed some of the inequalities which exist in the present Commonwealth electoral legislation. That was the real reason.

The Liberal and Country Parties believe that in view of the decision of the High Court and in view of the four new senators in the Senate, their power in the Senate will be reduced and probably lost, as well as their ability to reject Bills presented by the Whitlam Government, because of a mandate given to it on two occasions—the first in December, 1972, and the second in May, 1974. That is the real reason for this unholy grab for power by the Liberal and Country Parties.

However, I think their actions may have backfired on the Frasers and the Anthonys. One of the results of their actions—and this has been demonstrated in Australia during the last week—has been the unifying effect it has had on the Labor movement.

Sir Charles Court: On a temporary basis.

Mr HARMAN: I would like to point out to the Premier that in December, 1972, the Labor movement in Australia was obviously very well unified as it was again in May, 1974. The Premier must be concerned if he now believes that what I say is true; that is, that the Labor movement is unified again. If the unification is only temporary, it might be of a sufficient period to ensure a successful election for the Labor Party if one were held in the Senate.

Sir Charles Court: It will last only a few days.

Mr HARMAN: We will see about that. It is only conjecture by the Premier.

I say that the action of the Liberal and Country Parties has backfired and I will refer to some incidents which have occurred in the last two or three days to prove what I have said. There has been a massive unification in the Australian Labor movement all over Australia. Huge demonstrations have been held in support of Gough Whitlam. I am inclined to the view that we have not had a better or stronger Prime Minister—certainly not in my time—than we have at present.

Mr B. T. Burke: Hear, hear!

Mr HARMAN: Just consider the pressure that man must be facing and yet he does not lose his nerve or his temper.

It is all very well for the Premier to laugh, but the Prime Minister has certainly not lost his temper to such an extent that it has made him do anything irrational.

Sir Charles Court: What about the glass of water?

Mr Sodeman: He used four-letter words in Parliament.

Mr HARMAN: He told the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party that he would not trust them because of their despicable actions during the past few days. So, all in all, I do not think there is any doubt he will survive this crisis—

Mr Clarko: Have you read the Gallup poll on his credibility? It has halved in six months.

Mr HARMAN: —as he has survived previous crises while in Government.

I want to leave that subject now and deal with matters concerning the State which I consider on many occasions the present Government forgot when it was in Opposition. I want to refer to a speech made by the Premier at the conclusion of the Australasian Conference of Building in Perth on Sunday the 21st September. During the course of his speech the Premier made some remarkable statements and when I read the newspaper report of his speech in *The West Australian* of the 23rd September this year I began to believe there was some hope for the workers in Western Australia. However, as I read further on in the article, I was again disillusioned. I will take members through the speech as quickly as I can.

The SPEAKER: You cannot read it all.

Mr HARMAN: I would not want to.

The SPEAKER: You can quote from it.

Mr HARMAN: I want to refer members to one or two little paragraphs. Firstly the Premier said—

It is a matter of innate human capacity, a matter of motivational drive, a matter of attitude.

It is a fact of life that we do not motivate by controlling people.

That is a very interesting remark. I thought that here was some hope because the Government did not want to control people. The article became even better. Further on it reads—

People do more, and like doing it most, when they have responsibility thrust on them.

So here was the Premier saying that we should not control people any longer, but should give them responsibility because they are better when responsibility is thrust on them. Further on he said—

In meeting most of mankind's needs we do best to delegate the job to the market place, which has a long reputation for responding without delay—thereby maximising productivity.

I will return to that in a moment. Here was a real change of face by the Premier—no more control; the people were to be given responsibility and become involved in decision-making about their own lives, where they worked, and also about community affairs. I believe that this could be a step towards the removal of many of the inequalities which exist in the community today and which are the reasons for the confrontation in our society.

However, later on in the article when the Premier started to talk about the workers, I was disillusioned, because he said—

No matter what the work, it's measured in time. If a worker does not manage his time, or put his best into the hours he is on the job, he's bludging on his mates and on Australia.

I knew it could not be long before the Premier got around to his old trick of berating the workers of this country.

Mr Blaikie: What about the bludgers?

Mr HARMAN: The Premier continued—

Workers, like managers, need to get back to the old ethic of making working time really count.

So I was disappointed. At first I thought the Premier had seen the light and had heard about such things as worker participation and worker democracy and was prepared to make a move towards achieving this objective for the work force in Western Australia.

However, his attitude is the same as has been the attitude of conservative members of Parliament year in and year out as far as the workers are concerned. What they want is to ensure that the worker toils from sun-up to sun-down and gains as little as possible for himself, but as much as possible for the employers.

Mr Sodeman: Where does it say that in the article?

Mr HARMAN: If the honourable member would like to read the article I will give it to him.

Mr Sodeman: Read that part.

Mr HARMAN: That is the whole theme of the Premier's speech in the rest of the article.

Mr Sodeman: In what phrase does it state that?

Mr HARMAN: I cannot pick it up at the moment.

Mr Blaikie: You sure can't.

Mr HARMAN: For some time the Premier has been expressing concern about productivity in Western Australia and I have been hoping against hope that he would come up with a solution to the problem; but he has not done so. All he has done is tell the worker that he must toil harder. That is not good enough for the workers of today. I am not suggesting that productivity is the real objective towards which we should be striving when we consider the worker. What we should always be concerned about is the satisfaction gained by the particular worker. Experience has proved that when a worker is satisfied in his job his output is, to say the least, efficient, and meets the requirements of the management.

In recent times a great deal of work has been undertaken by certain major countries of the world on the subject of worker democracy. If the Premier were really interested in the workers of this State he would take a leaf out of the book of the Premier of South Australia who has established a special branch within that State's Department of Labour to deal with worker participation.

