

Mr J. T. Tonkin: I do not agree that that is why it put up the rate because the indications are, on the Treasurer's own words, that even if it increased the rate of interest it would not get the amount of money it was seeking.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I will come to that in due course. I am talking about the original decision when there was a great deal of money in Australia and the Commonwealth wanted to drain some of it off. That Government reached the unprecedented decision—for a Labor Government—which was very hard because it was contrary to its basic philosophy and objectives—and decided to put up the bond rate to record levels and draw the money off to cool down the economy. We had the situation where that procedure went too far and the Commonwealth would now like to reverse the situation. It is endeavouring to do just that.

So far as we are concerned now, if the Commonwealth does get out of the way and does make its bonds less attractive to the investors, it will give us a chance to get some money for semi-governmental instrumentalities, because most are desperate for money at the present time.

Discussions are taking place between all the Under-Treasurers and the Commonwealth Treasury in order to reach a decision on how best to handle the situation. That, of course, is dealing specifically with the semi-governmental instrumentalities such as the State Electricity Commission and that type of undertaking, as distinct from the Commonwealth's own underwriting of the loan programme.

That brings me back to underwriting by the Commonwealth. What the Leader of the Opposition has said is correct. The Commonwealth is obligated to underwrite the amount of money it accepted at the Loan Council meetings. As the Leader of the Opposition is aware, if the States used their numbers to outvote the Commonwealth, and increased the amount of \$700 million to, say, one million million dollars that would sound lovely as far as the States were concerned but the Commonwealth would still raise only the amount it was prepared to underwrite; in this case, about \$700 million. The States would have to limit their programmes to the amount of money the Commonwealth Government agreed to underwrite.

It is expected the Commonwealth will not be taking out of the market all the money it needs to underwrite the amounts for the States, and it will then have to provide a proportion of that money from its own sources, of which it does have some. The arrangement is quite clear-cut, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, and interest has to be paid at an agreed rate. There is a formula so no argument arises. Once we take the Commonwealth money, to make up the balance of the amount underwritten, then of course we

automatically accept the responsibility to pay the interest at that predetermined rate. I do not know the amount the Commonwealth will have to pay in this year to make up the amount underwritten, but I am sure it will be considerable because at the moment it is keeping out of the market in order to release more money for the private sector. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his support.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

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

SMALL CLAIMS TRIBUNALS BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Council with amendments.

*House adjourned at 1.08 a.m.
(Wednesday).*

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 27th November, 1974

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (2): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Appointment of Inspectors and Officers

The Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Agriculture:

In respect of the Agricultural Products Act Amendment Bill, 1974, what source of funds will support inspectors and other officers to be appointed under proposed new section 2A (1)?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

I am grateful to the honourable member for notice of the question the answer to which is as follows—

No new appointments are intended to be made.

Certain officers at present gazetted as inspectors under the provisions of the Plant Diseases Act will be appointed as inspectors under the authority of this clause.

The salaries of these officers will continue to be funded from the Consolidated Revenue Fund—Agriculture Vote.

2. EDUCATION

Care of Children: Before and After School

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What are the subjects of the research programmes in relation to children in need of supervision when parents are absent from home referred to by the Minister last night, the 26th November, 1974?
- (2) Who or what department is carrying out any such research?
- (3) When were the studies commenced and when is it expected that reports and findings will be available?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) The project, commissioned to the Education Department by the Commonwealth Government, is related to "Before and after School Care of Children". It includes studies of the attitudes of school personnel to the issues involved in such cases and a survey of the extent of current provision in selected school districts.
- (2) The Education Department of Western Australia.
- (3) The studies were commenced in early 1973 and the report will be submitted to the Commonwealth Child Care Research Grants Committee within the coming weeks.

QUESTIONS (9): ON NOTICE

1. *This question was postponed.*

2. POLICE

Abortion Information Service: Raid

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Police:

- (1) Who ordered the police visits to counsellors of the Abortion Information Service?
- (2) Who was the person responsible for ordering a female police officer to approach the information service for advice, and be further subjected to a pregnancy examination by a doctor?
- (3) Was the Minister for Police aware of the investigations?

- (4) Was his approval sought for—

- (a) the removal of confidential patient records from the doctor's surgery; and
- (b) the medical examination of the police officer mentioned above?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) The visits were made during the normal course of inquiries into complaints that members of the Abortion Information Service were arranging abortions on demand.
- (2) The woman police officer was one of a number of police officers engaged in investigating the complaints referred to above and approached the information service during the normal course of inquiries. She submitted a urine sample to a doctor but did not undergo a medical examination.
- (3) The Hon. Minister for Police was aware that complaints had been received and were being investigated by the Criminal Investigation Branch.
- (4) (a) No.
(b) No.

3.

FAUNA WARDENS

Number and Qualifications

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

Further to the reply to my question No. 8 on the 18th September, 1974, in which I was advised that there were 20 full-time wardens employed by the Fauna Protection Department—

- (a) does this number include all fisheries inspectors and vermin inspectors who have been declared fauna wardens;
- (b) if not, what is the total—
(i) fisheries inspectors; and
(ii) vermin inspectors?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (a) No.
- (b) (i) There are fifty-three full time fisheries inspectors (47 permanent and 6 trainees) of whom forty-four have been appointed as Wardens of Fauna.
(ii) Eighty-eight vermin inspectors are employed by the Agriculture Protection Board none of whom has been appointed as a full-time warden of fauna.

4. **WATER SUPPLIES***Salmon Gums*

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

Is it intended that the disused quarry adjacent to Salmon Gums is to be used as a water reservoir for the district?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

Preliminary investigations indicate the use of the disused quarry as a water reservoir for the district does not appear likely in the foreseeable future.

5. **STATE FORESTS***Sandalwood Production*

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Forests:

- (1) What tonnage of sandalwood is produced annually in Western Australia?
- (2) What is the price per tonne received by the Forests Department?
- (3) Where are the main markets?
- (4) What is the price per tonne received by exporters?
- (5) Why is it a direction of the Forests Department that all stumps be removed at the time of cutting?
- (6) Does this not restrict regeneration of the sandalwood?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) 1971-72—1 091 tonnes.
1972-73—1 166 tonnes.
1973-74—1 442 tonnes.
- (2) This information is confidential to the exporting company.
- (3) The main markets are in South-East Asia. Shipments are landed at the ports of Singapore, Hong Kong, Penang, Port Kelang, Kaosung and Bangkok. Small quantities were sold to a local manufacturer some years ago for extraction of oil.
- (4) Answered by (2).
- (5) It is the established practice to pull the whole tree, roots and all, as the oil content of the roots and butts is high.
- (6) No. Regeneration of sandalwood by coppice growth is known to be extremely rare under normal conditions. Evidence available indicates that the disturbance of the soil consequent to the pulling of the mature sandalwood favours the regeneration of sandalwood

seedlings and the disturbance is an advantage to the growth of these seedlings. The principal requirement is the availability of a host plant.

6. **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION***Subiaco Development*

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Conservation and Environment:

Would the Minister table papers of the Environmental Protection Authority meeting of the 10th September, 1974, concerning its decision on the departmental officer's report on Lot 160, Onslow Road, Subiaco?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

The report prepared for the Environmental Protection Authority on the matter has been previously tabled (paper 177) and the decision of the Authority communicated to the Subiaco City Council and the Hon. Member. The only other relevant papers are the minutes of the meeting of the authority referred to. I am not prepared to table these papers but would be happy to make them available for perusal by the Hon. Member in the offices of the Department of Environmental Protection.

7. **NORSEMAN HIGH SCHOOL***Stage 4*

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

Is it intended to proceed with Stage 4 of the high school at Norseman whilst the present workforce is assembled on site on the other school building construction projects?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

The advantages of proceeding with Stage 4 are recognised but it is too early for a firm decision to be reached.

8. **INDECENT PUBLICATIONS ACT***Amendments*

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS, to the Minister for Education representing the Chief Secretary:

- (1) In what year was the Indecent Publications Act proclaimed?
- (2) How many times has the Indecent Publications Act been amended since being originally passed by Parliament?
- (3) What were the years in which each amendment was passed?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) The Act was assented to in 1902.
- (2) Four.
- (3) 1967, 1972, 1973, 1974.

9. INDECENT PUBLICATIONS ACT

Prosecutions

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS, to the Minister for Education representing the Chief Secretary:

- (1) In each of the years since the Indecent Publications Act was proclaimed, how many prosecutions have been initiated?
- (2) What was the respective date of each separate authorisation, under the Act, to prosecute?
- (3) (a) Who was the Minister who signed the authorisations referred to in (2); and
(b) how many were—
 (i) successful;
 (ii) unsuccessful;
 (iii) withdrawn; or
 (iv) not proceeded with?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) to (3) This question will require considerable research. However, every effort will be made to obtain the information sought and make it available to the Hon. Member.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 21st November.

THE HON. R. T. LEESON (South-East) [2.46 p.m.]: This Bill provides for a further wheat stabilization arrangement for the next five years up to 1979. The Minister outlined the operation of the Bill in his second reading speech. It is quite straightforward and is complementary to legislation in other States. We on this side have no opposition to the Bill and support it.

THE HON. M. McALEER (Upper West) [2.47 p.m.]: Although this is mirror legislation, and although the Federal Wheat Stabilization Act of 1974 has been widely and intensively discussed, I feel on this occasion I should express some of the disappointment which is felt by wheatgrowers in relation to the new wheat stabilization plan.

The idea that the wheat stabilization price should reflect to some extent trends in the market rather than simply costs of production has gained currency and some acceptance since 1968-69, and in principle we may say it has merit. Nevertheless, as

applied by the Federal Government in the new stabilization plan, I think it is totally unsatisfactory to wheatgrowers.

One of the unsatisfactory aspects of the new stabilization plan is the home consumption price, which is now fixed at a figure far below current world prices, so that wheatgrowers are in fact subsidising the home market by 75c a bushel. They are subsidising this market and the people of Australia without any recompense and without any recognition.

One of most unsatisfactory aspects of the home consumption price is the calculation of the cost of production, because the item of the operator-owner cost—that is to say, the wages of the farmer—has been held at the 1968 level, and there must be very few wages in this country which remain pegged at the level of 1968. Quite apart from the natural rise due to inflation, I think it may be said that with the increased heavy capitalisation of the industry and with the increased need for management skills, the level of a farmer's efficiency now merits a higher wage than it did in those times.

The stabilization fund has been fixed at \$80 million, and the contributions and withdrawals are fixed at \$30 million a year. The fund already stands at \$48 million, and after this season's harvest the farmers' contributions should almost reach the target of \$80 million.

In the event of a sudden fall in world prices and the exhaustion of the farmers' contributions to the fund, the Federal Government has agreed to lend—not grant—the money needed to keep the fund in operation; and the money so lent must be repaid as soon as prices increase, and it will be a first charge on the farmers' wheat. This is known as the mid-term repayment.

So the taxpayers stand to spend no money at all on the farmers in this respect; and they are receiving a subsidy which might in fact be calculated at about \$64 million a year, at least while the present world price of wheat holds.

This, coming on top of the rise in super-phosphate rates and the loss of the super bounty, and the new 10-year period of tax deductibility for machinery—which is too long and is of little use with the high capital cost of machinery—presents an unsympathetic picture as far as farmers are concerned. This situation is felt by all growers but especially here in Western Australia where we have a small home market and a very real freight advantage for our export wheat—two factors from which we are receiving very little benefit at the moment.

Incentives have diminished; the average this year has been reduced, and this is emphasised by the proposal of the Federal Government to increase the first advance on wheat next year to \$1.50. Probably it

would have been better had the Government decided to raise the the first advance to \$1.50 this year, so that farmers would have the capital to invest on increasing their crops.

Nevertheless, we must be grateful that the amount has been increased for next year. I believe while the world price of wheat holds we will survive the present stabilization scheme; but if difficult circumstances arise we will find ourselves in even greater trouble than before.

THE HON. J. HEITMAN (Upper West) [2.53 p.m.]: I will not delay the House for long. This Bill is complementary to the Federal legislation in regard to wheat stabilization. Upon reading the Bill, we find it contains little alteration to the provisions of the 1968 and 1963 Bills. As Miss McAleer has pointed out, despite the inflationary trends over the last few years the first payment for wheat has not increased significantly. I feel as she does that farmers will find it hard to finance themselves on the first advance on the coming harvest, despite the fact that wheat is at present commanding a higher price than it did a few years ago.

The new scheme really starts in the 1974 season. As was the case with other Bills which have been presented from time to time, the Western Australian Wheat Board is to have seven members, four of whom will represent the farmers' Union, one will be the manager of Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, one will represent flour millers, and the other will represent the Western Australian Government Railways Commission.

The representatives of the Farmers' Union will carry out the prime functions of the board, because two of them are also members of the Australian Wheat Board; and from time to time the other two visit the Eastern States to learn what is being done over there. For some time I have thought that Western Australian farmers should get together to form one union representing everyone, instead of having the Pastoralists and Graziers Association and the Farmers' Union. It is only proper those organisations should combine and select representatives. I have not done anything about this, but I often feel surely both organisations should be represented on the Australian Wheat Board.

This at least would give another point of view to that board. Instead of four people going to the east with the same point of view, we would have another point of view, especially on the question of wheat quotas, which we will discuss later.

I point out in passing that Western Australian farmers produce 29 per cent of the Australian crop, but receive only 22 per cent of the quota. While the coming year will not be a quota year, it is as well to

remember that we have never received our fair share of the quota. I often think that if we had more representatives on the Australian Wheat Board we might receive a better deal. I am not saying our present representatives do not represent the State as best they can, but they would have to be very strong to toss the representatives of the Eastern States on the Australian Wheat Board. The representatives of this State have only a part-time job in this respect, whereas the Eastern States representatives have almost a full-time job.

As I mentioned previously, this Bill is not very different from the Bill presented in 1968, or that presented in 1963. I feel from time to time we should see some alterations. As far as I can see times are becoming harder and harder; and as far as the Federal Government is concerned this is not really a stabilization scheme at all because the farmers themselves provide most of the finance and subsidise the community so that wheat is available cheaper than it could possibly be obtained anywhere else. I wholeheartedly agree with the sentiments expressed by Miss McAleer in that regard.

Upon looking through the State Bill and the Federal Bill I noticed a tremendous difference. All wheat must be sold to the Australian Wheat Board, and if doubt exists as to whether a farmer is providing the board with all the wheat he grows, the Western Australian Wheat Board or the Australian Wheat Board may request the State or Commonwealth police to search the property and ascertain how much wheat the farmer has. The police may go through his books to ensure the farmer is not robbing the Australian Wheat Board. In normal circumstances a warrant would be required for such a search, but that is not necessary under the State legislation.

Under the Federal legislation a warrant must be obtained from a justice of the peace if the board wishes to conduct a search. I think the appropriate clause in that legislation covers something like 1½ pages, and sets out exactly how a warrant must be procured before a search is made. However, the State legislation merely says—

26. (1) A member of the police force of the Commonwealth or of the State who is authorized by the Board or the Chairman of the Board to act under this section may—

(a) at all reasonable times, enter premises and inspect any stock of wheat of any season or of corn sacks, and any accounts, books and documents relating to wheat of any season or to corn sacks; and

- (b) take possession of and remove any wheat of any season that is the property of the Board, or wheat of a season referred to in section 6 the delivery of which has been lawfully demanded by the Board, and any corn sacks in which any such wheat is contained.

That does not seem fair to me. Despite the fact I pointed this out to the Minister, he was not prepared to accept that I had researched the matter to ascertain the difference between the State and Federal legislation. In this State, once a policeman is authorised by the board to make a search he can march onto a property and remove books or wheat without any warrant whatsoever. I do not agree with this, but I did not succeed in having it altered.

However, I do think that as the State legislation is complementary to the Federal legislation, we should at least make the measures comparable in this respect.

I support the Bill, because if we do not pass it the farmers of Western Australia will not receive anything for their crop.

THE HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) (3.00 p.m.): It is a little over 12 months since similar bridging legislation was introduced into this Parliament to tide the stabilization scheme over for a further 12 months, until a new agreement was reached between the Australian Wheat-Growers' Federation, the Australian Farmers' Federation and, indeed, the Federal Minister. We can recall that 12 months ago we wondered what sort of Bill would come into operation to take us through the next five-year stabilization plan.

The Bill was subsequently agreed to by the representatives of the Australian Wheat-Growers' Federation and the Farmers' Federation in Canberra and you will recall, Sir, at that time this State Government did, in fact, hold up the legislation with a view to getting perhaps a better deal from another Federal Government should the Government have changed in the March election. This was not the case, however.

The Hon. T. O. Perry: Unfortunately.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Whether it was unfortunate or not is beside the point. The fact is that the reasons for the legislation being held up have been pointed out by Miss McAleer and Mr Heitman.

These are the very points against which we have been guarding in the industry for many years; that is, the recognition of our work as operators and the value of the commodity when placed against the home consumption and export price differential.

The feature about this complementary legislation is that it complements Federal legislation, so any difference we may have is with the Federal legislation, inasmuch as this is not a stabilization fund but an equalisation fund; and the money so advanced by the growers can in fact only subsidise their own industry which, indeed, should be the case.

