

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 3rd May, 1979

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

EDUCATION: SCHOOL YEAR

Alteration: Petition

MR CRANE (Moore) [2.17 p.m.]: I have a petition to present from the following primary schools: Yerecoin, Mogumber, Yanchep, Gillingara, Jurien, Wanneroo and Calingiri. The petitions are similar to others which have been presented recently and concern the proposed alterations to the school year. They bear 36 signatures and I certify they conform with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

The SPEAKER: I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

See petition No. 66.

RAILWAYS: FREMANTLE-PERTH

Closure: Petition

DR DADOUR (Subiaco) [2.18 p.m.]: I wish to present a petition containing 161 signatures dealing with the removal of the Perth-Fremantle railway. It is couched in terms similar to petitions presented previously on this matter. I certify that the petition conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

The SPEAKER: I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

See petition No. 67.

MARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [2.19 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The dairy industry has suffered a considerable loss of revenue in recent years due to the steep decline in butter consumption within Australia. In Western Australia, for example, butter consumption has declined from 9.98 kg per head to 4.66 kg per head during the last 10 years.

Butter which is not consumed within Australia has to be sold at a considerably lower price on the export market. The industry has sought to stem the decline in the home consumption of butter by providing a more spreadable product comprising a mixture of butterfat and vegetable oil.

It has been contended that the lack of spreadability of butter under refrigeration or low temperature conditions has been a major factor in the decline of its consumption. Although many consumers are thought to prefer the flavour of butter to that of margarine, they have tended to shift consumption to margarine because of the ease with which this product spreads.

A mixture of butterfat and vegetable oil known as "Dairy Blend" has been developed and is being test-marketed in South Australia by the Australian Dairy Corporation. Before "Dairy Blend" can be marketed in Western Australia it is necessary for the Act to be amended to exclude "Dairy Blend" from the definition of "margarine". Clause 3 (b) of the Bill provides for such an exclusion.

The Act also limits the weight of margarine that may be sold to portions not exceeding 500 grammes. Clause 5 of the Bill will enable margarine to be sold where the weight exceeds 500 grammes, the weight of margarine that may be sold being prescribed by regulation.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr H. D. Evans.

SKELETON WEED (ERADICATION FUND) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [2.22 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Legislation was first enacted in 1974 for a levy on grain producers to fund the treatment of skeleton weed outbreaks in Western Australia.

The levy imposed was a flat \$30 for each producer delivering over 30 tonnes of grain. The original Act covered three crop years, and in 1976 Parliament approved its extension for a further three years to include deliveries made up until the 1978-79 crop year.

The legislation now before the House is to extend the collection of the levy, at the same rate, for the three years up to and including the 1981-82 crop year. This extension has the support of both the Farmers' Union and the Pastoralists and Graziers Association.

It is important that the control campaign be continued, because since skeleton weed was first identified in Western Australia in 1963 there have been 56 outbreaks discovered on farms, nine of them in the 1978-79 season.

Of the 47 found previously, it is considered that eradication has been achieved on 31 of the properties. In some cases this cannot be established with certainty for another year or two, because eradication is not claimed until an area is found to have remained clean for four years after the discovery of the last plant.

On properties where plants are still known to exist, the areas of infestation are being reduced each year, and the total area which required spraying in 1978-79 was less than 25 hectares.

A pleasing feature in more recent years is that farmers have learnt to identify the plants on their land, and report them to the Agriculture Protection Board.

A vital part of the work has been the inspection of suspect properties and the reinspection of the areas where treatment has been carried out previously. This work is labour-intensive, and therefore expensive to maintain. Farmers have assisted to an enormous extent by acting as volunteer searchers, but even with this assistance the cost is high.

I am optimistic that if the campaign is continued at its present level, the APB will be able fully to control this serious weed in Western Australia, but it would be unwise to relax vigilance at this stage, with known infestations still remaining.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr H. D. Evans.

SUPPLY BILL

Second Reading

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [2.24 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The reasons for a Supply Bill at this time of the session were explained last year when we broke with past practice to give effect to the legal advice we had received.

I think members will recall it was explained that for many years Governments one after the other had relied on warrants from the 1st July each year until the House reassembled in the last week of July or the first week of August. Then the Supply Bill was passed pending the introduction of the Estimates. It would appear there is a possible challenge to that type of practice. Therefore, last year we began the practice of introducing a Supply Bill at this time of the session.

This measure seeks the grant of supply to Her Majesty of \$820 million for the works and services of the year ending 30th June, 1980, pending the passage of Appropriation Bills in the next sitting of Parliament.

An issue of \$720 million is sought from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and \$75 million from moneys to the credit of the General Loan Fund. Provision is also made in the Bill for an issue of \$25 million to enable the Treasurer to make such temporary advances as may be necessary.

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

As members are aware, the 1978-79 Budget, which was presented to Parliament on the 19th September last, was the fourth consecutive balanced Budget with both revenue and expenditure estimated at \$1 451 million.

Present indications are that revenue will not reach this level primarily because of a subdued level in some areas of economic activity during the year.

Fortunately, expenditure is also running at levels slightly less than forecast in the Budget. This is, in part, due to wage and salary increases being less than anticipated and the rigorous expenditure controls that have been applied throughout the year. In line with what I said in the Budget speech, a strict surveillance is being kept on any application for expenditure to exceed allocations.

At this stage, I am hopeful that the Government will achieve its aim of keeping revenue and expenditure in balance.

At this time last year I gave an undertaking to members to circulate a summary of the financial transactions as soon as possible after the close of the financial year in order that they be kept fully informed.

I give a similar undertaking in respect of 1978-79.

I commend the Bill to the House.

MR DAVIES (Victoria Park—Leader of the Opposition) [2.27 p.m.]: I am still trying to read the Bill which I am expected now to debate. I do not believe there was any need for us to proceed with this Bill this afternoon.

The first reading of the Bill took place on the 11th April. The Minister could have made his second reading speech and the Bill could have been circulated at any time after the 11th April. We could have looked at the figures contained in

the Bill to see how they fitted in with the Budget figures for last year and how they compared with what might have been done under the new procedure had there not been an autumn session of Parliament. We would have been able, in that case, to make constructive suggestions in relation to the Bill.

In the present situation, I have not read the Bill and I am expected to take part in the debate on it. I shall do my very best and I will have a few words to say about the contents of the Bill as I think it exists. If I make any errors, Sir, you will have to understand I have not had time to read the Bill.

At the most, it took the Premier three minutes to make his second reading speech. During that time I was supposed to follow his speech. He adopted the usual practice of circulating notes. I was supposed to follow his speech and read the Bill at the same time, to ensure that it met all reasonable requirements, because that is the job of the Opposition.

Mr Bryce: It is a bloody disgrace!

Mr DAVIES: On previous occasions when Supply Bills have been introduced in the House we have known that it was necessary to debate them immediately and we have been aware they were introduced to cover warrants issued by the Governor since the 1st July of that particular financial year. The only matter which may be in doubt in those situations is the actual figures quoted in the Bill.

That was all altered by an amendment to the Audit Act which was introduced exactly 12 months ago today on the 3rd May, 1978. The Premier introduced into this House a Bill to amend the Audit Act and the circumstances changed. At that time he said that arising out of information supplied by the Solicitor General there was some doubt about the procedures we had followed, and some doubt whether or not those procedures were correct. In order to make certain that there could not be any challenge to the way revenue matters were conducted by the Treasury, the amending Bill was necessary.

The amending Bill provided that should we have an autumn session of Parliament we should give authority, before the 1st July, for the Government to spend money out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. That is what we are doing at this very moment. There was also another provision in the Bill which was to the effect that if there was not an autumn session the Government could go ahead and spend in the first two months of the year—that is one-sixth of the year—one-fifth of the previous year's

Consolidated Revenue Fund Estimates. There was a difference of one-thirtieth which was to allow for inflation. Rather than allow the Government to spend one-sixth of the expected revenue during one-sixth of the year, the Government would be allowed to spend one-fifth of the expected revenue. Apparently that was the margin allowed for inflation, which we certainly need.

We are dealing with a Bill which will not have any effect on the finances of this State until after the 30th June, 1979, and there is not the slightest reason that we should not adjourn the debate and go on with some other business. It is true the Deputy Premier mentioned to me last night that the Premier would like to go on with the Bill. I suppose if that is what the Premier wants to do that is what we will do, but I still say it is an insult to me. Perhaps it is not an insult, but a compliment to me that I am able to listen to the Premier introduce the Bill, while following his notes, and read the Bill all at the same time. That is what I was asked to do. If I have to read the speech again, Mr Speaker, you will understand I am under something of a handicap in having to absorb what is being done.

It appears to me that the estimated revenue last year was \$1 451 million, or perhaps it would be more correct to say it was one billion four hundred and fifty one million dollars. Perhaps the amount could also be referred to as one thousand four hundred and fifty one million dollars. As a result of the Bill now before us it appears we will give the Government permission to spend something like half of that sum of money before the Budget is brought down. Before the Budget is introduced the Government will be able to spend a sum of \$720 million from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and \$75 million from moneys to the credit of the General Loan Fund.

As I see the situation, a sum of \$720 million is roughly half of this year's estimated revenue of \$1 451 million. We will tell the Government it can go ahead and spend that money before introducing the Budget. The Budget usually comes down about the end of September and is usually through by the end of October. We do not know what will be in the Budget. We do know there will be some massive increases in charges and so forth before the Budget is brought down so that the Premier will be able to say he is very smart and has brought down a balanced Budget without any increases in charges. The increases will have taken place long before the introduction of the Budget. We are all aware of that type of move; it has been happening over the past several years.

Whether or not we like the Budget, and whether or not we reject it, the Government will have sufficient money to operate for a period of something like six months. In this type of Bill the Government could have been a little less ambitious, and could have sought a little less money than the amount set out in the measure at the present time, bearing in mind that if this session of Parliament was not taking place the best the Government could hope to spend would be one-fifth of the estimated revenue for this year during the first one-sixth of the financial year. That means the Government would have to introduce a further Supply Bill immediately Parliament sat for the spring session.

That suggested method of handling the revenue of this State, or spending it, was quite acceptable to us but I do not know that we are quite agreeable to telling the Government it can go ahead without knowing what will be in the Budget. At best, we will give the Government permission to spend roughly half the revenue we are likely to receive during this financial year.

I do not think there is any justification for the amounts as set out in the Bill. The amounts could quite easily be halved, and if necessary another Bill could be introduced during the spring session of Parliament which the Government would be entitled to do.

What the Government is doing once again is showing scant regard for this Parliament. I do not know what Government members think about this procedure, or whether they will say anything about it, but I am quite certain a number of members on this side would want to say something about it.

If this is the way the amendment to the Audit Act is to operate, we are not very happy about it. I believe the Treasurer should give greater consideration to the actual amounts set out in the Bill. He should give some greater consideration to the timing of the introduction of the Bill in this part of the session. Members from this side might want to take the Bill away in order to consider it and then debate it. I have not had any opportunity to read the Bill, yet I am expected to speak to it.

This type of Bill deals primarily and generally with financial matters. As far as financial matters are concerned, I think the Liberal-Country Party coalition—both federally and State—has just about lost all credibility. In the Federal sphere we were told that interest rates would fall by 2 per cent in 1978. In fact, interest rates fell by about ½ per cent in some areas. As a matter of fact, interest rates are on their way up again and this is

a matter of great concern, certainly to home buyers and those who have large sums of money invested in inflated interest rates.

An increase of ½ per cent will mean something like an additional \$9 or \$10 a month in repayments over a 30-year period. That is a fair sum of money. I imagine that people who will collect the extra money will be rubbing their hands together and saying, "Thank goodness for this Government."

Mr Fraser said inflation would drop; he promised an annual inflation rate of 5 per cent. However, it looks as though inflation will be greater than it was last year, and will be between 8 per cent and 9 per cent on figures given out recently.

Of course, another side issue of the policies of the Government is the unemployment position. Between February, 1978, and February, 1979, unemployment, nationally, rose from 6.73 per cent of the work force to 7.54 per cent of the work force. That is how well the Government policies are working; that is a splendid record!

The number of people out of work rose by some 50 000 from 431 000 to 481 000. We are expected to tell the Premier that we will give the Government permission to spend, during the next financial year, a sum of money equal to half of what was available this financial year.

The Government must have money to spend, but we must have the right to hear what it is doing with the money. We must have the opportunity to debate it, and considering that the provisions of the Bill will not come into operation until the 1st June, 1979, we should be given more opportunity than we are being given at the present time.

Of course we must talk about the unemployment position in this State—100 000 jobs in seven years; that was the promise in 1974.

Mr Jamieson: In 20 months.

Mr DAVIES: I will be kind to the Premier, and I will not refer to the statement made by the then Minister for Labour and Industry who promised these jobs within 20 months.

Mr Nanovich: How many jobs are there?

Mr DAVIES: I will tell the honourable member how many jobs there are. When the State Government took office in 1974, there were 526 000 jobs. In February of this year—the last month for which figures are available—there were 516 000 jobs; that is, 10 000 jobs fewer now than when the Government took office in 1974.

Sir Charles Court: Are you sure of that?

Mr DAVIES: The Government was supposed to give us 100 000 jobs in seven years or 20 months.

Sir Charles Court: I say: Are you sure of that figure?

Mr Bryce: Very sure.

Mr DAVIES: I am absolutely sure.

Mr O'Connor: I do not know where you got it from.

Mr DAVIES: These were the figures used by the Minister.

Mr O'Neil: From the same research officer who frames his questions.

Mr DAVIES: The figures quoted by the Minister for Agriculture in his political notes last week are not the figures I used, and not the figures at the time the Government took office. What the Government promised, and what the Opposition is now—

Mr O'Connor: I tabled the ABS figures.

Mr DAVIES: The Minister is not quoting the figures he quoted for 1971 or 1972—

Mr O'Connor: I did not quote 1971.

Mr DAVIES: —when the State Government originally took office.

Mr O'Connor: I quoted 1974 to now.

Mr DAVIES: We will look at *Hansard* later. What I am putting is eminently fair. When the Government took office in 1977—

Mr O'Connor: I tabled the ABS figures.

Mr DAVIES: I looked at them and they are not the same. I am quoting—

Mr O'Connor: I think the Leader of the Opposition needs a research officer.

Mr DAVIES: I am telling the Minister that the statistics he quoted show that in January, 1974—not when the Government first took office three years before—the Government promised 100 000 jobs.

Mr Wilson: The year should be 1977.

Mr DAVIES: I am sorry, 1977. When the State Government promised 100 000 jobs, there were 526 000 jobs altogether. The latest figures available to me from the Bureau of Statistics show that there were 516 000 jobs in February—10 000 fewer jobs than when the Government took office.

Mr O'Connor: You are not quoting the ABS figures. You have been advised by your research officer, and you cannot even read it.

Mr DAVIES: After the Minister tabled figures—

Mr O'Connor: I tabled the ABS figures.

Mr DAVIES: I know, I took them away and checked them.

Mr O'Connor: Were they correct?

Mr DAVIES: The Minister went further back than the time his Government took office on this occasion. He went further back and he said, "Look, there is a true percentage increase." When his Government took office in 1977 there were 526 000 jobs. I would like members now to consider these facts: At the present time there are 516 000 jobs—10 000 fewer.

Members opposite have repeated the lie so often—I am sorry they have repeated the myth so often and that is what it really is, a myth—that they have come to believe it. However, if they look at the figures, they will find they are completely wrong.

I have to agree with the Minister: When the Government went into office three years before that, the number of people in employment was fewer than it is now. There has been an overall increase in six years, but in the last three years, when we were promised 100 000 new jobs, in fact the number of jobs has dropped by 10 000.

Mr O'Connor: That is not correct.

Mr DAVIES: It is correct.

Mr Young: Do you disagree with the AWU which says there has been a great influx of people from New Zealand and the Eastern States?

Mr Jamieson: That has nothing to do with it.

Mr Young: I am asking whether you disagree with the AWU.

Mr DAVIES: I have debated all this before. I showed that no research was available in regard to the effect on unemployment of people coming into this State.

Mr Young: Do you disagree with the AWU on the influx situation?

Mr DAVIES: I am sorry, I do not know what the AWU has said about this. If the Minister will give me a copy of the statement, I will comment on it.

Mr Young: It is to do with the number of jobs.

Mr DAVIES: I will refer to a speech I made on this question some time ago which showed that the influx of people from the Eastern States has had a negligible effect on unemployment. Research showed that the influx from other places would not make as much as a 1 per cent difference in the unemployment rate; that is, if every single person who came here from other places were taken into consideration. This is what has been shown, now that the Commonwealth

Bureau of Statistics has been keeping some kind of record.

Once again, a myth was stated so frequently that everyone believed it. We were told that we had unemployment in this State only because of the people coming here from the Eastern States. No figures were available to disprove the statement, but now figures are available they show the effect is negligible. I refer the Minister to my earlier speech on that matter.

My main worry is the attacks being made on the unemployed. It is unbelievable that a man like Mr Phillip Lynch, a member in the Federal Parliament, and who is on a salary of \$40 000 a year-plus, should say that the unemployed are receiving too much money. Such a statement is completely unacceptable to me; it is hard to believe, and yet that is his attitude.

I cannot say that the unemployed in this State are being attacked by our Government, because the fact is they are being ignored by it. We never hear anyone on the other side of the House talking about the unemployed. Government members ignore the unemployed because they feel everyone is in the same position as they are—comfortably well off. A person on \$21 000 or \$22 000 a year can be comfortably well off, but I could take members into my electorate and introduce them to people who are trying to live on just over \$50 a week. I am sure any Government member genuinely interested in the problem could find some of these people in his own electorate.