I was somewhat heartened by the attitude of the Country Party during the 1974 election campaign because one of its

promises made in its policy speech was that company management would make shareholdings available to employees as an additional form of remuneration and incentive to workers.

I am not suggesting that that is the be-all an end-all of worker democracy but that policy certainly indicated a change of attitude by the Country Party. However I have not heard any more about the matter.

In the session of Parliament next year I intend to move a motion in this House in order to stimulate a debate on the subject of worker democracy. I do not intend to press for an inquiry, but merely to obtain an expression of opinion by the House. Perhaps the House might decide that the Government should adopt the policy at present in vogue in South Australia and establish a separate branch concerned with worker democracy.

The principle of worker democracy involves not only job satisfaction, job enrichment, productivity, and perhaps shorter working weeks and hours, but the big factor behind worker participation is giving the employee the opportunity to be involved in his work place and in decisions which are made in the work place.

Mr Stephens: Have you ever thought of having management participation in trade union affairs, to reverse the process?

Mr HARMAN: The best way to overcome the problems is to remove the inequalities which exist in the community in the industrial field; then we would have no need for trade unions or management.

The main reason I am presenting to the House an argument for worker democracy is that I believe if a worker has the opportunity in his work place to become involved in making decisions which affect him so much he will be better off. He will be a more satisfied person; he will be a happier person; he might even become a more creative person, and ideas which he did not previously have the opportunity to present to management will then be able to come forward from him to the advantage of himself, his workmates, and management.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has three minutes more.

Mr HARMAN: I am not suggesting this could be achieved overnight. It is a complex matter, but I believe the real solution to the happiness of workers in Western Australia can be reached only by way of worker democracy and worker participation. I hope next year I will have the opportunity to present a more detailed case for worker democracy, and that after debating the issue the House will consider the possibility of supporting a motion that the Government of Western Australia should establish within the Department of Labour and Industry a branch to concern itself with worker democracy.

Debate adjourned until a later stage of the sitting, on motion by Dr Dadour.

APPROPRIATION BILL (GENERAL LOAN FUND)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 9th October.

MR J. T. TONKIN (Melville)—Leader of the Opposition) [4.48 p.m.]: Mr Speaker, the purpose of the Bill under discussion is to enable the Parliament to appropriate from the General Loan Fund the sums which are considered by the Government to be necessary for the capital expenditure it wishes to undertake. This is something which we invariably approve because it is necessary to see these works go ahead. Money must be provided, otherwise the capital works which are so essential could not be carried out and the State would more or less suffer serious inconvenience.

I remember that during the last election campaign Sir Charles Court, who was then the Leader of the Opposition, realising he had a programme which would involve substantial expenditure, came out with the statement that he would borrow outside the Loan Council and that he would make representations to obtain additional money for this purpose. I told him rather quickly he would not do anything of the sort because he would find it impossible to do it and it was just ridiculous to suggest it.

I could have been wrong, so I have looked through these Estimates and the Premier's speech to see whether there was any reference to the additional funds which the Premier could quite easily spend and which he would like to have to spend. But they are not there. What has happened to this wonderful idea? What attempt has been made to borrow this money outside the Loan Council and so supplement the inadequate funds available to the Government?

The fact of the matter is, as I had said, that it is quite impossible to do it. Permission would have to be obtained from the Loan Council and—although I am not absolutely certain of this—I hazard the guess that the Premier did not even try out the Loan Council on the proposition.

Mr B. T. Burke: A lot of hot air as usual.

Mr Rushton: The Commonwealth Government found a way around the Loan Council.

Mr Jamieson: Did it?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: In order to ascertain the nature of the capital works the Government proposes to undertake and how it intends to finance them, it is necessary to make a comparison of the funds available this year and last year. Since he has been in office the Premier has never ceased blaming the Commonwealth for not providing enough money to enable the States to do what they want to do. But the Premier is on record as having said when he was in Opposition that constantly going to the Commonwealth for money was

not the answer to the problems, that that was only a palliative, and that the State should itself get down to finding ways and means of getting the work done.

Of course, the Premier in Opposition is an entirely different man from the Premier in Government. He now keeps on clamouring for money and complaining he does not get enough, and the worst feature of it is that when he gets substantial sums he does not express any gratitude to the Australian Government for having given them to him. He makes announcements in such a way as to indicate to the people at large that he is doing wonderful things with his expenditure, when in some instances he is not providing a single dollar himself.

A glaring case was brought to light yesterday by the member for Avon. He saw in the *Northam Advertiser* of the 16th October an announcement by the Premier that \$275 000 would be spent on additions to the Northam High School. The member for Avon, being a little curious about this, asked some questions in the House as to how much of the \$275 000 had been provided by the Australian Government. The answer was—

The total funds have been provided by the Australian taxpayer through the Federal Government.

The total funds! One would at least have expected that in making an announcement of such importance to the people of Northam—that \$275 000 would be spent in connection with a high school—the Premier would say, "with money provided by the Australian Government".

Mr Jamieson: He would not do that. It would benefit the "Feds".

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Oh, no. He keeps on complaining that the State is not getting enough assistance from the Commonwealth but never at any time does he give credit where credit is due.

Mr Coyne: But it is our money after all is said and done.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: When the honourable member says it is "our money", does he mean money from the people of Murchison-Eyre?

Mr Coyne: I mean the people of Western Australia.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Does that apply also to the funds which the State itself raises?

Mr Coyne: Of course.

Mr Rushton: But the Commonwealth Government has already taken the credit. It does that over and over again.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The member for Murchison-Eyre apparently thinks it is quite all right for the Premier to make a statement that the State Government is going to spend \$275 000, and create the impression that it is his Government which is providing the money when in fact it is not.

