

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 3rd August, 1977

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

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by the Hon. R. J. L. Williams, leave of absence for 12 consecutive sittings of the House granted to the Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Metropolitan) due to official business overseas.

BILLS (7): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Administration Act Amendment Bill.
2. Criminal Code Amendment Bill.
3. Legal Representation of Infants Bill.
4. Offenders Probation and Parole Act Amendment Bill.
5. Securities Industry (Release of Sureties) Bill.
6. Sutors' Fund Act Amendment Bill.

Bills introduced, on motions by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Leader of the House), and read a first time.

7. Railways Classification Board Act Amendment Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by the Hon. D. J. Wordsworth (Minister for Transport), and read a first time.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION

Election

On motion by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Leader of the House), resolved—

That, in accordance with Standing Order 37, the following members be elected for the present Session:

- (a) Standing Orders Committee—The Hons. R. J. L. Williams, T. Knight, and D. W. Cooley;
- (b) Library Committee—The Hons. W. R. Withers and L. D. Elliott;
- (c) House Committee—The Hons. A. A. Lewis, G. E. Masters, D. K. Dans, and G. S. Vaughan;
- (d) Printing Committee—The Hons. H. W. Gayfer and R. F. Claughton.

SUPPLY BILL

Standing Orders Suspension

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Leader of the House) [5.15 p.m.]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended so as to enable a Supply Bill to be taken on receipt of a Message from the Legislative Assembly and to have precedence each day before the Address-in-Reply, and to be passed through all stages at any one sitting.

I would like to explain briefly this motion which the Leader of the House moves about this time each year for the purpose of enabling the House to deal with the Supply Bill ahead of the Address-in-Reply debate.

The previous Parliament authorised the appropriation of moneys for Government spending up to the year ended the 30th June, 1977. As is customary, the Government then operates on warrants until supply is granted to cover the period until further appropriation. I commend the motion and ask that the Bill be proceeded with forthwith.

Question put and passed.

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Leader of the House), read a first time.

Second Reading

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Leader of the House) [5.17 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This measure seeks the grant of supply to Her Majesty of \$630 million for the works and services of the year ending the 30th June, 1978, pending the passage of Appropriation Bills later in the current session of Parliament.

Before moving on to the actual provisions of the Bill a few brief comments are provided on the results of the last financial year.

As already announced, the Consolidated Revenue Fund Budget resulted in a surplus for the second successive year, the outcome for the financial year just past being a surplus of \$3 429 000.

A balanced Budget was presented to Parliament last October which provided for expenditure to equal an anticipated revenue of \$1 132 792 000.

The modest surplus that was achieved is a most satisfactory result. It again highlights the Government's responsible approach to the management of the State's financial affairs. It is also satisfying when one recalls the uncertainties there were at the time the Budget was framed such as, for example, an incipient drought, and also when one considers the magnitude of the figures with which we are now dealing, so that small percentage variations in forecast can result in rather substantial variations in sums of money.

There have been movements in both directions in items within the estimates. Overall, however, actual total revenue was \$11.7 million higher than estimate and total expenditure \$8.3 million higher than estimate.

On the revenue side, State taxation receipts exceeded the estimate by \$13.7 million. The main elements of the increase were stamp duty collections \$5.2 million; payroll tax \$3.2 million; and probate duty \$2.9 million. There were some small decreases in betting tax collections and tobacco licences.

The increased yield from probate duty resulted from a rise in property values and an increase in the number of estates processed. It has already been announced that legislation to abolish spouse-to-spouse probate duty will be introduced this year and made retrospective to the 1st July, 1977.

Territorial Revenue was up \$3 million, due mainly to mining royalties being \$2.3 million above the estimate.

The State received \$2.8 million more from Commonwealth specific purpose grants than was expected. Receipts under the hospitals agreement and technical and further education grants were \$2.3 million and \$500 000 higher than the Budget estimate. Of course, these increases are reflected in higher expenditure in the respective departmental votes.

Total departmental revenue collections were \$5.4 million below estimate. Receipts under most heads were better than Budget estimate but the overall result was affected by actions taken to assist Government business undertakings which had the effect of reducing Treasury revenue.

Interest totalling \$4.5 million due from the State Energy Commission has been deferred until 1978-79 to assist in maintaining the commission's

cash resources during a difficult trading period and to provide short-term loan funds during the peak requirements of the Muja project.

The Western Australian Meat Commission incurred a substantial trading loss in 1976-77 and faces further problems in the months ahead. To assist the commission, the Government agreed to defer payment of debt charges totalling \$600 000 for six months to December, 1977, when the situation will be reviewed.

It was also expected that to achieve a balanced Budget in 1976-77 it would be necessary to bring into the Consolidated Revenue Fund an amount of \$4.9 million from moneys earned by the investment of the State's cash resources under the terms of the Public Moneys Investment Act. The improvement in our Budget situation as the year progressed removed the need to draw on that reserve during the year which means that it will be available for services and works during the coming year.

The period 1976-77 was the first year of the new tax sharing arrangements and total receipts during the year from this source amounted to \$440.8 million which was \$3.2 million less than originally anticipated. The reduction was due to a slowdown in wage increases during the year resulting in personal income tax collections falling short of the original Commonwealth estimate.

Latest indications are that when final Medibank collection figures are known and appropriate adjustments made to the figures, Western Australia's entitlement for 1976-77 could be \$3.3 million less than the amount actually received during the year.

Under the tax sharing arrangements, this adjustment will be deducted from our entitlement in the present financial year.

As already mentioned the expenditure votes were overspent by a total of \$8.3 million.

Most votes were within Budget estimates due mainly to the tight rein which the Government held on employment in the public sector during the year, and savings which were made in the provision for wage increases.

The total number of Government employees at the 30th June, 1977, was significantly less than the limit set by the Government last year.

A staff growth ceiling of 3.04 per cent was imposed for the year but the actual increase amounted to only 2.46 per cent.

An overall provision of \$29.1 million was made in the Budget to meet salary and wage increases. In the event, these cost \$26.2 million—a saving of \$2.9 million.

Other savings were \$7.4 million in the vote for the Education Department, principally because of an overestimate by the department of the provision for salary payments, and \$1.4 million in the vote for the Department of Industrial Development.

When the Budget was framed, it was expected that the Government would be required to meet its obligations under the guarantee of the Yunderup Canals project with any subsequent proceeds from the realisation of the asset being credited to revenue as they arose. In the event, arrangements were made with the Rural and Industries Bank to continue financing the project supported by Government guarantee with only the net loss after sale of the blocks being a charge against the item "Assistance to Industries" in due course.

As a result of these favourable movements in Consolidated Revenue Fund transactions during the year, the Government was able to undertake a number of desirable moves which could not be accommodated at the time the Budget was framed.

These included the completion of the purchase of Her Majesty's Theatre, \$1.9 million; the acquisition of land for public open space and other public uses in the Beechboro area, \$1.4 million; the acquisition of Padbury Building in Forrest Place, \$500 000; acceleration of the work to provide an expanded water supply in the Carnarvon area to relieve drought conditions, \$400 000; and assistance to the City of Perth to replace the Perry Lakes athletics track, \$300 000.

The Government was also able to give immediate effect to election promises relating to increased textbook subsidies, abolition of pre-school levies, and the increased subsidies for school amenities, such as canteens, swimming pools, and ground improvements. It was appropriate that the concessions were introduced as early as practicable to ensure that parents and students enjoyed the benefits during the current school year.

Some further advances were able to be made to Government accounting procedures to improve accountability and uniformity in our practices. The moves will also ensure better utilisation of funds in our changing financial requirements.

The limit of \$6 000 for minor works which are charged to the Consolidated Revenue Fund was set in 1970. Since that time there has been considerable escalation in costs and so it was decided to lift the limit to \$15 000—a figure more in line with the real value of the work which was originally envisaged.

For many years administration costs associated with loan works have been recouped to the Consolidated Revenue Fund. This is a practice common to other States, but over the years the method of assessing the cost in this State has varied and the transfers have included part of the indirect costs of administration and of other service branches of the department not directly concerned with loan works.

The Public Works Department is a service as well as a professional department and the cost of its general operations is a proper charge against the Consolidated Revenue Fund. The charge to the General Loan Fund should be confined to the direct expenses of planning, design and construction, or supervision of works and buildings. Therefore, the surcharge against the General Loan Fund for 1976-77 was calculated on this new basis.

These changes in Public Works Department accounting resulted in an additional charge against the Consolidated Revenue Fund in 1976-77 of \$1.87 million with, of course, a corresponding amount being available for capital works in the General Loan Fund.

Accounting changes were also made in the treatment of depreciation of assets of the Western Australian Government Railways and the country water supplies, sewerage, and drainage schemes.

Members will acknowledge that depreciation is a proper charge against the operating revenues of a business concern as it represents that portion of the assets consumed in producing the income of the year.

Depreciation has always been charged against railways revenue but it has been confined to assets provided by money from the General Loan Fund. From 1976-77 depreciation will also be charged on assets funded from other sources; for example, from special Commonwealth moneys or contributions from the private sector. This will bring the railways depreciation in the Consolidated Revenue Fund into line with the amounts charged in the railways commercial accounts.

In the past, depreciation was charged on the assets of the country areas water supplies, sewerage, and drainage schemes. However, the Government had no choice but to discontinue the practice after 1970-71 because to continue to charge depreciation would have had the effect of increasing the deficit on the Consolidated Revenue Fund. The practice of providing for depreciation of country areas water supplies was reinstated in 1976-77 and will continue in future while we have the financial capacity to do so.

Members will appreciate that the provision for depreciation will be available for asset replacement thereby providing additional funds for capital works.

Looking back, 1976-77 was a year of sound progress for the State from a financial point of view.

As stated in my opening remarks the Government ended the year with the second surplus in succession on the Consolidated Revenue Fund. The previous high rate of growth of recurrent expenditure has been contained and the Government has been able to provide for a satisfactory capital works programme in 1976-77. It therefore moved into 1977-78 in a sound financial position and in a far better position to cope with the problems facing us this year than would have been the case if we had not practised prudent financial management during the life of the previous Ministry.

The year ahead will again be a year of restraint for State Government expenditure.

It is estimated that the State will receive \$518.3 million under the tax sharing arrangements—an increase of 17.6 per cent. However, our share of the loan programme is \$132.7 million—an increase of only 5 per cent—which, in effect, means that we will receive less, in real terms, than we received last financial year.

In addition the Commonwealth has already announced reductions in several specific purpose programme.

The Government has a challenging task before it, therefore, in formulating this year's Budget. It will be our aim, however, to present to Parliament a balanced Budget while, at the same time, providing some essential support for the capital works programme.

Full details of the Budget will, of course, be given to Parliament when the Appropriation Bills are introduced.

I now turn to the provisions of the Supply Bill presently before the House.

An issue of \$550 million is sought from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and \$65 million from moneys to the credit of the General Loan Fund. Provision is also made in the Bill for an issue of \$15 million to enable the Treasurer to make such temporary advances as may be necessary.

The amounts have been based on needs for the existing level of services and no provision has been made for new policy decisions which must await the introduction of the Budget.

I thank the House for its co-operation in allowing me to present this Bill with such alacrity, and I commend it to members.

THE HON. GRACE VAUGHAN (South-East Metropolitan) [5.32 p.m.]: The Opposition supports the Bill. We would never do anything to stop supply to an elected Government or threaten to do so. However, we cannot support all the remarks made by the Leader of the House in his second reading speech.

On perusing the second reading speech notes one finds almost a manic-depressive mental state—one minute it looks as though everything is rosy and the next, everything is pretty black.

The statement that we have a \$3.429 million surplus is qualified by another statement on page three of the notes of the Leader of the House that the surplus would have been closer to \$8 million had it not been for the fact that we allowed the State Energy Commission to wait until next year to pay us the money it owes us on loans. Turning to page 4 of the notes we find we could have had another \$600 000 from the Western Australian Meat Commission but the Government delayed payment of this amount because the commission is having a crook trot. Then a little further down we find we could have gathered in \$4.9 million which was owing to us from some investments we had made using the State's cash resources. However, the Government chose to leave that money for next year. So all-in-all the State did not have a surplus of \$3.429 million, but rather a surplus of \$13.43 million.

The Government may say, "Well then, we are even more worthy of praise", but to me, a surplus Budget is nothing to be proud of at a time when the economy is in such a mess and unemployment is rife. It may be very good to find a surplus in a housekeeping account at the end of a week, but it is not a good thing for a Government—which has a fiscal duty, as this State Government has—

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You would prefer a Whitlam-type Government?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: —to give some direction to the people and to get us out of our mess—in effect to have a surplus of \$13.5 million. This second reading speech sounds very much like the statement of a commercial enterprise out in the ordinary private enterprise world.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Let us hope it does.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Governments should not be commercial enterprises as such; Governments ought to bring in their fiscal policies depending upon the State of the economy at the time. If things are going very well, then private enterprise will get on with the job, except in certain areas where, because of some situations peculiar to the country, it may be necessary for a Government to step in. However, when the position is such as it is now—many people are unemployed and the situation is difficult for entrepreneurs, people who lease their land, and people who invest as well as workers—the Government should give some direction. The present situation is difficult for all people in all sectors of economic development, and I see no reason for the Government to be proud of having a surplus.

As most members of this House are well aware through their own occupations, Western Australians are very dependent upon primary industry, both in the agricultural and extractive sectors. We do not have the room to move as do some of the manufacturing countries which are able to store up produce when there is a temporary lapse in economic affluence. In this country produce is needed by our customers either straightaway or not at all.

It is quite interesting—or a little depressing depending which side one takes in the uranium dispute—to see a statement in yesterday morning's Press that the uranium market is shrinking. So it may well be that we throw all caution to the wind in regard to health and morals to produce uranium and then find that we do not have a market for it when we reach the end of the road. I believe we ought to look at managing the economy of this State not as a commercial enterprise, but rather as a matter of helping to direct the economy. As one of our new members said yesterday, we should be doing the leading as well as the lawmaking.

If we turn to page 11 of the second reading speech notes we find there a very great difference between the economic policy of the Government and that of members on this side of the House.

We still see a preoccupation with the inflation rate but very little about what is to be done in regard to unemployment. As a matter of fact, many remarks in the second reading speech made by the Leader of the House point to the fact that something will be done in regard to increasing unemployment. We saw an evident pride in statements about how the Government was able to restrict its spending and keep down the number of people employed in the public sector. To me that is a little sickening.

On page 11 of the notes we find that we still need to worry about inflation. I heard someone on the radio the other day say that the only answer to double-figure percentage inflation is double-figure percentage unemployment. We do not want that in this country again. When I was a child I saw up to 30 per cent unemployment in New South Wales and I do not want to see it again. It was not just a matter of the people who were hungry, the people who became diseased, and the people who died as a result of that depression, but also it was a matter of the spirit of the nation. The people were given a very severe shaking from which they did not recover for a very long time; in fact, some people never recovered. I do not think even the most conservative of us would be anxious to see inflation reduced so quickly that we reach such a rate of unemployment.

In our type of society unemployment carries a stigma which has not been known in other times and in other societies. Even if we were to use a logical method of dealing with an industry that we know will not be an economic one and say, "It would be much better for us to phase out this industry than to subsidise it", we would find that we have built up such a preoccupation with the work ethic that we would rather pay double the amount in taxes to subsidise such an industry, or perhaps one that cannot compete with other industries, than pay unemployed people at a decent level until new industries are set up and those people can be absorbed.

One of the multi-nationals involved in the motor vehicle industry has just announced a record profit of over \$1 000 million. This company is only the second in the United States to have recorded such a profit, and yet in Australia the moguls of the vehicle building industry are threatening to sack significant numbers of people at a time when unemployment is rife. Surely if we are intending to say to the workers, "Do not ask for a rise because the economy cannot afford it", it should cut the other way. Can we not say to the executive of General Motors-Holdens and the Ford Motor Company that rather than sack these workers because too

many cars are standing around in the yards they should put their employees onto a 20-hour week? This would mean that we would still have these workers as consumers.

It is one of the facts of economic life that the workers are also the consumers—they are the people who do the spending. Let us not forget that 60 per cent or even more of the workers are earning less than the average weekly earnings. It is very easy to say that people on the average weekly wage—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I thought the company made that offer and it was categorically refused by the union.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I am concerned about everyone in that industry working at least 20 hours a week.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are not concerned with the attitude of the union?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Of course this is a radical and revolutionary thing to say, and I will be accused of being radical.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are only saying what the companies have said.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: What actually happens when the supply is greater than the demand is that while a business is still making a profit its management says to the workers, "We are sorry but we already have too many cars"—or too many of this or that—"and we will have to put you off."