At the present time I believe the unemployment rate for a single person is \$51.45 a week—hardly enough to pay bus fares. Let us show genuine concern for the unemployed. Let us not keep cutting down on the money they receive. Let us not keep blaming the unemployed and the unions for the problems in Australia. The unions are not to blame for the situation we are in.

Mr O'Connor: Our State showed the greatest improvement in Australia for March of this year.

Mr DAVIES: That is so, for one month. However, when the Government came to office our State had the second best employment rate. Now we have the second worst—we have gone from the top to the bottom.

Mr O'Connor: The problem is the people coming from the Eastern States and New Zealand.

Mr DAVIES: It is not, and I refer the Minister to my earlier speech.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr DAVIES: I refer the Minister to my earlier speech—

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order.

Mr DAVIES: I refer the Minister to my earlier speech—

Mr O'Connor: No wonder your stocks are so low outside.

Mr DAVIES: —in which I gave the figures. I do not want to debate that any more—it is a red herring, a myth. It is being repeated all the time, but it is a myth. Not a word of truth in it. It is not the reason for the unemployment in the State.

The economic policies of the State and Federal Governments have led us into this situation. I am ashamed to think that people on \$40 000 a year, plus allowances, and plus a whole lot of perks, are saying that a single unemployed person, on \$51.45 a week, is getting too much money.

Mr Williams: A very cynical way of representing it!

Mr DAVIES: Of course the member would say that. The people who are advocating cutting down are the people who are comfortably well off, and it does little credit to them.

Mr Williams: It does little credit to you.

Mr Jamieson: It does little credit to you—you asked one question last year!

Mr DAVIES: Here is a man who, as my colleague says, asked one question last year.

Mr Jamieson: Look at *Hansard*.

Mr DAVIES: That was his whole year's work.

Mr Jamieson: For which he was paid \$22 000.

Mr DAVIES: The attitude of the member at this time is disgusting.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order.

Mr DAVIES: The attitude of the member is disgusting. He does not care about the unemployed. Of the single unemployed person on \$51.45 a week, he says, "Cut a bit more off them; talk about the dole bludgers, the surfies, and all the rest of them."

What about showing a little compassion and consideration and even more importantly, what about providing a few jobs for these people?

Mr Williams: Why don't you stop going on strike and you will have a few more jobs?

Mr DAVIES: The Government should stop being inept. It should introduce some policies to provide some work.

Actually, Mr Speaker, to hear the member who chatters away over there, one would think that we were the Government. We only wish we were, and we would show everyone some decent policies; some that would provide work. We would not be satisfied to sit back and say, "Let us cut down a bit more on the dole bludgers." We would be trying to help them and provide jobs for them, because that is what they want. They do not want sympathy; they want jobs.

Let us have a look at the financial deal we have been getting under new federalism. I cannot resist the temptation to write a few figures into *Hansard*. The Premier, who was the great architect of this new federalism, obviously is still extremely proud of the concept.

Mr Jamieson: He is the only who is; his pride is falling, too.

Mr DAVIES: Our Premier has been deserted even by the Premier of Victoria, although I believe that might have been on the basis of electoral expediency.

In the last three financial years, Commonwealth General Revenue grants to Western Australia have increased by a tiny 4.3 per cent in real terms. Of course, members all know there have been massive cuts in specific purpose grants, and that Western Australia is far worse off now than it was before. We have been far worse off over the last three years in the area of loan funds. The Fraser Government has cut general purpose capital funds by 10.3 per cent in real terms, specific capital funds by 22.2 per cent in real terms, and total capital funds by 17 per cent in real terms. That is equivalent to \$153.5 million which we should have received but which, under new federalism, we are not getting.

New federalism has been a financial disaster for Western Australia, especially in the construction and home building fields, and in road building; they are the areas which have suffered; that is what the master plan has done for Western Australia.

I mentioned earlier that the Fraser Government's problems spelt big trouble for the States. The chickens are coming home to roost, and they will arrive at next month's Premiers' Conference.

In recent years, various spokesmen for the Fraser Government have talked about getting spending down. I think we could find plenty of people who are quite happy about reducing spending, as long as the money which is spent is

spent in the right areas. Next month's Premiers' Conference will hammer out Federal-State financial relationships. That is when the crunch will come, and when the States will receive another hammering. I have already pointed out how badly Western Australia has done under the Fraser Government and how this "new deal" has cost us \$153.5 million in three years. I believe the position will deteriorate still further following next month's Premiers' Conference.

We must thank the former Premier of South Australia (Mr Don Dunstan) for insisting that it should be written into the new federalism agreement that the States would receive no less than the amount they would have received under the Whitlam Government's tax sharing arrangements. That provision has been something of a saviour to the States. However, there have been arguments each year about that provision, and I believe it will go by the board at next month's Premiers' Conference. Where are the States going to be then? It will represent a massive reduction in the level of Commonwealth funding to the States. Members already know the effect reduced Commonwealth funding has had on Western Australia. So, I believe next month's Premiers' Conference will be a very crucial time for Western Australia.

What does it mean? It means that, as the Premier has already said, a Bill will be brought into Parliament to provide this Government with the power to impose a separate State income tax. When that legislation is on the Statute book, I say the Government will use it. It will not use it this financial year, otherwise the legislation would be rushed through in this session. However, if it is there, it will be used.

Western Australia is the only State which has agreed with this aspect of new federalism. Even the Premier of Victoria (Mr Hamer) yesterday—I think it might be incidental that there is to be an election in that State this Saturday—said he would not introduce this legislation. He has been the last of the State Premiers—with the exception of our own Premier—to deny this aspect of new federalism.

In reply to criticism of the principle of State income tax, the Premier says, "We will be able to give you a rebate." We know the legislation will provide for a rebate but I bet I will never live to see the day there is so much money coming in under Commonwealth taxation that the Government of Western Australia decides to give back a little money to the Western Australian public—even if it is only \$1, \$2, or \$10.

Mr Young: Oh ye of little faith!

Mr DAVIES: I am so confident of what I am saying that I will double any refunds I receive and give them to the Minister for Health. That is now recorded in *Hansard*. I am so certain that I will not be receiving any refunds from this State Government—and nor will the Minister for Health or, for that matter, any member of the Western Australian public—that I am prepared to give him that undertaking. So, let us not hear any more nonsense about State rebates.

As a result of the failure of new federalism, this Government will find itself in the position of having to increase Government charges before the 1st July this year. Some months ago, I predicted there was likely to be a 50 per cent increase in hospital charges, and I was not believed. That prediction has proved to be correct.

The following charges were increased by the Court Government in 1978-79—

- Electricity
- Gas
- Country Water Charges
- Metropolitan Water Charges
- Industrial and Commercial Water Rates
- Westrail Freights
- Country Bus and Train Fares
- State Shipping Service Freights
- Metropolitan Bus and Train Fares
- Sewerage Rates
- Drainage Rates
- State Housing Commission Country Rents
- State Housing Commission City Rents.

The total increases in the various charges since the Court Government took office are as follows—

Country Water Rates—

North of 26th Parallel 165.7 per cent

South of 26th Parallel 137.1 per cent

Sewerage Rates 106.8 per cent

Drainage Rates 49.3 per cent.

Electricity Charges Average 309.4 per cent.

I think the fixed charge has gone up by something like 510 per cent. The list of charge increases continues—

Gas Charges Average 56.5 per cent

Abattoir Slaughtering Fees—

87.5 per cent to 115 per cent for Export Markets

110.7 per cent to 141.6 per cent for Local Markets

Meat Inspection Fees Average 270 per cent

State Shipping Service Freights 74.5 per cent

Westrail Freights 78.5 per cent
 Metropolitan Bus and Rail Fares 39.6 per cent
 Motor Vehicle Licence Fees 114.5 per cent
 Motor Vehicle Transfer Fees 50 per cent
 Driver's Licence Fees 133.3 per cent
 SGIO Comprehensive Insurance 52 per cent
 State Housing Commission Metropolitan Rents Average 155 per cent
 State Housing Commission Country Rents Average 81.3 per cent
 State Government Hospital Charges 100 per cent.

Another 50 per cent increase is mooted in this morning's newspaper, and I believe that will be a certainty. The list of increased charges continues—

Stamp Duty 33.3 per cent

Pay-roll Tax 11.1 per cent

Country Bus and Train Fares 48.6 per cent.

I believe we can expect further dramatic increases in most, if not all of those areas before the 1st July this year.

We might also ask the Premier to tell us how things are proceeding with the overseas private borrowings proposals, and whether he has any hope of success in this area. I read in the newspaper some months ago that the Under Treasurer went overseas. I think the projects for which the money basically is required are not yet confirmed. We certainly hope they are confirmed, and the Premier may be able to give us some indication as to what success he has had.

Recently, in the north of the State, a local authority was seeking to borrow \$300 000, and another local authority was seeking to borrow \$500 000 for on-lending to the State Energy Commission for capital works. Those authorities have tried all of the usual avenues in the metropolitan area and throughout the State. They have tried the banks, the superannuation funds, and other avenues. They could not find any body to accommodate their needs. They have the power and the legal right to borrow the money for on-lending to the SEC. The SEC will service the loans. However, the two local authorities which, between them, were seeking \$800 000, could not find any body to lend it to them.

I am wondering whether the Premier is aware of this, and if he is able to offer any assistance to those local authorities. It is a relatively small amount of money. However, if they do not obtain the money they have been told by the SEC that

the two towns will be subjected to power rationing within 18 months. Indeed, one town could experience power rationing within a relatively short time when a large works commences operations.

The fact that the SEC has to cut back on capital works means that there will be fewer jobs available for the people. In a country town, the withdrawal of even one job can have a detrimental effect on the town.

There is only a relatively small amount of money involved, yet the authorities cannot find any body to accommodate them. I hope that the Premier is aware of this problem. I hope he will be able to tell us where they might obtain this money.

The lending of the money will not be at any cost to the local authorities because, as I have already said, the State Energy Commission will service the loans. However, those country towns are faced with the loss of work, the loss of extensions, and the loss of jobs.

I apologise for the contribution I have made in relation to this Bill. I might have been able to do better if I had had time to read the Bill and think about it for a while. I might have been able to see what might be done in relation to making constructive suggestions.

We do not deny that the State must have money supplied to it to enable services to be performed, to pay the Public Service, and for a multitude of reasons. However, as I said, the Bill will not operate until the 1st July, 1979. The first reading of the Bill was on the 11th April last, and the Bill could have been read a second time at any time between then and now. Even with the second reading today, the Bill should have been adjourned so we could give it some mature consideration at a later stage before the House rose—possibly about the middle of this month.

MR BRYCE (Ascot—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [3.03 p.m.]: I will take only a few minutes. It was not my intention to speak in this debate at all. However, I find that it is necessary to come to the defence of the research officer who has been mentioned.

There was a cowardly attack by a leader of this Government on a young man who is defenceless. He is a young man to whose defence I am prepared to spring in this place, because I know that not only is he defenceless, but also he is right.

I do not mind attacks on the Leader of the Opposition or members of this front bench, because we are here to take it. However, we have heard the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Labour and Industry casting a slur on the

reputation of this young man. I want to say that he is a very fine research officer. He operates without the enormous resources behind him that the Premier has in the Treasury.

In this instance, the research officer is right. The Deputy Premier should have done his homework. Surely he has been here long enough to know that there is a difference between surveys of the total work force and surveys of civilian employees. Any member who reads the figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics should know that there is a warning on the front of the documents as they are presented. When the Leader of the Opposition presented the figures in this House some weeks ago, he was right then and he is right now. He said that when this Government made its promise in 1977 to provide Western Australians with an extra 100 000 jobs, at the time the promise was made there were 526 500 people in employment. That figure is supplied by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. It reflects the number of people in employment at that time. The latest figure in 1979 which our leader referred to reflects a net loss of 10 000 jobs. That figure was 516 500.

The Deputy Premier and the Minister seem to be unable to grasp that there is a difference between the figures constituting a survey of the total labour force and the number of civilian employees. That latter figure covers only the people who are wage and salary earners in this State. That is where the different figures come from.

Of course, the Government is hiding behind that reality.

Let me conclude on this point: when this Government promised Western Australians an extra 100 000 jobs in 1977 it did not say, "but we are only talking about wage and salary earners". That promise was aimed at the whole of Western Australia—self-employed people, employers, and the like—in fact, everybody in the economy; society at large. Everybody was embraced in that particular promise. It ill behoves the Deputy Premier and the Minister to come to this place nearly two years later and say, "But we didn't mean that."

Let me say to the House before I resume my seat that the intellectual integrity of the young man who serves as the research officer to the Leader of the Opposition is totally beyond reproach. If anybody needs to do his homework, it is the Deputy Premier and, behind him, the Minister. The Deputy Premier has been in this place for nearly a quarter of a century; and he should appreciate the need to do his homework.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool) [3.07 p.m.]: I intended to take the Premier to task in relation to some figures that he quoted about the railway closure, and I will do that in a minute. However, I also want to defend the research officer, because I believe that the debate is getting a bit low when a person is attacked by Deputy Premiers and Ministers in this Parliament in the manner they did.

It is out of character for the Deputy Premier to act in this way. I think he owes an apology to the person concerned. It is all very well for the Deputy Premier and the Premier, who have back-up personnel other than research officers to check matters for them, to place the blame on the research officer.

The research officer is a responsible person. He is so thorough that, when I was the Leader of the Opposition, he was responsible for picking up errors in the Estimates prepared by the research officers in the Premier's Department or the Treasury. In one case, there was a disparity of \$1 million. I pointed this out to the Premier, and he sent me a letter of thanks. He corrected his figures at a later stage.

Mr O'Neil: I do not know the person who is currently employed as the research officer to the Leader of the Opposition; but on two occasions I have answered questions which have no doubt come from his research. Those questions have reflected the fact that the answers given in the questions referred to provided the answers that he required.

Mr Davies: They were not from him.

Mr O'Neil: The Leader of the Opposition takes the blame for not reading the answers.

Mr JAMIESON: The Deputy Premier is anticipating. One should place the blame, as the deputy leader said, on the individual members of Parliament. Members of the Opposition have to blame the Ministers if there is anything wrong in figures.

Mr O'Neil: If that was so, okay; but there have been many occasions when your people blamed departmental officers and not Ministers.

Mr JAMIESON: This is a different matter. Departmental officers should share the blame if they give wrong facts and figures, because they have back-up personnel. They have a lot more information available to them, and they are able to do a lot more research than the one person looking after the Leader of the Opposition.

I do not want to say any more, except that it is bad when people are attacked individually on these bases. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition

clearly indicated that the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures were correct.

Now I wish to deal with the matter of the old saying that "Figures lie and liars figure." I will give an example of how this occurs. Recently the Premier made some outstanding and outlandish statements about the railway closure, and particularly about the patronage of the commuter railway services in the metropolitan area.

Of course, the Premier made great play of the fact that it was not very important anyway, because when one looked at the matter, what did the railways do? He said they carried only 15 per cent of all passengers. If anybody set out to deceive the people, it was the Premier when he made that statement.

Sir Charles Court: What is the percentage then?

Mr JAMIESON: The actual percentage given by the Premier is the correct one, but, of course he conveniently forgot to tell the public that the railways carry 15 per cent of all passengers over an area covering 66 kilometres; whereas the MTT covers an area of 1 500 kilometres and carries 85 per cent of all passengers. There is a great deal of difference. Although the railways carry 15 per cent of the passengers, they serve 4.4 per cent of the total number of kilometres covered.

If the Premier wants to quote figures, he should quote them properly. He should make valid comparisons. He should not quote figures in such a way that they favour the case he is trying to make without substantiating the matter by comparing those figures with the whole transport system. It is wrong to do that.

Sir Charles Court: Are they not the right figures? They are the official figures.

Mr JAMIESON: They are the official figures, but the Premier should make valid comparisons of the pattern of patronage so that the public may be properly informed. The Premier is trying to deceive the public.

Sir Charles Court: I was trying to explain that a lot of people already use buses.

Mr JAMIESON: The Premier is trying to confuse the public by failing to make the correct comparisons.

I do not want to hold up this debate, but I should like to take the Government to task over the way it has conducted the sesquicentennial celebrations. I have always had my doubts about the success of these celebrations and in fact they are reflecting rather badly on the State. I do not like something to reflect badly on the State of Western Australia.

Mr Davies: You are not supposed to like Western Australia.

Mr JAMIESON: Am I not supposed to like Western Australia? As a matter of fact I do like it. I have been here for quite some time and it appears that I shall be around for a while yet. I do not like to think that Western Australia is being badly managed by a Government which sets a particular activity in motion, but is unable to carry it through.

It is all very well for the Premier and other members of the Government to walk around dressed like the landed gentry of 1829, but in fact they are making apes of themselves.

Mr Laurance: You are jealous.

Mr JAMIESON: I am not jealous. I am pointing out that if Government members wanted to represent the people of the day they would not dress in that manner. About half a dozen people in Western Australia in 1829 would have worn the clothes which Government members are dressing themselves in today. Most of the people in those days wore simple attire and it is in poor taste to ape something which did not exist and put on such a foolish show.

Mr Laurance: I think you are being very petty over there.

Mr JAMIESON: I should like to turn to the point I am trying to make, but before I do so I shall refer to the landing of Captain Fremantle. No doubt there will be a suitable tree cutting to commemorate the activities of Mrs Dance in Perth. Later in the year we shall probably have the re-enactment of yet another landing by the captain. However, that is not the point I wish to make.