There is certainly no risk by the Federal authorities in presenting the Bill they have presented at the moment. Indeed if one considers the present rise-and-fall figures for grain being sold—it is currently being sold at \$4.40 a tonne—and the fact that this Bill sets down a home consumption price of \$2 one can see there is a great difference between the figures obtainable for grain and those subsidised by the farmers to the home consumption market, as against what would have been received overseas. As Miss McAleer has said the figure in the first year was at least \$64 million.

A set of figures is obtainable which points out that the subsidy could be well nigh \$100 million a year and if this \$100 million a year were projected on the present scale over a 10-year period it would be to an extent of \$1 000 million that the growers would be subsidising the pocket of the taxpayer.

Accordingly no matter what sort of arithmetical equation one uses over this period of five years it will be impossible, even if the price of wheat collapses completely over the last three years, for the Federal Government ever to be required to put more than \$10 million into the fund; which is a mere pittance when compared with the tremendous advantages obtainable to the home consumption market.

I have never advocated that there should be anything but a recognition of the fact that the people at home must be given consideration, but I do abhor the objection put forward by taxpayers which, to a degree, is encouraged by the media, that the taxpayers are, in fact, subsidising the wheatgrowers through such an agreement. This is not right; it is quite incorrect. It can never be, that the Bill will ask the taxpayers to dip into their pocket to help the growers. It cannot possibly be construed in that fashion. The wheatgrower is a mile in front looking after his own affairs—and Miss McAleer mentioned a figure of \$48 million in connection with this agreement—and therefore the wheat-grower's house is in order.

There is another set of figures which can prove that over the last 10 years the taxpayer is indebted to the wheatgrower to the tune of \$407 million by way of assistance to the grain industry.

Consequently I think the State Government should be congratulated for holding up this legislation in an endeavour to

strike a better arrangement with the Federal Government. I would like to quote what was said by Mr Whan in the Federal *Hansard* about this holding-up process. He said—

These actions by the State Governments of Western Australia and of New South Wales were condemned at the time by the wheat industry.

I would think that the wheat industry applauded the action of the Government—it certainly did in my area—for holding up this legislation until such time as the outcome of the Federal elections was known. Not only that, the Farmers' Union and the pastoralists and graziers' organisation endorsed the action of the Government and, indeed, I daresay they would have made representations to the Government to take such action.

The Minister seems to have covered in his second reading speech all relevant points in connection with the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act. Possibly the major item in connection with this includes the modification to strengthen the position of the board in relation to curbing deals with wheatgrowers outside the board's jurisdiction. It is well and truly known that over-the-border trading has been rampant in the Eastern States and I think without a shadow of a doubt had it not been for the Nullabor Plain this system would have been used—or abused; we may use what terminology we like—by the growers of this State.

Such was the case some years ago when it was much better to sell wheat within the State under section 92 when the export market had fallen away. Nevertheless the terminology in the Federal legislation tightens up this aspect and it would be most difficult now to have any of this type of dealing either in wheat or wheat products outside the board's jurisdiction.

The definition has been extended and it is now much more comprehensive. Also worthy of note are the two points made by the Minister in relation to the desirability of the Government's examining the provision for home consumption price for wheat if the price fixed by the Federal Minister is not considered to be satisfactory. This is a breakthrough in the legislation, in that the Minister now has the right to appeal to the State Government if he thinks the Federal Minister has not set a reasonable home consumption price.

The second point worthy of notice is that the Federal Minister has the power to direct the board. Notice has been given by the Minister in his second reading speech that this position will be watched. As far as Western Australia is concerned as a result of conventions with its counterparts in the other States through the Agricultural Council, the activities of the Australian Wheat Board will not be interfered with by the intervention of the Federal Minister.

The mechanics in relation to wheat quotas and the question of Tasmanian freight have already been covered by the comments of previous speakers. Other points raised in the debate include the so-called stabilization scheme which is a much better term than an equalisation scheme.

The question of entry into premises has been mentioned by Mr Heitman, as has the question of adjustment of the allowance for owner-operators. This last-mentioned point is a very important one, and Miss McAleer has spelt it out in detail, just as it has been spelt out in other State Parliaments and in the Parliament of the Commonwealth. This refers to the objection of owner-operators to the fact that the basic wage for these people has been fixed at \$3 181. This was the amount included in the formula for establishing the stabilization fund in 1968. Possibly this was the main objection by the State when it help up the legislation.

It is ridiculous that the value placed on the services of an owner-operator—for the use of his property, his know-how, and his management processes—should be fixed at \$3 181, as was the case in 1968 when that figure was set at the rate of a leading hand. Since then a calculation with the aid of computers has shown that the figure of \$3 181 has been increased by 71 per cent. If, in fact, that figure is adopted the home consumption price will be considerably more than \$2 per bushel; the figure will be more consonant with the average figure based on last year's grain harvest, when the price was between \$2.75 and \$3.00 per bushel.

These objections were raised in the Federal Parliament. At that stage it was impossible to amend the Bill, to which the Bill now before us is complementary, because it was necessary for the Federal Bill to be hurried through Parliament so that the borrowing powers contained therein could be brought into operation and farmers could be paid the money owing to them under the 20c advance in August last.

In spite of this, Dr Patterson in the House of Representatives did say that the owner-operator's allowance would be looked into in 1975, and that the Government should examine the possibility of bringing in a more realistic figure. I certainly hope that when he is considering a more realistic figure he does not regard the \$3 181 as the accepted figure for 1974. I hope he will upgrade the figure to take into account increases in wages and costs from 1968 to 1974, and also between 1974 and 1975.

These are the points which the Minister for Agriculture will have to watch. The Bill is absolutely necessary in order to put our house in order, so as to be ready for the coming harvest. I believe the legislation has been designed with some shortcomings; but those shortcomings must be in the Federal legislation to which the Bill before us is complementary.

In dealing with this proposition, another point which I should mention is this: the Federal Act contains a new definition of the term "approved bank". It now means the Reserve Bank of Australia or another bank for the time being approved by the Treasurer. This new definition was brought into being because the Federal Treasurer of the day would not give the Reserve Bank power to make the advance to growers that had been promised to them in August.

As a consequence, even though considerable funds were available under the first advance which had not been taken up, the proposal for the Reserve Bank to be given power to make a payment of 20c per bushel as promised to the farmers in August was not agreed to. In my opinion this is a farcical position, especially when we consider the debacle has been brought about through industrial stoppages in the Eastern States which prevented grain being sent overseas to fulfil contracts, to enable money to come back into Australia.

Another important definition in the Federal Act is that of "Australian Standard White Wheat". This means wheat other than wheat classified by or on behalf of the board as prime hard, hard, durum, or soft biscuit wheat, or as having a quality defect. In other words, for the first time a sensible move is being made in discarding the terminology "fair average quality" and terming fair average quality as Australian standard white wheat.

The new definition is beneficial, especially when one considers its appeal. Such benefits must surely be lost in the term "fair average quality". I cannot imagine anyone becoming excited about sales of wheat overseas as being of fair average quality. The new definition is a selling idiom, and it describes perfectly our Australian wheat. Contrary to reports which have been expressed by some people, this wheat is much sought after, and it must be sold in its own right. By so doing the term "Australian standard white wheat" will become established, in the same way as Canadian red wheat has become established.

I accept the Bill, although it contains many flaws. However this is the best that can be done under the agreement with the Federal Government.

One point has been raised by Mr Heitman and this concerns the Western Australian representatives on the Australian Wheat Board. The honourable member spoke of their ability, and hoped they would continue to serve the State and the farmers. I know both of these worthy gentlemen, who fly over to Melbourne each fortnight. They leave on a Tuesday night and return to Western Australia on a Thursday.

I think particular mention should be made of the supreme efforts of these worthy gentlemen. It is not a job which is highly paid; it is a true labour of love.

I think Ken McDougall, O.B.E. has for a period of some 18 years caught a plane bound for Melbourne on a Tuesday evening every fortnight, and sometimes he has remained in Melbourne without returning to Western Australia before he flew to countries in South America, to Britain, or to other countries.

I remember Mr McDougall phoning me one Sunday morning saying he wanted to see me on the Monday. I told him I would not be available until the Tuesday. He replied that on the Tuesday he would be overseas. I then asked him whether it would be convenient for him to see me on the following week. He said he would be back in Australia on the following Friday but would not be home for that weekend because he had to go to Chile for the purpose of selling some wheat there. This is the type of person who is handling the affairs of Western Australia on the Australian Wheat Board, and it indicates the tremendous effort these two representatives have put into their job.

The same applies to Mr Horrie Smith, the other representative, who has visited China, Russia, and Egypt. He is well known within the trade. Indeed, the work of these men cannot be publicised. That is another facet of the job; no credit can be given to those gentlemen for the work they do. Some people may look on and say that the job is not a bad way of being able to go on trips—trips for the boys—and it is not a bad lurk. However, I can tell members that the men concerned absolutely hate the sight of aeroplanes because every fortnight, during a period of 16 years, they have been going backwards and forwards to Melbourne. They are heartily sick of flying. When they have occasion to go overseas they become ambassadors of which this country can be proud.

It will be difficult to change the system and when the services of those gentlemen come to an end full credit must be given to them. Men like these were present when the first wheat sales were made to China, and they have been present during negotiations with many countries which have since become what we call, within the trade, positive markets. One of the reasons we have good relations overseas is that these men are known in the trade. To break into the trade, especially in South East Asia and Asian countries, is a matter of public relations and certainly a matter of complete trust. Business arrangements must never be let down at any time, especially those made on the Taiwanese, the Japanese, the Chinese, and the Malaysian markets.

I commend these worthy gentlemen and I sympathise with their families who have had to put up with their frequent absences over many years. Home has become little more than a place in which to change a shirt, as far as those men are concerned

because between trips they have to attend meetings all over the State. I hope that they will be suitably rewarded for the great work they have done for this State. I support the Bill.

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [3.22 p.m.]: I would like to acknowledge, with appreciation, the support given to this Bill by Mr Leeson, Miss McAleer, Mr Heitman, and Mr Gayfer. I do not believe any questions have been raised, by those who have spoken, which require any particular comment from me. I refer to matters other than those I covered during my introductory speech to the second reading.

Mr Gayfer, in particular, elaborated on those points and I would like to convey to him the view that his sentiments, in relation to the attitude of the State Government in these negotiations, are absolutely correct. I bear in mind, of course, that when the attitude was under consideration by the State Government shortly after taking office, and when it was apparent that we were endeavouring to take a firm stand as distinct from the attitude displayed by the previous Government, we were accused as a Government of playing the role for the purpose of trying to impress other people. Of course, that was not correct and it has been borne out again by the words I used when I introduced the Bill.

The constitutional position in regard to this legislation is not absolutely clear: hence, the reason we found it necessary to introduce what has been described as "mirror" legislation.

The point raised by Mr Gayfer, in relation to the owner-operator allowance, is completely valid and I subscribe to his view. Likewise, I subscribe to his views in relation to the home consumption price. These are matters on which the State Government is quite decided. When we indicated, at the time, that we as a State Government were giving serious consideration to going it alone—or using words of a similar meaning—we well and truly meant what we said. We were not prepared to sit idly by and see a stabilization scheme of traditional and historic importance to Australia—and Western Australia in particular—set aside in favour of a scheme which I have already described and on which Mr Gayfer and Miss McAleer elaborated to some greater extent.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: It was a very necessary stand.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: That is right. I again confirm the views expressed by Mr Gayfer when he said the attitude of the State Government is reflected by him and, more particularly, by the wheat-growing industry in Western Australia—if not completely, then to a great extent.

The necessary action was one of the first steps in the progress of our legislation and of our Government, which gave some moral support to the representatives of Western Australia in the negotiations when dealing with the Federal Government at the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation level. There is no question they knew they could look to us for support in their endeavour to obtain the best possible deal in the interests of Western Australian wheat-growers.

In view of the comments which have been made I would again refer members to the views I expressed when I introduced the Bill. I suggest those members who have a particular interest in this State might care to reflect on the significance of the words I used, and which will be uppermost in our minds in future negotiations.

We consider it was a retrograde step to call a Bill such as this a stabilization measure when equalisation was the real purpose of the Bill. It cannot be called "stabilization" in any way whatsoever, particularly as we know stabilization as it exists in this country.

Although I commenced my remarks by saying that no points were raised, Mr Heitman mentioned that the Bill is not framed on the exact wording of the Commonwealth legislation, or the model States' Bill. I think he will appreciate—as I think members generally will appreciate—that the likelihood or the possibility of implementing the provisions relating to black marketing are rather remote in Western Australia. Perhaps it would apply in a particular set of circumstances which we cannot exactly set out at this time. At this stage we do not see that there will be any necessity to use the powers with regard to blackmarketing. However, I do not think I need dwell on that point.

I again acknowledge the support which the Bill has received and I am indeed grateful for the added detail supplied in the contributions which have been made. I commend the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice), and passed.

WHEAT DELIVERY QUOTAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 21st November.

THE HON. R. T. LEESON (South-East) [3.34 p.m.]: One thing this House has taught me: if we want to draw the crabs, put up a wheat Bill. Here we have another amending Bill which is consequential legislation on the previous measure.

The subject of wheat quotas has been very controversial over the last few years in Western Australia. From what we are led to believe, the majority of farmers have always been opposed to quotas, although I believe they recognise the need to use this system in hard times. I feel the quotas have operated satisfactorily. I remember a farmer in my particular area who left because of the wheat quotas. He went somewhere else, and I believe he is doing all right—he is a prince, and has his own air force. That may be some argument for the retention of wheat quotas.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: He still has a wheat quota.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: He has a navy too.

The Hon. R. T. LEESON: This shows farmers just what can be done even with wheat quotas. I will not say any more about the measure, although other members may wish to express their views about wheat quotas. I support the Bill.

THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [3.36 p.m.]: Mr President—

The Hon. R. Thompson: Are you a prince or a duke?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: There are very few princes or dukes at Esperance.

The PRESIDENT: At the moment the honourable member has the floor.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Thank you, Mr President. I cannot help but use this occasion to mention once again the difficulties which wheat quotas have caused in my area, and particularly in the new land areas. Farmers in these areas have had great difficulty in obtaining suitable quotas.

I could not help but bring along today the latest copy of *The Wagin Argus* because it shows the contradictory nature of wheat quotas. In this issue of the 14th November, 1974, two articles appear side by side. The first article is headed, "1 Million Tonne Wheat Sale to USSR" and the last paragraph reads as follows—

The volume of business with the USSR during the last few years could have been considerably increased if Australia had had sufficient stocks of wheat.

Right alongside this is an article quoting Mr M. J. Lane, General Manager of Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited. Mr Lane announced that this year CBH will accept over-quota and non-quota wheat. Of course, this information has just been

announced, so it is a little late to sow the wheat! This illustrates the major difficulty experienced in our district. Most farmers are cropping and performing other farm work on borrowed money, but no bank will lend money to a farmer unless he has some hope of selling his product.

If a farmer does not have a quota, he cannot sell the wheat he produces anywhere but to the wheat board agents. It could mean that he will be paid for his produce at a very much later date—in fact, years ahead if he does not have a quota—and this is most unsatisfactory to new land farmers. It is for this reason that I once again draw the attention of the Government to this matter.

The Bill provides that records of wheat produced must still be kept. The records will be used in the future to provide past histories, but I would like to point out that it will be very hard for new land farmers to build up a past history. If we must again use the quota system, these farmers will be as badly off as they were before. Indeed, most of them have gone in for alternative crops of grain, such as barley, which does not have the same guaranteed price or high returns.

THE HON. J. HEITMAN (Upper West) [3.39 p.m.]: There is no need for me to tell the House that I have opposed wheat quotas for a considerable number of years. I am very disappointed that the measure still refers to them. I realise that a few sections of the parent Act will be repealed and that wheat quotas will not be imposed until such time as a Minister feels, in conjunction with farmer organisations, that they should be used again. Right throughout Australia, the year 1968 produced a bumper crop and wheat quotas were essential to the well-being of the nation at that time. However, in 1969 we suffered a bad drought throughout the country and nearly all the surplus wheat was disposed of—very little was left at the end of 1969. In my opinion the wheat quotas should have been abolished at that time, rather than have the restrictions eased as the measure provides until some future Minister feels, in conjunction with farmer organisations, that the system should be brought in again.

During the Brand Administration, some 1 000 000 acres of land was thrown open and much of that land was being developed when wheat quotas were introduced. Of course, it was a tremendous handicap for the people who were trying to develop the land for the production of wheat because, to begin with, they had to plant a cash crop or two that could carry them through the seasons. The only way to overcome this problem was to implement wheat quotas and to take a top cut from some farmers and across the board cuts from others to help the new land farmers plant some sort of cash crop.

I am not saying that some farmers did not do very well out of it; however, the fact remains that the wheat quotas took a lot of wheat from the first class farmers who were doing a good job in the industry. Because they were doing such a good job, they suffered an exceptionally high top cut to help the new land farmer out of the situation in which he found himself. I believe that if wheat quotas had been abolished at that time, there would not have been any need to take wheat away from the more efficient farmers in order to get the new land farmers going.