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: What did the unions do about Chrysler's offer?

Several members interjected.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: If we are to make a capitalist economic situation work at all times we need to have rules. We must have fair and free competition—and the Government needs to see that we do have fair and free competition. I really will have to give Mr Lewis a few lessons about socialism. He seems to be mixed up. Such ignorance is terrible when one considers that such people are representing others in the Parliament.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: My knowledge of socialism is as good as yours of capitalism.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Some people are not able to differentiate between socialism and communism or communism and capitalism, and they become all mixed up. So someone like Mr Lewis calls out in a loud voice hoping that the louder he talks the more people will listen to him.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Here endeth the first lesson!

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I am trying

to get across to members the fact that if we are to help capitalism to survive we should be concerned about the system under which we live at the moment. We should be mustering all our resources to keep the system stable, instead of which we are hearing these unsolicited and unprovoked remarks. I am not saying that the unions are always right, but neither are the employers or Governments always right. Unprovoked remarks have been made that the unions are always wrong. Unions are not needed in communist countries.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: How true.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Of course they are not, I acknowledge that and so does any other socialist.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Do you mean to tell us there are no trade unions in Russia?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: There are some, but they are not needed.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Grace Vaughan.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I will not be drawn into an argument about it.

People seem to think the only way to express patriotism is to say how terrible other countries are. But that is not the definition of patriotism; that is the definition of jingoism and chauvinism. If we are to be patriotic, what we must do is make our system work for everybody in this country.

Most people, even members who sit opposite, cannot help what they are or the way they were brought up. Things have happened to them in the past which influence them today and which make them behave in ways I think peculiar. Most of us are the result of our own experiences. Certainly, there are some very outstanding cases on the Government side about which we—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Get on with the thing! Stop giving us a lesson in social sciences. It is all rubbish.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I know the Leader of the House could never learn anything. I am beginning to wonder—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: This social worker stuff gives me the horrors at the best of times.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: We all understand the Minister's limitations.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am having difficulty in following the honourable member who is on her feet.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I should like to emphasise that support is needed for the trade

unions. Many people who belong to trade unions are told that they are being led by the nose by their union leaders. Those of us who have experience with trade unions know that does not happen. We had a very good illustration of that in South Australia recently when the unionists were not content with what their union leaders were doing, and voiced their opinion on the matter and in fact at one point were close to violence because of the way their union leaders were operating. Like this group of people here, or like any group of people in business, in any department, in a school or a factory, they are human beings who do their best with the available resources. We cannot say that one category of person is a villain while another is an angel, but so often we hear this method of attack adopted by the Government when referring to trade unions. What is needed is some understanding of what goes to make up a social system. Surely that is something which members in this House understand; I am sure they understand this point, even if the Leader of the House says he does not.

The Opposition certainly does not oppose the speedy passage of this legislation. We wish to see the Executive arm of the Government get on with its business, and accordingly we support the Bill.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [5.47 p.m.]: This is the first time I have spoken in the new Parliament, and I should like to take the opportunity to congratulate you, Mr President, on your election to the office of President of this Chamber. I trust your tenure in office will be one of value to this Chamber and will add dignity to the Parliament. I would also like to congratulate those newly elected members who are sitting in this Parliament for the first time. It will be quite a different experience from their occupations in ordinary civilian life. It is an occupation in which members have an opportunity to make a real contribution to the welfare of society at large. I hope the new members will be able to take their place amongst those many members who have served Parliament with distinction in the past.

A number of things are important in the process of Parliament, and one which has been neglected in recent times is the role the Press plays in a democratic system such as ours. I would say that in Australia, in the main, the Press has failed to a large extent in the important role it should be playing in maintaining a healthy democracy.

A democracy cannot operate successfully unless through the Press the people have access to adequate information on which to base their judgments. In the Australian situation where a

very small number of hands control the media, there is a narrowness of outlets for the many differing viewpoints within the community. Some of the more serious problems we are facing in this country at the moment are the result of that lack of an adequate variety of outlets for the expression of all shades of opinion.

I do not want to dwell on that subject at this time; I simply put it forward as an important consideration which has a bearing on this Government and the manner in which it is carrying out its functions. In Western Australia, far more than any other Australian State, there is a very narrow number of outlets of opinion available to the public and I believe this is reflected in the political climate in this State. As with previous Liberal-Country Party coalition Governments, I do not believe this Government receives the searching examination which is required in our sort of parliamentary system. This has meant that many of the important issues are inadequately treated or entirely neglected.

One of those matters which currently is a problem to this State is the inadequacy of our water supplies. Some weeks ago I released a brief statement to the Press criticising the lack of responsible action by this Government on the conservation of our water supplies which was necessary because of the climatic trends over the past two years.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I said that to the Labor Government in 1972.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I do not know to what the honourable member is referring; if he listens a little longer he will find out what I am talking about.

It should have been obvious at the beginning of this year that an extremely serious problem was developing in this State. As a result of the lack of action by the Government at that time, I believe this State is going to face a situation of extreme seriousness in the supply of water to the metropolitan area the like of which has not been experienced before.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: You are referring to water rationing, are you?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: If the honourable member will just wait, he will hear what I have to say. I received an answer today to a question I placed on notice relating to the storage of water in our metropolitan dams as at the end of February, this year. The figures which were provided are extremely startling. To remind members who listened to the answer when it was read in this place and to inform those who may not have listened so carefully, I will quote the

storage figures relating to the major storage dam for the metropolitan area, Canning Dam. In February, 1976, the dam held 50.205 million cubic metres; but as at February this year, the dam held only 21.73 million cubic metres, or only some 40 per cent of the quantity held in the catchment area 12 months earlier.

The total storage in the metropolitan dams for the last three years was as follows: In 1975, the level stood at 340.816 million cubic metres; in 1976, it was 285.386 million cubic metres; and, in February, 1 this year it was only 188.397 million cubic metres. In other words the amount of available water had been reduced to a very serious level, to just over half the amount which obtained in February, 1975.

I would have thought that a responsible Government, foreseeing that the State faced a very serious situation in the months to come, immediately would have set about conserving its supplies. But of course the Government was facing a general election and we can assume only that it did not take the necessary action at that stage in order to maintain its electoral popularity. Perhaps we can excuse the Government for that. However, I believe the fact that even after the date of the election, no serious steps were taken to conserve our water supplies completely damns this Government.

We know attempts were made to conduct some sort of public relations campaign in order to influence the community to use less water, but this obviously did not work. Fortunately for the Government there were a few mild days during the summer months which assisted in keeping consumption relatively low. However, we have now reached the stage where for the first time in the middle of winter, which is normally our flushest period, water restrictions have been imposed.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: It won't be the last time, because Perth runs out of water for further expansion in 1988. I have made this statement many times in this House.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I agree that the honourable member has real grounds for being critical of his Government.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: In fact, I was being critical of the last Labor Government when I made those statements.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: His Government has not listened to him any more than it has accepted the advice of the people it employs for the express purpose of giving the Government advice.

At the last Labor Party conference in 1976 it

was adopted policy that there should be an optimum size for Perth based on the available water supplies. It was quite clear to members of the Labor Party at that stage that Perth was approaching a very serious situation. It is unfortunate this situation faces the public so soon after that date but it has arrived and only a miracle, I believe, will save Perth from a most disastrous summer.

I have no suggestions as to how the Government will find its way around the problem. We can perhaps envisage water coming down from Kununurra but the sort of expenditure required would be far beyond the resources of this Government. That would appear to be the only alternative source for increasing water supplies for Perth. Very serious thought needs to be given to reducing the growth of Perth in something of a shock fashion to prevent the disaster reaching even greater proportions than it is likely to reach at this time.

We must remember that our water supplies come from along the ranges south of Perth, and even to institute new growth centres in those areas will have a limited effect for the amelioration of the water supply problem. But those are the sorts of alternatives on which action needs to be taken today—not tomorrow. That is the extent of the problem.

I could continue to speak on a number of other matters in relation to this Supply Bill and the failures of this Government's administration, but I doubt whether I could raise any other matter which would demonstrate so clearly its irresponsibility in administration. It is of little comfort to the people that it has achieved a favourable balance of \$3.2 million or whatever the amount is. That will hardly compensate them for the problems they will face from the shortage of water. I believe they would have much preferred that amount and perhaps a little more having been spent in ensuring that the situation did not arise, or that positive programmes were being implemented by this Government to slow down the growth of Perth and to develop growth centres in areas where there is a much more assured supply of domestic water.

Although I could probably spend more than several hours speaking upon many other matters, I think that matter clearly demonstrates the lack of skill in the administration of this Government. As indicated by the previous speaker, the Labor Party supports this Bill because we accept the convention that upper Houses do not prevent the passing of supply. We hope that this is one convention at least that will continue into the future.

Sitting suspended from 6.05 to 7.30 p.m.

THE HON. LYLA ELLIOTT (North-East Metropolitan) [7.30 p.m.]: We are being asked tonight to support a Bill which gives supply to a Government which, I believe, has broken every promise it has made to the people of this State on the two most serious problems before the nation today. I am talking about inflation and unemployment.

Many times over the past three years we on this side of the House have reminded the Premier and the Government of the promises made prior to the 1974 election, quite specifically and unequivocally by the Premier, that both inflation and unemployment could be beaten on a State-by-State basis. All that was needed we were told was to get rid of the Tonkin Government and install a Liberal-National Country Party Government because it had all the answers. Let anyone in this Chamber deny that that is the situation.

The Hon. T. Knight: But did not Mr Whitlam also promise to improve the situation?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The facts show what a sham and how fraudulent those promises were. If that was not enough, the Liberal Party in the recent State election had the gall to publish this advertisement on the 18th February in *The West Australian* and this is what it had to say—

For all people, particularly young people, we will develop more jobs, better jobs and wider opportunities. We will help balance your budgets by balancing ours. We will review all rates and taxes so further tax relief can be given.

That is a joke. To continue—

And we will maintain greater efficiency, less waste in Government departments. Through these sound economic policies we will cushion the effects of inflation on the people of this State. You know we will carry these things through. Our record says that for us.

The promises of 1974 were not honoured and obviously the promises of 1977 are not going to be honoured.

Firstly, let us have a look at inflation. If one looks at the figures, one will see that we now have the distinction of being the State with the highest inflation rate. Since this Government came into office in 1974, Western Australia has had the highest rate of inflation of any State, and much higher than the national average. The Western Australian increase has been 61 per cent, whereas the national average has been only 55 per cent.

One might ask how this has happened in one

State alone. Not only has the Government refused to legislate—it has the power to legislate on consumer questions and excessive prices—but it has imposed the most savage increases in taxes and charges in the history of the State.

Food prices in June showed the highest increase for six years. The *Daily News* of the 25th July pointed out as follows—

This sharp increase was in contrast to all the other capitals.

In one of the rare criticisms of business that we hear from Liberal Party spokesmen, Mr Grayden (the Minister for Labour and Industry) in the *Daily News* on the 4th May stated—

Profiteering is common among some Western Australian service stations.

But the Government will not take any legislative action to control this.

A 600 ml bottle of milk has increased 92 per cent since the present Government came into office; that may be compared with the national inflation rate of 55 per cent. There have been eight increases—

The Hon. Neil McNeill: Would not your Government have increased prices?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: There have been eight increases—

The Hon. Neil McNeill: Would you answer the question? Would your Government not have increased the price of bottled milk?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: We have had a Liberal-National Country Party Government since 1974, a Government with a leader who promised that he would reduce inflation, but what has happened? Not only has he not reduced it, but he has increased it far more than the inflation rate of any other State and, as I was saying before I was rudely interrupted, on the one item of milk alone there have been eight increases since 1974, bringing the total increase to 92 per cent.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: The farmers have suffered terribly under this Government.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Eggs and bread prices have increased considerably, and the increase in the cost of materials used for house building as at May this year was higher than any State of Australia, since the Court Government came to office. The prices of essential things like building materials for homes have increased in this Government's period of office by 64.94 per cent; while the national average was only 56.35 per cent.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: They have not been helped by the Fraser Government either.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: What was the national average?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The national average was 56.35 per cent.

Probably the most outrageous increases have been in State taxes and charges and perhaps this has been the real reason for the high inflation rate in this State, an inflation rate which is much higher than that in any other State. I would like to list some of these outrageous increases in taxes and charges, and I would ask members to bear in mind that the national inflation rate since this Government came to office in 1974 has been 55 per cent.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: It is a very sorry state of affairs in this State.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: There are 15 items on this list which are well above the national inflation rate. Metropolitan water rates—we are hearing a lot about these at the moment—show a total increase of 60.3 per cent; excess water rates, 143 per cent.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Do you think that is enough?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Country water rates in towns north of the 26th parallel, 53.7 per cent; and I am sure members representing country electorates would be interested in towns south of the 26th parallel which show an increase of 92 per cent for country water rates.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: We are not worried about the rates; we are worried about lack of water.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Sewerage rates, 83.3 per cent. It is a wonder that Sir Charles Court did not promise to produce some rain! He promised everything else.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: He has done fairly well, because he came back with an increased majority. You are asserting that the electors have no brains.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: This is an interesting figure; another distinction we have in this State is that we have the highest electricity rate in the whole of Australia. Tell me that is not inflationary.

The Hon. T. Knight: You know the reason.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: We have a terrible Government.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The increase in electricity rates has been 85 per cent. Gas rates have increased by 61 per cent. Both these figures are above the national average. State Government abattoirs slaughtering fees have increased—local markets by 93.3 per cent and export markets by

72 per cent. Public Health Department meat inspection fees—

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Do you suggest we get rid of those services?

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: No, we suggest you get rid of the Government.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: The people had their chance.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Surely meat inspection fees would have a bearing on the cost of meat; this Government has increased the figure by 270 per cent. State shipping freight rates have increased by up to 60 per cent, the Westrail freight rates, by 62 per cent; and metropolitan rail and bus fares by 60 per cent. Now this is a beauty—motor vehicle licence fees have been increased by 114.5 per cent.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Ours are still cheap compared with those of the other States.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Motor vehicle transfer fees have increased by 50 per cent.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: What other States did you have a look at?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Sir Charles Court did not talk about other States; he said he was going to reduce inflation in this State. He was going to reduce taxes and charges and I might add that since he promised that in the advertisement I quoted earlier, there have been further increases than those we saw during the last term.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: We can say he kept his promise to review them all—upwards.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: That is right. Drivers' licence fees, which will be increased again on the 1st October, show a total increase since March, 1974, of 132.4 per cent.

State Government Insurance Office comprehensive insurance rates have increased by 52 per cent; metropolitan State Housing Commission rents by an average of 75 per cent, plus the \$60 management fee that was imposed; country State Housing Commission rents by 50.9 per cent; State Government hospital fees by 100 per cent; stamp duty on cheques by 33.3 per cent; pay-roll tax by 11.1 per cent; and country train and railway bus fares by 35.13 per cent.

The Hon. T. Knight: You are missing one relevant factor; you have not given us the increase in wages in the same period.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: This is the sort of treatment that the taxpayers of this State have received from a Treasurer who said inflation could be beaten State by State and he promised,

both in 1974 and 1977, to review all State taxes and charges. But he has given us, as I said before, the highest inflation rate in Australia. We are now faced with the horrific prospect of double taxation.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: Cut it out!

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: You have been told to say that.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: We are faced with the prospect of double taxation, as I said, by a Government—

The Hon. R. Thompson: Can anyone deny categorically it will not come about and we will not be double-taxed?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Lyla Elliott has the floor.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The Government has provided evidence that it is a Government of high inflation and I just hate to think what is going to happen when the State Treasurer has the power to impose additional income tax on the taxpayers of the State. Incidentally, all Premiers were opposed to this principle with the exception of our Premier, Sir Charles Court. Do members on the other side deny this?

The Hon. T. Knight: I could not hear what you said.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I will repeat it for the benefit of the honourable member.