The Premier and the Government went to a great deal of trouble to ask people and organisations to hold their conferences in this State this year. There is no doubt many people have responded to that invitation. We have had a great number of these conferences, but the reaction to them has been terrible. Just recently I talked to some people who were attending a conference here. The conference concerned building societies. These people had visited Western Australia three or four years previously. It was not this State's turn to host the conference this year, but the organisers obliged and, as a result of the invitation issued by this State, held the conference here this year. The reception accorded the delegates who attended this conference as compared with the reception they received on the previous occasion was appalling. They may as well not have attended.

The reason for this poor reception is that too many of these conferences are being held here and the people who attend them are being left to fend for themselves. These people compared the reception they were accorded this year with that which they received four years ago when they were invited to civic receptions and other types of similar activities.

It is possible the Perth City Council and other organisations are running out of finance. Their 3 per cent account may be being taxed too much. The Premier should look at that.

Sir Charles Court: I am amazed that you have mentioned that, because I have had nothing but eulogy from the people who attended that conference.

Mr JAMIESON: I should like to mention the experience of another organisation, Alcoholics Anonymous, which held its conference here earlier this year. A total of 500 delegates attended, some of whom came from overseas. I represented the Leader of the Opposition at the official opening and I arrived at the same time as the opening was due to commence. I was given an appropriate name tag, which usually happens, and I was asked if I would sit on the stage. I went upstairs and was rather surprised when I looked at the stage to see that the chairman only was sitting there. I did not have any time to ask any questions, but when I moved onto the stage the chairman said, "We have quite a surprise. Mr Colin Jamieson, a member of the Opposition, is here to open the 19th Alcoholics Anonymous conference."

I stepped back a couple of paces while they applauded me, which gave me a little time to think about what I should say, because I had received no warning that I could be called upon to open the conference. I made the necessary speech and opened the conference. The delegates were quite satisfied with what I did. However, on making inquiries afterwards I found the Government had not been able to find anyone who would attend and open the conference, despite the fact that the 18th Alcoholics Anonymous conference at Orange in New South Wales was opened by Mr Fife, the Federal Minister.

If this type of situation occurs frequently this State will have obtained a bad reputation by the end of the year. We must do something about the matter. I was not happy to see a party being arranged for a full year, because it becomes tedious. It might have been better had we conducted our celebrations at certain times of the year.

I spoke to the Minister in charge of the celebrations and asked him to do something about advertising our anniversary overseas particularly, although I did mention other places as well. The Minister said, "It is too difficult to get special airline concessions for people to come here from Hong Kong, Japan, and Singapore." I thought, "I suppose he knows what he is doing." However, as a result of a question asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition recently it appears that practically nothing has been spent on advertising the celebrations outside this State.

Why does the Government want to spend money on advertising its own party to its own family when most of those people know what is going on? The Government should be attracting people from outside the State. When I was in Victoria a man who is prominent in trade union circles saw me wearing my little swan badge and he asked me how the celebrations were going. He said, "We are not hearing anything at all about it over here." I looked in the window of the WA Tourist Bureau in the Eastern States and saw that there were a few posters, but little was being done in the way of publicity to attract people to this State.

The Minister has indicated that there have been 10 000 cancellations amongst the people who were to come here to participate in the celebrations. We should be trying to improve this situation to make it work. It is no good approaching this matter in a half-hearted manner. The Minister has failed, because he did not recognise that he should advertise our anniversary more widely in places such as Hong Kong, Japan, and Singapore where tourists are passing through constantly. Perhaps he should have screened his television propaganda there, in which case we might have got something out of it, because we are certainly not getting anything out of it here.

I am not sure how many of the functions have been unsuccessful. The Premier may say, if he wishes, that he spoke to a few of the top organisers of a particular conference and they expressed satisfaction with the manner in which some of their executives were entertained at various functions.

However, the lay person who came over to the conventions would be experiencing something entirely different. The people who complained to me were ex-insurance people now associated with this type of thing in Tasmania and they are certainly not Labor voters. I would not expect these fellows to be associated in any way with my political views. Nevertheless, they are prepared to voice this criticism to me openly.

If there are problems with these organisations, the Premier should check to ascertain the reception they receive to ensure that it was at least as good as, but preferably better than, the reception they received some years ago. It would not be too much trouble for him to check with their local organisation to ascertain what arrangements had been made for them. If it is necessary for funds to be made available by the Treasury to the Perth City Council or the Fremantle City Council for these receptions, then this should be done.

I am afraid that at the moment it looks as though we will finish up with egg on our faces as a result of this whole affair if we are not able to live up to the expectations regarding the holding of functions in this State during our 150th year. It is important we come out of this looking well. We should not lay ourselves open to criticism because organisations transfer their scheduled meetings which were arranged to coincide with our celebrations.

That is about all I wish to say at this stage. I did have several other matters I wished to discuss, but I can deal with those at a later date. I wanted to get those two subjects out of the way at an early date because they both need urgent attention.

I hope the Premier gives a better explanation concerning the complaints about the railways than he has done so far by merely referring to the 15 per cent patronage.

SIR CHARLES COURT
(Nedlands—Treasurer) [3.22 p.m.]: I appreciate the comments of members opposite. However, first of all I want to deal with the objections raised by the Leader of the Opposition to the Bill being proceeded with as it is.

He would know from his experience here that it is customary for the Supply Bill to be introduced and dealt with on the one day once we commence the second reading debate. In fact, in former times we have had occasions when even the notice of motion has been followed by the completion of the passage of the Bill through the Chamber on the one day, as a result of the suspension of Standing Orders.

Mr Jamieson: That depended on whether you had met before the end of July.

Sir CHARLES COURT: This Bill has been on the Notice Paper, so ample notice has been given of it and, with all respect to the Opposition, I suggest that it would have dealt with the Bill in exactly the same way as it has dealt with Supply Bills in the past.

Of necessity the Supply Bill is simply a straightforward document authorising supply, pending the introduction of the Appropriation Bill and the detailed Estimates in accordance with the requirements of the Statutes and as is absolutely necessary before the Government can govern. It is an expediency to ensure that the Governor is authorising expenditure with the authority of Parliament and using the warrant system properly. We believed the warrant system was adequate between the 1st July and the meeting of the Parliament at the end of July or the first week in August. However, in view of the possible challenge, it was decided this was the best way to do it. Consequently the Audit Act was amended and now we have adopted this procedure as from last year. This is the second time we have used it.

It is customary for Oppositions and others who want to comment on the Supply Bill to come prepared with matters they want to raise because they know exactly the wording of the Bill except for the figures. By established custom a figure of approximately one half is employed. In fact, from memory I would say that over the years, every time I have checked when in Opposition or in Government, the figure was intended to carry the Government through to November or, at the latest, to the middle of December, so that no Government can go too far. In fact, it must get its Budget through before Christmas in order to have the Estimates and appropriations approved to enable it to get on with the job of governing in accordance with the Constitution.

Mr Davies: Sometimes we have had two Supply Bills.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Yes, that is right.

I want to remind the members of the House also that when the Supply Bill is debated while the Address-in-Reply is before the House, the Opposition has ample opportunity to deal with matters of a wide-ranging nature, almost without limitation through the Address-in-Reply. If the Address-in-Reply had been completed and we were just pressing on with the session in the ordinary way, it would have been different because that opportunity would have passed.

Might I remind the Opposition that it has members who have not spoken on the Address-in-Reply and they can use those occasions to deal with matters they want to bring forward, without limitation within the time that is given to them under the Standing Orders. This makes the passage of the Supply Bill a different thing from the passage of any other legislation. In fact, I would be surprised if there were anyone on the other side who did not acknowledge that the

Supply Bill is a Bill which, by tradition and established custom, is dealt with on the one day once the debate on it has commenced.

I do not need to elaborate further on why the Audit Act provided for one-fifth of a Budget to be spent in one-sixth of a year during an election year. The reason has been partly touched on by the Leader of the Opposition. Some inflationary factors must be allowed for, but also included is the fact that the House would be meeting by the end of July. And then a normal Supply Bill would be introduced—not an Appropriation Bill and Estimates, but a Supply Bill in the form of the Bill with which we are dealing today. Again the Bill would be dealt with in the one sitting if that procedure were followed. In fact it would be followed of necessity under the Statute when we meet in an election year, and on the assumption that the Parliament does not meet until after the 30th June.

Amongst some of the things the Leader of the Opposition mentioned and in regard to which he wanted information was the subject of private borrowings overseas. The private borrowing mechanism is quite satisfactory. We are preparing the groundwork. I had Mr McCarry with me last year meeting with banks to discuss matters of policy and to enunciate the Government's attitude. Subsequently I undertook he would go back and talk at the technical level to the bankers in Japan, Europe, and America, and at the moment he is doing just that.

Mr Davies: In petro dollars?

Sir CHARLES COURT: We have not become involved in Middle East money at all and there is good reason for this. We prefer to deal with the established banking system. There is a lot of talk about petro dollars and Middle East money and so on, but it is something of a myth.

Mr Jamieson: There is plenty of it invested in Perth.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It may be invested here, but the point is that when we want to get access to it, we must be extremely careful to go through the traditional banking system.

In my experience, the Middle East countries, and particularly the Arab countries, do not do business of the normal type unless they do so in very close consultation with the bankers of England. There has been a much closer link between the bankers of England and the Middle East than with the American banks, and most of the American banks of repute will admit they prefer to go into the Middle East holding hands with a UK banker; and we have found that to be ever so true.

With regard to the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition concerning local authorities and the SEC, it is known throughout Australia that semi-governmental instrumentalities and local authorities have been finding it difficult to raise the loans they want to raise, and this was one of the reasons which precipitated the interest change which was resisted by most States for good reason. It precipitated the change because of the movement which had taken place internationally in the money market in Australia, and because of and the price at which the Reserve Bank itself was trading on the market in respect of Government paper.

Then the change had to be made, otherwise local authorities and semi-governmental authorities would have found it extremely difficult to raise money. I have my own doubts whether the change in interest rates on its own will resolve the problem of semi-governmental and local authorities, for the reason that the Federal Government, as a matter of prudence in financing its deficit, will be going into the market very heavily. In fact, that was one of the reasons it wanted the ASB rate lifted—to make those savings bonds more attractive and take more money out of the market and make it available to the Government as part of its anti-inflationary policy.

I have made it a condition that if the Commonwealth Government cannot demonstrate that the money is available within Australia we reserve the right to be free to make application to the Loan Council to borrow overseas this type of money, but that has nothing to do with the other infrastructure borrowing programme which has been approved by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr Davies: How soon do you think we could expect something positive there? The situation is serious in those two cases.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I could not be precise but I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that without exception, to my knowledge, the local authorities are talking to the Treasury all the time. That is not unusual. From about February onwards a scramble always takes place to get money throughout Australia. The bigger authorities like the SEC, which have a long-established borrowing history, are of course more attractive to the market and to underwriters. When we came in with a new borrower, Westrail, we found that authority had to establish itself in the market place. In addition, it has an operation which does not trade to the same level of profitability as do State Electricity Commissions throughout Australia. Therefore, it has to demonstrate to the money market that it can

service its loans. It is not unusual to have to establish a reputation.

The other people are in close consultation with the State Government, and the Treasury is forever looking for alternative sources. Not one local authority would deny that the Treasury has always been extremely helpful in seeking sources of funds, bearing in mind it cannot do magic and if the money does not exist it cannot manufacture it.

Another matter touched on by the member for Welshpool was the 150th Anniversary. I am disappointed that the honourable member raised this matter. One of his colleagues also raised it the other night. I do not know why they want to go around trying to damn the celebrations. In our experience they are compounding in their success.

Mr Jamieson: You are too near the centre of the wheel.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am not. The celebrations are gaining momentum in country towns, in family reunions, and in local functions which I would have thought the honourable member would welcome. It is not intended that all the 150th Anniversary celebrations will be great State occasions, although some of them will be. Historic re-enactments will be organised by the State Government or the 150th Anniversary Celebrations Board. The whole purpose of the celebrations was to get community involvement. The member for Welshpool must be out of touch if he does not realise there is tremendous community involvement.

Mr Jamieson: We must be living in two different cities.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am not talking about the city only; I am talking about the State. The quality of some of the activities being undertaken is absolutely superb. Surely the honourable member is not denying that some of the publications put out for the benefit of young people and the community at large are desirable in order to have a stocktaking within the State.

Mr Jamieson: This is a pretty good one, too.

Sir CHARLES COURT: That publication has nothing to do with the 150th Anniversary. That was published for my visit overseas and it is something all leaders do when they go abroad.

Mr Jamieson: It is strange that it has the 150th Anniversary symbol on the back of it.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We took symbols like that abroad last year.

Mr Jamieson: I took them myself.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Then why is the honourable member being so cynical? He should

lift his sights a bit. I remind the honourable member that had it not been for the 150th Anniversary celebrations our hotels would be empty and the travel business would be going broke.

Mr Skidmore: We haven't any tourists here.

Mr Bryce: Things are worse than they have ever been.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The member for Ascot would like them to be.

Mr Bryce: On the contrary.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It is rather important that members opposite listen for a minute. When the 150th Anniversary year descended upon us it coincided with all the talk of reduced overseas fares, which immediately put a dead hand on travel within Australia, not only in this State. We see it reflected in the buses and the ferries which make tourist trips.

If it were not for the fact that certain conferences were committed to be held in Western Australia in the 150th Anniversary year, the hotels would be half empty and travel services would be as dead as the dodo. But we find tremendous conferences have taken place—the engineers, the great Agro celebrations, and the building societies' conference. The average person who came to the latter conference has, contrary to what the honourable member said, praised the reception and attention he received and the success of the conference. I refer to the surf lifesaving carnival which came here out of turn; the athletes, the Soccer Federation, and so it goes on.

Then we have WA Week coming up. Yesterday it was announced that a great orchestra was coming from Japan to appear only in this State. Later in the year we have the jazz jamboree and 10 000 boy scouts coming to the State. The member for Welshpool should get with it instead of pooh-poohing the whole thing.

Mr Jamieson: I am not pooh-poohing it. I am asking you to lift the tempo.

Sir CHARLES COURT: On one hand the honourable member says, "It is so fast we can't cope with all the receptions", and now he wants me to step up the tempo.

Mr Jamieson: You have rocks in your head. You would not know what day it is.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The honourable member mentioned the conference at which no Government representative was present. I will take the matter up, because to the best of my knowledge we have been strongly represented everywhere.

Mr Davies: I went to another function on Easter Sunday night. The organisers were disappointed that no Government representative attended.

Sir CHARLES COURT: During the Easter weekend we had Ministers everywhere, all over the State. I will certainly take up the matter of the function at which we were not represented, because the instructions are we must be represented by a Minister at all these functions.

The co-ordination question raised by the member for Welshpool is one on which I agree with him. There should be co-ordination between the 150th Anniversary Celebrations Board and all these organisations. I found only one instance where there was no co-ordination, and that was because the organisation concerned declined any assistance. It said it knew what it was doing. The association was involved with a series of traders and it said, "We have done all this before." When I went to the function I found to my amazement the local people had done nothing about badges and so on. The Government moved in immediately. It had the propaganda there within a matter of hours and ensured those 40 or 50 delegates left for the Eastern States fully equipped with material and something to take home as a souvenir.

So I am very surprised and disappointed that members opposite seem determined to try to cast a shadow over something that I thought was proceeding in a superb manner. However, one thing that is most gratifying is that we find young children, young students, and young people in general are becoming involved in our anniversary; and they are the ones that matter. People of my age or the age of the member for Welshpool do not matter so much; it is the young people of today who will have a full personal knowledge of what happened now when our 200th Anniversary comes around. They are the ones on whom we should be concentrating to ensure that they carry forward the message.

It is a fact of life that historic information has been revealed as a result of the propaganda and publicity of our 150th Anniversary that would not otherwise have come to light and would have been destroyed as a result of lack of interest.

Mr Grill: What about traffic and people from the Eastern States?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I have explained that. I have explained that because of the prolonged and agonising negotiations in respect of overseas travel, the bottom fell out of the tourism market within Australia—not only in Western Australia, but everywhere. It so happened that

our 150th Anniversary was coming up, and it has been our saviour. Had it not been for that people in the tourist industries would be facing a serious situation today.

Mr Grill: They tell me it has fallen by about 35 per cent.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I can tell the member the reason for that. People on his side of the Chamber were advocating that overseas fares be reduced, and they were applying pressure.

At the time I was not very enthusiastic about it. Who wants to encourage people to leave the country? We want people to travel within Australia. So when the propaganda started in respect of reducing overseas air fares, tourism within Australia dropped because people stood off and said to themselves, "We will wait and see, because we might be able to travel to England or America more cheaply than travelling around Australia." Thank goodness air fares within Australia have now been reduced in a realistic way. That is the key; the reduction of fares within Australia.

The only other point I wish to mention is that the member for Welshpool referred to my comment about 85 per cent of people travelling by bus. What other dimension could I use to express it? It happens to be a statistic, and that was the only way I could express it.

Mr Jamieson: You didn't bother to find out any more about it.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I tried to demonstrate that it is not as though bus services are new. We cannot have train services running into all the new suburbs; so if it were not for buses the suburbs would not be developed because people would not live in them, anyhow. I make the point that when we talk about the number of people travelling on public transport, 85 per cent already travel by bus, if the member for Welshpool wishes to be precise.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2: Issue and application of \$820 000 000—

Mr DAVIES: I failed to mention one point made in the Treasurer's speech when he said that

at this time last year he gave an undertaking to members to circulate a summary of the financial transactions as soon as possible after the close of the financial year in order that they be kept fully informed.