If we want to develop the State and if we can sell our wheat, surely we should allow everyone who wants to grow wheat to do so.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: We do not need wheat quotas at this time, do we?

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: No, we do not need them now and I do not see any need for the implementation of wheat quotas in the foreseeable future. However, if wheat quotas were required, surely a Bill introduced in 1968-69 would not be much good now. A different situation applied in those days from that which obtains now.

If wheat quotas need to be implemented now, surely new legislation should be introduced, rather than have the Minister and the Farmers' Union merely decide we are going to have wheat quotas again and consequently impose across the board cuts on everybody. I do not think this is fair to the State or the community at large; we all profit by primary production and the tremendous amount of wheat exported by this country provides the Australian Government with badly-needed overseas credit. Surely the production of wheat boosts the economy of the country.

I believe we should consider this point at all times, instead of adopting the attitude that "We do not have the storage, so we cannot grow the wheat". Thanks to Co-operative Bulk Handling, of which our friend, Mr Gayfer, is Chairman of Directors, Western Australia is in an extremely good position. The company has provided for a tremendous amount of storage in Western Australia and, in the light of this, surely there is no need to reimplement wheat quotas.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: You would not like the job of dividing the quotas; you had some experience of this before.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: As Mr Gayfer could tell the House, I did not want to take on the job, and he did not, either.

The Bill repeals sections of the old Act relating to quotas and the remainder of the Bill lays down the conditions which must be abided by. Proposed new section 29B states—

... the Minister may, after consultation with The Farmers' Union of Western Australia (Inc.), direct the Committee to publish a notice in the

Government Gazette, and in a newspaper circulating in the State, requiring all persons intending to deliver wheat of that season to the Company to supply the Committee with such information regarding the land to be used for the production of that wheat as is specified in the notice.

This provision makes it too easy to reintroduce wheat quotas in the future. I believe every farmer and every person in Western Australia should watch the situation and make sure that wheat quotas are not reintroduced until such time as there is an absolute need for them.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Were you referring to the State Minister?

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: Yes; I believe every State Minister should watch the situation and take particular care to make sure the States are not held back. Wheat quotas have cost this State alone millions of dollars because they curtailed production to such an extent that a wheat shortage has occurred.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I just wanted to be certain that you were referring to the State Minister.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: We can talk only about the State Minister.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: But it is the State Minister who has the power about which you were talking, is it not?

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: Yes, although we must not forget the Federal Government also has such power. This legislation is complementary to Federal legislation.

While I am pleased that we have reached a stage where the Federal Government and the States have agreed that wheat quotas will be abolished on a national basis, that is the best I can say about the legislation. It still provides the Minister with power to reintroduce wheat quotas for some purpose or another and I believe that purpose should be spelt out. I do not think there is a need for wheat quotas to be imposed today.

I mentioned a while ago that Western Australia produces more than 29 per cent of Australia's wheat and it always hurts me to know we receive only 22 per cent of the quota. Here again, I feel it is a matter of the numbers game; we do not have the numbers on the Federal committee to enable us to say, "This is what we should get". I point out that it does not matter what State Government is in power; this situation still applies. We often find that Western Australia is the poor relation and does not receive adequate representation on these bodies to justify the important standing of this State. I support the legislation, but only because it goes half way towards achieving something I have wanted since 1969.

Sitting suspended from 3.47 to 4.06 p.m.

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [4.06 p.m.]: Once again I acknowledge the support the Bill has received from members. I think I can share the sentiments expressed by Mr Heitman on wheat quotas, but I do not think, on this occasion, there is any necessity to enter into lengthy discussion on the desirability or otherwise of wheat quotas. Suffice it to say there is now an opportunity for quotas to be set aside but certainly not on a permanent basis.

When I say I share the views that have been expressed, I have in mind the comment made by Mr Leeson when he said that the operation of wheat quotas has been satisfactory. I qualify that statement to the extent that quotas have been found to be "satisfactory" only to the extent that they were necessary in the wheat-growing industry in recent years. That qualification must always be borne in mind, because the situation is not ideal; not by any means.

As Mr Heitman has observed, Western Australia and Western Australians—particularly the new land farmers referred to by Mr Wordsworth—have suffered some considerable disadvantages as a consequence of the imposition of quotas. We are now in the fortunate situation that we do not have to subject ourselves to the tribulations of quota determinations and quota seasons.

When one considers the Wheat Industry Stabilization Bill, one must, as a duty, be conscious of the world situation in relation to food and fibres and recognise that Australia has a positive part to play in this whole question. Certainly any action—either governmental or otherwise—that in any way limits our capacity to produce must surely add to the disadvantage of what in other places is a very serious food situation.

In his opening comment Mr Leeson said that if one wants to draw the crabs one need only introduce Bills to amend legislation dealing with wheat. I merely wish to qualify that comment. It was certainly not crabs that were drawn. I would remind the honourable member—if he is not aware of it—of an expression that is often made in Australian political circles: the party that holds the wheat seats governs Australia. There is more than just political significance in that particular comment. To a considerable extent I think it is true and if one wishes to delve into the import of such an expression, it will give a greater understanding of the necessity for members to express their points of view and advance a case on any matters dealing with agriculture and, more particularly, the wheat industry of Australia. With those remarks I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (the Hon. Clive Griffiths) in the Chair; the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 12 put and passed.

Clause 13: Section 31 amended—

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: I missed one or two points when speaking during the debate on the second reading. This clause gives the Minister power to bring in and control a wheat quota season. I might mention that when wheat quotas were first introduced many good seasons had been experienced and several farms changed hands. I know at least 14 farmers who came from the Eastern States and purchased properties at that time in what they thought were the best agricultural areas, only to find, following a drought in 1969, that wheat quotas were imposed from 1970 onwards. As a result they were unable to meet their commitments. We tried to do everything possible for them, even to providing a moratorium in relation to their debts to help tide them over for a year or two, but without success. I know that those 14 properties reverted to the original owners and that one farmer walked off the property after spending \$65 000 on it. This is what wheat quotas have done to people who purchased farms at that time.

I would also point out that many farmers came to this State from England and took up properties but lost all their assets following the imposition of wheat quotas. I do not have anything more to say about wheat quotas, and I have less to say about clause 13 because this contains a provision which will give the Minister power to bring in a wheat quota season and exercise control which I do not think is necessary. This is one clause I do oppose, but as this is complementary legislation it is too late to do anything constructive about it.

Clause 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 the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice), and passed.

STATE FORESTS

Revocation of Dedication—Assembly's Resolution: Motion to Concur

Debate resumed, from the 21st November, on the following motion by the Hon. N. E. Baxter (Minister for Health)—

That the proposal for the partial revocation of State Forests Nos. 4, 22, 24, 30, 32, 36, 38, 39, 64 and 65 be carried out.

THE HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [4.16 p.m.]: I have had an opportunity to peruse the motion and to examine the areas of land involving partial revocation of State forests, and they meet with my approval. Therefore I support the motion.

Question put and passed, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

PAINTERS' REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 21st November.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [4.17 p.m.]: This is yet another group of amendments to the Act. As the Government is persisting with this legislation, I hope it will take an early opportunity to have the Act reprinted because it is very difficult to follow with all the amendments which have been made to date.

The Bill is designed to achieve several objectives. Firstly, it deals with the registration and training of persons who want to become painters. It is intended that the course they follow will be improved.

Secondly, provision is made to try to counteract the practice of dummyming, by placing the responsibility for the maintaining of standards on the person who holds the registration under which the partnership, company, or corporation practises.

There is also provision for inspection, including a right of entry, which is new to the Act. Another amendment alters the method of fixing the registration fee. Instead of its being contained in the Act, under the amendment the fee will be fixed by regulation. Also, under the Bill, the provision in the Act for the *pro rata* payment of fees is to be deleted. At the present time if a person is registered halfway through the year he pays only half the registration fee laid down in the Act. It seems somewhat contradictory that we have just introduced a provision in the Local Government Act to provide for *pro rata* payment of rates, but under this legislation we are proposing to delete such a provision. This represents a degree of inconsistency on the part of the Government although we should not be surprised, I suppose.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: They call it flexibility.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I call it inconsistency. My understanding of the Minister's speech is that this amendment is an attempt to improve the finances of the board but, at the same time, it does represent a marked inconsistency when compared with the recent amendments to the Local Government Act.

Another provision in the Bill seems to conflict with what is said to be the philosophy of the Liberal Party; it sets a personal liability on the directors or principals of a company.

The chief action which set in progress western capitalism was the development of the joint stock company which removed personal liability and consequently made investment attractive to people. The provision in the Bill reminds me of the situation which existed before that time and I am somewhat surprised to find that the Government has included it.

The Bill is really a half-baked way of tackling the problems which the amendments are designed to overcome. If members have studied the *Report of the Inquiry into the Building Industry in Western Australia* which was tabled only recently they will have found it contains a number of recommendations which deal with practically all the problems covered by the Bill before us. Perhaps the reason those recommendations have not been included in the legislation is that the report contains a statement to the effect that the recommendations are opposed by the Employers Federation. On pages 64 and 65 of the report is the following—

That body made a lengthy and erudite submission setting out the history of training in this State which was most helpful on that aspect of the matter. So far as the future is concerned I do not think it unkind to the Federation to say that the policy which it advocated, apart from module type training for adults, followed laissez-faire principles. The Employers Federation as a matter of philosophy is opposed to manpower control or direction of any form.

The report actually recommends the repeal of the Painters' Registration Act and makes a number of suggestions. On page 59 the report recommends a three-tier licensing system as follows—

- (i) a general construction license which would entitle the holder to undertake any type of building work of any value.
- (ii) a limited builder's license which would entitle the holder to undertake construction of housing to an unlimited value and other construction work to a limited value of say \$30 000.
- (iii) a sub-contractor's license which would entitle the holder to undertake the type of work specified in the license to an unlimited value.

The report goes on to indicate that the licensing authority would be required to satisfy itself before issuing the license that the individual company or firm seeking the license had the technical skill, business training, and financial resources to carry out the type of work for which

the license was sought. With regard to training, similar things are mentioned in the Minister's second reading speech. On page 4 he said—

Therefore it is proposed to introduce progressively a number of subjects which a person seeking registration must pass. The subjects proposed by the board cover basic accountancy, costing and modern paint technology.

It can be seen from what I have read from the report and from the Minister's speech that the items covered by the amendments in the Bill are also dealt with in the report, and the implementation of the recommendations in the report would be the most satisfactory course of action to follow.

The report recommends the establishment of an advisory council to keep under review such matters as the splitting of trades, the length of term of apprenticeship, and examination syllabi. It further suggests that the Technical Education Department be required to provide vocational training on a much wider basis and that consideration should be given to making that body autonomous and responsible direct to the Minister charged with the responsibility of the administration of the training legislation. That recommendation is to be found on page 68.

On page 69, the report refers to the serious shortage of tradesmen and states that if this shortage is to be averted something must be done to encourage employers to accept apprentices, and the following suggestions upon which this might be achieved are made—

- (a) the immediate expansion of the pre-apprentice training scheme. The product of this scheme has proved popular with employers for the reason that when the youth commences his apprenticeship he has a basic knowledge of his trade and is trained in tool handling.
- (b) the awarding of government contracts in excess of \$20 000 to those licensed builders who train an adequate quota of apprentices.
- (c) the continuance and expansion of adult training schemes along the lines of the present government scheme.
- (d) the elevation of semi-skilled adults to tradesman status if they satisfy the appropriate training authority that they have attained the required degree of skill.

The first amendment in the Bill is of a tidying-up nature and deals with section 11. Clause 4 deals with the categories of persons who may be registered, these being a person who has completed the prescribed course of training and has passed

the prescribed examinations as laid down by the board for persons who have had five years' practical experience in the trade; and a person who has completed the prescribed course of training and has passed the prescribed examination as laid down under the Industrial Arbitration Act for apprentices to the painting trade, and has passed the prescribed additional examination laid down by the board. No reference is made to the number of years of training.

Paragraph (b) of section 12 (1) of the Act is a grandfather provision which covers all practising painters who have no qualifications. That type of provision is necessary when introducing legislation to regulate a trade or industry for the first time. Paragraph (c) of clause 12 (1) of the Act covers persons who come from outside Western Australia. It does not state that they must have any particular qualifications but they are allowed to be registered if they satisfy the registration board, which is a fairly loose provision. That paragraph reads—

- (c) has in some place other than Western Australia attained a degree of proficiency as a painter which the Board considers is comparable with that ordinarily attained by persons who have completed the course of training, passed the examinations and worked as mentioned in paragraph (a) of this subsection.

It appears to allow scope for people whose training is of a lower standard to compete with people who have gained qualifications in this State, to the disadvantage of the latter. If we are trying to improve the standards in the trade, it does not seem to be reasonable to allow that situation to continue. The Minister in charge of the Bill might comment on how that provision of the Act is administered, and the degree of oversight and examination exercised by the board in relation to people registered under section 12 (1) (c) of the Act.

The recommendations of the committee which inquired into the building trade are contained in chapter 10, beginning on page 73 of the report. The recommendations fall into two groups, one in which it is believed urgent action should be taken and the other requiring action in a longer term. The report says—

10.2 There is, however, an element of urgency in relation to implementation of some of the recommendations. To ensure much needed financial protection for sub-contractors prompt administrative and legislative action is desirable and for the general stability of the industry early introduction of legislation providing for the licensing of all contractors is necessary.

Those are rather strong words, and I am surprised the Government has not taken greater notice of them than it appears to have taken. In summary, the actual recommendations are—

A. For the general stability of the industry:

- (i) The repeal of the Builders Registration Act and the Painters Registration Act.
- (ii) The enactment of legislation to create a building industry licensing authority to administer the licensing of all persons contracting in the industry, in the manner discussed in Chapter 7. Such legislation should apply throughout the State and provide for a substantial license fee to be rebateable in part, in circumstances therein provided.

B. For the financial protection of sub-contractors and wage earners::

Then follow fairly lengthy recommendations. I will not read them all. The first refers to an administrative direction to government departments and instrumentalities, such as the State Housing Commission, in regard to work to the value of \$20 000 or more, that tenderers should specify the names of subcontractors and should not employ other subcontractors without the consent of the proprietor. The second recommendation relates to an administrative direction to departmental representatives on committees reviewing standard form contracts in the private sector to press for like amendments in the standard form contracts. The third recommendation is that legislation based on the South Australian Workmen's Liens Act be enacted to bind the Crown and extend financial protection to all subcontractors and workmen but not to persons who supply material and not services.

The recommendations in category "C" relate to financial protection for home builders, and the recommendations in category "D" to provision for an increased supply of tradesmen. I think the latter recommendations are important when we are considering means to increase the supply of qualified people in the industry, and I imagine that is partly the intention of the Government in the proposal now before us. The recommendations in this section are—

D. To provide for an increased supply of tradesmen:

- (i) The pre-apprentice training scheme conducted by the Technical Education Department be expanded.
- (ii) The present Government adult training scheme be continued and extended to cover trades other than bricklaying.

(iii) Government contracts of a value of \$20 000 or more be awarded only to those contractors employing the appropriate quota of apprentices.

(iv) The building trades award be amended to provide for the elevation of semi-skilled workers to tradesman status provided such persons satisfy the Training Board examiners that they have attained the required degree of skill.

(v) The licensing legislation contain certain provision for the rebate of portion of a license fee to licensed persons training an appropriate quota of apprentices.

I understand all those recommendations relate to increasing the supply of qualified tradesmen and giving a greater degree of stability to the industry. At present problems are experienced because of the shortage of trained skilled craftsmen.

On page 75 of the report are set out recommendations for the long-term benefit of the industry. Because the preceding recommendations are unlikely to provide for an adequate flow of tradesmen, it is recommended that a detailed investigation be undertaken of the English Construction Industry Training Board to see whether a scheme of that type could be set up in this State. It is suggested that the Technical Education Division be set up as an autonomous body, responsible to the Minister, in respect of training, and that tradesmen depart from the industry for the reasons outlined in chapter 9 of the report, which include lack of stability in the industry and unsuitable working conditions. The report reads—

10.6 The fact that tradesmen depart from the industry for the reasons outlined in Chapter 9 further aggravates the shortage of tradesmen and consideration should be given to the practicability of the introduction at an early date of legislation:

- (i) to provide for the portability of long service leave for employees of licensed building contractors based upon the legislation now in operation in Tasmania.
- (ii) to provide for a scheme similar to the Building & Civil Engineering Holiday Scheme now in operation in England to ensure adequate protection of benefits, such as holiday and sick pay.
- (iii) pursuant to which the main contractor is responsible for industrial safety measures and the provision of on-site facilities and amenities.

The report comes down against the suggestion that a security deposit should be required at the time a contract is entered into, which it had been believed would assist the industry.

I have given an outline of the recommendations of the committee of inquiry. They are not designed as stopgap measures, as is the Bill now before us. I think the Government deserves very strong criticism for having dealt with the report in this way—by implication, setting it aside and bringing in the amendments contained in the Bill. I think it indicates there has been pressure on the Government from the Employers Federation not to introduce new legislation to give the building industry the protection which is really required, and we will therefore have to continue to suffer under less satisfactory arrangements such as those we are now dealing with.