The Hon. T. Knight: Thank you.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Through you, Mr President, I say to the honourable member that all Premiers, Labor as well as Liberal, were opposed to this principle with the exception of Sir Charles Court.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Seeing he is the only bloke who opposed it, he might be right again. He is balancing the Budget.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I think the Hon. Grace Vaughan very adequately dealt with balancing Budgets at a time of high unemployment.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I do not think she dealt with them at all. I think she put her own interpretations on them.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Now, what will the new taxation policy mean to the State and to the nation? I believe this new federalism policy has been embraced warmly by all conservatives—by all Liberal-National Country Party politicians in this State. However, I believe this new federalism could destroy this country as a nation.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: That is what it is designed to do.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: It will divide this country into six competing sections, all competing for the revenue and resources of this country instead of co-operating towards an equitable distribution for all the people.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: All Australians.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Yes, for all Australians. The new federalism policy will destroy uniform taxation. Uniform taxation was originally introduced by the Curtin Government in 1942 with the intention of more equitably financing the war effort.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: We did not like double taxation at that time either.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: That historic measure was so important to economic justice and equity between the States, for the development of Australia as a nation, that nobody has thought of disturbing the principle until now. However, we now have a Government in power in Canberra which wants to opt out of the responsible management of the financial resources of the nation.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: It is the most responsible Government in years.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The Government in Canberra wants to pass the buck to the States. Its attitude is that the States should take over the responsibility for the social welfare of the people. It considers the States should finance essential services, and worry about environmental problems, education, health, and child care. The Government in Canberra considers that the States should find the money by taxing the citizens within the States in order to provide the services.

When we consider the size of this State and our population, and compare it with Victoria or New South Wales, it must be readily apparent to any rational or reasonable person that the new policy will seriously disadvantage this State. The taxpayers of Western Australia ultimately will be paying a higher tax than will the people living in Victoria and in New South Wales. Even Mr Bjelke-Petersen was able to see the weakness in such a scheme, and its disadvantages to the less populous States. However, our Premier enthusiastically embraced it. The Liberal and Country Party members in this Chamber also embraced the new federalism policy. I ask how many of those members in this Chamber constantly ask their secretaries to ring the State Housing Commission to seek housing for constituents in their electorates.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I spent more time seeking assistance when the Tonkin Government was in office than I have had to spend under the efficient Minister of this Government.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: It was the Curtin and Chifley Governments that were responsible for introducing the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement which made welfare housing a possibility in this country. How many members opposite meet elderly people in aged persons' homes that have been financed by Commonwealth funds? How many of them attend openings of child care centres, or community health and recreation centres, built with Commonwealth funds?

I cannot see anything wrong with tied money—Commonwealth money sent to the States for specific purposes, when it is for sadly needed community services.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: A very good Premier of your own, John Tonkin, did not agree. He could see problems with tied grants, and he commented many times along those lines.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I dispute that interjection. I believe that when Mr John Tonkin was Premier he would have been very grateful to receive the same financial assistance from the Federal Liberal Government which the Court Government received from the Whitlam Government.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: The Whitlam Government let him down, too.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I remember the large number of achievements claimed by this Government in the Governor's Speech last year. However, an examination of those claims revealed that a large amount of Commonwealth money provided the services and facilities which were made available.

On the question of the provision of welfare services, just recently all members were circularised by local authorities with a request for more law enforcement to cope with violence and vandalism in their electorates. I find it incredible, in this day and age, that people of influence in the community—politicians and local government councillors—refuse to accept the most elementary fact that money spent on preventive measures, such as a good standard of housing and the provision of child care, community health and recreation facilities, and various forms of family support is money well invested. In the long run the expenditure of such money on human welfare will pay great dividends.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I do not know that you are right there.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Talking about human welfare brings me to the question of unemployment. This is another problem which we were promised would be solved by the State Liberal-National Country Party Government. Members on the other side are very quiet because they know that what I am saying is right.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is just that we like you!

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: That has put the honourable member right off.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Members opposite only like the promises which they believe were kept.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: We have often quoted in this Chamber the Premier's now well-known statement that he would solve unemployment in this State within six months of getting back into office in 1974. The Liberal Party then had the gall to publish the advertisement, to which I referred earlier, during the recent State election campaign. The advertisement promised more jobs.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: We cannot even get any details when we ask questions.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: During the election campaign the Premier said that within a short period of time—I think it was seven years—he would provide 100 000 jobs. The Minister for Labour and Industry (Mr Grayden) went one better and at a meeting held in a school he said he would provide the jobs within 18 months. What a joke!

When Labor went out of office in 1974 the unemployment rate in this State was 1.62 per cent of the work force. That represented 7 527 people.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: We had an excellent Government at that time.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: That is right. The unemployment percentage as at June was 4.7 per cent, or 25 573 people. Unemployment has trebled since this Government came into office. There are 13 adult unemployed for every job vacancy, but even more disastrous is the position of the young people. There are 18 young people unemployed for every vacancy. What an indictment of a Government which has made so many outrageous promises with regard to inflation and unemployment.

I am not the only person who holds the opinion I have expressed. An article appeared in a journal, *Economic Activity*, published by the University Faculty of Economics and Commerce. Gordon Murray, who is senior tutor at the Department of

Economics, at the end of an article which he wrote on the economy of the State, said—

The state of the economy in West Australia benefits from the continued overseas demand for minerals,

So, we are very fortunate in that respect. The unemployment situation could be much worse, but because of the demand for our minerals it is 4.7 per cent of the work force. The article continues—

but suffers, along with the entire national economy, from the continued failure of those responsible for economic management at State and Federal level—

We have Liberal-National Country Party Governments at both levels. To continue—

to find solutions to the problems of unemployment, inflation and structural change in the economy.

The present State Government has broken the promises which it gave unequivocally to the people of Western Australia, and it deserves the strongest censure. However, unlike the Liberal and National Country Party senators in 1975, we in the Labor Party believe that if a Government is elected by the people it is given a mandate by the people to govern, and it is irresponsible for an upper House to vote against supply. So, we support the Bill.

THE HON. J. C. TOZER (North) [7.56 p.m.]: Like the previous speakers I support the second reading of the Supply Bill tonight, but unlike the previous speakers, I believe the Government is entitled to great credit and congratulations for the information which has been presented with this Supply Bill.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: We can all make mistakes.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: The Supply Bill introductory speech has much information relating to the operations of the accounts of the State of Western Australia during the year 1976-77. The Minister's speech did not give us all the details, but enough information to indicate that the Government had been a good steward for the people. The finances of this State have been in good hands and we find that after spending a total Budget figure of \$1 132 792 we have a few million dollars surplus.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: What is the Government going to do with it?

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: That is the way I like to see the State run. I believe this Government is looking after my affairs for me.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Looking after its friends, of course.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: I might repeat that at the beginning of my speech tonight I mentioned that I agree with the previous speakers in that I support the second reading of the Supply Bill, not that I was supporting the previous speakers in their criticism. Of course, in the case of the Hon. Lyla Elliott she did not refer to the Supply Bill at all except in her last sentence. The topic of her discussion certainly had nothing to do with the matters contained in the information which the Minister gave to us tonight.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: I thought you sat here all the way through her speech. You could not have listened.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Don't you think unemployment and inflation have anything to do with supply?

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: We have a Bill before the House; that is what we are discussing.

An interesting development has emerged in State finances over the years. In the past the States have been embarrassed through the lack of Consolidated Revenue funds. In fact, in the past it was probable that they had difficulty in spending the loan funds available to them.

This is being completely reversed now to the stage where there is a great shortage of loan funds for the carrying out of capital works.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: How long back is it that they had trouble spending their loan funds?

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: There are additional problems in regard to State finance because of the Commonwealth limitations in regard to tied money.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: I cannot recall anyone having trouble spending their loan funds.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: The interesting thing is that this ability to live within our means by using careful management has provided a measure of flexibility—a little manoeuvring space, in the carrying through of the expenditure in the Consolidated Revenue Fund Budget—provided there is a sensible budgetary restraint and there is a reasonable rein on the terrible empire building which we tend to see in all levels of government.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: What about private enterprise?

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: This enables several desirable projects to be carried through, as the Leader of the House referred to, and at page 12 of the notes he mentioned a few of them. He told us about Her Majesty's Theatre, the Forrest

Place development, the Beechboro open space development, and the improvements to the Perry Lakes athletic track. It is interesting to note that all those things are based in the City of Perth.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Do you class that as productive or unproductive spending?

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: The one mention I see of noncity development is the essential improvement to the Carnarvon water supply.

It is within this context of some measure of manoeuvrability which the State has developed through its careful management that I want to introduce a few items tonight. They are related to the remote areas generally and more specifically related to the North Province. Perhaps by bringing these matters forward at this stage during the debate on the Supply Bill which is introduced to provide for carry-on finance until the Budget is introduced we can hope the Government will listen to what is said and perhaps develop a better standard of priorities or a standard that will better fit the needs of the whole State.

The first thing I want to mention is housing. I regard it as important that the question of housing be given very careful consideration, and particularly housing in the North Province where a peculiar situation exists.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: In the North Metropolitan Province too, people want to live in houses.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: I believe these fluid funds we have, this liquidity which we seem to have developed by careful management, enable us to give careful consideration to the channelling of these funds into the abnormal demands for housing required in places like Port Hedland and Karratha particularly, but also, in fact, in every single town in the North Province.

Mr President, you, and I am sure, the members in this Chamber, will be interested to know that there are approximately 1 200 caravans occupied on a permanent or semi-permanent basis in the two conurbations of Port Hedland and Karratha, and this is a sad reflection on the housing programmes we have been able to institute.

People on the Opposition benches will tell us that the waiting time for a house in Port Hedland or Karratha is no longer than it is for a house in the metropolitan area, and in point of fact this is so.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: I haven't told you that.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: The trouble is, Sir, in the north, specifically in the two towns to which I

referred, and indeed in every single town in the North Province, there is no pool of rental homes. Under these circumstances private enterprise is not able to build houses to rent at a reasonable figure. A house of a very minimum standard would attract an economic rent of something over \$75 a week—perhaps it would come to something like \$100 a week. That is the nature of the rental that would have to be charged for a house built by private enterprise.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You mean private enterprise is failing in the north? You will upset the Government if you are saying that private enterprise cannot do the job.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: I would like the Leader of the House to go to the Treasurer—

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Private enterprise is supposed to be more efficient.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: —to ask that when he introduces his Budget later in the session he will make special allocation for housing in the north of the State and particularly in these two industrial conurbations where the housing situation is so adverse.

I suggest that if 1 000 homes were placed tonight in northern towns by the waving of a magic wand occupants would be waiting for every single one of them. So through you, Mr President, I ask the Leader of the House to please take this message to his Government and to the Treasurer in particular.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Certainly Mr Tozer.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: In the same category I could mention other things but as it would take too long to draw attention to all of them I will refer only to the lateral roads. We will proceed under the national highway programme and we will get our longitudinal—our north-south roads—completed, but in the meantime, the residents of the inland Pilbara do not have a road to take them to the coast. I believe this is another example of a special and peculiar requirement in this area. I would like to think that the flexibility which has been developed in Government financing will help to cope with this situation in some small measure.

On page 10 of his notes the Leader of the House referred to the Department of Industrial Development. We find that the department underspent its expenditure estimates by \$1.4 million. When we consider that the total Budget allocation for this department is \$5 million, it is a pretty big surplus. However, we do notice that a large contingency figure was set aside, and obviously we were lucky last year that we did not

need to draw on that contingency vote; so really the surplus is not surprising. On page 94 of the 1976-77 Consolidated Revenue Fund Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure we see that an amount of \$500 000 was set aside for assistance to industry. Another amount of \$250 000 was set aside for decentralisation incentives. I wonder whether these amounts were used.

During this same period of 12 months we are reviewing tonight, the pay-roll tax revenue was up \$3.2 million on the estimate. Again through you, Mr President, I ask the Leader of the House whether he could request the Minister for Industrial Development to adapt the pay-roll tax rebates legislation to provide a real incentive to decentralised industry. The existing Act fails in this regard—it does not provide an incentive at all. I wish that this additional amount of \$3.2 million over and above our estimate, and the \$1.4 million which we did not spend of our estimated expenditure, could be made available to make the existing pay-roll tax rebate legislation work.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: In fact it penalises because of the district allowances.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: Thank you. I notice from the notes of the leader of the House the rearrangement of the finances of the Public Works Department. I express my praise to the department in reaching the conclusion to place the overheads where they should be. I think this is a proper course and well overdue. The decision has been taken by the Treasury and the Public Works Department in concert. The result has been that, in the year 1976-77, \$1.87 million has been absorbed into the Consolidated Revenue Fund enabling better value to be gained from the loan funds made available to us.

I believe that the performance of the Public Works Department, in the Pilbara particularly, is of interest. A great deal of work has been proceeding over a number of years in the engineering and architectural fields, and I am sure that our future programmes will be vigorous and forward thinking. Only the other day I read about the launching of the new De Gray River water supply to serve the sister towns of Port Hedland and South Hedland.

What does concern me is that when we look at this capital expenditure, we find that an allocation was made last year for the Millstream water supply serving the towns of Dampier, Karratha, Wickham, and Point Samson. Other major allocations were made for the development of the Yule River water supply for Port Hedland and also for the Karratha High School. Until one reads the fine print, it is not immediately

apparent that the mining companies operating in these areas are paying a major part of the money required for these developments and I think that perhaps the State should look at this point to see whether the people of the Pilbara are receiving their share of the funds being spent throughout the State of Western Australia.

On the same theme we find that huge sums of money were set aside for the sewerage and water supply in the town of Karratha, but the people who purchase land are paying for this. By the way, when I am referring to the Government I mean all governments—the Federal and State Governments over the last 15 years, and local Government also. There is great feeling that the companies are the "universal providers" but in point of fact all levels of government are abrogating their responsibilities to a large measure. I hope the Government will take up its full responsibility in this respect.

I refer particularly to the cost of residential land in places such as Karratha, South Hedland, and all other developing towns. In Karratha and South Hedland the towns are developing in such spectacular fashion that the trend is more noticeable. The people who buy the land and build houses on it in fact pay all the service costs. The service costs cover not only all the reticulation costs but also a component of the headworks cost. It is quite clear to me that the State should make a decision to meet the headworks cost in the same way that it does in the Perth metropolitan area.

I received correspondence today from the Lands and Surveys Department about a land sale to be held in the Karratha townsite on the 23rd August. I find that a large single residential allotment will cost the purchaser \$12 500; that is the cost to provide services for a block of land in Karratha—out on a bare spinifex plain. I hope the Government will look at its priorities when drawing up its Budget and again I ask my leader to approach the Treasurer, the Minister for Works, and the Minister for Lands to ask whether the State can accept its proper responsibility in respect of the headworks costs in these residential subdivisions.

I believe this is in line with the spirit of the remarks of the Leader of the House when he said—

The Government has a challenging task before it, therefore, in forming this year's Budget it will be our aim, however, to present to Parliament a balanced Budget while, at the same time, providing some essential support for the capital works programme.

In other words, within the spirit of the comments made by the Treasurer and repeated by the Leader of the House tonight I feel I am not asking for anything that is not due to the people who live in this region and who bear this colossal penalty of a high cost structure.

Another item within the speech notes associated with the Supply Bill comes under the rather quaint heading of "Territorial Revenue". On page 4 of the Minister's notes we find that the revenue from royalties is up \$2.3 million in the year under review. Mr President, I remind you and all members of this Chamber that last year the iron ore royalties from the Pilbara alone exceeded \$45 million and this was paid directly into the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Western Australia. As it is, the people up there are paying far more than their share by paying the normal taxes, charges, and rates. In addition they are contributing \$45 million. I suggest this is the sort of thing the Government has to keep in mind when I ask it to ensure that the funds are disbursed fairly to all concerned. I have one other comment to make. It relates to the disbursement of income tax funds to local authorities. On this matter I have made representations to both the State Grants Committee and to the Commonwealth Government Members' Federal Affairs Committee. I think the Government should take an interest in this matter and I hope Mr MacKinnon will add it to the list that he will take to the Premier. Perhaps the Premier, as the Treasurer, and Mr Rushton, as the Minister for Local Government, can talk to the Grants Committee to see that it is taking into account what I believe to be a very important factor. I am asking for what I might call a "dollar effectiveness" factor to be built into the formula that is designed to disburse these funds.

I think members will recall that 80 per cent of these funds were disbursed under what is known as element A to all local authorities in Western Australia. The formula which determined element A takes into account the ratable population, the area of land and other general factors.