Shortly after the financial year ended I received in the mail, as promised, a copy of the Premier's Press release. I thought we might have been given a few more figures within the Press release, which merely gave some totals which meant little to us. I kept a copy of it on my desk for a long time thinking that something further might come forward.

The Press release gave a few percentages in respect of increases and suggested some reasons that some figures were different from the actual Budget figures. I had already read in the Press everything that was contained in that release, because its entire context was printed.

Does this mean the Treasurer will again let us have a copy of his Press release? If so, he need not bother because I can read it all in the paper and it will save a few bob on postage. I would be quite happy to read it in the Press. If the Treasurer is able to give us some meaningful summary of the year's transactions, not necessarily right at the end of the financial year but, say, by the end of July, we may be able realistically to relate it to Budget figures. That could be of some advantage.

The only other point I wish to raise is that the Treasurer said we always debate this Bill straight through. The point I was trying to make is that circumstances change. That is the reason I suggested that at least on this occasion we could adjourn the debate, because things do not always have to remain as they are.

Sitting suspended from 3.47 to 4.08 p.m.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Leader of the Opposition raised the question of the information which has been promised in respect of the financial year. I am speaking from memory, because during the afternoon tea break I was not able to obtain a copy of the information that was issued.

If I remember correctly, the Under Treasurer, when he reported to me as Treasurer at the end of the financial year, produced a document which was fairly comprehensive—much more so than normal. It was resolved, after consultation, that that document would be the basis for informing members. I will certainly check that I have my facts correct so far as that statement was concerned. However, speaking from memory, the statement was a comprehensive one, and it was the type of thing that would be circulated to

members. Perhaps if we were to send it out in a different form, and not on a Press statement letterhead, it might have been received better. I will certainly check on the matter.

It is the desire of the Treasury and myself to ensure that members receive the type of report to which they are entitled. They should receive the financial results without awaiting the reassembly of Parliament. When Parliament meets, in due course the Budget is introduced, and a more full report is presented in relation to the results for the year.

The message conveyed by the Leader of the Opposition has been received and understood.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Sir Charles Court (Treasurer), and transmitted to the Council.

BILLS (2): MESSAGES

Appropriations

Messages from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the following Bills—

1. Skeleton Weed (Eradication Fund) Act Amendment Bill.
2. Supply Bill.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: EIGHTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 1st May, on the following motion by Mr Shalders—

That the following Address-in-Reply to His Excellency's Speech be agreed to—

May it please Your Excellency: We, the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of the State of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to thank Your

Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to address to Parliament.

MR BRYCE (Ascot—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [4.40 p.m.]: It is my intention to devote my time in this Address-in-Reply speech explaining how and why the Government deserves to be censured because of the manner in which it has failed to appreciate and recognise the significance of the small business sector in Western Australia, and the manner in which it has failed to come to the assistance of that sector.

To demonstrate this in specific terms, we need only look at the Government's unbalanced approach to the State's economy by concentrating almost single-mindedly on the development of mineral resources; we need only look at the Government's extraordinary degree of indifference to the high rate of business failures in Western Australia over recent years; we need only look at the manner in which the Government has deprived the Small Business Advisory Service, which is a small part of the Department of Industrial Development, of adequate human and financial resources to handle its very important task; and, I guess, we need only look at the way in which the State Government has blindly adhered to the economic policies of the Fraser Government.

As a result of these sorts of things, we now have in Western Australia the most serious crisis in confidence in small businesses that we have had at any time since the early 1930s.

In order to articulate this censure of the Government in full, because of the particular nature of this debate, it is my intention to move a detailed amendment to the Address-in-Reply as follows—

but we regret to advise Your Excellency that—

- (a) because of the State Government's failure to appreciate or recognise the importance of the small business sector, as evidenced by—
 - (i) the Government's single-minded pre-occupation with large scale resource development projects;
 - (ii) the Government's indifference to the large number of business failures in Western Australia in recent years;

(iii) the Government's failure to devote adequate resources to the Small Business Advisory Service in order to encourage the establishment and expansion of small business, and

(iv) the serious lack of accurate information relating to the plight of small business in W.A.

(b) because of the Fraser Government's disastrous economic policies—

the State's small business sector is currently facing the most serious crisis of confidence since the early 1930s.

Accordingly in the interests of the State's economic recovery and long term well-being, Your Government should give immediate and earnest consideration to the following initiatives:

1. a significant increase in the resources of the Small Business Advisory Service or alternatively the establishment by statute of a "Small Business Development Corporation";
2. the taking of all necessary steps in consultation with the Commonwealth Government to make the banking system more responsive and accessible to small businesses;
3. the raising of the exemption ceiling applicable to payroll tax, to a level which would exempt a larger proportion of the State's small businesses;
4. the appointment of fulltime small business counsellors in each of the State's main regional centres;
5. the introduction of legislation to provide rebates of up to 100% on payroll tax for important rural-based manufacturing and processing industries;
6. the provision of assistance in the form of subsidies available to small businesses in other States relating to consultancy expenses and the cost of feasibility studies;
7. the provision of an "establishment payment scheme" similar to that which operates in South Australia;
8. the introduction of legislation for a Small Business Loans Guarantee Act;
9. the initiation for the first time in W.A. of a major study of the small business sector to provide the Government with comprehensive updated knowledge and data on which to plan the long term success of small business.

Mr Shalders: How about a capital gains tax?

Mr BRYCE: If the honourable member wishes to throw in a capital gains tax, that is his prerogative. Let the member for Murray stand in this place and advocate it during the course of the Government's defence.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: The role and importance of the small business sector is vast. It is so vast in fact that it is often taken for granted. The definition of small business varies from country to country and from industry to industry. Indeed, in this country, it tends to vary a little from State to State. However, what is called the Wiltshire definition of small business is one that has become generally accepted in Australia following that national committee of inquiry about a decade ago. Basically the Wiltshire committee defined a small business as a business which employs fewer than 100 people if a manufacturing business, or generally fewer than 20 people in any other form of business.

I will not be arbitrary and suggest those are the only figures to be used. However, that was one definition, and it has become generally accepted although it varies slightly from State to State. The other important criteria is that a small business is one where the one or two people who run a business are the individuals required to make decisions about management on a day-to-day basis, and who do not have the resources to give them access to specialists for such purposes.

Quite apart from economic reasons, there is a whole range of sociological and service reasons why small business plays a particularly important role in our society.

The first reason relates to employment. It is interesting and very important for us to appreciate and recognise that 42 per cent of the work force of this State is employed by small business compared with only 33 per cent employed by large corporations, and only 20 per cent employed by the Government.

In the manufacturing sector, on a national basis 97 per cent of all factories or manufacturing businesses are small businesses. In the retail sector throughout the nation, 98 per cent of all businesses are small businesses. In the wholesale sector, 90 per cent of all businesses are small

businesses. We are in fact a nation and a State of small businesses.

In addition to that, I believe a number of other very important features of small business have been overlooked, not only by the Government, but also from time to time by all decision-makers. Perhaps this is because small business has been taken for granted.

Very seldom do large firms come in direct contact with the public. By nature of the work they undertake and the goods they produce, they tend to rely upon small businessmen to relate directly to the consumer, and actually to retail those commodities to the people who consume them.

There are many products we enjoy but which would never come on to the market if large firms were expected to produce them. It is not economic for them to do so in many instances, and so we have to accept that many of the things we enjoy are the result of the efforts of small business.

There are many ancillary products and services which are used quite often by large firms themselves. However, it is not economic for large firms to undertake the production of many ancillary items and component parts, even products they require themselves. They appreciate the supply of these products by small businesses.

Nobody questions the importance of small business as a source of innovation. Many new ideas in management, in commodity development, and in a number of other aspects of commercial enterprise have had their origins in small businesses.

Probably one of the most important features and attributes of the small business sector we tend to overlook so often is the vital importance of competition within the small business sector. The very nature of large businesses in this society of ours is that they tend not to appreciate competition, and there tends to be less and less competition the larger a particular firm becomes within a particular industry.

The final, the very admirable, attribute that I would touch on here is the vital importance of small business to country towns and regional economies. The process of decentralisation is simply impossible without small businesses because large businesses so frequently are attracted only to very large centres of population. It is upon the small businesses that Governments and communities rely to take services to country centres, and it is, therefore, the small businesses which eventually will achieve any desirable degree of decentralisation in Western Australia.

As a result of any examination of the reports of small business advisory services or small business agencies in any of the States, and certainly as a result of examining the records and reports of the Corporate Affairs Office, one can appreciate very readily that there is a common thread of problems that confront small businesses. I would like to touch on these problems very quickly.

The foremost problem in the minds of most small businessmen is a lack of funds and money matters in general. There is a wealth of evidence to substantiate this.

A lack of business expertise and experience in training is the second most common problem encountered by small businessmen, not only in Western Australia, but in all the other States also. Thirdly, small businessmen lack resources for a thorough investigation of product services and markets.

The fourth problem so commonly listed is the effect of economic conditions on small business and that, of course, includes Government policies, credit restrictions, price-cutting wars, etc.

I said at the outset that this particular State Government has forgotten the small businessman. There is a wealth of evidence available in Western Australia to prove that that is patently clear. By slightly elaborating upon the terms of the first part of my amendment, I would like to suggest to the House that this is so.

Can anyone in Western Australia recall banner headlines from the Court Government about the importance of small businessmen? All of the money spent on promoting the State of excitement and the State of development in propaganda pumped out by the Department of Industrial Development concentrates on large-scale generally overseas-controlled mineral resources development projects. Nobody would suggest for a minute that those projects are not vital and important, but it shows a dangerous sense of unbalance—

Mr O'Neil: Imbalance.

Mr B. T. Burke: Oh, the Deputy Premier agrees with you.

Mr BRYCE: It is the Government that has an unbalanced approach.

Mr O'Neil: I was talking to somebody very intelligent—myself!

Mr BRYCE: I appreciate that that intelligence concurs with me. There is little doubt that because of this almost single-minded concentration on these large-scale mineral resource development projects, small business enterprise in Western Australia has been left in

the shadows. The Government has done precious little for it. It seems to have overlooked the importance of the fact that less than 10 per cent of Western Australians are employed in the mining sector, but 42 per cent of Western Australians are employed in the small business sector.

Is it any wonder, at a time when the promised second wave of mineral development has failed to materialise, that there is large-scale unemployment of our economic resources in this State? We have a Government that continues to look at the horizon, waiting for the second wave of great mineral development, and turning its back on small businesses which could provide so much of the needed employment in this State.

It is no surprise that the State of Queensland stands shoulder-to-shoulder with Western Australia as the other State in this nation that has neglected small business. It is probably because both States have reputations for glamorous mineral development projects and great mineral wealth. All the other States, particularly South Australia, Victoria, and New South Wales have, by virtue of the force of circumstances, been compelled to look after small businesses in their States. As a result of this, there is a vast range of different forms of assistance, legislation, regulations, and programmes for small businesses in those States. Similar assistance should be available to the small business sector of Western Australia.

Mr Spriggs: I think the South Australian small businessmen might not agree with you,

Mr BRYCE: If the member for Darling Range were to undertake a comparative analysis of the forms—

Mr Spriggs: That is a graveyard State.

Mr BRYCE: —of assistance available to small businessmen in South Australia from the Government department responsible for economic development and the forms of assistance available in this State from the Minister's department, he would be ashamed to be sitting behind the Minister for Industrial Development.

Mr Spriggs: Perhaps the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will undertake an investigation of the restrictions put on small businesses in South Australia. He would think differently then.

Mr Taylor: The longest speech you have ever made.

Mr BRYCE: I am just reminded by my colleague that that is the longest speech the member for Darling Range has ever made in this

House, and he has made both of his speeches from his seat.

Mr Jamieson: The two of them on the one day—the member for Clontarf also.

Mr Laurance: You are talking about a State in reverse.

Mr BRYCE: I suggest that members opposite should look at the situation in Victoria where their own colleagues are in power.

Mr Laurance: And still will be on Monday.

Mr BRYCE: Victoria is in the same plight, although it has left for dead the State of excitement as far as the small business sector is concerned.

The second facet of the Government's approach to this problem which is causing justifiable concern is the incredible indifference it has displayed about the ever-increasing number of company failures and business bankruptcies in Western Australia. I would like to commit some figures to the record. During the period this Government has been in office 1 150 Western Australian companies have gone to the wall. During that same period there have been 415 business bankruptcies. I am not suggesting that any Government could prevent all those companies from going to the wall, or prevent all those business bankruptcies. However, I am suggesting seriously that any Government which professes to be concerned about the economic development of a State should be doing more, and could be doing more if so minded, for small business.

I must say that it is not the large businesses which are going broke, but rather, it is the small businesses, and much of the trouble is due to the indifference of the Government. In addition to that indifference, there is also the Government's unpreparedness, although perhaps that is a reflection of the indifference.

It seems that the State Government is either not interested in the small business sector, or it finds it is too much trouble to be concerned about it. There is a very serious lack of adequate updated information about the small business sector of Western Australia. It is unfortunately true that this Government's approach to small businesses is a sort of patch-up and band aid assistance on a day-to-day basis. The Government does not have the information on which to plan a detailed and thorough approach to the development of the small business sector of this State.

I would like to take a quote from one of the most prominent experts in this field. In a

discussion paper entitled, "A National Policy for Small Enterprise Development" prepared in April, 1975, Professor Meredith of the University of New England made the following point very strongly at the beginning—

The area of small business in Australia has been one of neglect. In terms of knowledge about their performance, their ability to compete in and adapt to the market place under varying economic climates there exists an obvious deficiency.

The lack of knowledge concerning the facts of small business is a direct consequence of the limited data available.

By way of questions asked in this place over the past couple of weeks it has become perfectly clear that what Professor Meredith said as long ago as 1975 is even more true in 1979.

Let us consider our own State. The last census of Western Australian manufacturing firms was conducted in 1974-75. The last census of the retail establishments in Western Australia was conducted in 1973-74. The last census of wholesale establishments in Western Australia was conducted in 1968-69.

In addition to that, of course, there is a monumental lack of statistics in respect of key industries such as building and construction—and mining for that matter, despite the halo that seems to surround that industry—from which we can assess the relative position of small businesses. I would like to refer briefly to some questions I put to Government Ministers in this place only a few short days ago.

I asked the Premier how many country businesses currently contribute to pay-roll tax. I also asked what amount of money is contributed to pay-roll tax by country businesses. The Premier told me there are no appropriate statistics and the information is not available. I asked the Treasurer how many small businesses in Western Australia are exempted from the payment of pay-roll tax. The Treasurer told the House that information is not known.

I asked the Minister for Industrial Development what is the Government's estimate of the number of small business units operating in Western Australia by industry classification, and he told me that he had to get the information from the Department of Labour and Industry. He gave some approximate figures, suggesting there are some 14 000-odd shops employing one to 10 persons, and some 8 000 factories employing one to 10 persons. Then he said—and, after all, he is the Minister for Industrial Development in this State—"If you want other information on

manufacturing establishments you had better go to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, because my department does not have it." The Minister for Industrial Development did not have that information at his fingertips and, therefore, could not give it to us.

Mr Mensaros: I would rather go out and encourage small business than supply you with information you can get yourself.

Mr BRYCE: As far as this Parliament is concerned, the Minister for Industrial Development has a responsibility to supply the information.

Mr Mensaros interjected.

Mr BRYCE: The Minister has a responsibility to get that information for us. I asked him what proportion of small business enterprises in this State are Western Australian owned, and he replied that no known statistics are available. I asked him what was the number of small business failures and bankruptcies in Western Australia, and he replied he was not prepared to have his officers spend time on collating that information. If his department was on the ball, the officer most closely connected with the Small Business Advisory Service should have the information.

The point I make is that this information simply does not exist. The Government does not have the background information about the small business sector in Western Australia. It is true to say this Government's approach to small business is a hit-and-miss approach, a patch-up and band-aid approach. The sort of evidence I have just produced is conclusive in that respect.

The tail-end of the first part of my amendment suggests this Government, because of its slavish adherence to the economic policies of the Fraser Government, has done a great deal to harm the small business sector; and so it has. This is the appropriate opportunity for me to provide an answer or two to the Minister for Industrial Development. He seems to be under the very mistaken impression that it was his Government which took the first initiative to provide the initial Government help in the field of small business. It was the Whitlam Government's initiative which provided that impetus. That Government was the first Government in Australia to recognise the importance of small business and to establish a Government agency to do something about the plight of small business.

Mr Shalders: All those fancy words mean nothing.

Mr BRYCE: The Whitlam Government established the national Small Business Bureau. The only companies in which the present

Government is interested are the large and overseas controlled ones; they are the ones which provide much of the financial support for the political party that the member for Murray represents.

Mr Shalders: Go and ask the small shopkeepers.

Mr BRYCE: One of the first acts of the Fraser Government after its election in 1975 was to dismantle the national Small Business Bureau, and to throw the matter back into the lap of the States. To serve the interests of Liberal Party philosophy the first ever national Small Business Bureau was dismantled, and the offices in Perth and Sydney were closed. The initial framework of the bureau was abandoned, and the responsibility for the task was given back to the States.

As a result of that Western Australia and the State of Queensland have been the last to enter this field in any serious fashion, and we have entered it with less effect than the other major States, I have spent a great deal of time in Adelaide, Melbourne, and Sydney looking at the activities of small business bureaus, agencies, and services, which are developing their programmes to assist the small business sector.

Mr Williams: You are unreal.