We do not have much choice about the Bill. Admittedly it eases some of the problems with which we are faced, and I suppose we can be grateful for that. It would not serve anyone's purpose to defeat the Bill. I mention again that we are quite surprised the Government has introduced the provision in clause 10, which really reverses the situation which existed before the days of industrialisation and the general expansion of the western economy. It is the type of arrangement with which we are likely to be saddled when we deal with problems on an *ad hoc* basis rather than take an overall approach based on sound investigation. I support the Bill.

THE HON. CLIVE GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [4.44 p.m.]: Perhaps my comments should be left to the Committee stage, but I want to say something in general about the Act which this Bill seeks to amend.

Firstly, I have never been very enthusiastic about a state of affairs that has made it necessary for such an Act to exist; that is, an Act to register persons who want to carry on business as painting contractors. Having commenced my comments on that note, I would like to point out that some of the actions intended to be taken under this Bill make me like the function of the Act a great deal less.

The other general comment I want to make is that I do not know whether members have recently asked for a copy of this Act—

The Hon. R. Thompson: It is almost impossible to read.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: —but I can assure you, Sir, it is like trying to read a box of confetti, because it is in so many bits and pieces.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Is it in technical colour?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: As a matter of fact, it is; there is blue and red ink everywhere and there are arrows run-

ning here and there. Anybody who wished to ascertain the provisions of the Act would have to be very keen indeed to sit down and read it. I suggest that early consideration be given to reprinting the Act.

Mr Claughton has covered most of the Bill, and I will not go over all the ground he traversed. However, I would like to touch on one or two clauses to which I take exception.

When referring to clause 4, the Minister said in his introductory speech—

A further anomaly was that the Act, by implication, inferred that any person who had completed a five-year apprenticeship was entitled to be registered without further examination.

Let us pause there. I wonder where the Minister got that idea from? I do not take that to be an anomaly; I take it to be a person's right. After having served a five-year apprenticeship I think it is his right, with absolutely no area for doubt, to be registered. I take umbrage at the suggestion this is an oversight or something which has crept in and was never intended to be there. My investigation of the Act and the amendments over the years certainly did not lead me to believe that is an anomaly and that perhaps the Act really meant something else.

The Minister went on to say that the board submitted to the Minister for Works that, in the interests of the public, it was desirable that painters obtaining registration under the Act had additional qualifications to those gained through serving their apprenticeship. Perhaps I am a funny sort of bloke, but one of the things that always gets my back up is for someone to suggest that a person is not really a competent tradesman even though he has served an apprenticeship and carried out a great deal of study under qualified tradesmen, attended the trades schools laid down in the apprenticeship agreement, passed all his final examinations, and received a certificate to say he is a competent tradesman.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You wouldn't say that in respect of an electrician, surely. He would need to come under some licensing authority after he has completed his apprenticeship.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: That is right; when he finishes his apprenticeship he sits for a final examination, and if he passes the examination he is given a license.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: That is not so. He has to go before a board of examiners to obtain a license.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: When the apprentice finishes his apprenticeship and passes the examinations he receives a license. Having received a license, he is then qualified to work as an electrician.

He must serve another two years in the trade before he may hold a contractor's license, although he is not required to pass further examinations. One of the suggestions made in the document read out by Mr Claughton in regard to painters was that they should serve a minimum of seven years in the trade. I would not be opposed to that, but the Minister who introduced the Bill is opposed to it. However, if it is thought necessary for an apprentice to serve a further couple of years after he finishes his apprenticeship in order to obtain practical experience before he is competent to trade as a contractor, I reckon that is far better than saying that at the end of his apprenticeship, and after he has met all the requirements, he is not a qualified tradesman.

Certainly when I employ a painter or a carpenter I want a qualified tradesman; and if I employ a bookkeeper I want him to be qualified.

The Minister then went on to say that, therefore, it is proposed to introduce progressively a number of subjects which a person seeking registration must pass. The subjects proposed by the board cover basic accountancy, costing, and modern paint technology. The Minister said it is in the interests of any young tradesman desiring to set himself up in business as a master painter to have a knowledge of those subjects to increase his capacity to carry out work of a high standard and to maintain proper appreciation of the financial standing of his undertaking.

I fail to understand how a person's knowledge of basic accountancy will have the remotest effect on his ability to carry out a painting contract to a high standard. I repeat that for many years I have been bitterly opposed to schemes introduced from time to time which require people to be licensed to do this, registered to do that, and so on. I am opposed to schemes which say that people cannot grow this without a quota, or they cannot make that without a license. I am aware that I am repeating previous comments when I say I do not know what the next generation of young people will do to earn a living, because there is nothing left for them.

At one time if all else failed and a person just could not succeed he could become a poultry farmer; but now one must have a license to own some chooks! We have restricted all these areas so that there is absolutely no way in the world—unless he is an absolute genius or a millionaire—that a person can start a business of his own.

It seems to me this country was built up on the basis of people setting to and doing some hard work, and exploiting their talents as tradesmen, journeymen, and plain hard workers. I reckon we have developed in a short time into a pretty good,

forward nation. We certainly did not achieve this by placing all the obstacles one can possibly think of—and some that one could not conceive of in a trance—in the way of people who wished to commence businesses of their own.

I wonder whether during the course of the inquiries which were made the ordinary painting tradesman was asked for his reactions to the Bill. Consider a journeyman painter who has been in the trade for 15 or 20 years, whose family is now off his hands, and who has saved up a few bob. He might say, "I have served my apprenticeship; I am a tradesman painter; I would not mind using a bit of initiative and starting my own contracting business. I was never much good at accountancy, but I would like to try my skill seeing that I am the best painter in the business in this town."

The Hon. R. Thompson: Remembering it could be a one-man show, too.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: That is right. That man might go along to the Painters' Registration Board and say that he wants to start up a business. He would be told, "You must pass this examination; the fact that you have been a tradesman painter for the last 15 years means absolutely nothing to us. We do not believe you can do a good job of painting that building over there, because your knowledge of accountancy is dismal or perhaps nonexistent. Therefore, we do not believe you could carry out the functions of a painting contractor."

That painter might not be capable of learning basic accountancy. Plenty of people in this community are not capable of that.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: That's what I reckon, too: after some of the accounts one receives.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I hark back to the days when I commenced my business. I still have terrible difficulty in understanding what balance sheets mean. However, I ran a pretty successful business and employed many people. I was competent in my trade and I successfully built up a business. I quickly learned that the best person to look after my financial affairs was someone who was specially trained to do that. Such a person was one of the early employees on my payroll.

Prior to that, I did my own book work; and my knowledge of the subject was absolutely nonexistent. Indeed, had I been required to pass an examination in basic accountancy I would not have been a licensed electrical contractor, and still could not be one.

I would like to know what the ordinary painter thinks of this Bill, especially after considering the constitution of the board

which wants the power to set these examinations. Incidentally, the Bill does not say anything about basic accountancy; the Minister referred to that in his speech. The Bill states in proposed new paragraph (aa) of section 12(1)—

(aa) has completed the prescribed course of training and has passed the prescribed examination as laid down under the Industrial Arbitration Act, 1912, for apprentices to the painting trade and has passed the prescribed additional examination laid down by the board for those persons.

The prescribed examination laid down under the Industrial Arbitration Act is the one which determines whether or not he is a competent tradesman painter; it is the prescribed additional examination laid down by the board of which I am fearful. I believe this provision is designed to prevent other painters from going into business on their own.

What happens in the case of these trade associations and business organisations is that when a person desires to become a member, those who are already members of the associations do their best to keep him out. So having battled his way through all the objections, and having finally made the grade and got in he then joins forces with those who are already members of such organisations and immediately agitates for Governments, or for somebody, to raise the standard in order to prevent anybody else from getting in.

Accordingly this makes it more and more difficult for the next person to become a member. This is precisely what is happening here.

I would now like to read the constitution of the board. Before I do so I want to say that I have nothing against the men as individuals; they are probably very nice fellows; but let us see whether they are the sort of people who would have foremost in their thoughts the interests of the brand, spanking new tradesman who is 21 or 22 years old and who decides he is good enough to earn his living as a painting contractor; let us see whether they will have at heart the interests of the 40 or 45-year-old tradesman who has bided his time while looking after his young family and having got them off his hands then seeks to achieve his ambition of working for himself. I wonder whether the members of the board would have the interests of those people uppermost in their minds, when they consider who else should get in on the act. The Act states that the board shall consist of three people—a chairman who shall be the Chairman of the Builders' Registration Board of Western Australia; one member nominated by the association—and "Association" means the Master Painters, Decorators and Signwriters' Association of Western Australia—and one to be a person who is nominated in accordance with section 7 of the Act by a body

known as the West Australian Chamber of Manufactures (Inc.) who shall be a representative of the Australian Paint Manufacturers Federation (W.A. Branch).

I do not know who the individual members would be.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: They would probably be the accountants from each place.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: That could be so. I am not saying anything against these fellows as individuals; they are probably very nice people, but I feel their thinking would not be geared towards the desires and ambitions of ordinary tradesmen who want to do little else but take the opportunity to start their own business in their own right; working for themselves and possibly succeeding to such an extent that they eventually employ other people. For this reason I will oppose the clause in question and I hope that 15 other members of this Chamber will also oppose it.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Now I know why you could not pass the basic test in accountancy.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The honourable member is probably right. I merely happen to have faith in the ability of members of this Chamber to understand what I am getting at.

I prefaced my remarks by saying that I was opposed to the whole set-up anyway, but having resigned myself to the fact that we have an Act, I am prepared to believe that we should do all we can to make it work as well as possible.

There are several other provisions to which I wish to refer which relate particularly to giving authority to inspectors to go in and make sure they can have a look at any faulty workmanship in order that they might help raise the standard of the work done. I am prepared to support this, except that I am not prepared to support the provision which precludes any tradesman from exercising his fundamental basic right, which we in this community believe he ought to be permitted to exercise; namely, to use his talents to earn his living in his own right while working for himself.

Accordingly I will ask members when we get to that particular stage to vote against clause 4 of the Bill.

I am afraid I cannot get terribly enthusiastic about clause 5, either. Incidentally, while I am on the general theme, the provisions we propose to insert into the principal Act are not contained in any other similar legislation. I can see this as the thin edge of the wedge; and having got the provisions into the Act under discussion, at the very first opportunity we will probably include them in similar Acts on our Statute book.

Clause 5 seeks to amend section 13 of the Act. Section 13 (3) states—

There shall be paid to the Board by every candidate for examination such fee as the Board, with the approval of the Governor, prescribes but not exceeding three pounds three shillings.

In his second reading speech the Minister indicated the board was going broke; that it had \$8 000 which it had used and that obviously in these times of inflation it was necessary that it should be provided with more money. I have no axe to grind in this matter.

The amendment in the Bill does not say "not exceeding \$25, or \$50, or \$12.50"; it merely seeks to delete the words in question. So there will be no ceiling whatever, and the board will be able to set the examination fee at whatever figure it likes.

This is another feature which I believe is designed to discourage anybody who may decide he will try to become a registered contractor. The fees could be set at such an exorbitant figure that nobody would be prepared to sit for the examination in case he did not pass, as a result of his not having done basic accountancy. I only mention this aspect in passing and I will probably vote against this provision.

Clause 9 of the Bill seeks to amend section 21 of the Act. Again here we have a section which refers to fees; and what the Bill seeks to do is to provide for an increase in fees. It seeks to remove the present ceiling on the price of the registration fee from £7/7/0 and to leave no ceiling at all.

I should have thought the board would be able to calculate this aspect on the known numbers of registered painters and on its known expenses over the years, and arrive at another ceiling figure which would have enabled it to do two things; namely strike a figure which would permit it to survive under the present cost situation, and allow it some leeway to increase costs as these rise, perhaps, over the next two or three years.

If the fees are still not high enough, the board could bring the matter to Parliament and Parliament could decide whether or not there should be an increase in the fees. However, the Bill seeks to remove the ceiling in both instances and I do not like it at all. This would be a distinct advantage to people who are already registered painters, while being a deterrent to those who are seeking to become registered painters. I do not think this is fair, and I feel that most members in the Chamber will agree that if something is not fair we should not pass it. To my mind it is just plain unfair to give this advantage to a privileged section of the community who have qualified under less stringent requirements and who have succeeded in their business and are thus able to pay the higher fees, while denying the advantage to the individual who has to

qualify under a much more stringent set of rules at a time when he can least afford to pay the higher fee should he pass the more stringent examination. I repeat, I do not think this is fair and I do not intend to support the provision.

Having said now all the things I ought to have said in the Committee stage, I will support what is left of the Bill.

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) (5.12 p.m.): I have noted a singular lack of enthusiasm towards this Bill both on the part of Mr Cloughton and also on the part of Mr Clive Griffiths, particularly to those aspects about which he made specific reference.

I feel the first comments I make should be in relation to the remarks made by Mr Cloughton. With great respect I feel his comments were really an examination of the provisions of the Howard Smith inquiry into the building industry which the previous Government of which he was a member commissioned. That was the major part of his contribution. This is what he referred to, and I doubt very much whether a great deal of what he said had much relevance to the Bill before us.

Certainly there was some relevance in the obvious assertions he made which I think may have some application to the Bill. He described the Bill in rather unglowing terms and referred to it as half-baked, as a stop-gap measure, and so on.

I do not think that is fair comment. These propositions—though not all of them of course—have in fact come up as a result of the recommendations of people who have had a great deal of experience in the matter of painters' registration.

As to the amendments that ought to be made to this Act, I do not think they are half-baked and they are certainly not stop-gap arrangements. They are designed to effect certain specific purposes some of which have been raised by Mr Clive Griffiths.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: It might be better when the paint is dry!

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Perhaps I should refer to the other part of the television commercial, about the paint that "keeps on keeping on".

Mr Cloughton has referred to inconsistencies in the Bill before us, and the Local Government Act Amendment Bill which we discussed earlier. We have also heard charges of inconsistency on other occasions, and Mr Dellar has referred to the question of flexibility. I do not think it is fair for members to level charges of inconsistency, because under the Bill before us it is provided that upon registration the full fee shall be paid.

If Mr Cloughton joins a sporting club or a similar organisation he has to pay a registration fee. I do not think he is

granted a concession of paying a proportion of the fee if he joins half way through the year. That is what the provision in the Bill amounts to.

In respect of the Local Government Act Amendment Bill, Mr Dellar indicated to us the difficulties he confronted in determining the appropriate rate that was to be paid. On that occasion he supported the viewpoint enunciated in the Bill before us. I am sure other members will also support the viewpoint that when a person joins an organisation—for example if he becomes a member under the Painters' Registration Board—he ought to pay the full fee irrespective of the time of the year he joins. I cannot see anything inequitable in such a proposition.

One question raised by Mr Claughton causes me some concern because I am not able to give him the information. However, I shall endeavour to obtain it. I do not know whether he is desirous that the Committee stage of the Bill be proceeded with before I supply the information.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: It is not a question of raising any objection.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: To be specific about the matter and to clarify my own thinking, the honourable member was referring to the examination of persons by the registration board under section 12C of the Act. I shall endeavour to obtain the information for the honourable member.

Mr Claughton has made reference to the inquiry into the building industry by Mr Howard Smith, and said that some of the recommendations have not been put into effect. Special attention has been drawn to the need for training and education. This aspect is being implemented. It has been the subject of Cabinet and Government consideration, and the matter has been referred to the Minister for Labour and Industry and the Minister for Education for action. We can be assured that action will be forthcoming. If I recall the position, many submissions were made at the inquiry, but not many major recommendations were brought down. These were the recommendations Mr Claughton was dealing with.

Reference has been made to the need for the introduction of liens legislation. The Howard Smith inquiry came down with a recommendation for the introduction of such legislation. The Government was very concerned about that aspect, and Mr Claughton would have been aware of the indication of the attitude of the Government.

The report of the Law Reform Commission offered the view that liens legislation should not be brought down. That report has been circulated, and the Government has taken steps to make that viewpoint known to the people engaged in the industry. I understand that up to the

present the Minister concerned has not received advice to the contrary, and that it is considered liens legislation ought to be introduced. I should convey to Mr Claughton my surprise that the Law Reform Commission expressed that viewpoint in the light of the recommendation of the Howard Smith inquiry.

Other points have been raised by Mr Claughton in this debate, but I cannot give him any assurances on them. He drew attention to a suggestion that provision should be made for the engagement of apprentices in government contracts exceeding \$20 000. This is a matter of which the Government should take notice, but I am not in a position to indicate the precise action that is to be taken. I am sure that both the Minister for Labour and Industry and the Minister for Works are conscious of that recommendation.

Another comment related to a rebate in respect of licensing as a means to increase the supply of apprentices. Here again I am not able to give any precise information.

While I am prepared to subscribe to the general philosophy advanced by Mr Clive Griffiths, I do not agree that these proposals could be interpreted as further obstacles in the way of people trying to make a living. I take exception to one viewpoint expressed by Mr Clive Griffiths. Up to this stage of the parliamentary session the honourable member and I have had no differences of opinion on any points that have been raised. He said that perhaps we could revert to the stage where if all else failed, and people could not make a living, they could go poultry farming.