The other 20 per cent was disbursed on a needs basis and was known as element B. In determining the split-up of element B, the State Grants Committee followed the example set by the Commonwealth Grants Commission which had previously made these determinations and it tried to assess honestly where the deficiencies were in any communities and tried to allocate the funds according to the priorities that seemed to be reflected in the deficiencies that could be seen within the particular communities. I think in some small measure this element B did catch up

with some of the needs of the local authorities, particularly those local authorities where I come from which are very remote and very much lacking in the normal public facilities and utilities. I believe this was a small step forward in trying to help the ratepayers and members of the communities concerned, but it related to only 20 per cent of the total allocations and therefore would not be a major factor.

I am asking the Premier and the Minister for Local Government to place before the State Grants Committee, for its consideration, the introduction of a "dollar effectiveness" factor. This must be built into the element A formula in the total disbursement. I illustrate the point in this way: If a dollar has an effective worth of 100 cents in the metropolitan area of Perth I suggest that the dollar allocated to the Shires of Port Hedland, and Roebourne—the Karratha area—is effectively worth about 60c. I suggest that that dollar allocated to the Shires of Broome and West Kimberley at Derby is effectively worth about 50c. I believe that in Wyndham and Kununurra the dollar is worth an effective 45c, and in Halls Creek 37.5c. For this reason I believe we have to change that element A formula to incorporate what I choose to call a "dollar effectiveness" factor. I hope that Mr MacKinnon can pass my message on to the right places.

In conclusion I congratulate the Government on its handling of the taxes and revenues on my behalf and on behalf of all taxpayers. The Supply Bill provides carry-on finance until the Budget is introduced. Although I could name many more things, my real hope is that when the Supply Bill has been passed we will see built into the Budget special provision for three items specifically, they are housing, a better deal for local authorities, and a better deal for capital works. I hope the north gets an equivalent deal to what is given to the south.

As this is my first speech in the life of this new Parliament, before I sit down I must congratulate you, Mr President, on your appointment to this high office. Like an earlier speaker I am a little sorry that you are not on the floor of the House because I used to enjoy your contributions so much. There is a long list of congratulations and I do not need to mention them all by name. They include Mr MacKinnon as Leader of the House, Mr Wordsworth for his elevation to the Ministry, and Mr Ferry's election as Deputy President and Chairman of Committees. I should like to congratulate all members who were re-elected at the election and all new members who have entered this Chamber. I believe from the offices occupied by all these men we have lost good men.

We have replaced them by good men and women and perhaps history will show us whether they may be even better.

THE HON. R. HETHERINGTON (East-Metropolitan) [8.23 p.m.]: I rise to support the Bill. I shall be brief because much of what I had intended to say has already been very ably said by the Hon. Lyla Elliott. I hope the Hon. J. C. Tozer, who has just resumed his seat, does not mind if I do not stick too closely to the details of the Bill, but after all this is a Bill by which the Government is seeking supply to carry on the services of the Government until the Budget is brought down and it is traditional for the—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You can speak on anything.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I thank the Leader of the House. It is traditional for the Government's record to be examined at times such as this. Of course, this House can reject supply, but this is one of the things that I object to. I hope that before many more years have passed honourable members of this House will support a Bill which will do one of two things—either follow the practice of the British Parliament where the House of Lords can hold up a money Bill for only one month, because it is an unrepresentative House, or support a Bill which will make this a representative House, in which case the House might have power to reject supply with a little more justification. This is a power that can be used and might be used.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: This is a representative House.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: That is a matter of opinion. I would not call this a fully representative House. This is a House of very ill balance and only partial representation. There are two kinds of representation. They are the kind of representation in which honourable members opposite believe and which gives them a permanent advantage, and democratic representation which is the kind I am supporting.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: You have an advantage too by being elected.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I hope that in due course we might do one of those two things because I remember that in October, 1973, the Hon. Charles Court, who was then Leader of the Opposition, desired this House to reject supply. At that time common sense prevailed and the members of this House refused to do so.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Do you not think it always would prevail?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: Not

necessarily. I had thought it would always prevail in the case of the Federal Parliament and twice it did not prevail—once when Mr Snedden was Leader of the Opposition and once when Mr Fraser was Leader of the Opposition. One might have thought it would have prevailed in Victoria, but in 1947 the Opposition was so seized with the importance of the work of the Cain Government that supply was refused to that Government on the grounds that the Chifley Government had introduced bank nationalisation. So although one hopes that common sense will prevail one cannot always rely on it.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Shall we come back to this House and the fact that common sense has prevailed in this House?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I am saying that it has prevailed in this House but that this House was under very heavy pressure at one stage, and when I look at some of the members opposite I am not sure that it will always prevail in future because the nature of the House is always changing.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What do you mean by that?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I suggest the honourable member direct his comments to me.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I am sorry, Mr President. I was momentarily diverted by members on the other side of the House.

The PRESIDENT: I do not think you ought to take any notice of interjections.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I shall do my best. It is very difficult when honourable members on the other side of the House are so vociferous and do not follow my practice of sitting quietly and listening. But I have much to learn and they apparently have very little to learn.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: It would be better if you did that now.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I was intending to follow much the same lines that the Hon. Lyla Elliott followed. I repeat that the reason I shall not do so is that she has done it already and I have no need to do so. But I point out that the leader of this Government two elections ago made a very specific promise.

I am not one who blames Governments for not being able to do things they cannot do. I did not blame the Menzies Government because it failed to prevent inflation. But I did blame the Menzies Government because in 1949 Sir Robert Menzies made a specific promise to put value back into the pound—a promise which he knew he could not

keep. It seems to me that this Government must stand condemned because in his policy speech two elections ago the Premier said—

It will be argued that a State Government can do nothing to offset the damage of Federal mismanagement of the economy.

At that stage he was blaming Mr Whitlam for all his problems but then the Premier said—

Inflation can be beaten to a substantial degree State by State.

Inflation has not been beaten to a substantial degree State by State and inflation in this State is higher than in any other State. That was not the case when the Tonkin Government was in office. At the same time if the Whitlam Government and the Tonkin Government could be condemned—

The Hon. G. E. Masters: The public condemned them.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: If the honourable member would allow me to finish the sentence I would be pleased. If the Whitlam and Tonkin Governments could be condemned by members opposite because unemployment had reached heights that it had not reached previously—and it was true that unemployment had reached record heights since the depression under the Whitlam Government—how much more could they condemn a Government which said it would put things right and under which unemployment has reached even more record heights? If it continues at the present rate, we could face trouble.

Someone earlier referred to wages. One of the most important aspects is that the Whitlam Government did introduce wage indexation in an endeavour to maintain the standard of living of the wage earner while at the same time ensuring that wages did not escalate beyond what the economy could absorb.

The policy of this Government, as evidenced when it appeared before the Industrial Commission, and of the Federal Government, has been one of reducing the real value of wages by what is referred to as partial indexation. Those Governments talk about indexation guidelines, when they have got rid of indexation. They want to reduce the standard of living of the wage earner and, at the same time, they talk about the need to increase profitability.

One of the things about this Government which worries me is that like many conservative Governments it looks after the immediate prospect without always looking ahead to what may be, and if we on this side of the House say that an inquiry should be held or that some

planning ought to be undertaken we hear the parrot cry "socialism" across the floor of the House. This expression has wafted across the Chamber several times already tonight.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: When have you made any suggestion for a commission or an inquiry?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I have not done so.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Do not say "we on this side"; say "other people". Let us be accurate for a change.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: A lesson you could well learn.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: So could your Deputy Leader.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: When I say "we on this side" I am speaking of my party generally, and my party has followed a fairly consistent policy in the past, and I am aware of its policy. Of course we do change our policy democratically from time to time, but in general we follow two principles. We believe in freedom of the individual and in justice for the individual.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: No-one else in this House does? You are using clichés.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Our fear is that you must be the only socialist party in the world which does.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: If the Leader of the House interjects in that way it indicates he knows very little about socialist parties because, after all, the basis of—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The Russians call themselves socialists.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I am not talking about them.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: What are you talking about?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: About democratic socialist parties of the kind found in Germany, Great Britain, New Zealand, Sweden, and Australia. I am not just talking about Labor Parties which do operate on democratic socialist lines—I am not talking about revolutionary parties—but parties which attempt to bring in greater social justice in our society by democratic means. To listen to some of the remarks made by those on the other side of the Chamber one would imagine we are a party of wild revolutionaries paid with gold from Moscow!

One of the interesting things is that in Great Britain where there is a democratic socialist party, and in Sweden and Germany, the communists have never become a very strong

party. As long as we have a strong democratic Labor Party in Australia we will not have a strong Communist Party.

However, the aspect that worries me about the Government and its attitude towards economic affairs is its policy that if something exists it must be developed. It is developed unthinkingly and the policy is that it must be sold overseas. No thought is given to the future.

If the Premier is accurately reported—and I will accept that he may not have been, if I am corrected by someone knowledgeable on the other side of the House—he has returned from Japan rather disappointed with the markets there for our iron ore. He does not consider they are as good as he had hoped they would be. However, he is ever optimistic that we will find markets in Europe.

It seems to me that since the mining boom began in this State there has been an old-fashioned notion that investment must be made in the going industry with the assumption that markets will be available. When the markets are no longer available a crisis is reached. This has happened in our post-war era. We should be planning and looking for markets as did the Tonkin Government in its short term in office.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Looking for what?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: Markets—m-a-r-k-e-t-s.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He is teaching us to spell now.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: It is obviously a lesson long overdue.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We have just the bloke. We are overloaded with teachers.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: The markets are still available in Japan. The trouble is that Australia cannot deliver to them.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: The Minister tells me—

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will continue.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I will do my best against the background, unused as I am to this kind of audience. I know that life was not meant to be easy but I have had it easy up to date because I have had people who have come to listen to me because they wanted to hear what I had to say.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: They were forced to under a system.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: That was a very foolish interjection, so I will ignore it.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member should ignore all interjections.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I will take your wise words to heart, Mr President. The point I am trying to make is that many of the problems we face now are not the problems members opposite claim them to be. The majority of our problems arise from the fact that inadequate planning has been carried out in the past. The Government believed that as long as capital was pulled into the country it was not necessary to ensure it was allocated properly. It was merely necessary to invest and hope for the best without any thought about the consequences, whether those consequences be to the environment or to the future economy of the country. It was a philosophy of great optimism which was quite often proved incorrect.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Your words are utter rubbish.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: In America, the home of private enterprise, there are rivers which are fire hazards because of pollution. I am quite sure that if this Government had its way—and do not remind me that the Brand Government was the first to introduce environmental legislation—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He knows that!

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: —because it did so reluctantly when pushed very hard to do so, and its legislation had no teeth. It was interesting in what it did not do.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are a great man for clichés.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Did the Tonkin Government do anything about it and put teeth into it?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: It did as a matter of fact.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: It really did?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: The honourable member should read the legislation and learn of the step forward which was made by the Tonkin Government.

I am suggesting that many of the problems which we face today are the result of poor management by this Government. It is not the good manager it claims to be. I am not blaming it for all the problems, but many of the developments in the State, particularly in regard to inflation and rising costs, are developments which the Government said it could avoid although it knew it could not.

It is all very well for members opposite to say that they have the majority. They have; no-one

denies that. However, majorities can be wrong. Therefore we must watch very carefully developments during the remainder of the term of the Government. We must keep a close eye on the Government and bring its actions to the attention of the public. In this regard I would refer briefly to a matter raised by Mr Oliver the other night. I hope the media learns to play its part instead of placing all criticisms of the Government on the inner pages of the newspaper, and statements by the Government on the front pages. I am not complaining that I was reported on page 54. I am complaining that the debate in another place was reported on page 54, despite the fact that important items were discussed during that debate.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It sounds like you are complaining about the treatment you received.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: It may sound like it to the Leader of the House, but I can assure him that this is not the case.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: He is very sincere.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I thank my colleague. With those few brief remarks I support the Bill and look forward to the day when this House no longer has the power to reject Supply Bills.

THE HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [8.41 p.m.]: I rise to support the Bill. Traditionally, of course, it deals in the main with finance, but as is the custom, debate allows licence to members to talk on many subjects if they feel so disposed, and I intend to touch on one or two items during the course of my few remarks.

First of all, I congratulate you, Mr President, on your being elected to the high office in this Chamber, and I am sure others agree with my sentiments and join me in wishing you well in your official capacity. I also extend a welcome to all members recently elected to the Chamber, and trust that their service in the Parliament will bring reward to themselves in that they will gain great satisfaction by serving their State and, in particular, the people they represent. I also congratulate all those elected to the various positions of office and wish them a rewarding time in the future.

We have just heard a speech by a newly elected member and I am sure he will contribute a great deal more in the debates which will follow. Before I continue with the main theme of my speech I wish to refer briefly to a couple of points he made.

One was in respect of markets, and world markets in particular. I suggest to members that the present Government is probably more aware

of, and alive to, marketing of all products than were many if not all the other Governments of previous years. It is endeavouring to follow a very vigorous programme but it seems that some members are disappointed to find the Government is active in this role. They would rather the Government stood back and waited until we obtained a market before we did anything about establishing an industry.

We know from experience that in order to be geared to meet a market we must start, not today, but well before today. We must be geared up years beforehand. It is no good obtaining a market for oil and then building a refinery which might take about five years to complete. By the time the refinery is ready, the order has gone to another country such as Chile or Uruguay. It is no good waiting for a market and then building a refinery. It is not as easy as that. The same principle applies to many other products. The honourable member needs to do more research in this regard.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: I think you should. The companies make decisions concerning locations of refineries, not Governments. Governments provide only encouragement.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I do not intend to indulge in individual debates with the honourable member because he is quite capable of making his own speech in his own time.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Surely in the planned economy of a democratic socialist society it is the Government which makes these worthwhile decisions.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I wish now to touch on some facts which I consider to be vital to Australia and particularly to our State. Western Australia belongs to the Commonwealth and therefore the figures I am about to quote to illustrate the point I will make later are taken in a fairly broad sense. I would like to quote the average weekly total hours paid for by industry groups; that is, private and Government institutions of employment. It is interesting to study the figures over the years in respect of hours and also in respect of earnings.

I draw a comparison between the years 1972 and 1975 in respect of hours worked and I specifically refer to adult males. The figures I am quoting have been extracted from official statistics supplied by the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: What will you prove with these figures?

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Give him time and he will tell you.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: The total average weekly hours worked in Western Australia were 42.6 in 1972 and 41.4 in 1975, a decrease of 1.2 hours in a three-year period.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: The Court Government is failing there.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: The average weekly hours worked by adult females were 38.9 in 1972, and 38.7 in 1975. The average weekly overtime for adult males on an Australia-wide basis was 3.6 hours in 1972, and 2.4 hours in 1975, a decrease of 1.2 hours.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Less work around.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: A case for a 35-hour week.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: The trend is on the way down, and to illustrate the point further I will refer back some years. On the 31st March, 1939, the average weekly hours for adult males in all industry in Australia were 44.10; on the 30th September, 1941, 43.85; on the 30th September, 1947, 43; on the 30th September, 1953, 39.96; on the 31st December, 1966, 39.96, the same as in 1953; in 1972, 38.5; and in 1975, 38.2. We have not the official figure for 1977 but the hours of work are decreasing.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: What are the productivity rates?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I will now refer to the total earnings of Government and private employees other than those in the managerial category. The total average earnings, Australia-wide, for adult males in all industries were \$57.90 in October, 1965; \$97.80 in October, 1972; and \$164.40 in October, 1975. The figures for 1977 are not yet available. Obviously total average earnings are on the increase.

So we have a decreasing number of hours worked and an increasing reward by way of wages. I do not disagree with that but I will comment on the rate in a moment. It is quite clear that fewer hours are being worked because of automation and other factors.

During a worker's working life he or she has certain time off because of sickness or injury. Workers certainly have more leisure time during which they spend more on motoring, accommodation, and other luxury items. Therefore, leisure time costs them more. The figures I am now about to quote are approximate, for the sake of expediency. In round figures, the average worker enjoys four weeks' annual leave a year, an average of two weeks' long service and sick leave combined on a *pro rata* basis, and two weeks' public holidays, making a total of eight

weeks off each year and leaving 44 working weeks. Assuming the working week averages five days, in those 44 weeks the average worker works something like 220 days, which equals 60 per cent of a full year. Therefore, the average worker right across Australia works for 60 per cent of the year and for 40 per cent of the year is in a nonworking situation, on either long service leave, sick leave, or annual leave.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Is that good or bad?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I leave that to the honourable member. I am setting out the trend in Australia.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: How many hours do you work in a year?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: That has nothing to do with the figures I am quoting, which show the average person works for three-fifths of the year and has leisure time for two-fifths of the year.