Mr BRYCE: The member for Clontarf, who is accustomed to attacking the integrity of people who do not sit in this place, is very brave indeed. I suggest he should have the gumption to stand up in this place and participate in the debate. I suspect that, as a drycleaning expert, he is something of a guru for the Government to rely upon for advice about small business.

Mr Williams: You are so pathetic it is unreal.

Mr BRYCE: I suggested that the Government's slavish adherence to the Fraser Government's disastrous economic policies has done more to harm small business than almost anything else the Government has done. After the Fraser Government dismantled the national Small Business Bureau, we saw that Government embark upon its rather disastrous deflationary programme. Nothing has been more effective in sending small businesses to the wall than the serious depression in the level of demand in our economy brought about by the Fraser Government. Nothing could guarantee the bankruptcy of small business better than the way the Fraser Government is going about it by depressing the level of demand.

Large firms have resources which enable them to attain their share of the market. Small firms do not have the capacity to retain their share, and as a result many have gone broke.

Since Malcolm Fraser has been at the helm of the nation's economic destiny we have seen some changes occurring in the spending programme of the Federal Government. Not only has the level of Government spending come down, but the Government's spending itself has been aimed in the direction of large business rather than small business. When it comes to the crunch it is only the national Government which has the resources to do something effective about the financial problems faced by small businesses in times of crisis; yet this State Government has done nothing to criticise the Federal Government in this respect. In fact, the State Government has placed itself shoulder to shoulder alongside Malcolm Fraser in his determination to grind the economy to a halt, something he is managing to achieve very well.

The result of his economic vandalism has been not only to throw an extra 200 000 people out of work but also to send hundreds and thousands of small businesses to the wall.

Mr Spriggs: Do you have the statistics regarding New South Wales small businesses? Why do you check only on the two States—

Mr BRYCE: I have checked on all the States, and I am quite happy to present the honourable member with documentation of those statistics.

Mr Spriggs: The only States you pick on are Western Australia and Queensland, which are the only two States which have managed to increase their work force.

Mr BRYCE: Mr Speaker, will somebody ring a bell and tell the member for Darling Range that I am no longer talking about the work force, but have changed the subject?

Mr Tonkin: What century is it, Rip Van Winkle?

Mr BRYCE: The second half of my amendment to the Address-in-Reply motion contains a list of nine positive suggestions to which I believe the Government should give close consideration; that is why, with a great deal of respect, I ask the Minister for Industrial Development to do just that.

Mr Williams: How would you know? You have never been in business.

Mr BRYCE: It sounds as though the member for Clontarf is warming up to make his initial contribution for 1979.

Mr Williams: Do not be childish!

Mr BRYCE: If his contribution is to be on this subject, we await it with a great sense of pleasure.

Mr Young: I saw the member for Perth in the corridor a while ago. He was within 100 yards of

the Chamber at the time, which was something of a record.

Mr Spriggs: Even your leader has deserted you.

Mr Williams: What about the member for Rockingham and the member for Cockburn? They are never in the Chamber.

Mr BRYCE: I suggest to the Minister as the first of a series of nine positive suggestions that his department forthwith should increase the resources of the Small Business Advisory Service. It really is quite surprising when we consider that 42 per cent of the State's work force is employed by small businesses that only three people comprise the Small Business Advisory Service in Western Australia. I can anticipate the Minister saying, "Oh yes, but there are some officers of the Department of Industrial Development who do some briefing work in country towns from time to time." I am arguing in fundamental terms that to have a manager and two councillors is inadequate when one considers the significance of this sector.

The Premier made one of the most farcical promises I have ever heard when he went before the electorate in 1977. His policy speech promised a new deal for small businesses. Mr Speaker, what do you suppose that "new deal" was? The Premier shifted these three officers—in fact, it may have been only two at the time—from the building they were in to another building, and possibly added another officer to the service. He then said, "There, now you are a new centre." The Premier promised to establish a new centre for small businesses, and that was the way he went about it.

Mr Sodeman: When was the promise made?

Mr BRYCE: It was made in 1977, and is contained in the policy speech for that election. I suggest the member for Pilbara check it.

I suggest in all sincerity to the Minister for Industrial Development that if we are to develop a level of sophistication in the encouragement of small businesses in this State to match the magnificence and glamour of the development in our mineral industry, we should give serious thought to establishing a small business development corporation. For the benefit of the member for Darling Range, I should add that is the very important initiative which has been taken by the Victorian State Government, and it seems to be working very well. It is about the most sophisticated piece of machinery which has ever been established for the benefit of small businesses in Australia.

Some very valid arguments have been put forward in support of such a corporation. The Premier argued at the last election that small

businessmen are diffident about approaching civil servants for advice on how to run their businesses. It has been seriously suggested by some people that perhaps civil servants are not the best people to advise small businessmen on how to solve their problems. There is a great deal of sense in that suggestion. If we established a small business development corporation it would enable the State to gain access to many people who are experienced and expert in the small business sector and who have had experience with the pitfalls of setting up a small business; these people could be freely and easily seconded to such an organisation for a brief period. Probably, such a scheme has many other advantages but I do not have sufficient time available to enable me to elaborate on that point now. I simply say it is a concept the Minister should seriously consider.

Mr Sodeman: What is the corporation's function?

Mr BRYCE: The essential function of the Victorian corporation is to provide assistance and encouragement; they are using a whole range of different methods to encourage the expansion of small businesses in that State.

Mr Sodeman: That is good. But does it do any more than the Small Business Advisory Service in Western Australia.

Mr BRYCE: Yes it does; I do not have time to go through the list of functions of the corporation, but I will be happy to supply the information to the member for Pilbara. I might just add for the edification of the honourable member that wherever possible, the corporation avoids duplication of effort with the consultancy services provided in the private sector.

The second initiative I suggest the Government should consider is an approach to the national Government to see what can be done to make the banking system more responsive and accessible to the small business sector. There is no question in anybody's mind who has seriously considered the problems of the small business sector that the principal difficulty small businesses face is the availability of funds. They must be given access to venture capital and to capital which is cheaper so that they do not rely to such an extent on internally-generated capital. Whenever small businesses come into the market to borrow funds for expansion they are usually forced by the very nature of the market to pay the highest possible price for those funds.

I suggest that action can and should be taken to have another look at the exemption ceiling which currently applies to pay-roll tax. It was a sorry day for employment and for small businesses

when the Commonwealth Government decided to give the States control over pay-roll tax as a growth tax. Whether those State Governments were Labor Governments or Liberal Governments, they have used pay-roll tax as a system of generating more and more revenue.

Since pay-roll tax was handed to Western Australia in 1971 we have seen the amount collected by the Government increase until it is now \$116 million a year more than it was in 1972. The State Government collected \$42 million in 1972 and today it collects \$158 million.

I suggest in all sincerity to the Minister that the Government should consider raising that ceiling once again in order to exempt an even larger proportion of businesses from the current levels of pay-roll tax.

In particular, it is a great pity that we in Western Australia do not know how many country businesses are paying pay-roll tax. In at least one other State I can bring to mind there is a Country Industry Pay-roll Tax Rebate Act. Any industry in a country town in New South Wales can qualify for a rebate of pay-roll tax of up to 100 per cent; that is something at which we in Western Australia should be looking.

I do not have time to discuss in great detail the establishment payment scheme of South Australia or the subsidy schemes which, to the best of my knowledge, operate in Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia to assist small businesses in meeting the very expensive consultancy fees charged by private organisations. It is all very fine to have the Small Business Advisory Service to which small businessmen can turn for advice. However, more often than not they are referred to private entrepreneurs who charge consultancy fees of between \$10 and \$40 an hour.

In other States it is appreciated that the charges can become prohibitive and Acts are prepared which will cater for the needs of small businesses. Subsidies are created to enable small businesses to survive.

The final initiative I would like to spend my time in discussing is the need for and the value of a small businesses loans guarantee Act. The Act of the Parliament in this State which enables the Government to provide loans for businesses is as old as 1947. The definition of "industry" which underpins or relates to that specific Act is found in the 1944 Rural and Industries Bank Act. Therefore we have an Act that was passed in 1947, and has not been altered substantially since then. With a few minor amendments to take into consideration specific approaches by specific industries, that Act has as its definition of

"industry" a definition that was drawn up in 1944. It defines "industry" as "manufacturing and processing". I have not the time to read that definition into the record. However, I think it is particularly important. In New South Wales as recently as 1977 the State Government came to the conclusion that it was quite inappropriate to operate on the basis of a definition of "industry" that was 30 years old.

Let us have a brief look at the hoops that a business has to jump through in Western Australia if it seeks assistance from the Government by way of a guarantee for a loan. It is supposed to be a pioneering industry in a particular field, if it is in the metropolitan area, so there is not unfair competition to others; and it has to go through a quite rigorous test in the Treasury. I do not mind the need for that. I would not object to the need to prove the financial viability of a firm.

One of the reasons this Act does not provide assistance to small businesses is that so many small businesses in the building and construction industry and in the service industries are not encompassed within the definition of "industry" that was drawn up in 1944 and incorporated in the Rural and Industries Bank Act.

In New South Wales, any small business with more than five employees and fewer than 50 employees, for any reason related to the acquisition of land, the construction and alteration of buildings, or the acquisition of plant and machinery can approach the State Government and ask for a Government guarantee—

Mr Mensaros interjected.

Mr BRYCE: I have moved the amendment.

Mr Mensaros: You did not have the courtesy to give us a copy, and you did not move it.

Mr BRYCE: I said, "I move", and I read the amendment.

Mr Mensaros: You said you intended to move.

Mr BRYCE: I moved the amendment at the outset. In fact, I checked with the Clerk today to ensure that it was proper for me to do so, as I intended to do it then. I suggest that the Minister does not try to evade the issue by pulling that sort of stunt.

Mr Mensaros interjected.

Mr BRYCE: It is an absolute outrage.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRYCE: I insist that the record shows that I stated, "I move". I checked with the Clerk of

the House if it was proper and in order for me to move in the first five minutes of my speech.

Mr Mensaros: But the Clerk said you did not move it. That is the reason I do not have a copy.

Mr BRYCE: I have moved the amendment. It is 1½ pages long. I do not have the time to—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member's time has expired. Does anybody second the amendment?

MR CARR (Geraldton) [5.25 p.m.]: I second the amendment moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

In doing so, I want to speak about the small businesses which are in the decentralised and country areas of this State. The simple truth is that nearly all of the businesses in country areas are small businesses by the Wiltshire definition or any other definition of "small business". I would have expected that the Government would appreciate the plight of the small businesses in country areas. After all, there are many Government members who come from country areas; and I would have thought that those members would make sufficient impression on the Cabinet to introduce measures to assist the small businesses in country areas.

I would also have hoped that the Government would appreciate that small businesses contribute to a positive decentralisation policy of growth in country areas of the State. I would have thought that the Government would appreciate that the growth of country economies should have a balance which incorporates a strong small business sector.

The balanced economy in country areas should, firstly, have secure basic industries, be they mining industries, or major rural industries, or perhaps the newer industries such as retirement and leisure industries. Preferably the economy would have more than one of those basic industries. Secondly, the country economy would have an efficient Government sector providing the services to the people who live in the area, and, of course, protecting the residents from such problems as higher prices, and so on. As well as those two sectors in the country economy, there is vital importance in having a comprehensive range of profitable small businesses providing various services in the region. These small service industries are the fibre that binds together the industrial and Government sectors to make a co-ordinated unit in the economy of the country town.

While it is true that the small business sector is vitally important in all areas generally, it is particularly true in relation to small country towns. The presence of small businesses is very

helpful in the fostering of community relations in country towns. I refer here to the situation where the boss and the employee, if I may use those terms, have a much closer relationship than seems to be the case with the large businesses which operate in the metropolitan areas of the State. The boss and the employee will frequently drink together after work, and frequently they will belong to the same bowling club. That leads to a clear exchange of views between employees and employers in the small business sector of the country economy.

Small businesses are important to the growth of a town as it extends in size. This is because small businesses live off each other. As one service industry develops it employs people who, in turn, require a further service industry to service the newly developing industry. This is even more important with the present shift from primary and secondary industries to the tertiary industries. The tertiary industry sector is now the largest employer of the work force.

I note the importance of the leisure and retirement industries which have developed in recent years, particularly in attractive, pleasant, medium-sized towns in pleasant locations, most frequently on the coast. These leisure and retirement industries also require many service industries and small businesses to service their needs.

One would have expected that the Court Government would devote more attention to helping small businesses develop in country areas. However, that does not seem to have happened. The question arises whether the Government is committed at all to making decentralisation work, and to assisting small businesses in the country areas of the State.

Mr Sodeman: You have to be joking.

Mr CARR: This Government has never committed itself to making decentralisation work. This Government has never accepted that there are arguments against Perth's growing at a rapid rate to a size which is much bigger than most people would like it to be. The Government has never accepted the existence of problems of pollution, crime, illnesses of stress, transport, and so on which are becoming so prevalent in Perth. This Government has never accepted the need to promote one or more of the major country towns of the State to the size of a city.

This Government has never accepted that it is possible to use Government policy to influence the direction of growth.

Mr Laurance: Bunbury is becoming a city this year.

Mr CARR: It is in the technical sense of the provisions of the Local Government Act, which indicate a town's population must reach 20 000 in three years. I acknowledge the fact that Geraldton will follow this course, as will other towns; however, I am speaking of areas where there are something like 50 000 people with an economy that would develop in a self-sustaining way.

Western Australia lags badly in terms of assistance to small businesses in regional centres. There is a significant difference between the Opposition and the Government in their respective policies.

The Opposition believes that decentralisation can be made to work, although there will be certain difficulties. On the other hand the Government appears to base its decentralisation policies on minerals in particular and industrial development in general. The Government seems to put all its eggs in one basket so far as decentralisation is concerned. Its emphasis is entirely on industrial development.

Government members make great play about the 1960s when a good deal of industrial development took place. The truth is that it was a good time for industrial development. It was an era of strong world markets for our products compared with the current world markets we are facing. It was an easy time for the Government of the day. Had the Menzies Federal Government not held on to its embargo until after the election in 1959 we would have had the same industrial development but with the Hawke Labor Government being responsible for it.

The Government does not seem to realise that most development which takes place with mining booms is not necessarily a stable type of development. I cite examples such as Coolgardie and Big Bell, which were significant boom towns with major industrial development in their time but which are now ghost towns.

Modern booms such as that which occurred at Goldsworthy are similar; this town is destined to become a ghost town. To a lesser extent this can be seen in Morawa with the closing down of the Koolanooka development; Laverton, and the closing down of the Windarra operations; and Jurien Bay, although this town will survive because of its location. It did boom with the advent of the Western Mining mineral sands operation, but there was a downturn when the industry tapered off.

It does not always happen that a boom town will become a ghost town when the major industries leave if the towns can maintain some

long-term industry and Kalgoorlie, Port Hedland, Karratha, and Dampier are examples. Such towns are capable of going on to bigger things. While mineral development is a good base, it should not be seen as the only means to make decentralisation work.

The Government seems also to have a problem in coming to grips with helping small businesses for a different reason. It seems to have a philosophical dogma that free competition is more important than anything else. Such a policy means open slather for big businesses. Often in this House the member for Warren has said that the Government's philosophy can best be summarised by the expression, "Every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost, said the elephant as he danced among the chickens." We could go further and say, "It is every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost, said the big business city elephant as it danced among the small business country chickens."

The member for Bunbury was quoted recently in his local paper as addressing a meeting of businessmen and saying there should be a shakeup of business and that business should shake itself up. Our reply is that indeed there should be a shakeup but with Government assistance to business in that area.

The Government seems to be prepared to allow small businesses to carry on in this way, but where big business is concerned, with substantial donations to Government funds and an opportunity to wield political pressure—I instance oil companies—the Government does come to the party.

Mr Laurance: You are suggesting they make a profit; you know the ALP attacks all profit.

Mr CARR: To the contrary; I said one of the most important ingredients of a sound economy is a profitable and viable small business sector together with a significant Government sector. I trust I have made that clear.

A comparison is interesting if we look at the assistance provided by the Western Australian Government to small businesses with assistance given by other States. We have been through this before and I have compared the assistance given by the Department of Industrial Development and similar departments in other States. It would be in order if I make a quick recap.

Last year I contacted the department concerned with decentralisation and its counterparts in each State and asked for details of incentives provided to business to locate in country areas. I received one sheet of information from the Department of Industrial Development

with typed details on just one side. It was a flimsy sheet detailing when incentives are provided by the Western Australian Government to small businesses to locate themselves in decentralised locations. On the other hand, each of the other States provided a comprehensive pamphlet showing a large number of incentives available.

It is worth taking the time of the House to run through the incentives given by the State of New South Wales and relate them item by item to what is available in Western Australia. On the Western Australian sheet under the heading of, "Financial assistance" it is shown that such assistance is generally by way of a guarantee to approved lending institutions. In other words, all Western Australia gives are loan guarantees.

By comparison, in certain areas in New South Wales 100 per cent of the finance required is directly available for the purchase of land and the construction of factory buildings over an extended period. Elsewhere the department contributes up to 60 per cent of the finance required for land and factory buildings to accommodate country industry. The local authorities involved usually add 30 per cent of the figure. The department further guarantees loans up to \$50 000 for the purchase of factory buildings and in some cases the loan can be in excess of this figure. If the Government so desires it will at times lease factory premises in particular locations.

We have the situation where in Western Australia the Government gives a few loan guarantees while the New South Wales Government gives a considerable amount of direct financial assistance. It should be noted that on the sheet I received from the Department of Industrial Development there are half a page of limitations and restrictions as to who in fact can get those loan guarantees.