I should speak in defence of that industry. This is the type of viewpoint that has adversely affected agricultural industries for a long time. Too often do we hear people say, when they cannot make a success of a trade or a calling they could go farming. That is an unfortunate attitude for people to adopt.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: How many times have we been asked this question: why educate a child when he will only be a farmer in the course of time?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I am not sure that Mr Clive Griffiths intended his comment to mean that. Mr Clive Griffiths has maintained that one of the purposes of the introduction of the Bill, and in fact the parent Act, was to keep other people out of the industry.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The purpose was to maintain the standard of workmanship.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: That is correct, and to ensure that the reputation and integrity of those engaged in the industry are protected.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I was under the impression the purpose was "to join the club".

The Hon. N. McNEILL: That interjection illustrates the point I am making in relation to the remarks of Mr Clive Griffiths. There is a duty on painters and those involved in the trade to ensure that their integrity and the high standard of workmanship are maintained.

Whenever an attempt is made to maintain standards in an industry or profession, many representations are made by those engaged in the profession or trade, emphasising it is not desirable to have fly-by-nights going around the countryside, carrying out work of poor standard, and thus giving the industry a bad name.

That is basic to any attempt that is made to maintain standards in an industry. That being the case, there is some justification for advancing the proposal that those engaged in the trade should learn and have an understanding of certain subjects, including basic accountancy. Surely what is proposed as basic accountancy would be a simple exercise. I am sure that many members of the House, including myself, have had experience of representations being made as a result of difficulties experienced by people engaged in a particular trade or calling because they failed to understand simple arithmetic and could not handle figures. As a result they got into trouble with the law.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: That is going to the extreme.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: We are doing the people involved in the painting industry a great service by giving them an opportunity to gain a greater understanding and knowledge of certain required subjects. We all know that every child has to attend school and learn, and in that regard we thrust education onto the children. We are providing people in this instance with an opportunity for advancement by including a provision which enables them to learn. This is desirable, whether the people concerned be painters or doctors.

These are the grounds on which the proposals in the Bill have been based. This is a basic type of philosophy. I share the view of Mr Clive Griffiths in that I do not desire undue impediments to be placed in the way of the people. They should be given every opportunity to engage in an industry if they think they can make a success of it. I should point out that for those who make a success of it, a greater number fall by the wayside. We have a duty to all the people, just as we have to those who succeed eventually in an industry or calling of their choice.

In his opposition to the proposals, Mr Clive Griffiths has not spelt out the steps that should be taken. I understand he is deciding this question on principle. I have outlined the types of subjects which will be included in the curriculum of the Painters' Registration Board. I hope my

words will influence members not to support the opposition that Mr Clive Griffiths has put forward.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

Clause 1: Short title and citation—

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Section 3 of the principal Act provides that the Act operates only throughout the metropolitan area so the person about whom Mr Clive Griffiths was talking has an opportunity to operate over the whole of the State with the exception of the metropolitan area. Section 4 of the principal Act sets out that any person can undertake work to the value of \$100, and that only a registered painter can undertake work to a value above that figure. However, the registered painter can still employ unqualified people. Obviously, there is some scope for those people about whom Mr Clive Griffiths expressed concern.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 2 put and passed.

Clause 3: Section 11 amended—

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: This is the first of several clauses in the Bill designed to increase registration fees, without any limitation being prescribed. As I intend to vote against clause 5 I indicate I will also vote against this clause.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Bearing in mind that the Bill will remove from the Act the *pro rata* provision, what registration fee is envisaged? It seems reasonable that we should have some indication of the amount of the fee.

It seemed to me that Mr Clive Griffiths was a little confused between the Master Painters Association and the Registration Board. A painter can be registered without having to be a member of the association.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I was not confused about that matter.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The honourable member was talking about what one would have to do in order to be able to join the club. I presume he was referring to the Master Painters Association.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: No, the "club" comprises those who are registered painters.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Master Painters Association does not set the fee; it is set by the registration board. The union has expressed no opposition to the provisions in this Bill.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: That astounds me.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: A copy of the Bill was sent to that organisation with a request for comment, but no serious objections were raised.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Members will be aware that the application fee at present is \$4.20. I will endeavour to obtain the information requested by Mr Cloughton regarding the registration fee and if that information is available I will convey it to the Committee forthwith.

In reply to Mr Clive Griffiths, it is true this clause commences the process whereby fees shall be prescribed by regulation. I think that is appropriate because there will still be the safeguard of an opportunity to challenge them in this Parliament. It is essentially a matter of convenience, whether the fees should be set out in the Act, or established by regulation and be subject to challenge. The alternative to the proposed procedure is to continually bring Bills to Parliament to amend the Act.

Mr Clive Griffiths and Mr Cloughton both commented on the state of the Act, with all its amendments. I have noted their remarks, and, as I am the Minister in charge of reprints of Bills, I will take them seriously and look into the necessity for a reprint of the Act.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4: Section 12 amended—

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: As I pointed out during the second reading stage, this is a clause which I could not support under any circumstances. I will go a little further and say I am not opposed to the desire to maintain a high standard, and I am not opposed to the desire to protect the public from unscrupulous people. I suggest that the Act, in its present form, provides such protection and with the amendments contained in this Bill—other than the provisions of clause 4—it will provide even greater protection.

The provisions of clause 4 will not provide any protection for the general public, and I do not think they will provide very much protection for the painter. Why should we adopt this paternalistic attitude towards people whose only desire is to use their skills in an effort to earn a living? The men concerned will have learnt their trade as apprentices. If we are to adopt this attitude towards all spheres of life we will find ourselves in the position of strangling the community with red tape. We will reach the stage where we will dictate to people how much money they should spend, or how many times they should go to the pictures.

Some years ago I worked for a contractor in Fremantle and when I decided to leave him, and go out by myself, he said that I should stay and work for him. I pointed out that if I did not leave him and endeavour to start my own business I

would harbour in my mind, for the rest of my life, the thought that perhaps I could have succeeded if I had exercised my right to go out and sell the talents which I had.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The honourable member was very fortunate in that he had another opportunity at about the same time.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: That is right, but it does not really have anything to do with the Bill. What I am saying is that had it been necessary, at the time I decided to go into business by myself, for me to take another examination, which had absolutely nothing to do with my skills as a tradesman, I might have been disadvantaged for the rest of my life, simply because I was unable to pass the additional examination.

The person about whom I am talking will have passed an examination laid down under the Industrial Arbitration Act, at the completion of his apprenticeship. He will be qualified and will be competent as a tradesman. Surely that person should not have to pass a further examination before he is able to go out and earn a living for himself. What would be the situation if I decided to buy a greengrocer's shop and become a greengrocer? There is nothing in the law to say I have to pass an examination. It seems that if the perpetrators of this sort of legislation get wind that such a provision does not exist, legislation will be introduced shortly to cover that situation.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Mr Graham started this one, but he is not interested now.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The Act already achieves that.

The Hon. R. Thompson: No, that was in connection with builders' registration.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: What Mr Graham desired to do was to strengthen the rest of the provisions in the legislation, except those in relation to clause 4. The only person affected by the provisions of clause 4 will be the ordinary tradesman painter who desires at some stage of his life to earn his living by working for himself.

In his second reading speech the Minister referred to the type of knowledge the board would test in an additional examination. He mentioned basic accountancy and costing, and modern paint technology, although I do not know what is meant by this.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is what the man did not know when he painted Blue Poles.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The painter ought to know something about the paints he is using. If it is desirable for a painter to have this knowledge, he should learn it during his apprenticeship.

The syllabus for the apprenticeship course ought to be updated to teach these things. The examination for electrical apprentices is being changed all the time as technology advances. What an apprentice is required to know changes from year to year. If he does not pass the examination at the end of the course, he is not a qualified tradesman. Contrary to what Mr Cooley said, once an apprentice electrician passes his final examination he is qualified to be a contractor, with the additional requirement that he must have served at least seven years in the trade. I would not oppose a provision along these lines. However, we reject such a proposal in the recommendations. We prefer to say that a contractor must be a Rhodes scholar! I am sincerely asking members of this Chamber to leave this provision as it now stands. We would take nothing away from the greater protection which the legislation will offer the community against these fly-by-nights and unscrupulous people. A tradesman who has qualified by serving an apprenticeship will have the right to work for himself without going through all this other nonsense. I sincerely ask the Committee to vote against the clause.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I have listened with great interest to the debate so far, and I wish to comment on a particular point that has been raised. Mr Clive Griffiths—for whom I have a great respect in regard to his knowledge of tradesmen and his power of debating—has been projecting the principle of the right of an apprentice, after he qualifies, to earn his living and to succeed. No-one denies that right. What the clause proposes to do is to ensure that the tradesman has an elementary knowledge of accounting, and this will give him an added surety of success.

During my commercial career it was my unfortunate experience to come across many sad cases of tradesmen—in various trades—who were in the utmost difficulty; some were even bankrupted with the attendant worry for themselves and their families, merely because they did not know the very elementary rudiments of accountancy.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: That does not apply just to tradesmen.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: Indeed it does not, it applies in all walks of life. I do not believe this Bill will prevent anyone from taking advantage of opportunities provided. I suggest a tradesman with an elementary knowledge of accountancy will have a greater chance of success. I do not see that the provision is an impediment to a man with a natural ability and a desire to succeed. I make the point that he will become a better tradesman and contractor with this knowledge.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I have never heard so much rot in all my life as the comments made by the last speaker. A

little knowledge of elementary accountancy can get one into a great deal of trouble. The main cause of bankrupt tradesmen is their bank managers, who have no knowledge of trades, and no knowledge of what a person is endeavouring to do when he establishes a business. Not being a tradesman, I have run a business with no knowledge of accountancy. However, I could tell the difference between red and black in the bank statement and I always found that quite helpful. I never get out of the red—

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Do bank statements ever have black on them?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Apparently Mr Griffiths has the same type of bank statement that I have had all my life. Mr Griffiths referred to a greengrocer and asked whether we will require a man such as this to do a simple accountancy course. Are we to ask a man running a TAB office to do a simple accountancy course?

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: What about members of Parliament?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Members do not deal with any money, of course. It is ludicrous that an individual cannot make a decision to go into business for himself. It is just bad luck if he fails. It is very rarely that the public is disadvantaged—usually such people meet their commitments. It is for this reason that such a hue and cry develops when certain builders and contractors do not meet their commitments.

What about butchers? I believe about 73 butchers have failed financially this year. Should these butchers have had accountancy training, or should they have flicked their hand a little more heavily on the scales when weighing the meat? To try to instruct people how to go into business would be as futile as a Government attempting to run a business. We want more business in government, and less government in business. It is about time we woke up to this fact and repealed such provisions as this. It is absolutely ridiculous to instruct people about what they may do after they have completed their trade training.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I rise to support the clause. I sympathise with Mr Clive Griffiths and I do know what he is getting at. I do not like bureaucratic restrictions, and I have said so previously. However, his analogy misses the point. He said that greengrocers are not restricted in their business, so why should these provisions appear in this measure. He also said that the bureaucrats may wake up to the fact that they can put more restrictions on businessmen. Mr Lewis made much the same comment about butchers, but these analogies are quite incorrect. The greengrocer sells a natural product the quality of which has been enhanced

by the farmer—someone other than the greengrocer. Likewise, the butcher has a skill, but he sells a natural product with his skill. These men are selling produce at a small cost when considered in relation to the cost of painting a house.

A painter sells his skill at a higher capital cost to the purchaser, and depending on the quality of the paint used, the skill of the painter, and the climate in which the house or building exists, his work will last for a number of years.

Mr Clive Griffiths referred to paint technology and said that he did not quite know what that was. I do not really believe he means that because he is an intelligent man, and, being a tradesman, he must know all about it.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Most painters just use one particular brand.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: As part of a course I did—that is, dealing with aircraft finishes and paints—we were taught about paint. However, we were restricted in the types of paints we were trained with, and of course, other types of paints have been developed since then. I have met so-called tradesmen who have endeavoured to put acrylic-finished paints onto enamelled cars.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You would not put whitewash on a Wellington bomber.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I do not think a tradesman would do that. However, we can apply an enamel to an acrylic-finished car. This is the type of technology that is referred to. I agree with Mr Griffiths that knowledge of paints is taught during an apprenticeship, but it may be that an acquired skill in a particular area of the trade has not been used for many years. If a man has to pass an examination, he will have this knowledge at his fingertips when he sells his skill to the consumer. A contract painter must know the answer to certain questions so that he can apply his skill for the benefit of the consumer.

The clause will provide that a painter cannot go into business without knowledge of his duty to consumers. He will be required to have knowledge of basic economy, as referred to by Mr Ferry, and he must have technological knowledge. If he does not have this knowledge, his business will fail and then three things can happen. It will be to his disadvantage to be declared bankrupt, and also, as a registered tradesman, he will have opened accounts with retailers and wholesalers, and the fact that the painter cannot pay his accounts may in turn bankrupt other businesses. The consumer will either have an unfinished job, or he will be left with a job that is unworthy of any tradesman. He will then be faced with the further cost of removing the bad paint work before his house can be painted again.

I think this is a good Bill and the clause, although restrictive, is a good clause. It will work in the interests of the public and also of the tradesmen.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I merely indicate again that the union has expressed no objection to these provisions and, since it is the representative body of the people most concerned, I certainly do not intend to raise any sort of objection. Of course, as an Opposition, we would love to embarrass the Government by getting amendments approved; however, they would still have to be practical amendments, and I do not think Mr Clive Griffiths' suggestion was practical.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I do not know whether I can add a great deal more to what I have already said, other than to say I agree with Mr Withers that the analogy drawn by Mr Clive Griffiths was not an appropriate one. In fact, I would go further and say it was wholly inappropriate. I do not know how far we can take this practice of drawing analogies; it is so easy to go to extremes and get into areas which have no application at all to the legislation.

Mr Clive Griffiths and Mr Lewis referred to greengrocers and butchers; however, one theme running through both arguments was the reference to the desire for basic accountancy knowledge. It might well be that if there were a registration board for greengrocers or butchers, the additional subject required of those tradesmen would be not accountancy but, say, hygiene. A person in that industry may have to undergo inspection and examination on that question, which would be not only in his interests but also in the interests of his clients or customers.

As Mr Clive Griffiths said, there is what could be called a paternalistic attitude on the part of the Government towards these tradesmen. Any registration board must be mindful of the benefits to be gained not only by the tradesmen but also by the public by the implementation of these additional requirements. As Mr Cloughton said, this clause will not necessarily obstruct a person wishing to enter the business of painting for a living. We are concerning ourselves only with the requirements of registration.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I was quite astounded to hear Mr Cloughton say that because the union had not expressed objections, he did not intend to object to the Bill.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: He did not say that at all.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: He said that as the union had raised no objection, he certainly did not intend to raise any sort of objection. I have said for years that members of the Labor Party have an absolute inability to understand the people

whom they allegedly represent. It will be the ordinary tradesman painter who will be affected by this legislation.

I venture to say that if the union officials did not raise any objection to this Bill, it was because they read it rather hastily and may have missed certain points. The legislation was introduced only a few days ago. Once we bring to their attention what is contained in the Bill and what the legislation will prevent the ordinary tradesman from doing, I believe there will be a different sort of reaction from these people.

I do not have time to deal fully with Mr Withers' comments; I dismiss them, except to say that he always takes literally, but facetiously, things people say. Perhaps the analogy of a greengrocer or a butcher was wrong; perhaps I should have said a carpenter. However, that certainly was not intended to be the fundamental part of my argument.

The Hon. T. O. Perry: You could have used the analogy of a stonemason.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Yes, that is true; however, unfortunately, I used the example of a greengrocer. But that does not matter; it is what we are doing which matters, and I believe that this clause is fundamentally wrong. I intend to divide the Committee on this clause.

Clause put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—19

Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. N. McNeill
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. I. G. Medcalf
Hon. R. F. Cloughton	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. S. J. Dellar	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. R. T. Leeson	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. G. E. Masters	Hon. V. J. Ferry
Hon. M. McAleer	(Teller)

Noes—7

Hon. Clive Griffiths	Hon. T. O. Perry
Hon. J. Heltman	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. H. W. Gayfer
Hon. A. A. Lewis	(Teller)

Clause thus passed.

Sitting suspended from 6.11 to 7.30 p.m.

Clause 5: Section 13 amended—

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: This is another clause which seeks to amend the fees that will be charged for the registration of painters. It seeks to increase the fee that can be charged under section 13 of the Act. I said earlier that I believe there should be a ceiling of fees kept in the Act and we should not insert a provision that does not allow for any limit whatsoever on the fees that can be charged.

The Minister has said that this will be effected by regulation and therefore members will have an opportunity to move to

disallow any regulation, but as we all know, regulations can be operative for many months before Parliament reassembles. In other words, regulations can become a *fait accompli* before Parliament reassembles and members have an opportunity to move for their disallowance.