Sir Charles Court: Is it not part of our funds?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Then why complain on the one hand that the Government is not getting the money?

Sir Charles Court: I do not know what you are getting at when you go through this rigmarole all the time.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I am just leading up to my point. The Premier will not be frank. He makes these statements and they are true enough. I cannot fault them so far as their truth is concerned. It is what they do not say that concerns me.

Mr Jamieson: Like his Budget.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Let us have a look at the sums available. According to the Premier's own statement, the total available from the General Loan Fund this year is \$131.3 million, which is made up of \$80.2 million from the State programme, capital grant of \$40.1 million, repayments of \$7 million, and \$4 million unexpended balance in the General Loan Fund. If we compare that total with the figure for the previous year we find that last year only \$97.8 million was available from the General Loan Fund. So a very large increase is available to the Government from that source.

In looking at the actual expenditure for 1974-75 from the General Loan Fund we have to keep in mind that the Government provided two reserves from its loan funds. Having regard for the fact that the Government had a lot less money available to it last year than this year—and I emphasise that because I am leading up to something else—it was still able to provide two reserves.

A shortfall in semi-governmental borrowings was expected, so the Government provided a reserve of \$8 million for that; it also provided a reserve of \$8.746 million to fund an anticipated deficit. So before it drew up its works programme, the Government had more than \$16 million in reserve from a much smaller sum than is available to it this year. But although it is faced this year with the probability that it must curtail sewerage works and throw 300 men out of work, the Government is not prepared to run into a deficit on the revenue account, even though it has substantially greater funds available to it for capital works.

Sir Charles Court: That would reduce our works programme.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: It reduced it last year.

Sir Charles Court: I know, but it would reduce it this year at a critical time.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: No, it would not.

Sir Charles Court: Because you have to take it out of loan funds.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Of course, the same as the Premier did last year.

Sir Charles Court: Do you want us to do that?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I want the Premier to budget for a deficit.

Sir Charles Court: And take the money out of loan funds?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: No, because it would not occur, just as it did not occur last year.

Sir Charles Court: Budget for a deficit—

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The Premier could budget for a deficit and keep the men at work.

Sir Charles Court: —and go broke at the end of the year—never!

Mr J. T. TONKIN: If there is no validity in the argument that one budgets for a deficit in order to make provision for certain things, why did the Premier budget for a deficit last year—

Sir Charles Court: Not because we wanted to.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: —knowing full well that in budgeting for that deficit the Government had substantially to reduce the funds available for capital expenditure—in fact, by \$16 million?

Sir Charles Court: And we did not have to raise so much revenue.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: That is the course which should have been followed this year.

Sir Charles Court: You know what you are talking about is self-defeating.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: According to the Premier's statement, the total capital resources available to us this year under the Loan Council general works and larger semi-governmental authorities programme amounts to \$158.6 million compared with \$138.1 million last year.

That is quite a substantial increase in the sum and the Premier was not prepared to reduce the figure—it would not be an actual reduction; it would be a book reduction the same as it was last year—or prepared to incur any deficit at all on the revenue account, on the argument that to do so would reduce the amount available for capital expenditure. The Government did it last year.

Sir Charles Court: We had to use the money at the end of the year to balance the books. You did the same thing.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The point is that the Premier had available to him last year substantially less money than he has available to him this year.

Sir Charles Court: But you are defeating your argument; this time we are able to throw in the whole of the loan money. Last year we had to keep some back.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The Premier had this money available to him when he was drawing up his Estimates and he knew he had capital works to complete with a far smaller amount than he had available to him this year. However, he was prepared

to reduce that sum by taking \$16 million out of it.

Sir Charles Court: Do you want me to do that again?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Yes, I do.

Sir Charles Court: That means people cannot get the work if you take it out of the loan funds.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: But the Premier took it out of the loan funds last year.

Sir Charles Court: I know, because we budgeted for a deficit to keep charges and costs down.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Oh yes, and how the Government did keep them down!

Mr Jamieson: What a joke!

Sir Charles Court: I think you should go and have another look at your little textbooks.

Mr B. T. Burke: As many increases as there were months in the year.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The Premier said he budgeted for a deficit to keep charges and costs down. Mr Speaker, you are under no immunity so far as taxes and charges are concerned, and you would be familiar with the fact that electricity charges have been increased three times, and that there have been substantial increases in water rates.

Sir Charles Court: If these charges had not been increased, we would have been putting more men off.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: And so—

Sir Charles Court: Answer that.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: —this statement that the provision was made in order to keep taxes and charges down is the funniest thing I have heard in years, in view of what actually occurred.

Now, Mr Speaker, I hope you will follow me carefully with this statement, because I propose to show how the Premier is not frank when he is producing the figures. What he says is true enough, but he leaves out of his statement what ought to be said in order that the true position can be shown. I will quote from his speech where he said—

Last year, a programme of \$286.1 million was carried out with finance from similar sources and so planned expenditure in 1975-76 represents an increase of \$53.7 million which is 18.8 per cent above the outlay in 1974-75.

Realising that this may appear to be somewhat small to anyone who starts to work out the figures, the Premier proceeded—

It may be asked how it is that the Government has been able to mount a capital works programme 18.8 per cent

higher in money terms than last year when funds derived from the Loan Council allocations have increased by only 14.8 per cent—

I ask members to listen to this carefully—
—and Commonwealth funds provided under a number of specific purpose capital programmes have not increased and, in some cases, have been reduced.