In Western Australia there are 13 statutory holidays. This year we had an additional holiday because of the visit of Her Majesty the Queen, and I am glad she came to Australia and to this State so that the people had an opportunity to express their feelings towards the regime to which they have the privilege of belonging. Nevertheless, there are 13 or 14 public holidays a year—usually 13.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: There are only 10 statutory holidays a year.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I will provide Mr Cooley with a list of the holidays, which include the public holiday for the Royal Show in the metropolitan area. The figures are approximate but the principle remains: hours are decreasing, the monetary reward is increasing, but the value of that money is obviously decreasing.

Personally, I do not wish to deny people their leisure hours. They are good if we can afford them. If we cannot afford them we must put up with the consequences. It is quite apparent to me that leisure time is expensive for everyone because people spend more on luxury goods, they have more time to think about what to buy, and so on. But the point is we as a people have a choice of perhaps working a little harder or taking the easy road and accepting the consequences and the trauma of trying to maintain our living standards in comparison with our neighbours. If we choose the latter course we must put up with the consequent high inflation. The trend illustrates the inflationary state in this country and also in other countries.

We as people are entitled to enjoy our leisure and spend the money we earn as we like, but if we

find through our indulgence in pleasure and luxury items that we have not enough money to go around we have no-one but ourselves to blame. It is up to us to make use of our resources, be they minerals or money. I therefore put it to the people of Western Australia that they have a choice and I think it behoves everyone to give a little more service and satisfaction for their own welfare and the welfare of the community at large.

I make a further observation in respect of public holidays. It is my belief that we have a few too many one-day holidays.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: Did you not work in a bank at one stage? Banks are hardly ever open.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: The honourable member displays his ignorance. The one-day holidays are more costly to the community than the four weeks' annual leave and long service leave provisions.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Did you think of asking how often milk inspectors take samples, or something equally simple?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: One could use all kinds of examples of costly exercises. One-day holidays are nice but there are too many of them and they are a burden on ourselves as a community. I would like the Government to examine the public holidays throughout the year to see whether in fact some rationale is associated with them. It is pleasant to have additional holidays from time to time but I believe they should be restricted in some way.

I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

THE HON. D. W. COOLEY (North-East Metropolitan) [8.56 p.m.]: We have before us the Supply Bill, which is of course an annual event in Parliament. If the Government in a people's House, a lower House—be it a Legislative Assembly or a House of Representatives—which had been democratically elected by a majority of the people of either the State or the nation, required money to continue the affairs of the State, members of the Labor Party would not in their wildest dreams consider blocking supply to that Government and thereby denying the will of the people.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I think Mr Whitlam gave very serious consideration to it on one occasion. Or was it Mr Murphy?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We appreciate that despite all the inadequacies of the Electoral Act in respect of malapportionment of votes and boundary rigging this Government was elected on the 19th February this year and holds a majority in the lower House. It is therefore entitled to

receive the money necessary to continue governing this State. Democracy would never be able to withstand another shock similar to the one it received on the 11th November, 1975, when through an act of conspiracy the popularly elected Government of the country—

Point of Order

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Mr President, I have an idea that oblique or straightout references, whatever they might be, to the Governor or the Governor-General of this nation are out of order.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Shame!

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I think a Standing Order covers the matter and I wonder whether you would guide the House in that direction. As I recall it, we had a discussion on this matter last year in respect of the same member.

The PRESIDENT: There is a Standing Order which precludes comments concerning the Governor, the Governor-General, or the Royal Family. I do not think the honourable member transgressed on this occasion, although he was coming close to it, and I recommend that he continue his speech without transgressing.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Thank you, Mr President. If I referred to the Governor-General—which I do not think I did—I withdraw the reference.

Debate Resumed

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I was not referring to the Governor-General in respect of that act of conspiracy. I was referring to the conservative political forces in this country who conspired together with big overseas business interests and a foreign intelligence agency to destroy a Government which was democratically elected by the people of Australia.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: At least he is writing his fourth speech.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Since we last met in this House the truth has been told about the destruction of the Whitlam Government, and that destruction was brought about by the action of conservatives in this country who would not give supply to a Government that was elected twice in the course of about 18 months. The Labor Party firmly believes in democratic government, and we could never be a party to events regarding the denial of supply to a Government, as occurred on the 11th December, 1975.

I know noises are made by members opposite with regard to this matter, but deep in the hearts of decent, thinking conservatives they know it was

the wrong thing to do and they would not want it to happen again. In fact, moves are now being made by conservatives at the Constitutional Convention to have the situation rectified so that such an event can never happen again. I say it is a blot on this nation that such a thing could occur. However, that is over now, and perhaps history will define the real reasons that a Government of the stature of the Whitlam Government was destroyed in such a manner.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: The Constitutional fathers would have turned in their graves.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The debate on the Supply Bill gives members in this Chamber, and particularly the back-benchers—

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Changing your seat has not improved you much.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Masters seems to be making more noises over there; he makes more noises there than he made when he sat on this side. I wonder whether he was given his job of Whip or whether he bought it.

Point of Order

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I take that as a reflection on the Government Whip, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT: Mr Cooley, Standing Orders suggest that you withdraw the remark.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I do not wish to embarrass you, Sir, so I withdraw. I did not say he bought the position; I merely asked whether it was given to him or whether he bought it.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: A disgraceful suggestion.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would like the Hon. D. W. Cooley to resume.

Debate Resumed

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I would like to do that, Mr President, especially in view of the unruly interjections from members opposite.

As I was saying, this Bill gives to back-benchers the opportunity to speak on matters of general application. It is a rather rare opportunity in this House because mainly we are confined to the subject matter of Bills or other questions before the Chair. I would like to take the opportunity to contribute to the debate, and I regret that two points of order have been raised so early in my speech.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You created them.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, very sincerely on your elevation to the very high position you hold in this Chamber. My association

with you over the last three years assures me that you will carry out the duties of your high office with all the dignity and decorum of your predecessors. Such a high position demands honesty, integrity, and, most of all, impartiality; and while I know you to be a true and loyal party man—and I do not disrespect you for that—I know your impartiality will be paramount, and I assure you of my unqualified support during your term of office.

I express my sympathy to you for the embarrassment you must have suffered on opening day when Mr Pike delivered his tirade in this Chamber. I know members opposite will say that I am one person who should not make such a comment; I know in the past three years I have said worse things about the Liberal Party than Mr Pike said about the Labor Party on opening day.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You would be hard put to do that.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: The honourable Mr Cooley is giving his No. 2 speech again.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There are far too many interjections going on, and I am finding it difficult to hear the honourable member.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr President, there is a time and place for everything, and I do not think opening day when we have present all the good people who have been invited to this place—and they are of all political shades—is a time when we should be subjected to that sort of speech.

Perhaps had Mr Pike made his speech yesterday, I would have enjoyed it; however, I do not think it was appropriate on that occasion. Many dignified people were present on opening day, and they must have felt considerably embarrassed.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Are you implying there are no dignified people present here today?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Perhaps it was inexperience on the part of Mr Pike which made him act that way, and if that is so we can excuse him.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You have been here for three years, and you are still showing your inexperience.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Perhaps that is so, but I am simply saying I do not think Mr Pike's speech was appropriate for that occasion. I felt sorry for the Leader of the House because it was his first day in that position and in the past he has always been at pains to correct those on this side who get out of hand. In the course of a certain

debate we were berated quite severely by the present Leader of the House, and perhaps he was right.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Mind you, you did transgress pretty horribly.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Perhaps I did, but I do hope the Leader of the House will also tell his colleague that he was on the wrong track on opening day. I hope that on the next occasion Parliament opens the member who moves the Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech in this place is chosen with a little more discretion than was the case on this occasion.

I would like to refer now to the remarks made by Mr Ferry in respect of public holidays. I think it is pretty rough suggesting that we have too many public holidays. Which public holiday would Mr Ferry cut out? Surely he would not deny us New Year's Day? Surely we are entitled to a holiday on that day. Nor, I am sure, would he be unpatriotic enough to suggest cutting out the Australia Day holiday. I am sure he would like to remove the Labour Day holiday, despite union opposition. I could see that going by the board if he had his way.

Surely as an ex-serviceman Mr Ferry would not want to do away with the Anzac Day holiday; nor would he be irreligious enough to suggest doing away with Good Friday and Easter Monday. What about Foundation Day? Would he deny us a holiday on the anniversary of the day on which our State was born? I am sure Mr Ferry is a monarchist, and that he would not wish to do away with the Sovereign's birthday holiday, because that would be a direct insult to the Queen. The only other holidays left are Christmas Day and Boxing Day. Surely the birthday of the Lord would not be regarded by Mr Ferry as a day on which we should work.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We will agree to the retention of them all.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: With the exception of Labour Day, I am sure members opposite would not really sustain a reduction in the 10 statutory public holidays which presently apply.

I turn now to the Bill before us. Since I have been in this Chamber I have looked at a number of similar Bills. I have read Budget speeches, and I have found that since 1974 there have been two predominant features. In the early stages in the years 1974 and 1975 there was always a great deal of criticism about the Whitlam Government and the way it was ruining the country and doing all sorts of things alleged by the conservatives to be bad. Then, since the destruction of the Whitlam Government the arch villains have been

the militant, left-wing unions which are making excessive demands on the community, or ruining the economy so that Budgets cannot be balanced.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: At the same time, they were full of Liberal Party voters.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: However, in the document before us no recognition at all is made of the wonderful restraint which the trade union movement—I am speaking collectively, and not of individual unions—has shown during the time that indexation has been in force.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You would agree there are some leaders who are a bit irresponsible?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am not silly enough to believe there are not extreme left-wing militants in the trade unions or extreme right-wing militants in the Confederation of Western Australian Industry or the Liberal Party; of course there are. There are some anarchists on both sides.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I have never heard you criticise them before.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am not criticising anyone, but there are some who do not show responsibility right throughout the whole sphere of industrial relations, and in my Address-in-Reply speech I will point out the person who has shown the least responsibility in respect of industrial relations is the present Minister for Labour and Industry.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: That is absolutely untrue.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: He should not be in the job.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I hope you will justify that comment when you speak in the Address-in-Reply debate.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I will, well and truly.

The point I was coming to is that no recognition is given in this document of the part played by the trade union movement in respect of the surplus contained in the Budget. It almost makes me sick to the stomach to hear Mr Tozer, Mr Ferry, the Premier, and others stand up and say what a good Government this is because it has a surplus of \$3.4 million, while 25 000 people are unemployed and walking the streets. We were told last night this surplus is to be channelled into financial institutions in the Eastern States. I do not know whether that is right or wrong, but I do not doubt the honourable member's statement. We have people walking the streets at the present time—25 000 of them—who are unemployed.

When the Tonkin Government went out of office we had a deficit of something like \$6 million with 7 000 people unemployed. Today we have a surplus of \$3.4 million, with 25 000 unemployed.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: It is a credit, not a deficit.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I say to members opposite that if a deficit of \$6 million represents the difference between an unemployment figure of 7 000 and 25 000, then give me a deficit every time and to hell with surpluses.

Getting the people back to work is where surplus money should be employed. I know the Government will say that they are acting responsibly; but if the Government told the people outside—the people who are unemployed—that a surplus is a good thing they would not be believed. Those people who are on the bread line or the dole do not believe this Government to be a good Government by any stretch of the imagination.

Members opposite should not become complacent because the Government has a majority of seats in the other Chamber. The attitude should not be that the Government is right and everybody else is all wrong; because at the present time the State is in very poor condition while 25 000 people are unemployed.

Perhaps the Government has tried hard but it has not tried hard enough, and some of the blame can be laid at the door of the administrators.

It is no wonder that the Japanese are balking at the things that are going on in this country at the present time and do not want to develop further. When we have the Premier of this State saying that the workers in the Pilbara are controlled by people in Moscow, and then going to Japan and asking the Japanese to buy our iron ore, what can we expect other than that the Japanese must reject our proposals?

The Premier is a very astute businessman but those statements are quite out of hand. He is almost saying, "Do not buy our iron ore and other resources". There is a Press statement by the Victorian Premier (Mr Hamer)—I could not put my hand to it—which states that industrial relations are not so bad and he quotes Canada, America, Great Britain, and all the other places which have got a worse track record.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Newport.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Those are the things that should be brought out. Everybody in this Chamber knows that the workers in the Pilbara are not controlled by Moscow. That is quite an outlandish statement. The Premier continually takes this line and then goes overseas

and asks the Japanese to buy our products. His action is quite irrational and I do not think he should continue in this vein.

We have a very serious problem in our State at the present time and the quicker we can all get together, put our shoulders to the wheel and try to get the economy moving, the better. It seems to me that there is something lacking in the way in which the Government is dealing with this matter.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Would you not think that the best thing would be for us to honour our overseas contracts, for a start, and if so would you support any moves in that direction?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes, I would support anything which would help our State and nation and get us on the move again.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: How can the Fraser Government keep its promises on uranium?

The Hon. G. E. Masters: It is useful to know that Mr Cooley makes those statements.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Mr Cloughton has made several speeches on this Bill. I suggest he allow Mr Cooley to make one!

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Thank you for that acknowledgment.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: There were two things that the conservatives could not stand in 1972-1975; one was that the Whitlam Government was applying more welfare money to improve the lot of underprivileged people, thus correcting the neglect in this area for 23 long years. Social security suffered a great disadvantage. That is one thing that the conservatives could not stand. They could not stand public funds being used for that purpose and taking money from private industry and applying it to this cause. The knives came out and Whitlam went out.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: What do you mean by the knives coming out?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: You know what it means—

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I do not really. I know the electorate gave Mr Fraser an overwhelming majority.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes, that is all very well. The majority is not always right.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: The majority is not always right?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: No.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I suppose you say that was a rigged election, too.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The honourable

member cannot tell me he is always right. He has been wrong on many occasions.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Why do you not prove it?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If I had the time I could prove it.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: We will give you plenty of time.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The other complaint was that investment was being restricted. I have not got the figures here to prove it, but I have read reports to the effect that \$1 500 million has been injected into the private sector since Fraser came to office in an endeavour to promote more investment and more activity in private industry. The result of this is that we have more people unemployed and a higher rate of inflation than we have ever had in the history of the country.

What has gone wrong? The lights should have been turned on but someone has forgotten to throw the switch. It is a very dark situation for a lot of people in the community at the present time. We find that all this money has been injected into the private sector and yet there is no improvement in the unemployment situation; so what has happened to that money? Is it going into the pockets of the shareholders?

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Poor old BHP! I thought you had learnt your lesson on that one.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The other day it was reported that it had made \$89 million.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: What is the capital investment in that company, do you know? You make reckless statements.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The great promises that were made in 1975 are not working. The fact is that during the era of the Whitlam Government there was a recession right throughout the world. Australia was suffering from its effects. However, that is not the situation today. Most of the western nations and democracies are picking up. They have reduced their unemployment and their inflation figures; but not so in Australia, despite all the promises that were made.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You are changing your whole tack. You said just now the recession during the Whitlam Government's term was due to world-wide considerations and not local considerations; but now you say the present recession is due to local considerations.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have been extremely tolerant but I can assure members that unless we observe some decorum in this House I

will have to take some further action. Mr Cooley may proceed.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The time has come when the Government should take stock of itself. It should get out and spend some of the money it is stashing away. When we examine last year's Budget, we find that there was some \$19 million floating around that should have been spent in the preceding year.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: We did not find that money when you were in government.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I believe that the Government should act with the greatest urgency not to interfere with, but to initiate ways and means by which it can improve industrial relations in this State.

I do not think, outside of "the banana republic" with Mr Bjelke-Petersen as its Premier, one could expect to find the same kind of industrial relations in other parts of Australia as are prevailing at the present time in this State. It is time something was done to improve industrial relations. The Government is not trying to resolve disputes or bring about ways and means of promoting better industrial relations; it is exacerbating industrial disputes to the detriment of the State. It is time it had a good look at itself.