The second item on the local sheet shows the heading of, "Subsidy of interest rates". I will give credit where it is due; there are useful incentives which are not matched by New South Wales or perhaps other States. It is the one bright spot in the general comparison, with Western Australia giving something that New South Wales does not.

The third item is, "Rail freight concessions". We are told that Western Australia grants concessions of up to 30 per cent of the gazetted rail freight for selected industries. There are one or two limitations: a maximum concession of \$15 000 a year for any one enterprise; and the phasing out of that concession over a five-year period. Compared with Western Australia's 30 per cent concession, New South Wales gives a concession of 60 per cent. That State's Public

Transport Commission provides subsidies that range up to 60 per cent of normal rail charges. In addition to that assistance from the commission, further concessions for country industries assistance provide additional rail freight concessions. Clearly, on the question of rail freight subsidies, much more is provided by New South Wales than Western Australia.

The next heading is, "Preferential tendering" and in Western Australia tendering for Government contracts is subject to three significant limitations. There is a 5 per cent preference on Government tenders for building or renovating contracts up to a value of \$20 000. I ask members, "How many Government projects are constructed for less than \$20 000?"

The firm which gets the benefit from this must be within 50 miles of the location and State housing contracts are excluded. By comparison, in New South Wales that 5 per cent country industry preference scheme extends right across the board of Government contracts. There is no limit of \$20 000 and State housing contracts are included.

The next point mentioned here is the question of pay-roll tax concessions. We find in Western Australia that concessions are granted with certain restrictions. They are subject to the establishment of a need in order to ensure the continuation, extension, or establishment of operations. There is a limit of an \$11 500 weekly pay-roll compared, of course, with the new New South Wales situation where there is no restriction at all. The assistance there can be up to 100 per cent without the \$11 500 restriction. That deals with the five points mentioned on the Western Australian sheet and the comparisons with the New South Wales counterparts.

I should like to conclude by drawing the attention of the House to six other items available in New South Wales which are not available in Western Australia, in addition to the matters I have mentioned already.

I should first of all like to refer to housing. Housing for key personnel will be made available by the Government if it can be established that their employment is essential to the effective operation of the factory. Secondly, I should like to refer to the training of unskilled labour subsidy. A subsidy is available toward the cost of training unskilled labour where, through locating in a decentralised area, a manufacturer would incur costs which would not arise in the metropolitan area. The third New South Wales incentive not available in Western Australia is the establishment costs subsidy. A subsidy is available

to meet either wholly or partly the cost of transporting machinery, equipment, and stock, and the personal effects of key employees from a metropolitan area to a country location, and other establishment costs.

The fourth incentive is the subsidy towards the cost of technical consultant services. A subsidy of 75 per cent of the cost of a technical consultant service scheme designed to assist decentralised manufacturers is available. The fifth incentive is the subsidised feasibility study. The New South Wales department subsidises feasibility studies up to 75 per cent of the cost and then, after that feasibility study if decentralisation actually occurs, the other 25 per cent is paid also. The sixth and final incentive provided by the New South Wales Government which is not provided by this Government is the subsidised industrial design scheme which enables country manufacturers to gain financial support from the Government.

It is clear from that comparison with one State, New South Wales, that much more is provided there than is provided in Western Australia. The comparisons with States other than New South Wales are not quite as dramatic, but certainly in most cases much more is provided in other States than in Western Australia, with the exception of Tasmania which already has a considerable number of regional centres compared with our one major central city situation.

While the amendment moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has criticised the Government, it has put forward also a number of constructive points. I suggest each of the six incentives available in New South Wales which are not available in Western Australia could well be granted in this State. The amendment includes a total of eight suggestions which would help small businesses either in the metropolitan or country areas of this State.

I trust the Government will approach these suggestions seriously and will examine the possibilities which have been put forward. Hopefully, as a result, small businesses, and small businesses in the country in particular, in Western Australia will benefit from such an initiative.

MR MENSAROS (Floreat—Minister for Industrial Development) [5.45 p.m.]: The amendment moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is part of a budding election campaign which the Opposition starts fairly early and at a selected time in the hope that the Government might not be able to reply and the Opposition will receive all the publicity. There is no doubt the policy of this Government is to support all

businesses, large or small. To accuse the Government of concentrating on large businesses only or on mineral projects only is entirely wrong.

The economy of Western Australia must take into account the fact that the State covers a vast area and is populated by a comparatively small number of people. The population in itself does not create a sufficiently large domestic market for large-scale secondary manufacturing industries to develop successfully and be based on the domestic market only. It is a fact that the resource development projects are the basis of our economy, because we have the resources and we can develop them.

It is precisely these resource development projects—the large projects on which we have been accused of spending too much attention—which feed the small businesses which the Opposition pretends to protect. It is precisely these large projects, as a result of the economic flow-on they create, which provide an opportunity for the existence of small businesses either directly or indirectly through various flow-on channels.

I want to deal with some of the points on which the Opposition attack was concentrated. We have established the Small Business Advisory Bureau. Where was it during the time of the Tonkin Government? It did not exist then.

Mr Bryce: The Whitlam Government established it.

Mr MENSAROS: The Labor Party is always hanging its hat on the Federal Government. It does not care about the State or what is being done in the State or by the State Government. Whatever was done by the Federal Government, it was only centralism.

Mr Bryce: What a beauty!

Mr MENSAROS: When this matter was discussed at the ministerial conference, Ministers both Labor and Liberal, supported the idea that constitutionally and practically this is a State matter. All the Ministers applauded the decision of the Fraser Government to hand back this matter to the State Governments. All Ministers, both Labor and Liberal, were in favour of it. The only responsibility left with the Federal Government was the publication of various pamphlets and information material which can be dealt with more effectively and possibly more cheaply from one source.

This Government established the Small Business Advisory Bureau which has done tremendous work. I should like to quote a few figures pertaining to the year 1977-78. The inquiries which came from small business sources

to the bureau in the manufacturing sector were 483; in the wholesale sector the figure was 129; in the retail sector it was 840; in the service sector it was 389; in the professional sector it was 266; and in all other sectors it was 227. A total of 2 334 inquiries were dealt with in one year in the State of Western Australia.

The statistics show the various divisions in which the approaches were made; but I do not want to deal with them in detail. It is easy for the Opposition to say, "You must spend more money, but at the same time lower the pay-roll tax." That is the commonly-repeated argument from members opposite. They say, "Pay for something more from Government funds and collect less tax."

The lack of logic must be clear even to members of the Labor Party. When there is less revenue how can more money be made available?

The Small Business Advisory Service does not comprise only three people. They are the employed officers, but there are many volunteers and also assistance is given by the DID. Through questions and speeches by the member for Geraldton and others it has been suggested that we send officers from the service permanently to the country. That would be absolutely superfluous because soon after it was elected in 1974 the Government established offices of the DID in country centres. Officers there are employed permanently and they give original advice to the small businessmen. This has been the situation ever since and the people appreciate the service.

Mr Bryce: There is not one up north.

Mr MENSAROS: There are four altogether in those places. Also many visits have been made by the Minister himself and his advisers in order to address people in various northern towns. The people up there have been told to seek advice. In many instances I have dealt with these queries myself or have assigned the work to my officers.

Of course the Labor Party is always ready to introduce more legislation and an array of inadequate rules.

Mr Davies: Fair go!

Mr Bryce: Some of them were made by the Liberal Party.

Mr MENSAROS: We go about the situation in a practical and pragmatic way. We do not merely introduce legislation; we take action. This is unlike the ALP which, at meetings, spends half its time on procedural rules.

Mr Bryce: How many ALP meetings have you attended?

Mr MENSAROS: It might well be claimed that general incentives and the colour and magnificence of pamphlets which are published are not measuring up to those available in some of the other States, but we consider each case on its merits and no-one could justifiably complain.

Comments have been made about statistics. It is a fact that I do not ask my departmental officers to do a job which could be done by anyone merely by referring to statistics. We are not there to do this. We would rather help business people, but the Opposition claims we do not do it. Statistics are the responsibility of the Federal Government. No-one has suggested that the State Government should establish a statistical office. It probably could not do so constitutionally. Everyone is free to look up statistics.

Several members interjected.

Mr MENSAROS: If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will recommend a constitutional amendment, I will support it. I am asking what the Labor Party has done about all these things. The Opposition says we have done nothing. Who created the Inventions Advisory Committee? We have all the incentives for investors and the Australian council has said ours is the best working organisation in the whole of Australia. Did the Labor Party think of it? No; but today it complains.

Response is made to every inquiry of the department which gives valuable help.

The Opposition has said that we do not advertise the services available to small businesses. Of course, obviously the Opposition does not know that every week the DID pays for a half page advertisement in the *Daily News*. If I were to take out the statistics I guarantee I would find that 80 per cent to 90 per cent of small businesses are getting help through these advertisements, contrary to what the Opposition says.

Every week I visit at least one factory if I am here and the other day I visited a factory which is doing a magnificent job on the manufacture of a PVC component used widely in ventilation in the mining industry. Again this is an example of what can be done. I was enthusiastic about the work this factory is doing because it is replacing a part which previously had to be imported.

I issued a Press release, but the media did not think it very important. The person involved has only a handful of employees and his family, but he is manufacturing something which was previously imported and is augmenting local industry. Therefore the Opposition is talking

absolute nonsense when it says we do not publicise our services.

The Opposition says that we should introduce pay-roll tax legislation. First of all I remind members that we were the Government which introduced the increased statutory exemption level. The Opposition claims that legislation should be introduced to allow 100 per cent pay-roll tax rebate for country businesses but the Opposition omitted to notice that such legislation was one of the first pieces we introduced. It is on the Statute book. Country businesses do have 100 per cent rebate if they come under the provided conditions.

Mr Bryce: How many and which ones?

Mr MENSAROS: What does the Deputy Leader of the Opposition mean?

Mr Bryce: What small businesses?

Mr MENSAROS: Any small country business.

Mr Bryce: It does not apply universally.

Mr MENSAROS: Read the legislation. It gives full exemption to qualifying applicants. Of course, there are limits by the Treasury, but so far we have been able to satisfy every application which has appeared reasonable and have provided assistance.

Mr Bryce: So it does not apply to everyone.

Mr MENSAROS: The Opposition talks about lack of statistical information. I say again we are treating the situation pragmatically. We are not collecting statistics to put in hundreds of files. We do not think that is right.

Mr Bryce: Hit-and-miss arrangement.

Mr MENSAROS: Not only do we give advice through the DID and the Small Business Advisory Service. We also watch businesses even if they do not make an approach to the department for advice. Occasionally staff of the department go to various companies to offer advice. We collect data within the department from consumers and again this is the data of purchased manufactured items by large projects. An estimate can be made of the items which can be manufactured in Western Australia within reason and of a feasible quantity in order that the quantity is large enough for the sales price to be competitive. In this way we do not have to obtain the items from interstate or overseas where manufacture is on a much larger scale.

We are succeeding. I will give an example. When mining projects, and particularly processing industries, were being developed it was realised that almost everything was imported right down to the smallest metal fabricated item. Now some of the equipment in the mines is

manufactured here, not necessarily on a first-contract basis, but on a sub-contract basis when we deal with the smallest manufacturer.

The best example was when the department realised that there are many long conveyor belts which are on pulleys, and obviously the pulleys have to be replaced fairly often or repaired. No such pulleys were manufactured in Western Australia. However, we encouraged someone to establish a manufacturing plant and ever since the pulleys have been manufactured here. The business, which comes well within the definition of "small business" is successful. This is one example of the many concerning what the Government and the department do for small businesses. This is the primary policy on which our principles are based. We have taken the initiative.

With the help of private industry, the confederation and the Chamber of Commerce, the staff of the department does all it can to help private industry.

There are various lists. Again, these are the fields where we feel that the domestic market and demand might be large enough to establish a manufacturer where items are being imported. This is done not only within the State, but also through the Agent General and the Sydney representative, about whom there was a question today in an apprehensive manner. The question asked why he was still there, but services have been attracted through him. Businesses have been encouraged to come here and become established, filling a gap for items which previously have been imported.

The question of failures was referred to. Of course there are failures. Statistics show how many bankruptcies and how many liquidations there have been, and we are asked why they are not prevented. It is never set out in statistics, however, the number of bankruptcies and liquidations which have been prevented because of the Government's intervention, advice, and very often financial help through loan guarantees.

Let us look at what else the Government has done, because it stands accused as though it has done nothing. Let us look at the Local Products and Sources Cabinet Sub-committee. It is an active committee incorporating outsiders. Its members comprise three Ministers who are mostly involved with Government orders. There are representatives of the larger Government instrumentalities such as the SEC, the railways, and the Government Stores on that sub-committee. Private industry also from all fields, is included. There is representation from

manufacturers, consultants, engineers, architects, and other people. We have regular meetings. We do lay down a policy.

Several members interjected.

Mr MENSAROS: Members opposite can just talk around; they do not know what they are talking about.

This committee busies itself in other fields and has a very practical approach. If the department receives complaints about the possibility that the Government has not used locally manufactured goods, the company concerned is examined by visits of the whole committee. We take out statistics and the results are there. We took out statistics to satisfy ourselves with regard to the Hamersley heavy media separation project and the result was that in a capital expenditure of over \$300 million, 85 per cent was Western Australian supplied goods which had been manufactured in Western Australia. The same statistics have not been taken out for the Newman beneficiation plant, the extension of the Robe River venture, and other projects, but the results would be the same.

The member for Geraldton mentioned the State Housing Commission, but his comments relate mainly to large group construction. In small areas the local builders in this field have an advantage, and there are very few cases otherwise. I do not think he could cite one other single case involving an individual house in Geraldton, built for the State Housing Commission, which would have gone to a Perth builder. Local builders have the advantage. We have done nothing wrong. In all other constructions the local and regional manufacturers have a 10 per cent advantage. Of course, a 10 per cent preference for local manufacturers for Government contracts has no parallel in private enterprise. There is a close liaison however with private businesses and they do everything to give an equal chance to have local people manufacture items. The same applies to Government agreements with companies.

I come back to the importance of resource development, and other large projects, and how much they offer to small businesses. The Government has included an important clause so that local services—professional, advisory, and manufacturing—will be utilised and applied to projects.

I said previously that our Sydney representative was doing a valuable job for many people here. He has assisted them to set up manufacturing plants; he has made repeated successful efforts to prevent branches of Eastern States companies from discontinuing to operate in Western

Australia. The same job is done at a different geographic level by the Agent General in London. Members will be aware that the last two appointments cut across the normal tradition, and businessmen were appointed as Agents General. They were appointed precisely for this reason. If any member of the Opposition were to walk into some of the European banks he would see our pamphlets showing the so-called gaps which could be filled in Western Australia by small manufacturing businesses. We are interested in encouraging and setting up businesses here to stimulate our economy.

It was a Liberal-Country Party Government which, a long time ago, established the Industrial Lands Development Authority. That was an example to the other States. The authority assists large and small industries, and many successful businessmen are very grateful for having been able to purchase land on reasonable terms and at reasonable prices in order to set up their own manufacturing businesses.

The suggestion that the setting up of a small business corporation as a statutory body will suddenly make everything better, I do not accept. We are not out to regulate or make rules; we are out to help. There is no large business corporation, yet the Opposition accuses us of paying too much attention to large business and caring only about mining corporations.

Mention was made of the Rural and Industries Bank Act and the Industries Assistance Act. The Industries Assistance Act provides, and it is the policy of the Government, that Government guarantees under that Act should primarily be given to decentralised manufacturers, and secondly to manufacturers in the metropolitan area who are pioneers. If we were to do things the other way around the Opposition would accuse us of establishing one business to kill off another. We have not a large market, and if the market is satisfactorily supplied by the existing manufacturers it would be folly to support another manufacturer to serve only as competition and take away the work force or the work of competitors.

In addition, the member for Geraldton said we were placing too much emphasis on competition and that was a bad thing. So, I do not really know what the accusation is—whether we should support competition or be opposed to it. In any case, the fact remains that we successfully support business, not only through those two Acts which I cited but also by examining individual cases. No business, small or large, would have come to the Government and not received the proper attention and support for its case. There

are many examples of this, of course, but without looking up the records I cannot cite them exactly.

I repeat that this motion is purely electioneering propaganda. However, no matter how small the Government or the Budget, more than half of the budget of the Department of Industrial Development is expended on personnel and effort for the assistance and encouragement of small businesses. For those reasons I urge the House to reject the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The question is that the amendment be agreed to.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 13	
Mr Barnett	Mr Hodge
Mr Bertram	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bryce	Mr Tonkin
Mr T. J. Burke	Dr Troy
Mr Carr	Mr Wilson
Mr Davies	Mr Bateman
Mr Harman	

(Teller)

Noes 22	
Mr Clarko	Mr Nanovich
Mr Coyne	Mr O'Connor
Mr Crane	Mr Old
Dr Dadour	Mr O'Neil
Mr Grayden	Mr Rushton
Mr Grewar	Mr Sodeman
Mr Hassell	Mr Spriggs
Mr Herzfeld	Mr Tubby
Mr Laurance	Mr Williams
Mr McPharlin	Mr Young
Mr Mensaros	Mr Shalders

(Teller)

Ayes	Pairs	Noes
Mr Pearce	Mrs Craig	
Mr T. H. Jones	Mr Sibson	
Mr Grill	Mr P. V. Jones	
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Ridge	
Mr McIver	Mr Watt	
Mr B. T. Burke	Sir Charles Court	
Mr Skidmore	Mr MacKinnon	
Mr Taylor	Mr Blaikie	

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Grewar.