Word for word that is perfectly true, but what the Premier did not say was that although a number of Commonwealth payments under specific purpose capital grants had not increased, overall the payments had increased. His statement gives the impression that the specific purpose grants available to him were actually less this year than they were last year, and that is just not true. It is true that some of the specific purpose grants are less than they were last year—and the Premier said a number of them—but if we look at the specific purpose grants together, the amount the Premier received from the Commonwealth was greater than the amount received last year. If that is not creating a wrong impression publicly, what is it? It is not telling the true position at all.

We cannot fault the actual truth of the figures he stated. However, what I want to impress upon the House is that this State is so much better off this year than it was last year. Firstly, the specific purpose grants from the Australian Government are greater in total than they were last year. So why does the Premier keep blaming the Commonwealth for having reduced some of these specific purpose grants? It is not reasonable and it is not fair.

Let us have the true position stated so that we know exactly where we are in regard to the funds available to the Government. The total of the Commonwealth specific purpose grants last year was \$77.5 million. This year it was substantially ahead of that—I think the figure given was \$80.1 million.

Surely it would have been reasonable to say, "Here is the position: this is the amount of money from our own funds; this is the amount of our loan repayment; this is the amount that is the balance in the Loan Fund; add to that the borrowings of semi-governmental authorities; then add to that the Commonwealth Specific Purpose Grants; and then add the internal funds from the various departments, which last year amounted to \$65.6 million." In that manner we arrive at the total amount that is available to the Government for expenditure.

I am disappointed to learn there has to be a continued reliance upon temporary classrooms in a number of districts. My district is one of them. In these districts the circumstances are such that the teachers and the parents believe the time

has arrived when they are entitled to have some permanent classrooms such as other districts are getting.

Mr Thompson: Just as the people in my electorate reckoned you should have replaced a few of the temporary classrooms there when you were in Government.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The member for Kalamunda has the same problem, has he? Why does he not have a word to the Treasurer?

Mr Thompson: I had the problem, but it has now been overcome.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Ah! Is that the reason? The money is going to seats occupied by Government members. Is that it?

Sir Charles Court: If it makes the Leader of the Opposition any happier, there is going to be a transportable in my electorate.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The member for Kalamunda has let the cat out of the bag!

Mr Thompson: They really have to work in my electorate.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: A statement the Premier has just made shows how absurd was the Liberal Party policy with regard to secondary schools at the election. It was going to limit the number of children in secondary schools to 1 000; it was going to promote children to secondary schools one year earlier; but under the existing policy it has to continue with temporary classrooms even in the Premier's own district. If that does not show how ridiculous the proposal was, what does it show? When I endeavoured to point out to the electors how impossible and impracticable the proposals of the then Opposition were, all I got from the member for Scarborough and the present Premier was that I had asked the Treasury officers to cook up the costs of the proposals. We heard something about an empty barrel and that there was no money in the Treasury.

Mr Young: There is no question at all that I did not say anything about getting Treasury officers to cook up the figures.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: No, the Premier said that.

Sir Charles Court: I did not say that.

Mr Young: He did not say that; he said that opportunities were not provided for him to discuss it.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: No, he did not say that at all.

Sir Charles Court: I said you should not have involved those officers in the election campaign.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: As a matter of fact, the opportunity will present itself to me later to read precisely what the Premier

did say. I think I have it in my drawer. An empty barrel!

Mr Thompson: Looks like an empty drawer.

Mr McIver: They were going to have a big inquiry into the Treasury. We are still waiting for it.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: With regard to this empty barrel, I recommend to the member for Scarborough that he read the report of the Auditor-General, and he will find there was more money in the fund when we left office than there was when we took office. That is on the statement of the Auditor-General himself.

Anyhow, that is only in passing; my main point is that what I said about the education proposals of the Liberal Party was proved to be true, because the Government has since seen the light and has abandoned the scheme. However, the policy served its purpose.

Mr Shalders: Do you think educationally it was a good proposal?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I could come forward with many good proposals, none of which I could pay for; and so could any Government.

Mr Shalders: That doesn't answer the question.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: If a party can get onto the Treasury bench and all it has to do is to think up a lot of good proposals, it would be in utopia.

Mr Thompson: Wasn't the position the same when you said you would abolish road maintenance tax without replacing it?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The important difference between being in Government and being in Opposition is that when one is in Government one is supposed to make good the proposals one puts forward; that is, unless one adopts the method of this Government and says, "Circumstances have changed."

Mr Thompson: What did you do with road maintenance tax; you were going to abolish it without imposing any other charge.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The member for Kalamunda's party prevented me doing that.

Mr Thompson: Because you were going to replace it with another charge that was even more obnoxious.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I made the statement then, and I make it again now, that if the Legislative Council had passed the legislation in respect of the abolition of road maintenance tax and did not pass legislation providing for the alternative, I would still have abolished the tax.

Mr Thompson: And if your aunty was constructed differently she would be your uncle.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The member for Kalamunda can say what he likes; that

was my stand in connection with the matter; even though it worried my colleague, the Minister responsible for main roads, that is what I intended to do.

Mr Thompson: In the heat of the moment.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: However, I had no worries. This leads me to deal with another matter with which I had no intention of dealing: the idea of using the power of another place to withhold supply. The present Premier tried that in this Parliament in respect of my Government.

Sir Charles Court: I'll say I did. It didn't get me far.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: He moved a resolution, which was supported and seconded by the then Leader of the Country Party, in terms precisely similar to those used in the Federal Parliament. He said, "We will pass the Supply Bill when you indicate your readiness to call a general election." That is what was attempted in this place. I say it is to the credit of those in another place that they would not agree with the idea. Do not tell me the Premier was only fooling in this House—

Sir Charles Court: No fear he wasn't.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: —because he was not, and if he could have gone ahead with it he would have done so. And for what purpose: to get into Government as quickly as possible. That is what the Opposition is trying to do in the Federal House.