The Government promised to put things right three years ago but it has not done so yet. It did not do so during the last three years and it has not done so during the past six months that it has been in office. The Government should face up to its responsibilities—not blame the unions—and get on with the job of putting people to work. That is the principal responsibility that the Government has—putting people to work. It should not worry too greatly about making a profit out of the people's money by way of large surpluses of funds.

THE HON. O. N. B. OLIVER (West) [9.25 p.m.]: I am surprised to be standing on my feet at this stage. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition spoke about the speech I made last night and the coverage it received in the Press. One of the points I did make was that debates should be relevant. I understand that the Address-in-Reply has been adjourned and we are debating the Supply Bill.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: That is right.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Do not reflect on the President.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: I am at a loss to understand how the Government of Western Australia was able to balance the books. In fact,

it was an incredible effort to be able to come out of the present stagnation that we are undergoing and to be able to present a balanced Budget. Budgets are a guideline or an indicator of what we wish to achieve; and this Government has actually achieved those aims.

May I just dwell briefly on what are called "deficits". Deficits are not very popular in private enterprise and I will refer to this later. But I intend to be correct. In the five years from 1969 to 1974 the total deficit was \$1 337 million. The deficit in the year 1975 was \$2 567 million. I know that the previous Federal Government, commonly called the Whitlam Government, had its own printing presses; that is, it was able to print money and it printed 140 per cent more money while the gross domestic product stood still and nothing more was produced. However, the present Government has been able in its term to maintain some sort of stability.

There has been talk about employment or unemployment. I would like to quote a few figures here and I do this purely to set the record straight. I have been sitting here tonight listening to statements, and the figures I shall quote are from the statistics compiled by the Bureau of Statistics. I quote now the unemployment figure that we have heard so much about this evening. Rather than deal with the Federal Government, let us examine a State that is under a Labor Government. Let us look at New South Wales and let us be relevant.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: We still have 25 000 people unemployed.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: It is most interesting to note the figures, and they are for the year ended the 30th June, 1977. In New South Wales the figure of unemployed was 6.15 per cent; and in Western Australia it was 4.75 per cent. In the year ended the 30th June, 1976, the New South Wales figure was 4.89 per cent and in Western Australia it was 3.95 per cent.

One of the most incredible things is that, whilst Western Australia under a Liberal-National Country Party Government has a lower unemployment rate than a State with a Labor Government, the work force in Western Australia increased in the following year. In the year ended the 30th June, 1975, it had increased. In the year 1974 it was 243 000 and in 1975 it rose to 247 900.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: In what industries?

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: All civilian employment.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: It was the mining

industry which helped our employment figures then.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: I am not referring to the honourable member's speech, but to the number of people in the civilian work force during this period. The Australian figures of those employed in the work force decreased. I do not intend to quote figures because under the Tonkin Government the number of people employed in this State decreased during those years and the figures are available to prove it. The figures under this Government have increased in Western Australia.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: But the population has increased overall in Western Australia.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: That is an interesting point. In actual fact Western Australia is such a good place in which to live that we also have an influx of population. People are flocking here from other States.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Because there is employment here.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: It happened during the Brand Government's regime and the situation was reversed during the Tonkin Government's regime.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: These are the figures. They are available for people to read and they are official.

Profits have been mentioned a great deal and I have been absolutely astounded at what has been said. It is as though it were a dirty word. For example, if anyone has an enterprise which makes a profit some people think that is scandalous.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Who in the Chamber has said that "profits" is a dirty word except you?

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: The honourable member can examine the comments tomorrow.

In 1975-1976 company profits netted the Federal Government \$2 500 million. I hope the Hon. Grace Vaughan will note that that exceeded the Government expenditure on education and housing.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Why should I note that?

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: This does not include pay-roll tax, council rates and taxes, and sales tax.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Are you trying to say that businesses should not pay taxes?

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: I am quite surprised that the Hon. Lyla Elliott stated that certain figures had risen in Western Australia in comparison with the national average, when in

actual fact I would say that from memory the figures she quoted were 65 as against 58.

The national CPI for housing for the three years was 202.1 while in Western Australia it was 202.4. I would like to quote from the *Building Industry Quarterly* for December, 1976 which, at page 26, states—

There was a slowing down in the rate of building cost increases. The Wholesale Price Index of Materials Used in House Building rose by 1.9 per cent compared to increases of 2.9 per cent and 5.3 per cent in the two preceding quarters.

I just wish to correct the statistics which have been placed before us.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: You do not contradict my figures on building materials. They are still higher in this State than the national figure.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: I would like to conclude by dealing with the unemployment situation. The following quote is by a gentleman called Samuel Gomper who founded the American trade union movement—

The worst crime against working people is a company which fails to operate at a profit. Companies without profits mean workers without jobs.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: No-one would argue with that.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Very profound.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You people do all the time.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: Another quotation is from a speech by Clyde Cameron, a previous Minister for Labour who fell into an unpopular situation. He said—

The economy could not pull out of its downturn unless company profits were increased.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: That is right.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: I cannot recall the exact figures, but it was stated that if unemployment reached beyond 100 000 the Government should resign. Unfortunately, it still remained and refused to resign even when the unemployment figure reached 180 000-odd.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: And Mr Fraser said that if it reached a certain figure, the unemployed should receive the minimum wage. It is well past that figure, so why not give them the minimum wage?

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: There has been a great deal of talk and I was rather pleased that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred to

the speech I made last night as being relevant. That is what I wish to be.

In conclusion I say that this Government should be congratulated on its performance because we had endured before it in the previous period a record which indicated the most disgraceful handling of public finance this country has ever experienced.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: We agree. Mr Fraser has done a very bad job.

THE HON. I. G. PRATT (Lower West) [9.37 p.m.]: I do have certain congratulations to offer but I will leave them until I speak in the Address-in-Reply debate.

On this occasion I rise to speak for two reasons. The first is to share a thought with the House. I am sure most members would agree that we would be lost without Mr Cooley's speeches. We have become so used to them. However, a couple of light points were introduced tonight and for those we should give out thanks to Mr Ferry who referred to public holidays which was certainly a change, and also reference was made to Queensland bananas.

In one way I do agree with Mr Cooley. I think we should examine very closely allegations which are made concerning collusion and this type of activity. This was mentioned in reference to the Whitlam Government's disposal—I will use that word because when the choice was given to the people of Australia they decided they wanted to dispose of the Government and they did so in no uncertain manner.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: The people of Australia did not do that.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: Unfortunately the honourable member does not bother to listen. I said that when the chance was given to the people of Australia they disposed of the Whitlam Government.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: No they did not. The Fraser Government was in office then. Don't forget that.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: For a gentleman who talks about numbers, he does not seem to understand what happened in that election.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: A minority Fraser Government was in office.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: There are none so blind as those who do not wish to see. If Mr Cooley wants to keep his eyes closed, far be it from me to attempt to open them for him. I wish to remind Mr Cooley that some members of the then Whitlam Government are at present under scrutiny in regard to a matter of conspiracy; and

if anyone has an allegation to make regarding conspiracy, is this not the way to ascertain whether there is any substance in it?

Point of Order

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: On a point of order, I am not sure what the ruling would be on *sub judice* in the situation regarding what the honourable member is saying considering there is a case in progress in another State.

The PRESIDENT: There is no point of order. The honourable member will resume his speech.

Debate Resumed

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I was making the point that if one has allegations of this nature to make, they should be made in the proper manner so that an opportunity is given to one to substantiate the allegations. In that way people can bring forward their proof and do something about the matter instead of merely talking about it without producing any shadow of proof or substance to back them up.

This is the kind of behaviour in which Mr Cooley indulges. We have the example of a gentleman in the Eastern States doing just this in regard to senior members of what was the Whitlam Government.

Mention has been made tonight of unemployment and we are all concerned about this matter. There is no doubt that every person in Australia is concerned about it.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: We see you weeping crocodile tears. Would you like my handkerchief?

The PRESIDENT: Order! Would the honourable member continue his speech?

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: We are discussing the Supply Bill and we are concerned about unemployment and inflation. I believe that the second reading speech on the Bill is a document which will give hope to the Western Australian people because it reinforces the message we put across to them and which was accepted by them earlier this year. We indicated we had a responsible Government which was undertaking good housekeeping. I am sure the members on this side and I hope the members on the other side understand our system of government which comprises local government, State Government, and Federal Government. Local government cannot run on a deficit. A State Government should run a balanced Budget. A Federal Government, which controls the finance of the Commonwealth, has an opportunity to run on a deficit.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You are not clear on how local government operates.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: When we are debating the function of local government I will be only too delighted to demonstrate to Mr Claughton that I know as much about the running of local government as he does.

We do not want a bankrupt State because there is no hope for unemployed people under such conditions. During the election campaign earlier this year I talked to unemployed people, and not for a moment would I suggest that all of them would vote against the Government merely because they were unemployed. In actual fact many of them saw in the Government a hope for the future. They realised that under the Government they would get an opportunity to gain employment again. They had faith in the Government because it did its job and kept the books straight and kept the State running in a businesslike manner.

The second reading speech of the Minister on the Bill is a document I would be proud to take around my electorate and I will do so at every opportunity I have so that the people can be satisfied that they elected a Government which will keep good housekeeping and run the State on a balanced Budget so that the unemployed will have an opportunity of employment in the future.

THE HON. A. A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [9.45 p.m.]: I did not intend to enter this debate.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You have our permission to sit down again, Mr Lewis.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I was beginning to wonder for a few moments, who was exercising the function in this House, while looking at the Opposition Whip.

I believe Mr Pratt has put his finger on the positive matters with regard to this Supply Bill. It seems to me that members of the Opposition are either very naive or very new, and as I look around the Chamber I can see that some of them are extremely new and their memories are extremely short. It seems they want to go back and drag out matters which they want to talk about.

Let us talk about some of the things which have occurred in the past. In 1971, when the Brand Government went out of office, it left \$6 million to \$7 million in the coffers, and yet Mr Cooley talked about the Tonkin Government's \$6 million deficit. It was not a \$6 million deficit; it was a \$13 million deficit in three years.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: That is not true.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Tonkin Government used the money which was left in the coffers by the Brand Government.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Abused the money.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Tonkin Government abused the money which was left in the coffers by the conservative Brand Government. I am proud to say I supported that Government, and I support this Government because of its good management. It can be imagined how easily another \$13 million could have gone down the drain had we had the misfortune in this State of having the Tonkin Government re-elected. Things were bad enough while the Whitlam Government was in power.

I suggest to members opposite that when they get up to talk they should look at the facts, and look at what is actually happening in this State. I know it hurts Mr Claughton because he knows what I am saying is true. He was a member of the Tonkin Government.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: An excellent Government, too.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It was amazing that despite the fact that Mr Claughton was keen on the theatre and cultural affairs, he was not able to influence the Tonkin Government to purchase Her Majesty's Theatre. This Government was able to purchase it. We have heard Mr Claughton speaking about pre-school levies, and their abolishment, but the Tonkin Government was not able to do that. The Tonkin Government went through an extremely prosperous time in this State. There were no droughts to the extent that we have had during the last 12 to 18 months. The Tonkin Government had a legacy from the Brand Government, and it was one of the greatest legacies of this State to have the progress which occurred during the time of Sir David Brand. The progress has been unequalled and this State went ahead further during that time than it had under any other Government in a 12-year period. We will see the same sort of progress in the future. We already see progress in the figures which are available, and they cannot be denied.

The Opposition has the absolute gall to talk about members from this side not thinking about people. Our assistance to education has been better than any assistance given by the Labor Party.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: That was done with Whitlam Government money.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Miss Lyla Elliott does not know anything about financing.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: What about the Schools Commission funds?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: They were like the cream on the top of a jug of milk. At the maximum the Schools Commission funds were 10 per cent, and if the Opposition would like to debate that fact I would welcome the opportunity because I am sure I know more about the subject than do members opposite. The Hon. Grace Vaughan does not know anything. She has never been able to speak on this subject since she has been in this House.

It is fascinating to hear the remarks of ignorant people who are not prepared to look at the facts. The Hon. Don Cooley cannot talk about facts, because he has never looked at facts in his life. The Court Government has created employment, and I challenge the Opposition to deny that fact.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: What about during the last three years?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: To say that employment has not increased in this State since the Court Government came to power, at a quicker rate than it increased previously, is so much rot.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: That is irrelevant; what about the unemployment figures?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Again we see the dead hand of socialism in its full force. This State is drawing people from my home State and from the home State of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Those people want jobs, and they come here in crowds; but there is then the problem of unemployment.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Quote me some figures.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I do not need to quote figures; we know that what I have said is true.

All members in this House are aware that labour transports itself from South Australia to Western Australia and back again, wherever the jobs are available. That is why unemployment increased in Western Australia.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: You cannot give any figures.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Miss Lyla Elliott does not know anything about tradesmen.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: My father is a tradesman, so I do know about them.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The honourable member knows about one of them; I am talking about the plural.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: What do you know about them?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I have had the

privilege of employing many of them, and I am very grateful for the fact that they all vote Liberal because they work for me. The people in the Pilbara all vote for Mr Brian Sodeman because they know from where their opportunities will come. Those opportunities will come from strong government, like the Court Government.

I do not intend to speak any longer. We have a negative attitude from the Opposition. I have taken this opportunity to set the record straight with regard to the money wasted by the Tonkin Government. The Court Government has started to build up this State again. I support the Bill.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [9.52 p.m.]: I intend to be very brief, but I rise because I was rather intrigued by some of the figures quoted tonight with regard to percentages. I do not think Miss Lyla Elliott quoted the source of her figures when she quoted from a piece of paper.

Miss Elliott referred to a 270 per cent increase in meat inspection fee charges, and that is completely erroneous.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: What is the figure?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: When I took office as Minister in 1974 the basis of meat inspection charges was 1c per kilo right across the board, including cattle, sheep, pigs, goats, and even donkeys. The cost per beast, for cattle, at an average of 200 kilos at 1c per kilo was \$2 per head. The charges had to be reassessed because of a challenge issued as to the constitutional situation regarding the charge per kilo for meat inspection. An interim charge had to be introduced for a period, which did not cover anywhere near the cost of meat inspection. The interim charge applied until December, 1974, when a new set of charges were introduced in order to cover the actual cost of meat inspections carried out by local authorities and metropolitan abattoirs.

There were three zones in the new system. In Zone A the charge was \$1 per head, a noticeable difference from \$2. In Zone B the charge was \$1.25, and in Zone C the charge was \$1.50—quite a difference between those charges and the charge of \$2. So there was no increase in the meat inspection charge for cattle.

A different situation applied to sheep and lambs. There was an increase in charges, but nowhere near 270 per cent. The actual charge was 1c per kilo for mutton, and on an average of 20 kilos of dressed carcase, that would work out at 20c per head. That charge compares with 38c, now charged, but it is nowhere near an increase of 270 per cent.

For lamb the charge was 14c at an average of 14 kilos, as against the new charge of 38c. Pigs remained pretty well even at 40c. So, it is not possible for those figures to show an increase of 270 per cent.

I do not know where the honourable member got her figures. I believe she must have looked at a total figure without taking into consideration the number of stock involved. For that reason her figures are suspect.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: The figures are correct.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: They cannot be correct because I have stated the facts. I would have to challenge those figures, and if those figures are wrong, there is no guarantee the rest of the figures she quotes are not also wrong.

I support the Bill.

THE HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [9.57 p.m.]: Whilst the record is being put straight there is one matter which should be ventilated at this stage and certainly put back into the picture. Many people seem to be taking a lot of credit for the purchase of Her Majesty's Theatre.

I know a little of the history of the theatre and it seems to have been forgotten by many people. Soon after the war the theatre was to be sold, and demolished. At that stage the grain industry purchased it—a one-third share by Co-operative Bulk Handling and a two-thirds share by the Grain Pool.

Building materials for country storages were not available at the time, so it was decided to invest in the building, at a time when it looked as though it would have to be pulled down. However, the grain industry decided the purchase of the theatre would be a good investment, and it was hoped that some preservation would take place and increase the value of the property in order to pay for the investment which was made.

A board of trustees was set up, known as Westralian Wheat Buildings Ltd. I believe the purchase price was \$200 000, and we ran the theatre for many years from 1951 to 1968. It was running at 7 per cent return in the very early stages.

When country buildings became necessary it was decided by the grain industry that the money was needed to construct grain storage facilities. We asked \$500 000 for the building.