House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: INDUSTRIAL LANDS DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Land at Cockburn Sound.

1. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Does the Industrial Lands Development Authority own an area of land with beach frontage to Cockburn Sound between the SEC power house Kwinana and Alcoa?

- (2) What is the size of the block in hectares?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: DAMPIER SALT COMPANY

Access Road

2. Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

My question is to the Minister for Decentralisation, and refers to question No. 726.

Mr O'Neil: We do not have a Minister for decentralisation.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Then I direct my question to the Minister for Industrial Development. It is appropriate there is no Minister for decentralisation!

Following the admission to the House by the Minister for Transport that he is entertaining representations seeking financial assistance for the Dampier Salt Company, will the Minister urgently inform his colleague of the statement he made in this House last night when he said the Government was not in favour of helping these major multi-nationals.

Mr MENSAROS replied:

I do not know anything of the comments upon which the alleged question is based. I do consider that is not a question, but some sort of admonition to which I am not prepared to respond.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE

J. Doohan

3. Dr TROY, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the State Government Insurance Office has failed to comply with the Act in the case of Mr John Doohan?

- (2) Will he direct the State Government Insurance Office to furnish to Mr Doohan his medical report?
- (3) If he will not, why not?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) A copy of a report from a psychiatrist was neither requested by nor given to J. Doohan in 1975 as it had no influence on the settlement of his workers' compensation claim. The doctor had in any case requested that the report be kept confidential. It was subsequently returned to him.
- (2) and (3) The report is no longer in the possession of the State Government Insurance Office.

FUEL: OIL

Rigs

- 4. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) What work is available for the four Australian built rigs after May of this

year, particularly the three working out of Western Australia?

- (2) If all three are laid up after this month, how many people will be thrown out of work?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) It is assumed that the honourable member is referring to the work opportunities in Western Australia for the four Australian-built oil drilling vessels and in such case it is estimated that during 1979, 13 wells will be drilled offshore Western Australia by Australian drilling vessels providing the equivalent of work throughout the year for the two vessels with some work for a third vessel.
- (2) From information available it is not anticipated that the three vessels will be laid up after this month.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Confidential Information

622. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) Further to the answer to part (1) of question 522 of 1979, if information released by her department was of a nature normally given on request to any sector of the public, why were local government councillors, as members of the public, told that the information was confidential and not to be released publicly?
- (2) Under the policy guidelines announced by the Premier on 27th November, is the status of local government councillors in respect of the release of confidential information different from other sectors of the public, such as land developers?

Mr Young (for Mrs CRAIG) replied:

- (1) Information released was of a nature normally given following a specific request relating to specific property. The broad regional nature of roading proposals in the Ferndale-Cannington area were confidential to council and others prior to public release.
- (2) No.

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN: PREMIER

Use of Expression "Don't Tell Lies"

681. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Speaker:

- (1) Is the Speaker aware that during debate on Tuesday last, the Premier used the expression "Don't tell lies"?
- (2) Is he further aware the Deputy Speaker refused to ask that the remark be withdrawn?
- (3) Will he—for the benefit of the Premier in particular and members in general—make a statement concerning the use of this expression in this House?

The SPEAKER replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.
- (3) To accuse another member of lying, telling lies or being a liar has always been regarded in this House as unparliamentary and objectionable. I do not have available to me a complete list of words disallowed since the commencement of this Assembly but the list I do have, covering the years 1972 to 1978 indicates that this accusation, in one form or another, has been disallowed and its withdrawal sought on no less than 24 occasions in that period. This far outnumbers any other unparliamentary expression.

I appreciate that there could be a difference on the occasion referred to in that the phrase used was "Don't tell lies". One could interpret such an expression as a warning or caution, rather than an accusation. However, I personally would prefer that members refrained from using the word in any form when referring to other members. It seems invariably to lead to heated arguments, quarrels and similar unparliamentary behaviour. It is less than two years since the refusal to withdraw the words "At least he could be truthful instead of telling lies" led to a member being suspended from the service of this House.

Although I am not able to quote a precedent in this House concerning the expression "Don't tell lies" I find that this phrase was disallowed in the New Zealand Parliament in 1969.

At an earlier stage in the evening referred to, the *Hansard* report reveals that the Member for Morley, responding to an interjection from the Member for Gascoyne, said "That is a lie".

I regret that this statement was not noticed by me, nor was my attention drawn to it. However, I must deprecate the practice of making accusations of this nature and ask members to desist from it.

I am not in a position at this stage to make a ruling in respect of past events and I make no reflection on any earlier ruling of Speakers or their deputies. I simply ask members to observe the established practice of this House and indicate that it will be my intention to ask for a withdrawal of any accusation of this nature—on my own initiative, if I am aware of the incident, or upon request of any member, if I fail to hear the offensive words in the first instance.

Point of Order

Mr B. T. BURKE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, as you have indicated in answering question No. 681, a retraction was asked for at the time and refused by the then Deputy Speaker. Is it in order that you seek a retraction of those words, or perhaps the Premier would be willing to withdraw them?

The SPEAKER: As the member for Balcatta would know—and as other members would know—any action available to members in respect of that particular incident was available to them at the time. There is no provision for me at this stage to deal with an incident which was dealt with and ruled on by the Deputy Speaker. The opportunity presented itself at that time for any member to move to dissent from the ruling, and no such action was taken.

*Questions Resumed***LEGAL AID COMMISSION***Criteria for Aid*

682. Dr TROY, to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) Does the Legal Aid Commission refuse aid in cases where "proceedings are not likely to be determined in a manner favourable to an applicant"?
- (2) Does the Legal Aid Commission offer aid conditional on an applicant entering a guilty plea?
- (3) How often has aid been refused by the Legal Aid Commission on the grounds of likely unfavourable outcomes?
- (4) How often has aid been offered conditional on guilty pleas being entered?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) This is only one of the factors which the commission takes into account as required under section 37 of the Legal Aid Commission Act.
- (2) and (4) No. The choice of plea rests with the applicant. Where it appears a plea of guilty should be entered, an applicant may be offered aid for a plea in mitigation if he or she decides to plead guilty.
- (3) No statistics are kept on this particular aspect by the Legal Aid Commission.

PLANT DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL*Discussions*

683. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Was the amendment to the Plant Diseases Act Amendment Bill which was read a second time in the Legislative Assembly on 1st May, 1979, discussed with fruit fly baiting schemes and local government authorities before introduction?
- (2) If "Yes" with which organisations were discussions carried out?
- (3) If "No" to (1), why not?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) With Local Government Association meetings at York and Katanning in 1978. Informal discussions have been held with committee representatives of most of the existing baiting schemes. More detailed formal discussions have been held with a number of scheme committees in an effort to find remedies for the widespread financial problems they face. These include—

Albany	Tambellup
Manjimup	Wagin
Collie	Boddington
Darkan	

- (3) Not applicable.

FRUIT FLY*Baiting Schemes*

684. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many fruit fly baiting schemes have been operating in each of the past five years?
- (2) How much money has been paid to fruit fly baiting committees in each of the past five years?
- (3) What was the cost, actual or estimated, to the Department of Agriculture for fruit fly control in each of the past five years?
- (4) How many inspectors, checking fruit fly, have operated in fruit fly baiting committee areas, in each of the past five years?

Mr OLD replied:

	1974/75	1975/76	1976/77	1977/78	1978/79
(1)	20	20	26	27	27
(2)	\$3 170	\$685	\$2 325	\$1 627	\$5 170
(3)	\$143 710	\$145 919	\$137 763	\$132 534	\$150 387
(4)	10	9	8	9	10

I would point out to the member that most of this information was forwarded to him as answer to a question asked on the 9th August 1978, in my letter to him of 16th August, 1978.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT*Superannuation Scheme*

685. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Have negotiations for the introduction of a new local government superannuation scheme been concluded yet?
- (2) When will legislation be introduced to implement the new scheme?

Mr Young (for Mrs CRAIG) replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not until agreement has been reached with all the parties concerned.

POLICE*Crime Increase*

686. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

As an increase in crime appears inevitable in our society, what major policies are being implemented to counter this likely increase?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Re-structuring and enlarging the present Criminal Investigation Branch motor patrols to provide additional patrols of detectives and uniformed personnel in city and suburban areas.

- (2) Expanding the role of the police computer to assist in the apprehension of offenders.
- (3) Continuance of the activities of the crime prevention bureau to inform the public of anti-criminal measures and gain more public co-operation.
- (4) Increasing the police establishment to provide more police in the prevention and detection of crime.
- (5) Continuance of work studies and systems analyses to obtain optimum value from police resources.
- (6) Continuance of Government policy to give trained men more opportunity for active duty through re-structuring clerical requirements.

PRISONS: INMATES

Rehabilitation

687. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Chief Secretary:

- (1) What are considered to be the major problems confronting prisoners attempting to rehabilitate themselves in society?
- (2) What policies are being implemented to counter these difficulties?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

This question is framed in such a way as to necessarily require a subjective answer rather than a factual answer and is not appropriate as a Parliamentary question.

If the member so desires, arrangements can be made for him to discuss these matters with the Director of the Department of Corrections.

PRISONS

Problems and Rehabilitation of Inmates

688. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Chief Secretary:

- (1) What major problems are encountered in maintaining adequate and orderly running of Western Australian prisons?
- (2) Which professions are involved in rehabilitative work?
- (3) Which is considered to be the most efficient method of rehabilitation?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

See answer to question No. 687.

LAND: BUILDING BLOCKS

Salter Point

689. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Was an auction of State Housing Commission owned land conducted on Saturday, 28th April?

(2) If "Yes" was the land advertised as being at Salter Point?

(3) (a) If "Yes" to (1) and (2); is Manning the recognised postal address of the area in which the lots were offered for sale; and

(b) how and why did this apparent misrepresentation occur?

(4) Is he aware that the selling order of the lots was reversed?

(5) Was this done to ensure maximum prices were received for the lots?

(6) Did the auctioneer seek an initial bid of \$30 000 for the first lot offered and for which the only bid received was \$25 000?

(7) Was a similar procedure followed when the next four to five blocks were offered?

(8) Is he aware that a big number of people left the auction after the fourth block was offered?

(9) How many blocks were offered at the auction?

(10) How many blocks were sold—

(a) at auction;

(b) following the sale by auction?

(11) How does his department justify procedures which may deliberately ensure maximum prices are obtained?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr RIDGE) replied:

(1) and (2) Yes.

(3) (a) No. I am advised that the locality is designated by Australia Post as Salter Point.

(b) There was no misrepresentation.

(4) Yes.

(5) No.

(6) to (8) Yes.

(9) 17 lots.

(10) (a) Two under the hammer.

(b) 6 immediately after the auction.

(11) The auction was arranged and conducted with the intention of achieving the best return to the commission without exercising a depressing influence on the existing home investment of families already resident in the area.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: DEPARTMENT

Townsite Committee: Karratha

690. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) Has the department's town site committee for Karratha given consideration to the expected—

(a) construction work force;

(b) permanent work force, for the North-West Shelf project?

- (2) If so, what are the expected accommodation needs for—
 (a) single workers;
 (b) married workers,
 for—
 (i) the construction workforce;
 (ii) the permanent workforce?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes.
 (2) Preliminary estimates of the direct workforce to the North Rankin (Woodside) Project in the Dampier-Karratha area.
 Constructional: Single status—2 400;
 Married status—1 100.
 Operational: Single status—125;
 Married status—375.

ENERGY: ELECTRICITY SUPPLIERS

Power Station: Derby

691. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Further to parts (3) and (4) of my question 365 of 1979, can he advise whether he has received a list of 18 complaints from Derby power station workers contained in the notes of a meeting held at Derby power station on 5th April, 1979?
 (2) If so, what action does he intend to take on each of the complaints?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) The State Energy Commission has received complaints relating to Derby power station and the matter is being dealt with by the commission as a normal industrial matter.
 (2) Not applicable.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: DEPARTMENT

"Western Australian Business Letter"

692. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Has he seen the article entitled "what price a summer election?" in the latest issue of *Western Australian Business Letter* in which the National Country Party is described as "remnant", the National Party is described as proving its "nuisance value" and a landslide election victory for the Liberals is described as having several advantages?
 (2) Was the article in question considered by his department prior to purchase of the March quarter issue of the newsletter?

- (3) Will he ensure that publications used by his department devote their contents to promoting the State, and not engaging in vague speculation and propagandising on behalf of political parties?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.
 (3) I do not agree with the assessment by the Leader of the Opposition regarding propagandising. For some years the Department of Industrial Development has forwarded publications to Governments, companies and individuals interested in developments taking place in Western Australia. Many of these publications have been prepared by organisations which have no connection with the Government of the day; for example, the department has sent out copies of supplements prepared by *The West Australian* newspapers, *The Sunday Times*, and *Time* magazine organisations. In the case of the business letter the department is providing interested parties with up-to-date news, comments and projections, without suggesting that such comments are in any way an expression of Government policy.

ENERGY: GAS

North-West Shelf: Work Force

693. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

Referring to his announced programme to train 7 000 workers for the North-West Shelf, can he advise:

- (1) (a) How many workers are currently being trained under the NEAT scheme for this programme;
 (b) how many workers are currently being trained under other schemes?
 (2) What are the types of employment by trade classification for which people will be required for the North-West Shelf project in each of the proposed phases of the shelf's development?
 (3) As the answer to question 2153 of 31st October, 1978, does not indicate the expected construction and permanent workforce for the shelf project, is he able to provide that information?
 (4) Can he provide details of the various training schemes referred to in the answer to part (3) of question 363 of Wednesday, 25th April, 1979?

- (5) Do the apprenticeship numbers of 12 684 referred to in part (4) of said question 363 indicate apprenticeship numbers in those categories required for the North-West Shelf project?
- (6) If "No" to (5), can he provide those details and the apprenticeship types by trade classification?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) At the present time no workers are being exclusively trained for the North West Shelf Project. However, there are a number of workers that have been and still are being trained in various categories under the national employment and training scheme and I refer specifically to mechanical fitters, riggers, abrasive blasting and protective coating, plasterboard fixers and hand laminators.
- (2) Precise details of all trade classifications are still not available. The State manpower planning committee, which is a tripartite committee, is currently engaged in determining information of this nature.
- (3) The information provided in my answer to question No. 2153 related to the expected construction workforce. Precise details of the permanent workforce requirements are not available.
- (4) Training schemes have been conducted to provide labour for the Western Australian economy generally. Training programmes have included those under the national employment and training scheme and the apprenticeship training programme. Previous training programmes have, for example, included the trades of bricklaying, cabinet making, wood machining, upholstering and farm worker training.
- (5) No, the figure of 12 684 represented the total number of apprentices in training at 31st December, 1978.
- (6) A full list of all trades required has not been compiled. However, the main areas of demand are expected to be in the metal trades, electrical trades and building trades. This is why the State Government has been vigorously pressing the Commonwealth Government for the introduction of a special intensive trade training scheme so that the State will have

an adequate supply of skilled workers when they are needed for the anticipated projects. At this time, despite persistent representations to the Commonwealth Government, we have not been successful in our attempts.

JESUS PEOPLE INC.

Government Donation

694. Mr BATEMAN, to the Premier:

Reference *The West Australian* dated 28th April, 1979, in which he stated "the Jesus People cared for a section of the community who would otherwise be neglected", and in view of his generous donation of \$20 000 to a very worthwhile cause, on Sunday, 29th April, 1979, would he advise how much he gave the Jesus People towards the "WAY '79 Homeless Youth Appeal"?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I was not asked to contribute to the appeal at this stage.

However, in the current financial year, the Jesus People have received a State grant of \$10 000 to assist in their operations.

Perhaps the member is not aware that the donation to "Appealathon" will assist several well known worthy charitable organisations.

Members will appreciate that the start of this answer should have been, "The Government was not asked . . .".

MR HODGSON

Address and Value

695. Mr BATEMAN, to the Premier:

- (1) Is Mr Hodgson who was appointed "expediter" in May 1974, still employed in that capacity?
- (2) If "Yes" will he advise is he still living in Sydney, where his commission extends to Queensland, Victoria and many other areas?
- (3) In view of the continuing unemployment problems facing Western Australia, can he tell the Parliament exactly what value Mr Hodgson's role as expediter really is?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (3) Mr Hodgson's original role as expediter was essential during a period of critical shortages of raw materials and components from eastern states sources. His contribution significantly assisted in minimising these problems. He was appointed Western Australian trade representative in the eastern states after it was apparent that a demand existed for facilitating marketing and industrial investment inquiries.

His presence has also enabled greater awareness of developments in Western Australia in the eastern states business community through his personal contact and his representation in promotional activities, including major trade exhibitions. He has initiated, and was instrumental in promoting a number of successful ventures bringing manufacturing outlets by Eastern State's companies to Western Australia.

There is still a continuing role for him representing the State.

- (2) He has his own residence in Sydney. He periodically visits other Australian States in his representation role.

PRISONS

Recidivism Rates

696. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Chief Secretary:

What are the current recidivism rates in Western Australian prisons (i.e., rate of prisoners returning to prison)?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

Statistics are not available. It is anticipated that once the departments records are fully computerised, such information will be readily retrievable.

PRISONS

Overcrowding

697. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Chief Secretary:

What problems is overcrowding causing in prisons, and to the Government?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

See answer to question No. 687.

PRISONS

Violence

698. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Chief Secretary:

To what extent is violence occurring within the prisons and what problems are arising from this?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

See answer to question No. 687.