Mr Clarko: If you don't control both Houses in a bicameral system you don't have full power; it is as simple as that.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The essence of what the member is saying is that the sooner the people of Australia realise that second Chambers are an anachronism, the better it will be for them.

Mr Clarko: But they don't and they have voted in referendums indicating that.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Can a Budget be withheld in New Zealand? No; there is no second Chamber. Can a Budget be withheld in Queensland? It cannot, because there is no second Chamber. Can it be done in Canada? No. Can it be done in Great Britain? No.

Mr Mensaros: It can be done in Canadian Provinces.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: It is time the power to do it was removed in Australia, too.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Mr Sodeman: What has what goes on in other countries to do with Western Australia? Your logic is inconsistent. Remember the statement about Medibank, "Don't worry about what happens in Canada, New Zealand, and other places; we will make it work here"?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: When a Government loses its majority in the lower House there is only one course for it to follow. Whilst it retains its majority it is entitled to attempt to govern.

Mr Rushton: Even if it is corrupt.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: There is no justification for a second Chamber to withhold supply simply because it wishes to get its own side into Government.

Mr Clarko: Whitlam said exactly that in 1970.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Look how unfair it would be in Western Australia. Surely one can look for some common, basic fairness in these matters. There has never been a situation in Western Australia where the Labor Party has had a majority in the Legislative Council.

Mr Clarko: And a good thing, too.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Therefore, this option of withholding supply is a monopoly to members of the Liberal and Country Parties.

Mr Clarko: That is not true of Canberra.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: It is their private monopoly.

Mr Clarko: You are talking about Western Australia, but the situation in Canberra is different.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: If the honourable member wants to talk about Canberra, I point out the Liberal and Country Parties had to capitalise on the death of a Labor senator in order to get in the position in which they now find themselves.

Mr Clarko: But Lionel Murphy said this was the proper thing to do.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Convention does not mean a thing—

Mr Rushton: If the Labor Government followed convention, it would call a full election now.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: —when the Liberal and Country Parties are considering what course they should adopt to get them back into Government.

Mr Clarko: They are following the rules as written down. What is wrong with that?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Let us think for a moment about a statement made by Sir Robert Menzies, for whom I have had a lot of time; he is a very clever politician and lawyer. He said recently there was no doubt that under the Constitution, the Senate had the power to refuse supply, to pass supply or—mark this—to adjourn the discussion in the course of the debate.

But what have they done in Canberra? Have they adjourned the discussion in the course of the debate? No. They have amended the motion—something they are not constitutionally empowered to do—by adding a proviso that they will pass the Bill only upon the Government giving an undertaking to hold an election. This is something which they have no power

to do, and which Menzies in his statement—

Mr Young: What they do not have the power to do is to amend the Bill. However, they can amend the motion.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Let the member for Scarborough read Sir Robert Menzies' statement which was published in *The West Australian*. He will see that Sir Robert says the Senate has the power to adjourn a discussion in the course of a debate.

Sir Charles Court: That is right; that is what they have done.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: They have not done that at all.

Sir Charles Court: Yes they have; they have not amended the Bill.

Mr Young: They do not have the power to amend the Bill, but they may amend the motion.

Sir Charles Court: They have deferred the Bill, which is the classic way.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Is it in the course of the debate?

Sir Charles Court: Of course it is. It is the classic way of handling the matter, so that the Government can declare an election date, following which the Bill will be passed.

Mr Young: Any procedural motion must be passed in the course of a debate.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: What would happen in this House if, when I stood to move the adjournment of the debate on a Bill—which I did this afternoon—I attempted to move it with a proviso attached? Would that be accepted by the Speaker?

Mr Young: That has nothing to do with the Australian Constitution. You are talking about the power of the Senate to amend a motion.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: We are talking about adjourning a Bill in the course of a debate. If we adjourn discussion on a Bill in the course of debate, as we have done already today—the debate on the Revenue Estimates was adjourned until after consideration of the Order of the Day dealing with the Loan Estimates—that is in order. But to make a proviso that no more debate will take place until a guarantee is given—

Mr Young: "Until"—that is the operative word.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: —and once the guarantee is given the debate will be resumed—

Mr Young: But "until".

Mr J. T. TONKIN: That is nonsense!

Mr Young: The debate is still open.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Is that in the course of debate?

Mr Young: Of course it is, if the debate is still open.

Sir Charles Court: They have not attempted to amend the Bill.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: During the discussion of the Bill, members of the Liberal and Country Parties refused to pass it, refused to accept it, and refused even to discuss it. My understanding of adjourning something in the course of a debate is that the debate is continuing. What debate is continuing in the Federal Parliament in connection with the Appropriation Bills? Absolutely none.

Sir Charles Court: Yes it is.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I give up!

Mr Young: According to the motion, if the Prime Minister sets an election date, debate on the Bill will resume, and the Bills will be passed.

Mr B. T. Burke: That is what the motion says, but never mind that. Are you in favour of the Senate's right to reject supply?

Mr Young: Of course I am.

Mr B. T. Burke: Then you are as misguided as your Premier.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Before I was inveigled into departing from the theme of what I had intended to say, and was led to say things I had no intention of saying, I was emphasising to the House that it would not be unreasonable for the Premier to admit that so far as funds for capital works are concerned, he is immeasurably better off this year than he was last year.

Therefore, in view of the fact that the Premier himself stated some time ago that it was the responsibility of Government to try to relieve unemployment, I would have expected the Premier to have been prepared to set aside a small amount of this increased sum available to him for capital works in order to ensure that a very important capital work—namely, work on the sewerage backlog—will continue. There is a tremendous backlog of sewerage work in Western Australia; we are one of the worst capital cities in Australia in this respect.