It would be most interesting to look at the files in the possession of the Government and the files that have been in the possession of successive Governments. It was some time before we could convince anyone of the value of the celebrated building. In fact, the building was sold to Michael

Edgley after long negotiation. We did not show any profit except for the initial 7 per cent per annum. In the last years we spent quite a percentage of it on renewing and renovating.

However, no Government wanted it; no people were interested enough to whip up enthusiasm to obtain what we thought was a fair monument to Western Australia and, consequently, it was sold to Michael Edgley who in turn has sold it to the Government.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He sold it to Sir Norman Ridge.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Yes, and then to the Government. It is interesting to note that this same principle applies in many matters. It pays now and again to look at these matters. While we rejoice that the building is now in Government hands, that it will be restored as part of the national heritage, as indeed it should be, it is a pity that the wise thinking that has now been given to the acquisition of such a building did not take place in earlier years when it was offered at a considerably lower price for the same activity for which it is being preserved at the present time.

I could go on to speak about many other things. We could put forward arguments about what the Government is doing in regard to expenditure and whether the balancing of the Budget is correct in the light of the number of shire councils which are increasing their rates and taxes. Because it is around local government budget time, every week we hear of another council which has increased its rates.

We could say that everything is lovely because we have balanced the Budget. However, I am from the country and I am responsible also for the activities of many of my constituents as well as their welfare and I say that things are not rosy in the country at the present time. The outback does not look good, particularly in the areas I represent. In the last three or four years these people have had to face expenses which have been almost impossible to bear, and this is especially so in the grain industry with the additional costs involved with Kwinana.

People in my electorate are facing the increased burden of rail freights. We are paying an extra 17½ per cent both ways—down to the city with our produce and back with our groceries and everything else. It is not a happy situation to be in. We are paying more and receiving less.

Three years ago we were receiving \$150 a tonne for our wheat but with the last sale to China we will possibly gross something in the vicinity of \$85 a tonne. Certainly it is good that we have got rid of 3 million tonnes of wheat, but when we

commence to get rid of our produce at any price, things are not rosy.

I like to see a balanced Budget, but I do not think any of us should throw accolades around the place about this being a wonderful Budget. It is a Budget that this Government has been able to balance in hard times, but I certainly do not think that there will be much joy out of the proposals which apparently are to be introduced by the Federal Government. I believe the Federal Budget will be a tough one which, as well as other increased charges in the future, we will have to face.

I am a member of the Government; I support the Supply Bill, but at the same time I do not intend to jump up and down with glee about it.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Leader of the House) [10.04 p.m.]: I thank members for their co-operation in supporting the measure as they have done. I suppose one might expect that I would simply say that and sit down. However, on this occasion I do not intend to do so because I would like to comment on a few matters.

Firstly, Mr President, may I take the opportunity to congratulate you on your preferment to your present position. I look forward to working in the Chamber under your control. I am quite sure it will be a fair and rigid control. I am sure also that you will grace your position and people will remember you for the term you will serve in it. We will miss you on the floor of the house but, nevertheless, as one responsible for getting some of the measures through, I am not sure that I am not a little happy that you are where you are. However, congratulations to you, Sir.

May I congratulate also those new members who have won their seats and who have taken their places here. I hope that they will find their terms here as interesting and as rewarding in terms of satisfaction to themselves as I have found. To those who have secured positions of all sorts, I also offer my congratulations.

I was a little alarmed that a number of members have seen fit to comment on the speech delivered to this House on opening day by the Hon. R. G. Pike. I have read the speech again, and I notice that he was critical of both the Liberal and Labor Governments in regard to a particular attitude. Under all the circumstances I wonder why such pointed references were made to his speech.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Who referred to it?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: He was very critical of Mr Gorton.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: But who was it that referred to his speech?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Let me proceed with my speech. I wondered why it was that Mr Dans, Mr Hetherington, and Mr Cooley mentioned the honourable member's speech. Of course I know now because the comment was used as a spin-off for the speech which Mr Hetherington made, and it would seem to me that he was probably told by Mr Dans of the custom of this House and he was not prepared to accept it. I am only guessing on this matter, of course. However, the point is that any errors of commission or omission which Mr Pike may have made were blown up in order to excuse an infinitely worse exhibition, under any circumstances, put on by Mr Hetherington.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: That is not true.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It is true; it is the strictly factual truth. The honourable member should read the speech. We listened to Mr Hetherington in great silence.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: His speech was not made on opening day.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I would not have said this had there not been the repeated criticism of Mr Pike's speech. I am not saying I enjoyed Mr Pike's speech; had I written it—

Point of Order

The Hon. Lyla ELLIOTT: On a point of order, Mr President, I thought the Minister was replying to the debate on the Supply Bill and not the Address-in-Reply.

The PRESIDENT: There is no point of order.

Debate Resumed

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The comments were made by at least two members during the debate on the Supply Bill, and I am replying to it. Moneys from the Supply Bill pay the *Hansard* staff which records the speeches, so I am quite entitled to discuss it.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: That is a pretty tenuous connection.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Tenuous it may be but I am quite sure that you, Mr President, would have pulled me up had I transgressed in any way. In fact, I am not transgressing either morally or factually. The honourable member should read the speeches and judge for herself.

Enough of that, Mr President. Let me deal with some of the matters that I believe ought to be discussed.

Statistics have been thrown around this

Chamber with gay abandon, but statistics must be dealt with with great care. The Hon. N. E. Baxter demolished with one blow the statistics that have been given.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: That is untrue.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It is not untrue. Mr Baxter knew the situation. He was responsible for meat inspection in this State; he employed the people who carried out the inspections and he paid the bills. In short, Mr Baxter knows what he is talking about. He gave us the figures accurately.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: You are not in a position to challenge any of my figures because you do not know.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: But Mr Baxter does, and I rely implicitly on Mr Baxter.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: I will reply to that later.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Let me give an example of an incorrect use of statistics. Mr Cooley said that a great many days were lost through strikes in Canada. I have not written down the exact words Mr Cooley used, but I am quoting the general tenor of his remarks. He said that in some circumstances the position in Canada in regard to strikes was worse than it was in Australia, and certainly Australia has nothing to be ashamed of when the Canadian figures are looked at. About a month ago I spoke to a Canadian mining man who now operates one of the biggest companies for employing mining labour in any State of Australia. We were speaking of statistics and the difference between the Canadian scene and the scene here, and this man gave an explanation.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Would you like a blackboard?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I would dearly love one.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You couldn't understand if he had three!

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I will endeavour to keep my words simple and concise so that honourable members will understand me. This gentleman said that he was bitterly disappointed with his experience here. In a number of parts of Canada it is commonplace to have one union only involved in an industry, and this is commonplace also in other parts of the world. As members are aware, about once every two years, when a contract is up for renewal, it is common for the union involved to strike in order to secure a better contract. We all know about that. However, he told me that where a strike lasted five days, for an industry employing 4 500

people the Canadian statistics would show a loss of 22 500 work-days.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Very good!

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Thank you.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: We nearly needed that blackboard!

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The statistics would show that 22 500 work-days were lost through a five-day strike. This Canadian said that the situation here was that an organisation in which 4 500 people were employed could be broken up something like this: 3 000 men would be work-face miners; 1 000 men would be maintenance workers and I suppose members of the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union; 300 men would probably be carpenters, cooks, and bottlers; and 130 men would be members of the Federated Engine Drivers and Firemen's Union.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: He would be all in favour of the amalgamation of unions.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Not necessarily. If the members of the Federated Engine Drivers and Firemen's Association were to strike for five days, that would be shown as 650 working days lost even though no other work took place during this time. That is the way our statistics work in regard to strikes. With identical situations, Australia would show 650 man-days lost through strikes and Canada would show 22 500 man days lost. The effective production of both industries would be exactly the same; in other words, not one shovelful of iron ore would have been moved in either situation.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Your party opposes amalgamation; that is the whole problem.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: This is the old TLC technique. I can remember when I started to argue politics with Bill Latter in Collie—Bill Latter was an open and avowed member of the Communist Party in those days. He would use the technique of changing the subject. I am not talking about the amalgamation of unions; that was the thought furthest from my mind. I am talking about statistics, as everyone in this House well and faithfully knows.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You were talking about Bill Latter.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Mr Cooley is trying this sharp little argument switch.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You know you were wrong.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: One can only discuss statistics when one knows the way in which they were collected and the basis on which

they were compiled. So often this argument has been held in this place. I remember when Mr Dolan sat on the other side of the House and I sat here when the same arguments were put forward. Many statistics have been given tonight. Mr Baxter dealt with some of these, and I think to everyone's satisfaction he showed that Miss Elliott's statistics were not acceptable.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: You are carefully avoiding inflation and unemployment. Why don't you deal with them? You cannot.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am endeavouring to show that what Mr Cooley said was unacceptable.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: You cannot give an adequate answer to the figures I have presented. That is why you are not answering.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am prepared to listen to Miss Elliott, if Mr Claughton will only give her a chance.

The PRESIDENT: I am prepared to listen only to the Leader of the House, not to interjections from Mr Claughton or Miss Elliott.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: To continue, I believe I have covered what Mr Cooley put forward.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: You cannot deny the figures I have given you.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am sorry; the President will not allow me to answer.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I wish to hear the Leader of the House.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: You have nothing to say.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Mr Cooley also inferred that this House was not allowed to discuss many matters, apart from the Supply Bill. I advise Mr Cooley that over the last few years the Standing Orders of this place have been amended. May I draw his attention to Standing Order 151, where a new paragraph (c) has been added. It states—

In the case of the annual Estimates of Expenditure for the Consolidated Revenue Fund that it be taken note of by the Council.

That means they are put on the Table of the Legislative Council, and debate ensues. There is very little, except for complaints in the Legislative Assembly, that is not debated in this Chamber, and Mr Cooley should be made aware of that.

In reply to a query by the Hon. J. C. Tozer, all these speeches are drawn to the attention of the relevant departments, and are handled by them.

I must admit I see no reason that I should enter

into the theories of economic management and the like which have been enunciated by various members of the Opposition. When Mr Hetherington, Miss Vaughan, Miss Elliott, and Mr Cloughton were speaking I made notes on my pad as follows, "More theory, more theory". However, all relevant matters will be referred to the appropriate departments for their attention. I really do not see much point in bringing to the attention of the Under-Treasurer their comments on financial matters.

Mr Hetherington referred to the way we proceed with development simply for development's sake, without any concern or consideration for the environment. One tends to get a little sick of these constant inferences by cliché that the Government shows a lack of concern for these problems. In the United States of America there are rivers which are almost fire hazards, and it is inferred that the same situation applies in Western Australia. This is utter rubbish.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: It does not apply yet, but it will, given time.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It will not. Mr Hetherington is not a foolish man. Perhaps one can say he is misled; anyone who believes in the socialist myth by definition is misled. However, he is not a foolish man; he knows it is totally impossible for such a situation to develop here. Australia was settled 150 years later than the United States of America; we do not have the problems relating to oil as has the United States; we do not use our rivers as open sewers, as they used the Hudson and other rivers in the United States. Only some 300 years ago, this was not regarded as being a bad practice; it just happened. The river was a natural drain, and people simply poured their mess into it. This practice caught up with the United States. It is a very rich and open-hearted country which accepted a tremendous number of migrants. I have said repeatedly that people whom I term the "do-gooders" of this world—

The Hon. R. Hetherington: You were talking about clichés. You are fairly good at them yourself, are you not?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I must resort to clichés to make myself understood by members opposite.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You have obviously made yourself understood by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I have a feeling that if one examines the situation one will find that many of the organisations concerned

with environmental protection have sprung up in the wake of initiatives made by industry itself, by what thoughtful people have made to happen and by what Governments have done. They have not so much forced companies and Governments into restrictive measures; rather, they have seen the need after it was pointed out to them.

I can remember years ago watching a television programme by a Professor Cowan from Canada, whom I met once in Western Australia some 12 years ago. He was engaged by a paper manufacturing firm on the west coast of Canada to study its entire operation and establish environmental management controls. This is not the bogey that people imagine it to be. The suggestion by Mr Hetherington that all these firms have had to be stood over to make them take any action in regard to environmental protection simply is not true. For the information of Mr Cooley, the first undergrounding of electricity lines in this country was carried out by BHP.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I have more interest in the brewery than in BHP.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I thought that because Mr Cooley was so interested in BHP, he would appreciate that fact.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You have more interest in the brewery than in BHP.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I understand that Mr Cooley's chief interest is with the brewery; he was secretary of that organisation, was he not?

In conclusion, Mr President, I should like to quote some interesting remarks which have some bearing on the comments which have been made tonight. The quote is as follows—

There is an overwhelming recognition by nearly everybody, including trade unionists and especially their wives, that 20 per cent wage increases are of no lasting benefit if they are followed by 20 per cent price increases. Everywhere I go I find widespread acceptance of the view that we must not go back to the madness of two or three years ago . . . The real issue for this country during the next 12 months is whether our democratic structures will enable long-term commonsense to triumph over short-term expediency . . .

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: From what are you quoting?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am quoting from a speech made by the British Prime Minister (Mr James Callaghan) when opening a one-day

debate in the House of Commons on the 20th July. I believe it to be an interesting comment which brings the whole matter of prices and wages into sharp relief in a most understandable way.

I thank members for their acceptance of this excellent Supply Bill. Long may we be able to bring down a balanced Budget, because I believe in good housekeeping.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: No matter how many people are unemployed?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: In the long run—and the long run is not all that long—it leads to a better standard of living for everyone in the country. I support 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.

House adjourned at 10.27 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

AUSTRALIAN RESOURCES

Foreign Policy

13. The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Federal Affairs:

- (1) Does the Premier agree that the report in *The West Australian* on Thursday, the 17th March, 1977, which stated that he welcomed the comprehensive foreign policy statement by the Foreign Affairs Minister, Mr Peacock, and that it recognised the importance of Australian resources as a significant part of its foreign policy accurately described his views?
- (2) If not, to what extent, if any, were his views misrepresented?
- (3) In what significant way does he believe that the resources policy of the Fraser Government differs from that of the previous Whitlam Government?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Not applicable.

- (3) The Premier's understanding of the Fraser Government's policy is that it relates resources to their proper role in foreign policy and not on a straight-out "resources diplomacy" basis as was the direction in which the Whitlam Government was committed—hence, the Premier's reservation in his comments.

WATER SUPPLIES

Kwinana

14. The Hon. R. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) How many of the industries in the Kwinana region use water supplied by the Metropolitan Water Board?
- (2) What is the amount used daily by each of these companies?
- (3) Which companies re-cycle water and in what quantities?
- (4) (a) What amount of scheme water is used by the Kwinana Power House and South Fremantle Power House daily;

(b) is any of this water re-cycled?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) Major industries—5.
- (2) Average daily consumption July, 1976—June, 1977:

ALCOA	2 202.74 kl
Aust. Iron and Steel	1 797.03 kl
C.S.B.P.	601.35 kl
Kwinana Nitrogen	1.44 kl
BP Refinery	7 921.84 kl

- (3) Not known.
- (4) (a) Average daily consumption July, 1976 June, 1977:

Kwinana Power House	713.74 kl
South Fremantle Power House	712.98 kl

- (b) Yes, the greatest part of this consumption is for make up to the boiler feed system which re-cycles continuously.

ROADS

Allocation of Funds

15. The Hon. H. W. GAYFER, to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Works:

- (1) Into what categories and individual amounts does the Main Roads Department intend to break up the \$43.650 million allocated this year from State funds for road works in Western Australia?
- (2) What were the comparative figures of the allocated total expenditure of \$42.116 million last financial year?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

	1976-77	1977-78
	\$	\$
(1) and (2) National Highways.....	1 482 000	416 000
National Commerce.....	—	1 118 000
Rural Arterial.....	13 270 000	14 313 000
Rural Local.....	5 306 000	3 334 000
Urban Arterial and Local Roads.....	4 458 000	7 948 000
Unclassified including Tourist and Forest Roads.....	646 000	633 000
Traffic Services.....	<u>2 879 000</u>	<u>3 470 000</u>
	28 041 000	31 232 000
Engineering Charges, Planning & Research, Administration, Housing and Depots, Loans Repayment, National Safety Council, etc.....	<u>14 075 000</u>	<u>12 418 000</u>
	<u>42 116 000</u>	<u>43 650 000</u>

URANIUM

Yeelirrie Deposits

16. The Hon. F. E. McKenzie for the Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

- (1) Is the report in yesterday's *Daily News* That "the Western Australian Government has been given a secret clearance to push ahead with the development of the \$200 million Yeelirrie uranium project", correct?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) on what date was the decision communicated to the State Government; and
 - (b) what conditions, if any, are to be imposed?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).