This clause relates to the fee that can be charged to a candidate who wishes to sit for the examination and it seeks to remove that part of the section in the Act which contains the words, "not exceeding three pounds three shillings". I contend that if the board, in submitting its recommendation to the Government, said it was necessary for it to increase its fees because it was unable to carry on with the charge set under the existing Act it should also have informed the Government what fees it requires to charge currently to enable it to carry out its functions. It is not unreasonable to expect the board to do that. If it did not take that action, did the board say to the Government, "We have been eating into our reserves and, indeed, we have practically exhausted them and we desire to have the opportunity to increase the registration fee. We do not know what it is costing us currently to run our operations, so we want you to give us *carte blanche* to charge whatever fees we seek"?

If that is not what happened the board should have said to the Government, "It is currently costing us X number of dollars to run our operations and therefore it is necessary for us to increase our various fees in order to obtain the particular sum that we require." I ask the Minister: Did the board give the Government any indication what it required to run its operations, or did it ask for an open cheque so that it could charge what it liked until such time as it reached a figure that suited it?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: The views I expressed in replying to Mr Cloughton apply equally to this clause. I do not have the information sought by Mr Clive Griffiths, despite the fact that I took the opportunity to check with the Minister responsible for the legislation on whether he could provide information that would answer the honourable member. Therefore I am unable to provide any additional information. However, I do not think the situation is that which was suggested by Mr Clive Griffiths; namely, that the board wants the lid lifted to give it virtually an "open Sesame" to charge what fees it likes.

The Painters Registration Board seems to be a self-sufficient organisation by virtue of the fact that it raises fees to cover its expenses and in a number of years, as has been indicated, it created a reserve of \$8 000. However, this is now almost exhausted and it is simply a matter of striking charges by regulation.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Surely its members would have a say in this in any case.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Which members?

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: What for?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I am asking the honourable member that question.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: We are talking about the board and it would be the board that would make the decision. It is required to carry out certain functions. We have to recognise that it has been responsible and has not sought to charge unduly high fees. I see this merely as an operation to finance the board's undertakings without any likelihood of its lifting the lid to make a great deal of money, because there is no occasion for it to do that. I say again that I cannot provide the information as to what the prescribed fees will be.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I want to make sure that Mr Dellar understands.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I do.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The honourable member does not.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I do.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (the Hon. R. J. L. Williams): Order!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The interjection by the honourable member clearly indicates that he does not understand what we are talking about. He interjected by saying that the members would have a say in this operation and when I asked him which members would have a say, he replied by saying, "What for?" The only people who will have a say in this matter will be the chairman of the Master Builders Association, a representative of the Master Painters Association, and a representative of the Chamber of Manufactures.

The Hon. N. McNeill: And the Minister of course.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: It does not say anything about the Minister.

The Hon. N. McNeill: The Minister will be approving the regulations.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Of course he will, and so will Parliament. However, we know what that means. I do not have much confidence in the reassurance given by the Minister. The people who will make the decision on what fees shall be charged will be the board members. Also, we must not forget that it is not only the registration fee that will be charged annually from February onwards. A fee is charged to a candidate who wishes to apply to sit for an examination, and there are other fees imposed. The whole operation is lopsided and designed to disadvantage a person who is seeking to become a registered painter in order to compete with other painters in the building trade. Of course, the greater the application fee

that is imposed on an applicant who wishes to sit for an examination, the less chance there is, to the possible delight of the painters who are already registered, of a candidate seeking to sit for an examination to enable him to become qualified to compete against them.

That is the situation we are creating and what astounds me is that no member seems to be able to understand it, or if any member does understand it he does not have the slightest twinge of sympathy for the poor unfortunate who will be disadvantaged by this provision we are seeking to insert in the Act.

I should have thought I would have gained unanimous support for the proposition I have put forward. I would have assumed that every member would have supported this proposal because all I am saying is that during the time the Act has been in existence the legislators have seen fit to provide that the board shall be entitled to strike various fees but only up to a certain limit. Therefore why are we removing this limit or ceiling? I ask you Mr Deputy Chairman—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (the Hon. R. J. L. Williams): I remind the honourable member that I am not allowed to answer.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Let us increase the ceiling for fees by all means, but we should not seek to remove it, because we all know that costs are escalating. If this board were able to come to the Government and say, "It is currently costing us X number of dollars to run the Painters Registration Board; we currently have X number of painters registered; normally we expect a certain number of candidates to sit for the examination and a certain number actually does sit," then somebody with a more limited mathematical mind than I have would not take long to work out the total sum the board would require to run its operations. Having done that it would not be difficult to make provision for the escalation of costs for the next year or so and establish a ceiling in the Act by providing that we grant the board power to strike a fee to enable it to carry out its functions but prevent it from striking a fee that would adversely affect some individual who wished to become registered as a painter.

So all I say is that it is easy to lift the ceiling so that we do not have to amend the Act again in a couple of years. This is an Act that has been amended so many times that one needs to be a contortionist to read it. Yet here we are being finicky about it and becoming perturbed about having to amend an Act that has been amended so many times it looks like a box of confetti.

I see no alternative but to vote against the clause if for no other reason than to convey the message that I do not intend to stand idly by and allow a board which,

by its very makeup, would not be constituted with the interests of the ordinary tradesman painter at heart. I think this is grossly unfair and I cannot understand members of the Labor Party not supporting my viewpoint because it is the very people they purport to support who are being crucified.

The Hon. R. Thompson: We support them 100 per cent. You know that.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The Leader of the Opposition was on the opposite side of the floor a moment ago when he had an opportunity to demonstrate two things. He had an opportunity to demonstrate to that section of the trade union movement affected by the Bill that he had their interests at heart.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: What about the other section of the workers who will be affected?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (the Hon. R. J. L. Williams): Order!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I have already explained that every other provision in the Bill provides machinery to strengthen the powers the board has to protect the general public from unscrupulous people. I am happy to go along with those provisions because they do what members opposite say they want; namely, increase protection for the general public.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Also workers in the industry.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Mr Cooley has a fixation in his mind that there are two groups—the general public and the workers.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: There is a basic difference.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I do not know it.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: There is—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (the Hon. R. J. L. Williams): Order! I will remind members that in the interests of the expedition of business, interjections are considered to be unruly. Members will address their remarks to the Chair.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am sorry if I have been unable to control those rowdy interjections.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You have baited us.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Fortunately that is a task which falls to you, Mr Deputy Chairman. I am saying that members of the Labor Party had an opportunity to demonstrate their concern for some trade unionists who I believe will be adversely affected by certain of the provi-

sions in the Bill. They have also had an opportunity to demonstrate that they have that trait which they accuse members of the Government party of not having; namely, the ability to express a point of view in this House of Review other than the one solid point of view dictated to them by someone outside.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Are you trying to talk the Labor Party into voting against a Government Bill?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: They have already demonstrated what they will do. We can bet our bottom dollar that whatever their leader does when I call for a division on this, the others will do.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Don't be foolish. Don't call for a division.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I can remember a Bill called the Daylight Saving Bill.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I would answer the honourable member about the Daylight Saving Bill except that you would not permit me to do so, Mr Deputy Chairman. As I was saying, members opposite have an opportunity to demonstrate that they are concerned about the disadvantages which will apply to a section of the community. I do not believe that we should knowingly support a piece of legislation which has nothing to do with our political philosophies if it disadvantages certain people.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Do you think we could put this to a referendum on the same day as that for daylight saving?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (the Hon. R. J. L. Williams): Order!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: It has nothing to do with our political philosophy and it provides us with an opportunity to ensure that at least some justice is done to those people who I believe will want to do nothing else but finish an apprenticeship, pass an examination and be classed as a competent tradesman painter, thus giving them the opportunity if they so desire to work for themselves. What the devil is wrong with that? This Bill and its provisions will make it difficult for such people to do this, and I intend to vote against it.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I think Mr Clive Griffiths has his wires a little crossed in respect of the people he claims we represent.

The Hon. R. Thompson: They are fused.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I do not think you represent them. I am sure you don't.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is all very well, in this so-called land of milk and honey, to say that a person should be able to become a qualified journeyman and then go out with a starry-eyed look and

enter the world of business merely because he is qualified as a painter. Many other considerations are involved.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Of course—union dues and so on.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Government is to be commended for introducing legislation to provide conditions to apply to people who wish to become employers of labour. This year—and Mr Clive Griffiths should know this—in the building industry a number of employers have gone broke and many have gone broke as a consequence of not being able to understand business practices. If they are on their own and they affect only themselves, then that is their risk. However, the situation is different when these people are involved in contract work and employ large numbers of people. When they enter these arrangements they have no capital and no knowledge of business procedure. These men might employ four or five workers.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I think it might be pertinent to mention that is not the clause we are dealing with.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order! Mr Cooley has the floor.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We should be concerned about the general public who are liable to get a bad deal from a painter who does not know business procedures. But the people we worry about are the workers employed by these types; almost daily there are employers going broke and leaving the workers with unpaid accrued leave and wages.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: If they go broke how can they pay it?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is the whole problem.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: It is not their fault they go broke.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is if they have not been trained properly in business procedure.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: That is only one circumstance involved.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is Mr Gayfer's understanding of the situation, but I do not think he understands very much about industrial matters. He has a profound knowledge about the poor farmers and the problems confronting them, but no understanding at all about the things we are discussing at present, because he does not mix with the people concerned and does not understand the hardships experienced by them as the result of their employers being unable to run their businesses properly. As a consequence the workers employed are being left high and dry with respect to their entitlements.

I believe that by supporting the Government's legislation we are assisting the people we represent. Mr Claughton handled the Bill on behalf of the Opposition and he has indicated that he has had long talks with the painters' union which is quite happy with the provisions in the Bill. It is not correct for Mr Clive Griffiths to say that the Labor Party is neglecting the interests of the people it represents. What the Government is doing is ensuring that the interests of the people employed by master painters are protected and that the right people become employers and enter into the field of master painting.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I do not want to pursue the matter, but I cannot permit some of those comments to pass without saying something.

Firstly, for Mr Cooley's information, the clause we are discussing is the one which provides for the board to increase the examination fees.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: How does that affect the interests of the workers?

The Hon. N. McNeill: It is also consequential on the previous clause.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: That is true. I will tell Mr Cooley how it affects them although I have already indicated this. Clause 5 deals with the examination fee. A person involved under this clause would not be a registered painter and therefore he would not be a businessman with a painting business. The person affected by the fee provided for in the clause is the new painter who wants to sit for the examination to become a registered painter. Where does he come from? He comes from the ranks of the working class. If he were a businessman he would have already passed the examination. This is why I say the clause affects the new tradesman or the fellow who wants to become a registered painter.

It affects the tradesman who has reached the decision that he no longer wants to be a painter working for somebody else but wants to be a painter working for himself and wants to become registered.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: A prospective employer.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Not necessarily.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: We do not represent those people.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The honourable member's party does represent those people.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Not employers.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Wait a minute! This discussion has taken a peculiar turn. We have now reached the stage where Mr Cooley has told us the real reason that members of his party

voted the way they did. I did not understand it before but now I can see it as clear as crystal. What members of the Labor Party want above all else is to ensure nobody makes the decision to go into business for himself in any capacity whatsoever.

The Hon. R. Thompson: How much did it cost you to join Actors' Equity?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I have quite sensitive feelings and that type of interjection has a tendency to upset me. I suggest, Mr Deputy Chairman, you ask the Leader of the Opposition to desist. I am serious in what I am saying. We now have the picture that the Labor Party is bitterly opposed to the very thought that one of its tradesman painters might become a registered painter.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: What has this to do with the registration fee?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: It has a great deal to do with it because only those persons will be called upon to pay the examination fee mentioned in clause 5. Nobody but a person who is currently a worker and wants to become a registered painter will pay the fee. Mr Cooley said his party does not represent that fellow from the moment he becomes a registered painter.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I did not say that. I said our party does not represent employers.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The member said this person becomes a prospective employer and his party did not represent employers.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Surely that is understood.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: This is enlightening. I represent everybody in my electorate—every single person.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: They do not all vote for you, though.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: No, but a huge majority of them do. There is no point in my arguing any longer because the previous division indicated to me that at least members of the Liberal and Country Parties are prepared to concede there is an alternative view in regard to some of the provisions of the Bill, and they voted accordingly.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Very convenient! I have seen it for 3½ years. Do not try that again.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Mr Cooley has left us in no doubt whatsoever what his party will do. I am therefore only wasting my time by talking. I have expressed my opposition to the clause. I am disappointed the Government has seen fit to go along with what is contained in the Bill. I have no alternative but to concede defeat.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: The Hon. Clive Griffiths has said he intends to oppose this clause. I remind the Committee that in an interjection I said the clause was consequential to the previous clause; that in itself creates a certain situation.

The second point I make is that the Hon. Clive Griffiths apparently attributes to the Painters' Registration Board a sinister purpose—that it is out to prevent people from becoming registered painters. That is not my understanding of the activities of the Painters' Registration Board.

This clause provides for the setting by regulation of fees for examination purposes; that is all. Assurances were contained in the speech I gave when introducing the Bill that care will be exercised to ensure undue charges are not imposed. I have indicated on more than one occasion that it is intended to limit the fees so that they simply finance the operations of the board. To attribute to the board a purpose other than that it is set up to protect the people involved in the industry, including those who wish to become painters, is going to an absolute extreme; and the insinuation against members of the Painters' Registration Board is unwarranted.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 6 to 10 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 the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice), and passed.

DEATH DUTY ASSESSMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice), read a first time.

Second Reading

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [8.10 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This measure implements our policy proposal to restore the provisions removed by our predecessors last session which were of vital importance to family farms and family businesses.

The provisions to which I refer are those which were removed by the enactment of paragraph (o) of subsection (2) of section 10 of the Act and associated subsections. This paragraph, on the explanations given, was designed mainly to prevent the avoidance of duty by the use of

private companies with what are known as "life governor" shares. However, in our view, the provisions are much wider than that and, more importantly, have caused a great deal of uncertainty as to their meaning and scope.

We have made an exhaustive study of these new provisions and have received a great deal of advice and complaints from many quarters. As a result we are convinced that the Act as now worded will present very difficult matters of legal interpretation. Our examination also revealed that it is possible to circumvent its provisions.

In brief, as the Act now stands, the provisions are too difficult to understand and, therefore, uncertain as to interpretation. As a result, individuals do not know where they stand when planning their affairs. No members of the community should be placed in this position by taxation laws.

These deficiencies were drawn to Parliament's attention by our members when paragraph (c) and its associated provisions were before the House, and our subsequent researches have confirmed our original view.

For these reasons this Bill contains amendments to repeal paragraph (c) and its associated subsections. It also contains other consequential amendments.

I must add that the repeal of these unsatisfactory provisions is only a preliminary move to a full review of probate duty legislation which is currently being undertaken. To assist us in this task we will be seeking expert advice on a just and equitable arrangement for levying duty and administering the Act.

As part of this review it is our intention to ensure protection of family farms and family businesses, as we are proposing in this Bill, but at the same time we will be looking closely at this exemption with a view to proposing amendments to prevent others from using it to avoid their tax liability, thus forcing a bigger and unfair burden on the remaining taxpayers.

The completion of the current review, together with the expert advice which we are seeking, will determine the nature and timing of legislative action to give effect to the remainder of the Government's policy objectives.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. R. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition).

SMALL CLAIMS TRIBUNALS BILL

Assembly's Message

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendments made by the Council.

ASSISTANCE TO DECENTRALIZED INDUSTRY BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [8.15 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This measure is introduced in conformity with Government policy to moderate the effect of pay-roll tax on the viability of decentralized enterprises.

When introducing the Budget, the Premier foreshadowed the introduction of this legislation for the purpose of making grants to decentralized enterprises on the recommendation of the Minister for Industrial Development and the approval of the Treasurer.

The provisions of this Bill give effect to that undertaking.

The legislation will be administered by the Minister for Industrial Development, and assistance will take the form of grants from the Consolidated Revenue Fund for which provision will be made annually in the State's Budget.

The assistance will be made available to all businesses which require such assistance to ensure the establishment, expansion or continuation of those businesses. In other words, the grants will be made in cases where the payment makes the difference between the success or failure of the business concerned.

Under the proposed law, businesses eligible for assistance will be those which are a prescribed distance beyond the metropolitan area, and the reason for this is to give a positive incentive to decentralization.

The proposals also contain powers to prescribe specified areas which are inside the prescribed distance from the metropolitan area. This will allow assistance to be given in appropriate special cases.

The prescriptions of distance and area are to be made in regulations to the Act, and will be determined in the light of decentralization needs from time to time.

The proposed legislation allows the Minister for Industrial Development, with the concurrence of the Treasurer, to approve assistance on a completely flexible basis so that it can be scheduled to the economic needs of individual businesses. The maximum limit of assistance to any particular business in any one year is not to exceed the amount of pay-roll tax paid by that business on wages paid to employees who are normally employed in the decentralized location.

The Minister is to be empowered to receive and consider applications and to seek additional information which will permit him to arrive at a proper decision as to the level of assistance. Having completed the examination of the details supplied by the applicant, the Minister may

then determine the level and term of the assistance. This may be equal to the whole or part of the pay-roll tax paid in connection with the decentralized activity and may be for any period which he believes is necessary to establish the viability of the project. The Minister may attach terms and conditions to the payment of the assistance.