Mr Thompson: If that is the case, why did the Commonwealth stop the money?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: It is to the credit of the Australian Government that it came to the help of the States and provided substantial sums of money to enable some in-roads to be made into the backlog of sewerage work.

Mr Thompson: The Australian Government got things moving, then pulled the money away.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: It gave to this Government more than twice the total amount of money I received for this purpose. But I did not complain; it had to start somewhere.

Mr Bryce: And still they squeal.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: A substantial amount of money still is being made available for sewerage work. In view of the fact that this work will slow down if the 300 men are sacked, there is a responsibility firmly on the shoulders of the Government to provide for this work to continue.

I forecast that substantially greater funds by way of extra revenue and capital grants will be received from the Commonwealth than were taken into consideration when the Estimates were prepared. That has been the pattern in previous years. It has been the custom of Under-Treasurers to underestimate these amounts. One can understand that, because if they were too optimistic and overestimated the amount, they could create trouble for their Treasurers. So, they are very careful in their estimates of the amount of revenue to be obtained from other sources.

It is my very firm opinion, based on the experience of previous years, and a close study of these matters, that the Government will receive substantially more by way of revenue and loan funds from the Australian Government than it has budgeted for. If I were in the Premier's position, having regard for the probability that these men will have to be laid off, I would take a gamble and provide the necessary \$3 million to keep these men at work. It will not be money that will be lost.

If they were to chip grass off the footpaths it would be a different matter, but the work they will do is work the State Government will have to do sooner or later.

Sir Charles Court: The Commonwealth Government held back and we went forward and gave them more money. Are you not going to give us credit for that?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Give them more and keep the men on.

Sir Charles Court: Where do you stop, when we have to have money for schools and hospitals? You cannot just keep going on indefinitely.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Keep these men at work. That is important for the economy generally and should be done. What is more, the Government is in a position to do it, having regard for the fact that for the whole of the 12 years of the Brand Government—when we had a period of buoyancy for a large part of that period—only twice did the Premier budget for a balanced Budget. Also, one year happened to be an election year and so one does not have to go deeply into the reason the Premier wanted to balance his Budget that year. However, when the final results were made known he had a deficit of \$4 million, despite the fact that he budgeted for a balanced Budget.

When members look at the Loan Estimates some will be disappointed that expenditure is not being made in their particular electorates. It was ever thus. There

is never enough money around to satisfy the needs of all districts. So we have to try to assess the position generally, and there will be differences of opinion as to whether more money should be spent in one direction or another. There will always be differences of opinion on that. However, a conflict of opinion and an interchange of ideas make for good government and for improvement in running the State. So I welcome differences of opinion and a conflict of ideas, so that we can work out the best course to travel in the interests of the State.

I support the appropriation.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [5.33 p.m.]: I appreciate the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition on the Loan Estimates. It is very important that members thoroughly understand what is in the Loan Estimates although I know it is customary for the main debate to take place on the Revenue Estimates and on the departmental estimates that come under those Estimates. However, I realise that many members look at the Loan Estimates from a rather parochial viewpoint because it is in these Estimates that a fair indication is given of expenditure in their own electorates.

The Leader of the Opposition has been critical of the fact that I have not been as frank as he thinks I should have been in the presentation of the Loan Fund Estimates. On the contrary, I believe that on this occasion a very genuine effort was made both by myself and those who prepared the detail to present to the Parliament as much information as could be presented to explain the very complex situation that develops with the Loan Estimates these days, compared with the situation that existed a few years ago.

One of the complexities with which we are faced is clearly set out in my second reading speech under the heading of "Works programmes". In that part of my speech a clear explanation is given of how the amount of \$339.8 million is arrived at. Great care was taken to explain where there have been increases and where, in fact, there have been decreases.

The Leader of the Opposition, very conveniently, refrained from mentioning the disability the State Government has suffered because of the arbitrary decision of the Federal Government to remove from our semi-governmental borrowings—which are very important to us—\$6 million that was there previously on a so-called temporary basis. It was my firm belief and my hope when we went to the Premiers' Conference and then to the Loan Council immediately following that conference that when we were settling on the new formula the Prime Minister would agree to this amount being included, although this was not as satisfactory to us as an amount being included in the normal loan funds that we get and when it becomes part of the base figure. However,

at least it could give us the chance, in a favourable money market, to raise this amount of money and to feed it into semi-governmental activities or organisations, such as the SEC, the Metropolitan Water Board, many hospital boards, and, in fact, quite a host of organisations that come into this category when they borrow in the dimensions provided for semi-governmental organisations.

We therefore finished up in a lamentable situation in that field. We finished up with only about \$300 000 more than we had last year. However, we had to accept it, with the result that, ultimately, instead of the money we obtain from the Loan Council increasing by 20 per cent in the normal way in the loan funds, it was increased by only 14.8 per cent. In addition to being completely frank about the situation, I believe, in the remarks I made immediately following the summary which shows how the works programme is made up and financed, I went to considerable pains to explain the variations that do occur, and why it was possible for us to embark on a programme that was 18.8 per cent greater than last year, although the actual amount obtained from the Loan Council increased by only 14.8 per cent. In fact, some items in the specific purpose grants payments were reduced.

The Leader of the Opposition also spoke at some length on this occasion as he has done on other occasions to castigate the Government for not having a deficit Budget. I do not seem to be able to get the message across to him and to some of his supporters that had we budgeted for a deficit Budget I would have had to take an equivalent amount of money out of the loan funds like the Leader of the Opposition did when he was Treasurer and as I did last year. If I had not done that, and if the Leader of the Opposition had not done it when he was Treasurer, the Leader of the Opposition of the day would be standing in his place castigating the Government for imprudence, extravagance, and recklessness in its financing, because the simple fact of life is that the State Government cannot print notes and it does not have bankers. So if we budget for a deficit we have that money available from London, otherwise we would be subject to justifiable criticism for imprudent housekeeping.