PRISONS

Problems

699. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Chief Secretary:

What are the major upsets, difficulties and problems being brought up by prison staff and officials with respect to the current prison programmes?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

See answer to question No. 687.

HEALTH

Women's Refuge Centre

700. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is it a fact that Emmaus refuge whilst operating in North Perth was a body approved by the Public Health Department?
- (2) Is it a fact that they left their North Perth premises and sought premises in the Bayswater-Belmont Shire after being advised to do so by officers of his department at a meeting on 6th March last?
- (3) Is it a fact that as a result of their move to Bayswater his department advised them by mail that as a result of their move they were no longer an approved project and their funds had been withdrawn?
- (4) Have they now been refunded?
- (5) If not, why not?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The organisation left the North Perth premises because the landlord served notice to vacate within one calendar month of 1st March, 1979. Departmental officers advised Emmaus representatives that any efforts to establish an alternative refuge should concentrate on the Belmont-Bayswater areas in conjunction with local authorities.
- (3) The original approval related to the property at Glendower Street, North Perth, and the proposed change of venue would constitute a new project.
- (4) No.
- (5) Because there is no approved project at this time.

WATER SUPPLIES

Cockburn Sound Region

701. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

Further to his answers to my question 195 of 1979, Dr Chittleborough in a speech to the University Summer School 1979 advised publicly that the following contaminants were present in ground water in the Cockburn Sound region:

- (a) hydrocarbons;
- (b) phenol;
- (c) 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T;
- (d) detergent;
- (e) caustic soda (two locations);

- (f) ammonia;
- (g) nitrate;
- (h) chromium;
- (i) copper;
- (j) nickel;
- (k) zinc;
- (l) cadmium.

As there is a possible health risk in particular with items (c), (e), (l), what action is being taken by the Government at this time to minimise health risks to the public?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

The presence of such contaminants in the concentrations present in ground-water which is not being used for drinking water is not considered a public health hazard.

COCKBURN SOUND

Heavy Metals Level

702. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Further to my questions 1486, 1558 of 1978 and 207 of 1979, concerning cadmium levels in Cockburn Sound, is it a fact that clause 15 of "Industrial Lands (Kwinana) Agreement" says in part—"Sea water so drawn may be returned to the sea in such positions as aforesaid admixed with effluent from manufacturing operations hereunder provided that the discharge is not dangerous or injurious to public health"?
- (2) Is it a fact that Cuming Smith-British Petroleum have been found responsible for discharging effluent into the sound causing an increase in cadmium levels to a level in excess of acceptable Western Australian health department levels?
- (3) Does it then follow that CSBP are in default of their agreement?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) No.

WATER SUPPLIES AND SEWERAGE: RATES

Collection

703. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Further to my questions 2047 of 1978 and 206 of 1979 relating to an overall investigation of decentralised revenue collection, will the Minister advise the number and names of officers concerned in the investigation?
- (2) How long has it been going on?
- (3) When can a result be expected?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Two years.
- (3) About 2 years.

EXPLOSIVES

Warnbro Area

704. Mr BARNETT, to the Deputy Premier:

- (1) Further to his answers to my question 204 of 1979, would he please advise what arrangements are being made to clear land adjacent to houses in Warnbro of high explosive projectiles?
- (2) Why is priority being given to a road site over that of a housing estate where many families already live?
- (3) (a) Would he indicate the make and type of machine that has been ordered from the United Kingdom;
- (b) what is its cost;
- (c) when can it be expected to arrive;
- (d) when will it be brought into use in Warnbro?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) The Commonwealth authorities have utilised in the area the best detection equipment obtainable in Australia but results have fallen short of the requirement. They have been awaiting for some time the arrival of more advanced equipment from overseas.
- (2) The disturbance, and possible detonation, of any explosive shells in their path could not be avoided by road-makers. There is therefore an immediate need to remove the hazard.
On the other hand, no disturbance within the near future of the land adjacent to the housing area is envisaged. Owners are aware of the potential danger and notices warn the public.
- (3) This information is being sought from the Commonwealth.

ROAD

Ennis Road

705. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Works:

- (1) Who was the successful tenderer for the extension of Ennis Road, Rockingham to the Mandurah Road?
- (2) (a) What was the price accepted;
- (b) when will the job commence;
- (c) when is it expected the job will be completed?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) and (2) No tender has as yet been accepted.

COCKBURN SOUND: JERVOISE BAY*Impact*

706. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

Is it a fact that the impact of the Jervoise Bay proposal has not been considered in relation to Cockburn Sound as a whole?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

I refer the member to my answer to his question No. 109 of Wednesday, 4th April, 1979.

COCKBURN SOUND: JERVOISE BAY*Public Comment*

707. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

As interim reports from the Cockburn Sound study group indicate possibly serious environmental problems in Cockburn Sound, will he consider allowing public comment on the Jervoise Bay proposals after the release of the final report of the Cockburn Sound study group in June even if for a small space of time?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

No. In the summary of the Jervoise Bay ERMP (page 5) the consultant points out that his environmental management plan "incorporates sufficient flexibility for possible future modification pending the outcome of the proposed ongoing management programme or pending adoption of any unlikely divergent recommendations forthcoming from other investigations such as the Cockburn Sound study group".

SHIPPING: STATE SHIPPING SERVICE*Order in Germany*

708. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Transport:

Is it a fact that the ship being built for the State in Germany had its component parts built in Denmark and transported to Germany?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

No.

However, the Western Australian Coastal Shipping Commission will be chartering a vessel to be named *M.V. Kimberley*, which is at present under construction in Denmark.

EDUCATION: TEACHERS*Number and Qualifications*

709. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Education:

Can he provide me with the numbers and percentages of full-time teaching staff with the following qualifications, at the University of W.A., Murdoch University, Western Australian Institute of Technology, Churchlands, Mt. Lawley, Nedlands and Claremont Colleges:

- (a) doctorates;
- (b) honours degree;
- (c) pass degree;
- (d) other qualifications;
- (e) no formal qualifications?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

No. Information of the type requested is not collected as part of regular statistics. Further, such data can be misleading in that many full time teaching staff have more than one of the qualifications listed.

WATER SUPPLIES*Onslow*

710. Mr SODEMAN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) When is it planned to commence the proposed upgrading of the Onslow water supply?
- (2) What is the nature of the work to be carried out?
- (3) What will be the resulting increase in capacity of the pipeline to be upgraded?
- (4) What percentage increase does this represent?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) The laying of pipes will commence in July.
- (2) The laying of a total of 10 000 metres of 200 millimetre diameter pipe in four sections of the supply main.
- (3) The present capacity is 550 cubic metres per day. The capacity on completion of improvements will be 820 cubic metres per day.
- (4) Approximately 50 per cent.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Property and Valuation Section

711. Mr McIVER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is it a fact that the property and valuation section of the Public Works Department is to amalgamate with the Valuer General's Department?
- (2) If "Yes" when will the amalgamation commence and what are the reasons for the amalgamation?
- (3) Have all staff in the valuation section been notified of intending amalgamation and duties they will perform after amalgamation?
- (4) Will the Public Works Department still administer all Government properties?
- (5) (a) Is it proposed there will be staff redundancy following amalgamation;
(b) if so, in what form?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes, however some officers who are not valuers and the assistant property and valuation officer will remain with the Public Works Department.
- (2) (a) 1st July, 1979;
(b) to ensure all valuation advice to Government departments and instrumentalities comes from the one authority.
- (3) (a) Yes.
(b) It is not anticipated that there will be any significant change in duties in those officers transferred from the Public Works Department to the Valuer General's Department.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) (a) No.
(b) Not applicable.

EDUCATION: SCHOOL

Heathridge

712. Mr NANOVICH, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Further to his recent announcement that a primary school would be built at Heathridge for year 1980, when will tenders be called?
- (2) How many classrooms will the school consist of?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Tenders were called on 26th April and will close on 15th May, 1979.
- (2) The new school will comprise 12 teaching areas, library, resource centre and administration block.

EDUCATION: PRE-PRIMARY AND PRE-SCHOOL

Centres: Number and Permanent Buildings

713. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Can he say how many—
(a) community based pre-school centres have come under complete departmental control;
(b) new pre-primary centres have been built—
(i) as part of new schools;
(ii) as part of established schools;
(c) existing buildings have been converted for use in pre-primary centres,
in each year since the pre-primary system was adopted?
- (2) How many primary schools are still without pre-primary centres and which are the schools concerned?
- (3) How long does the Government propose to go on using leased premises outside the schools as pre-primary centres, and what is the Government's policy on replacing these leased premises with permanent pre-primary centres adjacent to schools?
- (4) What is the Government's policy regarding the replacement of transportable buildings in use as pre-primary centres by permanent buildings?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

The information sought is extensive and would require considerable research. I am not prepared to agree to such work and expenditure at this time, although should it be possible for an officer to undertake this research it will be considered.

EDUCATION: PRE-SCHOOL

Four-year-olds

714. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Education:

Can he say why there is a levy payable on four-year-olds attending community based pre-school centres, when there is no levy on parents with children of the same age enrolled at pre-primary centres?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

Levies payable on four-year-old children attending pre-school centres were charged by the Pre-School Board and have been continued under the early childhood branch. In many instances in pre-school centres attendance of four-year-olds requires the employment of staff over and above that required for the five-year-old children.

Four-year-olds are not admitted to pre-primary centres erected on a school site. Where a pre-school committee has transferred its centre to the Education Department the waiting list and enrolment procedures are honoured. This means that some four-year-olds may be included, but as staffing is based on five-year-olds in attendance, no additional staff is required and levies are not charged.

ROAD

Dianella Roundabout

715. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Can he say whether there have been any further developments arising from discussions between the Main Roads Department and the City of Stirling concerning proposed changes to the traffic roundabout serving Morley Drive, Alexander Drive and the Strand in Dianella, along the lines of the advice given to the council last year that the solution lay in re-planning the area to reduce the number of legs entering the roundabout to a maximum of four?
- (2) If "Yes" what is the present position with regard to proposals for replanning the area and the timetabling of such work?
- (3) What attention has been given to the effect that any such replanning is likely to have on people living in the area north of Morley Drive, and west of Alexander Drive, in terms of—
 - (a) the diversion of through traffic into suburban streets;
 - (b) decreased access for local residents?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Planning of the area is the responsibility of the Stirling City Council and State Housing Commission as owners of the majority of the undeveloped land. Following a request from the State Housing Commission, council resolved at its meeting on 18th April, 1979, that it is in favour of the proposed extension of Northward Drive at the earliest opportunity. Though not substantially in council's resolution, it is assumed that future planning of the area would involve closure of The Strand at the roundabout.
- (3) (a) and (b) Detailed attention is being given in planning the area to stop the diversion of through traffic into suburban streets and to maintain access for local residents at a satisfactory level.

RURAL AFFAIRS

Inquiry

716. Mr CARR, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Will he detail all action taken by the Government arising from the report of the rural affairs inquiry?
- (2) In particular, will he please specify all individual suggestions contained in the report which have been implemented?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) The terms of reference of the inquiry called for a report on all matters concerning improper, discriminatory or unfair trading and any lack of services or facilities in relation to the provision of goods or services to the rural communities of Western Australia. The report was duly prepared and published.

A copy was sent to the permanent head or director of each State Government department or instrumentality referred to in the submissions and to each Federal Minister whose department was mentioned.

That is the limit of my department's role. Questions of implementation of specific suggestions should be referred to the relevant individual Commonwealth or State Ministers.

CEMETERIES

Muslim Burials

717. Mr CARR, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Has she received my letter drawing attention to a possible inconsistency between the Cemeteries Act and a by-law of the Geraldton Cemetery Board and requesting advice concerning Muslim burial procedures?
- (2) Can she advise what stage has been reached with her inquiries?
- (3) What procedure should be followed in the event of a death occurring in the Muslim community in Geraldton before her inquiries are completed?

Mr Young (for Mrs CRAIG) replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Inquiries are being made, but have not been completed.
- (3) Until otherwise determined, any burial at Geraldton should be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the trustees of the cemetery.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Wood Chipping Industry

718. Mr STEPHENS, to the Minister for Forests:

- (1) With regard to the woodchip industry in Western Australia, how many hectares are being cleared per day?
- (2) Is it fact that the use of the present seed tree technique for regeneration has not been successful?
- (3) What percentage of regeneration is now being carried out by hand planting?
- (4) What is the cost per hectare of the hand planting technique?
- (5) In each of the three preceding years to 30th June and 30th April, 1979, what was—
 - (a) value of royalties;
 - (b) f.o.b. value of woodchips;
 - (c) weight of woodchips?
- (6) Has clearing for woodchipping taken place right down to edge of streams and rivers in breach of the woodchipping agreement?

Mr Young (for Mrs CRAIG) replied:

- (1) As the member was previously Minister responsible for the environment it would be hoped he would recognise that no clearing is undertaken in Western Australia for the purpose of the production of woodchips. The chip mill mainly draws on forest residue resulting from sawlogging operations, but some additional material is obtained from road works, farm clearing, etc. In addition, chips are produced at a number of sawmills by satellite chippers using mill residue.
- (2) No.
- (3) The amount will vary from year to year according to the availability of seed for natural regeneration. Over the past three years the amount has ranged from 22 to 68 per cent.
- (4) The average cost of 1978-79 is \$171.00 per hectare.
- (5) (a) The member is referred to the answer given to him on the 19th October, 1978, for the three preceding years. The information is not yet available for the period up to 30th April, 1979;
 - (b) this information is not available;
 - (c) the Forests Department records log volumes and not weight. Information as published in the annual

report of the department over the three years to the 30th June, 1978, is as follows:

1975-76 98 370 m³,
1976-77 377 021 m³,
1977-78 434 377 m³.

Information is not available up to the 30th April, 1979.

(6) No.

719. *This question was postponed.*

FISHERIES

Rock Lobsters

720. Dr TROY, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) What quantities of live rock lobster have been exported annually from Western Australia to Japan and over what period?
- (2) What quantity, whole or part, of the live rock lobster exports are used for purposes of establishing a rock lobster breeding industry?
- (3) Is it known what quantities of rock lobster meat are produced on the Japanese market or export market from an artificial rock lobster producing industry?
- (4) Should this State develop such artificial breeding programmes?
- (5) Does such activity threaten current markets in rock lobster meat?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) These figures are not available.
- (2) Not known.
- (3) No.
- (4) No. The western rock lobster would be one of the more difficult lobsters to breed in artificial conditions.
- (5) I am advised that the live rock lobster market is a luxury market which poses no threat to the rock lobster meat market.

SKELETON WEED

Outbreaks

721. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

How many outbreaks of skeleton weed have occurred in Western Australia in the past 12 months, and what was the location of each outbreak?

Mr OLD replied:

Nine farm outbreaks of skeleton weed were found in Western Australia in the 1978-79 crop year. These were located at:

Narembeen 3,
Dandaragan 3,
Eradu 1,
Pithara 1,
South Moorine 1.

A few individual plants have been found immediately alongside the railway line between Perth and Koolyanobbing and also in Perth marshalling yards.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Broome Shire Council

722. Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Has the Broome Shire Council recently received a loan or grant from the Government for the building of offices in Broome?
- (2) If "Yes" will she supply details of this transaction?

Mr Young (for Mrs CRAIG) replied:

- (1) and (2) No.

HEALTH

Osborne Park Rubbish Tip

723. Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is it a fact that rubbish is from time to time dumped at the Hertha Road Osborne Park tip at late hours of night and immediately burnt?
- (2) If "Yes" why is this necessary?
- (3) (a) What form of rubbish is involved; and
(b) why is it burnt?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) and (3) Not applicable.

EDUCATION

School of Mines Technical Education College

724. Mr GRILL, to the Minister for Education:

Referring to question 597, part (4), of 1979, and the answer given thereto on 2nd May, 1979, could he advise as to what advice is being awaited from the

Public Service Board and Treasury, the reason for the obvious delay in the provision of this advice, and give some approximate date as to when the appointment might be made?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

The Public Service Board is providing advice on the classification of the position and the Treasurer's approval is needed in relationship to funds for the position. Due to the unusual nature of the position, examination of the matter has taken longer than expected. The appointment may be made by early next month.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: DAMPIER SALT COMPANY

Carnarvon Jetty

725. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Has the Dampier Salt company indicated that it is investigating the possibility of extending the original salt-loading jetty at Carnarvon so that when production at Lake MacLeod recommences ships of 100 000 tonnes could be loaded rather than a maximum size of 65 000 tonnes possible from the original jetty?
- (2) What stage has the investigation reached?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Investigations have reached the stage that Dampier Salt (Operations) Pty. Limited shall shortly be submitting to qualified engineering construction companies tender documents for two alternative jetty designs based on ship capacities of—
(a) 65 000 tonnes,
(b) 100 000 tonnes.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: DAMPIER SALT COMPANY

Access Road

726. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has the Dampier Salt company made an approach to the Government seeking financial assistance under the terms of the agreement for the sealing of the access road from Carnarvon to the Lake MacLeod minesite to provide a comfortable all-weather access road to the site when production resumes?
- (2) What stage have the negotiations reached?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The question of funding the work is in discussion with the Treasury Department.

**INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: DAMPIER
SALT COMPANY**

Power Supplies

727. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Has the Government received an approach from the Dampier Salt company

seeking assistance with a feasibility study relating to provision of power when production resumes from the town of Carnarvon for the Lake MacLeod minesite some 60 kilometres away?

- (2) What stage has the study reached?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes, but not financial assistance.
- (2) This information is of a commercial nature, since the company is doing the study, and the company itself should be approached for an answer.