URANIUM

Radioactive Wastes

17. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

- (1) Is the Premier satisfied that adequate safety measures in regard to radioactive wastes from nuclear reactors are at present possible and are being carried into effect in countries which would import Australian uranium?
- (2) Will he oppose the sale of Australian uranium to countries using fast breeder reactors?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No, provided international and Australian safeguards are met.

MOTOR VEHICLES

Licence Fees

18. The Hon. H. W. GAYFER, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Following the announced increase of 30 per cent in motor vehicle licensing, and the \$5 to \$7 increase in drivers' licence fees, what extra amount in both cases is expected to be realised this financial year?
- (2) What were the amounts in both categories of the above collected in the last financial year?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) The estimated increase in funds available for expenditure on roads from motor vehicle licence fees is \$7.45 million and drivers' licence fees \$0.45 million.
- (2) Motor vehicle licence fees—\$31 388 085.
Drivers' licence fees—\$3 195 634 (half of which only is available for expenditure on roads).

AMERICA'S CUP

Government Grant

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

With reference to a news report in *The West Australian* dated the 23rd June, 1977, regarding the payment of \$50 000 from Government funds to the Bond Syndicate to assist with the America's Cup Challenge—

- (a) was the Minister correctly reported when he said the grant was a very small sum and the payment of it was a gamble; and

- (b) if so, could the Minister inform the House of any other occasions when his Government has gambled with public funds?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (a) As reported I said that as a business proposition the amount represented a very small sum compared with the immense potential benefits, and I used the word "gamble" as a figure of speech to illustrate the Government's awareness of the difficult task ahead of the Western Australian challenger.
- (b) I am not aware of any previous instance where the Government has entered into a business proposition of this nature.

RAILWAYS

Mullewa-Meekatharra Line: Expenditure

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

For each of the financial years—

- (a) 1975/1976; and
(b) 1976/1977;

what amounts were spent on maintenance work on the Mullewa-Meekatharra railway line?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (a) 1975-76—\$523 861.
(b) 1976-77—\$277 208.

PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN

Health Disorders

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

- (1) (a) Is it a fact that there are two or three hundred children with various disorders at present cared for, on the advice of health centres, by pre-school centres under the advice of the Pre-School Board; and
(b) if this is a fact, is the Education Department to become responsible for the care of these children?
- (2) When the functions of the Pre-School Board are taken over by the Education Department—
- (a) will pre-school teachers with security of tenure under the Board, retain security of tenure when they transfer to the Education Department; and

- (b) will pre-school teachers who transfer to the Education Department continue to teach pre-school children or will they be regarded as primary school staff?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) (a) Yes.
(b) The Education Department will ensure the continued care of these children.
- (2) (a) Yes.
(b) At pre-school centres which transfer to become pre-primary centres, transferring teachers will continue to teach pre-primary children, but will be regarded as part of the parent primary school staff.

SOUTH EAST ASIAN COMMON MARKET

Effect on WA Exports

22. The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

- (1) Is the Premier aware of the formation of a South East Asian Common Market?
(2) Has the Government investigated any effect the formation of this market would have on Western Australian exports to the region?
(3) What steps has the Government taken to safeguard the State's interests in this region?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) The Government is aware of the recent deliberations by the ASEAN group of countries. The implications for Western Australia are under constant and close monitoring.
- (2) In so far as the recent ASEAN summit was only the second to be held since the organisation was formed 10 years ago, the group is in the process of formulating the direction of its approach toward trade and other matters.

Governmental investigation on the impact of policies will proceed when these have been formulated.

In 1975-76 Western Australia's exports to the ASEAN countries were \$99.1 million and imports from the group amounted to \$41.4 million leaving a favourable trade balance of \$57.7 million to Western Australia.

- (3) Government to Government discussions were recently held by the Hon. Premier during his recent visit to Singapore and by the Hon. Minister for Industrial Development during his June 1977 visit to Indonesia and other South-East Asian countries. Additionally, the Government has actively encouraged and assisted the efforts of local exporters in the market place.

EDUCATION

Programme for Unemployed Youth

23. The Hon. F. E. McKenzie for the Hon. LYLIA ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Education:

With reference to the programme just introduced at Technical Colleges known as the Education Programme for Unemployed Youth—

- (1) Is it a fact—

- (a) that although an amount equal to unemployment benefit will be paid to the participants they will be penalised by losing one week's payment when transferring from unemployment benefit to the programme;
- (b) that although these young people will be undergoing full-time education for three months they have been refused the usual student concession for travelling?
- (2) If the answers to (1) (a) and (b) are "Yes" will the Minister make representations to the Federal Government and to the State Minister for Transport, or take such other steps as may be necessary, to ensure these anomalies are eliminated?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) (a) This is a matter for the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations, which is responsible for the provision of allowances for youths enrolled in this scheme.
- (b) The student concession is available only to full-time students attending the colleges.
- (2) Not applicable.

ROADS

Road Maintenance Tax

24. The Hon. H. W. GAYFER, to the Minister for Transport:

With regard to road maintenance tax collected—

- (a) what proportion goes to country shires;
- (b) how much road maintenance tax has been collected in each of the last three financial years; and
- (c) what is expected to be realised from road maintenance tax this financial year?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (a) Country Shires will receive in 1977/78 a general maintenance grant of \$1.10 million for unclassified roads and \$1.95 million has been allocated to assist with the maintenance of secondary roads. These allocations are derived from State funds, both road maintenance and traffic fees, the proportion of which varies from year to year. In addition, Shires can utilise up to 50 per cent of their Statutory Grant which is from Commonwealth funds for maintenance of roads.
- (b) 1974/75—\$4 177 823
1975/76—\$4 449 626
1976-77—\$4 621 937.
- (c) \$4 750 000.

PRE-PRIMARY EDUCATION

Salmon Gums

25. The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS, to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the Minister aware—

- (a) that the building housing the pre-primary class at Salmon Gums was a secondhand building when transported to Salmon Gums 51 years ago;
- (b) it is now completely inadequate because of its structure of timber and corrugated iron, and its dilapidated and dangerous condition, owing to the partial collapse of the roof timbers;
- (c) ventilation is difficult because of the height of the windows;
- (d) supervision of the playing area from within the building is impossible;

- (e) lights have to be kept on all day because of the lack of natural lighting;
 - (f) the gas heater near the only door, and the flammable nature of the building, could make a fire hazard;
 - (g) no water is supplied to the centre—water has to be carried by buckets;
 - (h) water in the rainwater tank is contaminated and its use prohibited on health grounds;
 - (i) drinking water for the children is from a tap situated between the two toilets of the school;
 - (j) one power point is available, and many times when used all lights in the building fused and the power outlets are considered dangerous;
 - (k) toilet supervision is difficult because of the distance from the building—the toilets are unsuitable for pre-primary children—the termites have attacked the screens and so are in danger of collapsing;
 - (l) no maintenance has been carried out for two years; and
 - (m) amenities are lacking that are normal in other schools?
- (2) In view of the above, the building being dangerous and costly to repair, and does not meet the standard of health requirements, will the Minister provide the pre-primary class with a new transportable classroom?
- (3) If so, when can it be expected?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) to (3) It is acknowledged that the building is not in good condition, a matter that was known when the local committee took it over. Improvements of a temporary nature have been instigated and will continue until a replacement can be scheduled from a future capital works programme.

EMPLOYMENT

Election Undertakings

26. The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

As the Premier promised during the State Election campaign to provide 100 000 extra jobs in the State, would he detail where these new jobs were to be created?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

There is a tremendous range of negotiated or potential development projects of a job creating nature calling for further investment over the next seven years, at least equal in real value to what we have received over the past 17 years.

The magnitude of the development potential is such that it is estimated that within the next few years the State will have a need for a further 26 000 tradesmen which, in turn, will mean a total of 100 000 new jobs when consequential growth and backup industries are taken into account.

These projects include—

Wagerup Alumina Refinery
Agnew nickel project
Muja Power Station expansion
Iron ore expansion involving Hamersley and Cliffs
North West Shelf Gas

and many others, which would not only create new jobs in their particular region, but new jobs in backup industries in the region, and also in the metropolitan area and other parts of the State.

ART GALLERY

Staff and Trustees

27. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

- (1) Why was Mr K. S. Shimmon appointed as Acting Director of the Art Gallery from outside the Gallery instead of the appointment being made from one of the staff of the Art Gallery?
- (2) Will the Minister state by what criteria the present Trustees were chosen for appointment to the Art Gallery Board?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) Mr Shimmon has not been appointed Acting Director of the WA Art Gallery. He is acting as Administrator pending the appointment of a Director.
- (2) The Trustees of the Gallery are appointed in accordance with Section 10 of the Art Gallery Act, 1959-1974.

PENSIONERS

Concessions

28. The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS, to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) What are all the pensioner concessions provided by the various government departments?
- (2) What pensioner concessions are now available through municipalities?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) These are listed in the pamphlet available from the State Government Information and Inquiry Centre, 32 St. George's Terrace, Perth. Copy is tabled herewith. The pamphlet is currently under review.
- (2) Concessions and services available to pensioners through municipalities vary from one to the other. Details of benefits available to pensioners from the various municipalities are being obtained during the review mentioned in (1).

The pamphlet was tabled (see paper No. 160).

RAILWAYS

Metropolitan Passenger Service

29. The Hon. D. W. COOLEY, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What were the respective revenue and expenditure figures for the 1974/1975, 1975/1976 and 1976/1977 periods with regard to metropolitan passenger rail travel?
- (2) How many passengers per annum were carried during the same periods?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

	Revenue	Expenditure
	\$	\$
(1) 74/75.....	2 169 965	9 731 710
75/76.....	1 966 119	10 215 345
76/77.....	2 201 826	10 651 826
(2) 74/75.....	10 005 560	
75/76.....	9 149 711	
76/77.....	8 016 329	

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Litter Levy

30. The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Has the Minister given consideration to the imposition of a levy on manufacturers of materials known to be major components of litter?

- (2) Is it the Government's intention to introduce a levy for this purpose this year?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.

RAILWAY BUS SERVICE

Kalgoorlie-Esperance

31. The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) How many Westrail buses, both on a permanent and on standby basis, are there on the route between Kalgoorlie and Esperance?
- (2) Are they fitted to provide toilet facilities for passengers?
- (3) If not, what stoppages are arranged, and where, for the toilet conveniences for passengers?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) 1 permanent, 1 standby; total 2.
- (2) No.
- (3) At Norseman where departmental facilities are provided. In addition on request the driver will stop at any known toilet facilities en route i.e. service stations, hotels at Kambalda, Coolgardie and Salmon Gums.

TRANSPORT WORKERS' UNION

Deregistration

32. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Labour and Industry:

How would it help the present situation with regard to the problems confronting oil companies, the Transport Workers' Union, and the fuel agents, were the Federal Arbitration Commission to de-register the Transport Workers' Union?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

The concept of industrial arbitration in Australia provides for the registration of unions and employers under the appropriate Arbitration Act and Regulations. Registration confers both benefits and responsibilities on unions and employers, and both parties are required to comply with the law.

If a union or employer is not prepared to obey the law after the normal process of conciliation and arbitration have been exhausted, then there is no alternative but de-registration proceedings.

De-registration provides for other appropriate organisations to replace the de-registered body and this invariably remedies the situation.

WATER SUPPLIES

Salmon Gums-Mallee Area

33. The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS, to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) How often in the past has it been necessary to cart water to towns in the Salmon Gums-Mallee area?
- (2) In each case, over what period did it occur?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) and (2) This is the first season in which water has been carted to towns in the Mallee for domestic purposes. This year water is being carted to Salmon Gums for use by farmers. Only two Mallee towns—Salmon Gums and Grass Patch—have reticulated town supplies. Water has never been carted to augment these reticulated schemes.

Water has been carted previously, however, for stock purposes. Large quantities were railed to various Mallee towns in the 1956/57 and 1957/58 summers from Norseman for these purposes. Periodically since then the Farm Water Supply Committee, under the auspices of the Drought Consultative Committee, has also trucked water to various points for stock purposes. Complete records of carting prior to 1956/57 are not available.

Road carting of water from Esperance to Salmon Gums for farmers' domestic purposes commenced on July 29th.

ART GALLERY

Staff

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

- (1) Was the Minister approached by the recently resigned Acting Director to meet with Art Gallery staff to discuss problems that had developed in the relations between the Art Gallery Board and the staff?

(2) On how many occasions was the Minister approached by the Acting Director on this subject?

(3) (a) Did the Minister meet with the staff; and

(b) if not, will the Minister give reasons why he did not do so?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

(1) and (2) Discussions between the Minister for Cultural Affairs and the former Acting Director are confidential.

(3) (a) and (b) The Minister met with senior curatorial staff on Tuesday, 2nd August.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL MEMBERS

"Honourable" Prefix

35. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Leader of the House representing the Attorney-General:

(1) By what authority or instrument are Members of the Legislative Council given the prefix "Honourable"?

(2) Is the use of this prefix mandatory or merely permissive?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

(1) The prefix "Honourable" is a titular honour only. It is not given by any instrument, but by established practice was borne by members of the Legislative Councils and Executive Councils of all self-governing Dominions, and this practice has been retained. Members of the Legislative Council have been entitled to, and have used the prefix from the first sitting of the first Parliament in Western Australia.

In certain cases the prefix may be retained after retirement from the Council—the Government Gazette up to 1900 records a number of such cases. By circular despatch of November 14, 1896, it was laid down that members of the Legislative Councils of the Colonies might be permitted to retain the title on retirement after not less than 10 years' service.

(2) The use of the prefix is an entitlement; while it may not be mandatory for the member to use it himself, Parliamentary etiquette requires that he accord the title to his fellow members.

WATER SUPPLIES

Storage

36. The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Which water supply dams and reservoirs supply the Perth metropolitan area?
- (2) What quantity of water was held in each of these at the end of February in each of the following years—
 - (a) 1975;
 - (b) 1976; and
 - (c) 1977?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) South Dandalup, Serpentine, Serpentine Pipehead, Churchmans, Victoria and Canning.

(2)	February 1975 (million Cubic metres)	February 1976 (million Cubic metres)	February 1977 (million Cubic metres)
South Dandalup.....	111.435	114.846	86.788
Serpentine.....	137.221	115.114	75.470
Serpentine Pipehead.....	3.523	3.644	3.644
Churchmans.....	1.056	1.218	.820
Victoria.....	.207	.359	.402
Canning.....	67.374	50.205	21.373

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

WATER SUPPLIES

Grassmere Basin: Drilling

The Hon. T. KNIGHT, to the Minister for Transport representing the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) When will the Water Supply Department commence drilling in the Grassmere Basin to supplement the water supply for Albany and Mt. Barker?
- (2) What quantity of water will be expected from the bore field in that area per day?
- (3) As this area is a permanent potato growing area and used for market gardens, will the department—
 - (a) guarantee the bores will not affect the upper level water table of the valley;
 - (b) cease pumping if the pumping of the lower level water drops the table in the upper strata;
 - (c) could the department supply water from the bores for agricultural purposes; and

- (d) agree to a reasonable compensation for any loss incurred by farmers due to the loss of water for their activities?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) The water potential of the Grassmere basin is still under investigation. The proposed drilling programme to be undertaken this year involves the drilling of 3 to 4 exploratory holes. The purpose of these holes is to determine if the extraction of water from the deeper aquifer will affect the upper water level. There are no proposals to drill production bores for the Albany and Mount Barker water supply at this stage.
- (2) Answered by (1) above.
- (3) (a) to (d) The department is aware of the importance of the area to the potato growers. The needs of the growers will be kept in mind if recommendations for future development are put forward. It is not appropriate at present to give guarantees such as set out in the question.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 3rd August, 1977

The SPEAKER (Mr Thompson) took the Chair at 4:30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

BILLS (4): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Building Societies Act Amendment Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr O'Connor (Minister for Housing), and read a first time.
2. Construction Safety Act Amendment Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Grayden (Minister for Labour and Industry), and read a first time.
3. Physiotherapists Act Amendment Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr O'Neil (Chief Secretary), and read a first time.
4. Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Act Amendment Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Mensaros