Somewhere along the line the cash has to be found. Say we did decide to have a deficit Budget of \$6 million. The first thing I would have to do would be to take \$6 million out of the loan funds programme and set it aside. Where would it come from? From the money allocated for schools and hospitals? What if I said to the Leader of the Opposition the money would come from the amount of money we are allocating to the Metropolitan Water Board which would mean that more men would be retrenched? However,

we would very much like to be able to keep men on the pay-roll.

Mr Jamieson: You do not even believe that argument yourself! Come off it!

Sir CHARLES COURT: No Government cheerfully increases the number of unemployed. I say again, because the Deputy Leader of the Opposition does not seem to get the message—

Mr Jamieson: I have the message. You are a fool with finance if you think what you said is correct.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The message happens to be getting through to the people in this State that we are prudent and careful housekeepers. We could very easily—

Mr Jamieson: There are many things that you could do that you have not done.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We could, very easily, have had a deficit Budget. We could have been extravagant in a number of ways, but the first thing we would have had to do would be to reduce the works programme. If I cannot get my message across to Opposition members tonight, at least I want other people to understand that if we had had a deficit Budget we would have had to reduce the works programme immediately, because we have no Father Christmas, no bankers of our own, and no means by which we can print money like the Commonwealth Government can, and appear to finance a very prodigious and record-breaking deficit.

Mr Jamieson: You are assuming that you will not have a surplus over and above what you have estimated, but I am telling you that you will have a surplus.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I hope the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is right, but I will tell him this: The Leader of the Opposition has said the amount of money this State will get from the Commonwealth at the end of the year will be greater than the amount we allowed for in the Consolidated Revenue Budget. The Federal Treasurer has sounded a warning and said that it will not be, because to this stage, as a result of wage indexation working partially, the figure the Commonwealth uses for adjustment and which the States, by arrangement, use for their own budgeting purposes will be less if this trend continues. Instead of the amount being 22 per cent more it will be less.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: We will see.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It was the Federal Treasurer who warned the people that they should not be overoptimistic. If that figure is cut down then the figures for pay-roll tax receipts and other items will also be smaller. Let us not get the idea that we will forever-and-a-day be in a spiral of inflation, and hope that we will be able to get out of our financial problems at the end of each year as a result of continuing inflation.

The portents are that we will receive less money from the Commonwealth when the formula is applied than we have budgeted for. If the anticipated percentage wage increase of 22 per cent does not take place, the cheque from the Commonwealth Government at the end of the year will be reduced by that amount.

I reject completely the proposition that we should have adopted an overoptimistic view, should have worn rose-tinted glasses, and should have taken a punt on this and a punt on that. With inflation moving as rapidly as it has in recent years one cannot forecast the result.

I well recall the words the Prime Minister uttered at the Premiers' Conference when he warned that if certain things did not happen—this was before the present crisis arose in Canberra—the rate of inflation by next March could be double the rate at that time. This was the atmosphere in which the Prime Minister asked us to be prudent in our budgeting. He was emphasising the whole way through the principle that the user must pay.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: It is a pity that you did not use as much care when you framed your policy speech in respect of education.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We are not doing so badly in respect of education.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: You are abandoning the scheme you announced.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Leader of the Opposition will be greatly embarrassed by the performance of this Government, and he should not rush into this madly.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: For example there are temporary classrooms at Nedlands.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The present Minister for Education is at least imaginative and vigorous in his approach. I think the Leader of the Opposition will be agreeably surprised when we get to the next election and show the people what we have introduced into education, and the improvements we have made to the education system.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: From where are you getting the money?

Mr Jamieson: You are using socialist money!

Sir CHARLES COURT: We will get our money for these purposes through the normal legal channels.

Mr Jamieson: Shame on you.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: You are so short of money that you cannot budget for a \$3 million deficit, yet you have all this other money to spend on education.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We have a record budget for education. That does not seem to sink into the minds of members opposite. At a time when the Commonwealth Budget has cut back on its programme we in this State have adopted a more generous attitude towards education

in the loan fund Budget. Instead of members opposite criticising our Budget in a carping way they should be applauding it.

I want to deal with the question of the increased funds that are available to us. We decided as a matter of Budget strategy to allocate the whole of the funds available to us into the loan programme, and this meant we had to have a balanced Budget so that we would not have to intrude into the loan funds at all and reduce the capacity of those funds to generate employment. The result was that we gave a number of departments extra money; I believe that by doing this we were adopting a wise and prudent course. One of the departments which was treated very generously—and this was done deliberately—was the Metropolitan Water Board. Of course this extra money was also to be used for sewerage and drainage works. Even the union itself will acknowledge that is the position.

Mr Jamieson: You should not start to speak for the unions. I have talked to the unions myself, and I know your standing with them is not too high. You are not reliable at all. I remember what the Collie miners said and what you did to them.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Commonwealth Government has made it very clear to us and to the union concerned that there will be no increase in funds; therefore we as a State had to accept the fact that we were on our own. A sum of about \$750 000 has been added to the originally announced increased amount. We have had discussions with the union, and I am sure the members of that union understand our position as a State Government and our attitude that we want to alleviate any hardship that will be incurred when we have to reduce the work force in this field.

The Commonwealth Government has made it clear that it has cut back in its expenditure in these cases. Take the allocation for roads; the Commonwealth has allowed us the same amount of money this year.