Because there are some businesses which are operating in both the metropolitan area and decentralized locations, and there are others in the metropolitan area which may wish to establish or expand in decentralized locations, the Bill contains a formula for determining the maximum assistance which will be available in any one year to meet such circumstances.

In simple terms, this formula requires the Minister to ascertain the total of the pay-roll tax paid in any one year by the business to be assisted, and to determine the proportion of that pay-roll tax which has been paid in respect of the wages paid to the employees employed in the decentralized location. This figure then sets the maximum level of assistance available.

In order to determine the amount of pay-roll tax paid by any business, it is necessary for the Minister or his officers to have access to the records of pay-roll tax payments kept by the Commissioner of State Taxation. Accordingly, the Bill provides this authority but the commissioner may not supply the information to the Minister or his officers unless he has sighted the written consent of the taxpayer to do so.

That safeguard will be understood by members. It is not normal for information of this kind to be made available, even within the Government itself, but it is considered it would be impracticable to administer the legislation unless it contained such authority. That there must be written consent of the applicant is considered to be a satisfactory precaution.

In addition, to preserve the essential secrecy of individual taxpayers' affairs, the Bill contains a provision which places those obtaining this taxation information under penalty if the information is used for any purpose other than for administering the provisions of the proposed Assistance to Decentralized Industry Act.

Other provisions of the Bill will allow the Minister to recover any grants made which are based on false or misleading information wilfully or negligently supplied to the Minister, or in cases where the terms and conditions of the assistance have not been carried out.

It is proposed that the provisions of the legislation will be brought in on a day to be proclaimed. This is to allow the department to prepare the necessary forms of application, and to arrange the publication of the regulations which will determine

the areas from which applications may be made. It is the Government's intention, subject to Parliament approving the legislation, to proclaim the Act to come into operation on the 1st February, 1975.

The amount provided in the Consolidated Revenue Fund Estimates for 1974-75 to meet the cost of the assistance proposed under this Bill is \$50 000. It is expected that a much greater sum will be required in the next financial year as the proposed Act will then have been established and publicised.

In summary, the purpose of this Bill is to make a positive contribution to the policy of decentralization, and I commend it to the House.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [8.20 p.m.]: A total of \$88.560 million is proposed to be spent in the Budget brought down in another place, and we find the sum of \$50 000 is being made available for the purpose of assistance to decentralized industry. Of course, the provision of this assistance is the result of a promise made when pay-roll tax was increased earlier this year under the Pay-roll Tax Act Amendment Act, No. 7 of 1974.

At the time that measure was discussed it was suggested by some members the increase in tax could have an adverse effect on struggling decentralized industry in country towns. However, we find the Bill before us is not necessarily confined to the arguments we presented at that time, because the area can be prescribed under regulations and the industry to receive assistance need not be situated in a country town.

The Minister pointed out in his second reading speech that although the sum of \$50 000 is proposed to be spent in the current year, the amount may have to be increased next year after the measure is publicised through the State.

Of course, when one takes into consideration the amount of wages an employer must pay before he is liable to pay pay-roll tax, I feel that even if the amount of assistance proposed were \$150 000 it would not have any great effect on decentralized industries. This is rather an empty gesture because if industry is in the plight in which we are told it is—and I have failed to notice that in Western Australia—then the provision of the sum of \$50 000, which probably would be expended within the next six months, does not reflect any merit at all on the Government.

We opposed the increase in pay-roll tax for very good reasons. Those reasons will again be brought to light when we deal with the Appropriation and other Bills later.

However, the employers who obtain relief as a result of this measure will find the relief is not of a substantial nature. I

do not think the meagre sum of \$50 000 will help many employers to survive, especially when we take into consideration the arguments adduced against the imposition of increased pay-roll tax.

I intend to support the measure, but at the same time I would rather see a more positive approach towards decentralization of industry. The Labor Government, during its three years of office, did just that. It created some new industries which were well researched, and which have been successful in country towns. Many kites were flown by people who wished to commence businesses in country towns, and we examined those propositions with all due care to see whether they warranted relief from rail freights, or whether they warranted other incentives.

I feel the incentive to establish industry in a country town should be more than simply a gesture of the nature proposed in this Bill. As I said, I will support the Bill, although I am sorry the present Government has made this measure necessary as a result of an increase in pay-roll tax earlier this year.

Clause 6 of the Bill sets out a formula to be used in calculating the amount of assistance. As I read that formula, it is one that a child in first standard could work out. The formula is—

A x B

C

Using that formula, I cannot see how the Minister could arrive at any answer other than to provide total relief from pay-roll tax. However, when we read the Bill we find it goes a little further than that, because after the Treasury has examined the application it will be necessary for a decision to be made as to whether the employer will receive full or partial relief. As I understand the formula, there is only one answer which can be arrived at. However, the Bill states that partial relief may be provided on advice from the Treasurer.

Although I think the Bill is a bit of a kite, I will support it because it puts into effect a Budget promise.

THE HON. J. C. TOZER (North) [8.27 p.m.]: Mr Thompson referred to the Pay-roll Tax Act Amendment Bill which passed through this Parliament in about August of this year. Of course, we were all terribly disappointed that it was necessary to introduce that legislation; and, in fact, the Treasurer explained that he introduced the Bill very reluctantly. He explained it was introduced virtually upon the demand of the Prime Minister.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Here we go again.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: With regard to this Bill to provide assistance to decentralized industry—which is music to my ears—I am delighted to see it, and I welcome it.

I obtained a copy of the Liberal Party policy. I had to look hard as I thought all copies were in the hands of the ALP members, but eventually I found one. I would like to read a short passage from the page entitled "Moderating Payroll Tax" as follows—

However, we are prepared to consider selective moderation of the tax, where it can mean the difference between success and failure for the attraction and retention of industries which, in the interests of decentralisation, should be established in country and northern areas and away from the Metropolitan area.

That was clearly stated.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: So were many other things.

The Hon. R. Thompson: And four months later you increased the tax.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: Of course, the Bill before us tonight is in fact putting into effect what the Premier told us would happen at that time.

I would like, if I may, to read another short quote. I have in my hand a photocopy of a page from *The Bulletin*—a national paper—dated the 1st June, 1974. I would like to read a short quote under the heading of "Get into a Rare State. Don't pay your Taxes." It is as follows—

Decentralised Industries in Victoria are in an enviable position.

Their State Government actively encourages them to seek Rebates of certain taxes.

Unique in Victoria, these incentives are available to new and existing country industries:

100% Rebate of Payroll Tax
100% Rebate of Land Tax

Other benefits include:

100% Government Support
Training Allowances
Rail Freight Subsidies
Road Transport Advantages
Plant Transfer Allowances
Personnel Transfer Subsidies
Housing Finance

Let one of our officers advise you on how to get your taxes back in Victoria.

It's a rare state to work yourself into.

This was placed in the paper by the Director, Division of Industrial Development.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: What date is that?

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: The 1st June. I am not saying it appeared in *The Bulletin* only on that particular week, but it led me to approach the Minister for Industrial Development by correspondence and because the matter dealt with pay-roll tax

it concerned the Treasurer and I also had discussion and correspondence with him.

We discussed the matter and the proposition I put forward called for something in the nature of a sliding scale whereby we might anticipate someone living in a remote area, like the people in my province, would get 100 per cent rebate while those living at a lesser distance would receive a proportionate figure. The Treasurer asked for the matter to be left with him and this legislation has now come forward.

Certain questions arose in my mind when I read the Bill. There are some very small incentives already in existence in the southern part of the State where rail freights are subsidised to a degree; where there are interest assistance and Treasury guarantees. Unfortunately the rail freight incentive does not apply to the province I represent.

The Hon. R. Thompson: What wages and salaries would a small businessman have to pay before he got a rebate under this Bill?

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: I agree that the incentives which already exist are only tokens. Quite frankly I accept the comment made by Mr Thompson that this Bill is also a token; but it is a start.

For example, a man who has a pay-roll of say, \$100 000 per annum, who we might anticipate has something like 10 employees, say in Port Hedland, will obviously be saved \$5 000 per annum. It is not a big proportion of the total cost of running his business but it is a start along with other incentives. I insist that we must make a start somewhere along the line though naturally I do look for something greater.

The Bill disconcerted me because I felt the real assistance should be spelt out quite clearly. It seemed this was a matter which was to be left in the hands of the Minister and I daresay he would certainly draw up the necessary regulations in connection with the measure.

I wondered about that when I read the Bill. I also wondered why it was framed so that grants were being offered instead of exemptions from pay-roll tax. But, on reflection, I accept that the machinery is there to cover all employees from all places and it was not desirable to upset that machinery, thus it is necessary that a grant equivalent to the total or a proportion of the pay-roll tax should be made.

I was also concerned that the manner of doing this should be selective and I wondered about competitors. But here again I feel the Department of Industrial Development is in a position to assess these facts and, I believe, within given spheres of activity there will be uniformity in the application of regulations relating to this Bill.

As I mentioned earlier I do not think we go far enough in this measure. But there is no doubt at all in my mind that we have to get cracking on something, and this is a start.

I do not think there is anything confusing—as was suggested by Mr Thompson—about the formula $\frac{A \times B}{C}$. Clearly this is

only applicable to those employers who employ people in remote areas—those who are eligible for grants to compensate for pay-roll tax applicable in those remote areas—and also have employees in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The Bill does not say that at all.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: It is quite clearly stated.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Not in remote areas.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: Where the employer has employees in both places the percentage of grants he gets back in lieu of pay-roll tax will match up with the wages he pays in that area as against what he will pay in the metropolitan area. I do not find that difficult to understand.

I believe the present Minister for Industrial Development and future Ministers will administer this legislation sympathetically and I think it will provide a measure of incentive for the development of service and support industries, particularly in the rural and more remote areas of the State.

If there is ever an area that is in need of help in this type of activity it is clearly the north province. During the week, I asked a question on land in the Port Hedland light industrial area. Having asked the question in good faith I thought I would get a list of people who had asked for and been allotted land on the light industrial estate. I have with me a whole sheaf of papers which were tabled; I thought I would find that a given number had been able to continue their businesses; that others had surrendered their businesses while others still would transfer their businesses to other people.

One day I will extract the information from the hundreds of sheets of paper I have with me, but I suggest that of the people listed who have taken land to conduct business enterprises in the light industrial area not one in four has succeeded and is still operating the business he started.

Not all of these people have been fly-by-nights; quite a few came in with a lack of capital and know-how, I admit, but most of them have been unable to succeed because of the adverse economic conditions which prevail. I have drawn attention to this fact previously and I certainly referred to it during my speech on the adoption of the Address-in-Reply.

One of the problems in a one-industry town—and this relates to iron ore towns generally, although it does not strictly relate to Port Hedland at all—is that there is not a wide base for employment opportunities and economic strength created by only one industry. It is only the strength provided by the service and the support industries which cluster around to serve the industry itself and the consequential community attracted that will give a proper broad economic base for the permanent development of these towns.

It will come, eventually, but it will be a slow, hard process. I mentioned that some of the companies which have gone out of business had been very sound and strong. I am thinking of people like World Services and Constructions Pty. Ltd. who at one time were employing close on 40 tradesmen. It is sad that the economic situation should be such that they could not survive.

In some respects I blame the mining companies because they have expanded their machinery shops to the extent that they do not find it necessary to farm out some of the jobbing work to help the service industries in the area. I believe this is a basic error which I would like to think the Minister could influence by discussion with the major companies.

Quite recently two major companies closed down in this light industrial area at Wedgefield. Bradford Kendall was one such company. It was a foundry which was very well known and it was providing a wonderful service to the industry in the region. It was in a high quality steel alloy field with two small electric furnaces. It was collecting the chute liners from the iron ore handling equipment, the teeth and cutting edges from the buckets and blades of the mechanical equipment, and after melting this down it added the necessary special minerals to cast a high-grade product which was readily received by the industry. The company was doing a good job, but it could not survive economically and it had to close down and dismiss its employees.

The worst feature of it all is the scrap which costs too much to be sent to the metropolitan area for reprocessing and making new components is, of course, thrown away now and completely new items are manufactured and brought up from Perth. It is to everybody's disadvantage to have industries such as this closed down.

Another such industry was North-West Tyres which was one of the two companies in Australia capable of re-lugging the biggest tyres in the world—used extensively in the Pilbara region. This firm has not been able to maintain its operations on a proper economic basis and has been forced out of business.

There is no doubt in my mind that the relief given by grants in lieu of pay-roll tax is quite essential. It is a starting point and I hope it will presage in this State a wide range of Government incentives similar to those which exist in Victoria.

I will certainly be encouraging my Government to ensure this type of incentive is given. I am encouraged by a letter I received from the Minister for Industrial Development. I will not read the entire letter, which is dated the 24th July, 1974, but I would like to quote one paragraph of it. The paragraph in question reads—

I agree with the suggestion expressed in the last paragraph of your letter and have asked the Department accordingly to undertake an economic research study and to get in touch with you directly.

In other words, that research study is progressing at this point in time and I would like to think something worth while will emerge from the study to help the already ailing service and support industries in the remote areas of the north and particularly in places like the Port Hedland and Karratha light industrial areas.

As I said when moving the adoption of the Address-in-Reply, there is no doubt at all that we, the Government, and the whole community must adopt a completely new philosophy towards governing the outlying areas of the State. We must remove the factors that make those areas unattractive and undesirable, and make it economically and financially virtually impossible for these small industries to succeed.

I think that this Bill could be a first step forward in achieving this end, and I support the second reading.

THE HON. W. R. WITHERS (North) [8.55 p.m.]: In the past you, Mr President, and other members have heard me request the Government to consider legislation for the benefit of decentralized industry in relation to the pay-roll tax. My colleague, Mr Medcalf, requested a specific amendment on the last occasion when the Pay-Roll Tax Act Amendment Bill was before us. He endeavoured to effect some changes to allow some form of assistance to be made to decentralized industry. We all know that the Bill was transmitted from this House to another place, but the Government of the day rejected the proposal.

I consider that the maximum assistance formula listed in the Bill before us is a very simple and fair formula; and the Minister explained it adequately in his second reading speech. It is very pleasing to see so simple a formula achieving such great effect.

On behalf of the very important people who participate in decentralized industries for the benefit of the country as a whole,

I would personally like to thank the Premier, the Cabinet, and all members who will vote for the Bill in order that it may become an Act.

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [8.46 p.m.]: I acknowledge the remarks that have been made on the Bill. Needless to say I am pleased that members have indicated their support of it. However, I would like to make one or two references to the comments that have been raised.

The Leader of the Opposition has referred to the formula in the Bill, and Mr Tozer has explained that provision is made in the formula for industries located in both the metropolitan area and decentralized locations. It does not use those words, but that is the meaning and the intention of the measure.

The Leader of the Opposition also made some comment to the effect that the Bill does not achieve very much, and not a great amount of money has been allocated to assist decentralized industry. True, the amount of \$50 000 is not great in terms of total Government finance.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: That is for a five-month period.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Yes, it is for that period. It is anticipated the amount will be much greater in future years when the position becomes better known and applications for funds start to come in. The Leader of the Opposition said that industries which were promoted by the previous Government to become established in the country are doing very well at the present time.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I said to the best of my knowledge.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: The honourable member's remarks might well be interpreted as having general application. If he believes that industry in the country or in the metropolitan area is doing well he ought to have another look at the position. It must be very evident to him that industry generally is not doing very well at present. Far more prominent and knowledgeable people than I have made observations to that effect.

The remarks of Mr Tozer are noted. He described the general effect which will come about as a consequence of, firstly, the introduction and, secondly, the extension of this measure. The same comments might well be attributed to the remarks made by Mr Withers. I am grateful for their support of the measure.

There is little else I need add, because there appears to be general acceptance of the measure.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3: Definitions—

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If we look at the definition of "decentralized location" we find it is—

- (a) an area of the State beyond such distance from the General Post Office in Forrest Place Perth as is prescribed for the purpose of this definition; or
- (b) an area of the State prescribed as a special area for the purpose of this definition;

The Bill is not restricted to remote areas, as Mr Tozer seems to think. The application of its provisions can be restricted even to an area within one mile of the General Post Office, Perth. The title does appear to be somewhat of a misnomer.

In the debate on the pay-roll tax measure the question of assistance to decentralized industry was mentioned. The general application of the measure could be applied throughout the State if the occasion arose, and if the Government saw fit to prescribe the whole State. I think my interpretation is correct; I think Mr Tozer has a somewhat different interpretation of the meaning of this definition.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 to 12 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 the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice), and passed.

FORESTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

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

SALE OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Assembly with amendments.

Assembly's Amendments: In Committee

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

The **DEPUTY CHAIRMAN**: The amendments made by the Assembly are as follows—

No. 1.

Clause 6, page 7, line 30—Add after subsection (1) a subsection as follows—

(2) Where a person who was the owner of an undivided share in land on the tenth day of September, 1974, satisfies the Minister that it would be unreasonable for the provisions of this Part to apply so as to restrict him from making offers or invitations relating to the whole or any part of that undivided share, the Minister may exempt that person from the restrictions of this Part in relation to the whole or any part of that undivided share, and in that event section 19D does not apply to any contract entered into or any option granted by that person in relation to that undivided share or any part thereof while that exemption remains in force.

No. 2.