Mr Bryce: You wanted the Commonwealth to cut back, and you insisted it cut back.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Commonwealth has said to the State, "We will give you the same number of dollars this year for roads." The Commonwealth admits that allocation will result in 30 per cent less work effort. The same applies in connection with sewerage.

In the case of State expenditure we pumped more money in. Members opposite should be fair about this. I want to come back to this point: If we did budget for a deficit we would not have pumped that extra money into the Metropolitan Water Board, because such additional amounts we have allocated would be some of the first moneys that would be set aside to cover the deficit in view of all the pressures from other departments, particularly in respect of education, health, and other

essential services. The other departments have claimed that they have higher priority.

Mr Bryce: You knock the Australian Government when it has a deficit, but as soon as it reduces the deficit you knock it for doing that.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am not knocking the Commonwealth Government; I am saying we as a State have pumped more money in. We could have used the excuse that we should not. I have not criticised the Commonwealth in this regard; all I have said is that it has decided it will not increase the amount of money to enable us to retain the same work effort as last year. That is the point, and the unions will tell members opposite that is so. The Commonwealth has made its position very clear. I was not criticising; I was pointing out the facts of life.

Mr Bryce: If Mr Fraser becomes Prime Minister you will have further cuts.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We have pointed out that we deliberately put money into this particular department when the Commonwealth was cutting back on its expenditure. In that regard we are being very fair. We believe that the programme we are putting up is a very balanced and responsible one. If we take the two Budgets into account, I cannot imagine how any Government which has a record of good housekeeping could have done differently.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Thompson) in the Chair; Sir Charles Court (Treasurer) in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Before dealing with the clauses of the Bill it will be necessary for the Committee to consider the Estimates of Expenditure. However, I wish first of all to draw attention to a small booklet available to every member to indicate the procedures which are to be followed in debate on the Estimates.

Vote: Agriculture, \$250 000—

Item No. 1: Agricultural Development, \$250 000—

Mr JAMIESON: I notice that the vote for this item has been almost halved. With the improvements necessary in research stations and the like, I would have thought that instead of the expenditure being reduced, it would be increased. The amount being allocated for the offices and laboratories at South Perth is being reduced from \$170 601 for last year to \$45 000; the amount for district offices has been reduced from \$80 128 to \$12 000; while the amount last year of \$219 269 for improvements to research stations is to be reduced to \$193 000.

We need some explanation as to why the Government is reducing the amount

of money available for these very worthwhile causes. We hear many complaints at times that not enough money is spent on agricultural research and it appears from these Estimates that the Government is taking a retrograde step. All sorts of problems are plaguing farmers and graziers and an increased amount on research in this regard would be justified.

Is this to be the trend in the future? Can we expect that eventually no amount will be allocated for agricultural development? It appears that will be the situation, particularly when we realise that in almost every other instance, if not every instance, the allocation has been increased.

Quite often we hear country representatives tell us in this Chamber that the people they represent are the salt of the earth and should be looked after, particularly in the field of research, in order that they might continue to produce the wealth of this country. Now, however, we find that the Government, of which they are a party, is to reduce expenditure drastically while in all other departments allowance is made for an increase.

When we take into consideration the problems of inflation, we must realise that in addition to the amount being reduced this year, we will not get as much value for that amount as we would have gained for the same amount last year.

I could not let the item pass without making some comment and I hope that some of those members who look to the agricultural areas for support will question why this amount in the Estimates has been reduced so drastically.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I seek clarification, Mr Chairman. If I speak now will I prevent anyone else speaking on this matter, or are we in Committee?

The CHAIRMAN: We are in Committee so the Treasurer may reply to each point as it is raised.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I invite the attention of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to the fact that the Department of Agriculture as such in the Loan Estimates is never in its own right a big spender of loan moneys. While it appears that the reduction in these items, percentage-wise is big in comparison with the amounts allocated last year, we must remember that not only must we read these figures in conjunction with the schedule at the back to ascertain the spending allocation and the spread of the spending, but we must also consider them in conjunction with the money allocated to agriculture under the Revenue Estimates.

Under those Estimates an amount of \$15.45 million was allocated to agriculture last year, which is roughly \$15.5 million, and this year the amount allocated is \$18.4 million which is near enough to \$18.5

million which makes an increase of approximately \$3 million in the amount allocated to the department.

Mr Davies: From what are you quoting?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am quoting the figures in the Revenue Estimates which is where the main debate normally takes place on agriculture as it is in that area that the big sums of money are allocated for such things as staff, research work, extension work, and so on.

Mr Jamieson: But capital works must come under this.

Sir CHARLES COURT: True; but on the other hand I make the point that normally—some years the situation is different—under its own heading agriculture does not have a large amount of money allocated to it for its own actual capital works. In that regard the matter must be kept in its proper perspective. I hope I have explained the position.

I might add that it was not my intention to rush the item through tonight. If members wish to report progress it is quite all right with me. On the other hand, if they wish to proceed further, it is equally all right with me. I again emphasise that this has never been a big vote on its own. The main expenditure for agriculture is in part 5 of the General Estimates for which this year the amount allocated is \$18.4 million compared with \$15.4 million last year.

Progress

Progress reported and leave given to sit again, on motion by Mr T. D. Evans.

House adjourned at 6.00 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 28th October, 1975

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

BILLS (10): ASSENT

Message from the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator received and read notifying assent to the following Bills—

1. Inventions Bill.
2. Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill.
3. District Court of Western Australia Act Amendment Bill.
4. Recording of Evidence Bill.
5. Auction Sales Act Amendment Bill.
6. Evidence Act Amendment Bill.
7. Health Education Council Act Amendment Bill.
8. Electoral Districts Act Amendment Bill.
9. Juries Act Amendment Bill.
10. Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).