Clause 6, page 7, line 30—Delete the subsection designation "(2)" and substitute the subsection designation "(3)".

No. 3.

Clause 6, page 7, line 31—Delete the passage "subsection (1)" and substitute the passage "subsection (1) or subsection (2)".

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I move—

That the amendments made by the Assembly be agreed to.

Members will be aware that when this Bill comes into operation it will prevent any person who owns an undivided share in land from publicly seeking offers to purchase part only of that person's undivided shareholding.

Representations have been made to the Government that this change in the law could cause considerable hardship to persons who purchased undivided shareholdings prior to the date on which the proposals were announced by the introduction of the Bill in this place.

Up till now any person who had an undivided shareholding in vacant land or in a flat, factory, hotel or other project could lawfully advertise to seek a buyer for any part of his undivided shareholding, so long, of course, as the undivided shareholding did not also amount to an interest under division 5 of part IV of the Companies Act.

Such advertisements would become unlawful under the Bill unless the owner is advertising that he only wants to sell his

total undivided shareholding to a single purchaser, and, of course, the finding of a suitable purchaser might prove impossible, particularly in times when finance is difficult to obtain.

Accordingly, the Government decided to move for an amendment to clause 6 which will enable the Minister to exempt persons in this situation from the restrictions of the Bill, but subject to such conditions as the Minister thinks fit.

One of the malpractices which the Bill has set out to correct is the practice whereby persons selling undivided shares in vacant land misled prospective buyers into believing that they would obtain a separate lot; that is to say, exclusive possession and ownership of an identifiable part of the land concerned.

Although under the amendment it would be possible for the Minister to grant an exemption to a person who held an undivided share in vacant land prior to the 10th September, 1974, I wish to assure members that if such an exemption were to be granted in relation to an undivided shareholding in vacant land, conditions would be imposed ensuring that prospective purchasers were made aware of the fact that they were not being offered a lot, but merely an unidentifiable interest in common with all other owners of the broad acres of land concerned.

It is the Government's view that if the amendment is accepted it will provide a means of giving relief to persons from the provisions of the new Bill in circumstances where relief is really required without derogating from the protection to the public which the Bill sets out to give.

Members will be aware that it is some time since this Bill was dealt with in this place. I think it will be appreciated that attention has been given to some proposals advanced and I hope the explanation is satisfactory.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: As the Minister has stated, it is some time since we dealt with this Bill previously. It appears that the amendments to the Sale of Land Act have caused some concern. As a result of representations made to the Government the Bill has been amended in another place, and the situation has been clarified.

The Minister has given assurance that if exemptions are granted strict conditions will be imposed. Furthermore, persons concerned will be made fully aware of the fact if they are offered an unidentifiable interest in land. I accept the explanation given by the Minister and indicate that we support the amendments.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I commend the Government for the amendment which has been inserted in another place. It should receive the support of this Committee because it will protect people who have purchased undivided shares before the change in the law, and who have

become locked in a situation where they knowingly, or unknowingly, bought undivided shares in land. It would be quite unfair that those people should be prevented from selling their interests because of a change in the law.

The Bill already contains a provision to allow for a total interest to be sold. The Minister is also empowered to exempt people who offered for sale their undivided interest prior to the 10th September. The amendments made in another place seek to protect people who had not offered their undivided interest for sale before the 10th September, when the Bill was read a second time in this place. Those people will now be permitted to sell undivided shares, but the Minister has made it quite clear that any person purchasing such shares will not be misled. I add my support to the amendments and congratulate the Government for their introduction.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendments agreed to.

Report

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

SKELETON WEED (ERADICATION FUND) BILL

In Committee

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

Clauses 1 to 8 put and passed.

Clause 9: Liability of grower to pay contribution—

The Hon. N. McNEILL: It will be recalled that last evening Mr Gayfer raised a query for which I think we ought to be grateful. He examined the Bill rather penetratingly and pointed out that there could be some varied interpretations regarding the liability of a grower to pay a contribution. Subclause (2) of clause 9 states—

(2) Subject to this Act, every grower who delivers thirty or more tonnes of—

- (a) grain;
- (b) seed; or
- (c) grain and seed,

to the Company or to a receiver of grain or seed grown during the crop year 1974-1975 or the crop year 1975-1976 shall in respect of each such crop year in which he so delivers pay a contribution to the Fund.

This clause has been closely examined and the validity of the point raised by Mr Gayfer is recognised. The intention of the amendment which has been circularised is that a grower will be liable if he delivers 30 tonnes or more of grain, seed, or grain and seed grown during the crop

years 1974-75, or 1975-76, irrespective of the season in which the delivery actually takes place.

We are concerned with the year in which a crop is grown and, of course, delivery might take place at any time. The original wording could be subject to a different interpretation and I hope the Committee will accept the amendment I now propose to move. I move—

Page 5, line 13—Delete the words “in which he so delivers”.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: It is now necessary that we make a further amendment. I move—

Page 5, line 28—Add after the word “aggregated” the following passage—
and for the purposes of this Act any grain or seed—

- (a) delivered during the period of twelve months ending the thirty-first day of October, 1974, shall be deemed to have been grown during the crop year 1973-1974;
- (b) delivered during the period of twelve months ending the thirty-first day of October, 1975, shall be deemed to have been grown during the crop year 1974-1975; and
- (c) delivered during the period of twelve months ending the thirty-first day of October, 1976, shall be deemed to have been grown during the crop year 1975-1976,

unless the person delivering the grain or seed satisfies the Board that it was produced in another crop year.

It is now desirable that we spell out the intention of the provision, and the purpose of this second amendment is to clarify the position beyond reasonable doubt.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I just want to say that I feel the words now fill the “Bill” admirably.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 10 to 18 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, with amendments, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice), and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

SHEARERS' ACCOMMODATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 21st November.

THE HON. D. W. COOLEY (North-East Metropolitan) [9.18 p.m.]: The Opposition has no alternative but to support in principle the amending provisions of the Bill before us. With due respect to the Government, I feel it did not go far enough with this measure, particularly in view of the consultations which took place prior to its preparation, and also having regard for the fact that the previous Government had undertaken some research along similar lines. Members will be aware that time ran out last year, and it was not possible to deal with the amending legislation proposed by the Tonkin Government.

The Opposition feels that the deficiencies in the Bill are apparent mainly in clause 4 which is to amend section 2 of the parent Act. I will speak about this further during the Committee debate, but it seems to me that many people will be excluded from the provisions of the Shearers' Accommodation Act. Section 2 of the parent Act commences—

This Act shall not apply—

- (1) to buildings provided for the accommodation of shearers in cases where the total number of shearers employed in the shearing-shed is less than five;

And the next subparagraph goes on to exclude shearers whose residences are in the immediate neighbourhood of the shearing shed in which they are employed, and those who sleep at their own homes, and this seems fair enough. It then excludes shearers who are accommodated in the residence of the employer on the property where the shearing shed is situated. Also excluded are members of the family of the employer and shearers who are employed in any city, town, or municipality.

The union which represents the shearers is the Australian Workers' Union. I understand from information conveyed to me since the Bill was introduced that more than half the shearing in this State is performed by teams of two men, and often one shearers only is employed on a property. In view of this it appears that the provision to exclude teams of less than five shearers is rather harsh. It was the intention of the previous Government to remove this exclusion altogether so that accommodation would be made available even to one shearers working alone. It seems to me that insufficient facilities are provided to the shearers who are excluded under section 2, and especially to those who must travel great distances to the properties where shearing is to be carried out. For instance, I understand it is not uncommon for teams of less than five shearers to travel 40 or 50 miles a day to and from the shearing shed in which they are working. These men often find that there are no washing and showering facilities in close proximity to the shearing sheds.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What do you suggest should be the distance? You would not mean 100 metres.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: No, I was speaking of shearers who must travel 50 miles to a shearing shed. Of course, I am not experienced in shearing and I am merely repeating what I have been told.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Do you mean 50 miles each way?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I was thinking of 25 miles each way, a total of 50 miles. No facility is provided at the shearing shed and the shearers must travel this distance in a dirty state.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What mileage do you say should be the yardstick?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I would not like to lay down a yardstick.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Last year a distance of over 100 yards was suggested.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I suggest that at least washing and showering facilities should be provided so that shearers may clean up before they travel home.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Last year the previous Government wanted another set of facilities even when facilities were available within 100 yards of the shed.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We are referring to shearers who are not accommodated on the property.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: If you know arbitration matters as well as I do, you know you have to be specific.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We know that Mr Gayfer is very knowledgeable, and that he likes to air his knowledge. Perhaps he will put me right and give me the benefit of his superior knowledge.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Thank you.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: An amendment was moved in another place to provide these workers with some facilities, but unfortunately it was not passed. Perhaps the union could take this matter up with the employers concerned. It is a pity that after all the good work in the preparation of this Bill, such a provision should be lacking.

The Hon. J. Heitman: They would not use those facilities if they had them. Immediately they knock off shearing they are in their cars and off. Those who are not ready in five minutes are left behind.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I know that happens, but it does not apply to everybody. Showers are available in the Midland workshops, but many workers do not use them. However, surely we should provide the facilities to people who do want them. After all, we are talking about human beings.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Of course.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Not everyone is the same. Many of the shearers like to be hygienic in their habits.

Subsection (3) of section 8 causes some concern to the union, and many people feel it should be deleted. It refers to the employer's right to deduct a sum of up to \$10 to cover any damage that may have been done to accommodation, or any cleaning that may be necessary. I do not believe any other provision in any other Act gives an employer the right to take money from a worker's salary. This is usually accomplished through a procuration order with the authority of the worker concerned. It seems to me it would not have been out of place to remove such a provision in this day and age.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You do not know. There may a good reason for this provision.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: No other Act gives an employer the right to take an amount of money from a worker's pay.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: There is in fact good reason for its being framed in that way.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Only one other authority has the power to do that—the Commonwealth Taxation Department.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I did not think even the Taxation Department could do this.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It can garnishee wages.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: There is a very good reason for this provision.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Perhaps that can be explained.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is in the Act, not the Bill.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I know it is in the parent Act, and it cannot be altered. However, I am disappointed the Government did not see fit to delete it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Be fair—no Government has seen fit to remove it because, on investigation, there is good reason for its being the way it is.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is probably right, but it is a different legal situation from that applying to all other workers.

The Bill provides that where an employee fails to conform with the new provisions, the Minister has power to make certain exemptions. The union believes there should be a phasing-in period of five years, rather than the Minister having the right to exempt an employer once and for all. It is felt that a period of five years should be sufficient for all employers to comply with the new provisions.

A most desirable part of the Bill is that the discrimination against Aborigines will be removed. Of course, this meets with the

approval of the Opposition. I indicate to the House that we support the Bill, although we will seek to amend the reference to a five-man team to a two-man team.

THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [9.30 p.m.]: I rise to support this Bill. Undoubtedly, we must keep shearers' accommodation up to a high standard; living standards are increasing all the time, and it is only natural that workers' accommodation should also be improved. Personally, I find little need for such a complicated measure. The truth of the matter is that we have become very competitive in the field of labour. Pastoralists and those who own sheep find they must provide living quarters of a high standard or they will not get shearers to work for them. So, in fact, the legislation lays down only minimum standards. The shearers' quarters built today are constructed to standards far in excess of those laid down here.

I must admit, however, that there are one or two clauses in the Bill which are quite new to the shearing industry. Until now, the Victorian Act has been taken as the standard in this State. I do not suppose these few innovations will do any harm, as they are not of major significance. For example, I refer members to page 12, subparagraph (iv) which states—

washing units (consisting of a copper and two troughs or of a washing machine and one trough): one for every six shearers or part of six;

The Hon. J. Heitman: You would provide the shearers with washing machines, would you not?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: In my own particular shearers' quarters I have installed a fuel-fired hot water service; however, I can see that now I will have to install coppers as well. This is one of the things which seems to happen when we lay down what are really minimum standards; someone tries to do better and, say, puts in a hot water service, and we find it does not comply with the Act.

Another alteration proposed in this legislation is to change inches to millimetres; this could cause a lot of confusion. While admittedly the older accommodation will not have to comply with it, obviously this legislation will become a standard. Where previously we had windows which measured two feet by three feet, we now have windows which measure a ridiculous number of millimetres. We see that we must provide mattresses 1.9 metres long and 760 millimetres wide.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Is that single or double?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: It is very hard to work it out. Generally speaking, I am in agreement with this Bill. I

notice that shearers are to have refrigerators for their beer; I suppose that is a very good thing too.

I believe the few points mentioned by Mr Cooley are easily explained. Mr Cooley said this Bill should apply where less than two shearers are employed. Less than two means one, and if a farmer must build shearers' quarters to these standards for only one employee, it is getting rather ridiculous. Those members who have read the Bill would realise there must be separate accommodation for the cook and separate toilets away from the sleeping accommodation, a list of cooking utensils and things like this. Such an arrangement could not be expected to apply to only one shearer. The idea of this Bill is to lay down conditions for multiple living and we certainly could not class one shearer as multiple living.

The Hon. J. Heitman: What about private shearing contractors?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: It is true that in some cases a farmer might have just one shearer employed on his property and would do the work himself in the shed. Where this Bill refers to five shearers, it actually refers to two shearers and the three men they take with them. However, there is no worry about men not being included under the provisions of this Act.

Mr Cooley referred to these men travelling 50 miles. Obviously, Mr Cooley is not a shearer because one has only to see how a team comes onto a property to know what he says is incorrect. Even if they are going to live in their house, 50 miles away, the first thing they do is inspect the shearers' quarters, count the teaspoons, measure the windows, and check the whole area to ensure that it is in compliance with the award and then they say they are ready for work. The shearer will always make sure that his accommodation is in first-class order.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: But if there are less than five shearers there is no requirement to accommodate them.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Mr Cooley will find that will be included under the pastoral award legislation. What most pastoralists do in such situations is to go down to the shearers' quarters a couple of days before they are due to arrive and make sure everything is in order and then, when everything is first class, they take away something vital. When the shearers arrive, along comes the cook with a long face and says, "I cannot find the kettle; we cannot start work without a kettle". So, the farmer immediately finds the kettle.

The cook is happy because he has found something wrong with the quarters, and they start work. This seems to be one of the things that regularly take place and

is regarded almost as part of the fun of the shearing season. Members should realise that there is a shortage of shearers today and they can pick and choose; no person would be able to obtain the services of good shearers while offering them poor accommodation.

Mr Cooley also referred to the clause relating to damage done to fittings. I believe the Minister pointed out several reasons for the inclusion of this clause. Of course, the accommodation is provided free of charge and while one does not interfere with the shearers, certainly if damage is done it would be normal practice to ask the shearers who were responsible to pay for the damage. The shearers make sure they tell the farmer who was responsible for the damage so that they do not have to bear the cost of repairs. In that way, the matter is fairly easily overcome. Usually, at the end of the cut-out time there is a party in the shearers' quarters and quite often a sheet of asbestos or something of that nature is broken.

Most farmers would not bother deducting the cost of repairs from the employees' wages; they would rather repair it themselves before the start of the next season. With those remarks, I support the Bill.

THE HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [9.39]: My remarks will be brief. Mr Cooley mentioned that the Shearers' Accommodation Bill introduced last year was similar to this legislation. However, I hardly think that the Bill was not proceeded with because of lack of time at the end of the session. If Mr Cooley cared to read the *Hansard* record of the debates which took place, he would see that the Bill as introduced then was most impractical and did not suit the industry. It may have suited part of the industry, but it certainly did not meet with the approval of the entire industry.

As a matter of fact, if he cared to analyse that legislation and compare it with the Bill we are now considering he would see that it has been found necessary by this Government to include in this legislation 29 amendments which were not included last year, in order to make the legislation acceptable. In other words, we might say that the two Bills are not similar; in fact, they are entirely different.

I also want Mr Cooley to realise that when we opposed the provision to install hot and cold showers, toilets and what-have-you at the shearing sheds, there was a very good reason for doing so. Adjacent to my shearing shed I have installed hot and cold water, showers, septic tank facilities, hand basins, wash troughs and even a refrigerator in a room just off the shearing shed.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Nobody said you did not.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: No, but I am telling Mr Cooley that I have installed these facilities. I can see now that to a great extent it was a waste of money. I think it was the correct thing to do; however, when Mother Nature calls the shearers, he answers the call on the grating, while he is talking to the sheep. When I tap him on the shoulder and say, "There is a convenience down the back", he has a most impolite way of telling me what to do.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Would you say all shearers do this?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Every shearers who has come into my shed and who wished to answer the call to which I have referred has done so on the grating rather than walk down to the back of the shed and use the septic facilities and wash his hands in hot and cold water.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I suppose he reckons that the sheep do, so why shouldn't he?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Let us face it; I join him myself. We must be practical about this. If we are talking about a shearers who must travel a long way to reach such a facility, fair enough—a toilet should be placed near the shed. But is Mr Cooley going to tell me tomorrow night that the man I employ to plough my paddock should have a toilet at every corner of paddock? This is what the previous Bill implied, when it referred to the shed being 100 yards from existing toilet facilities. In fact, the previous legislation did not stop at a toilet; it required a shower, a hand basin, etc.

In my book, there is no difference between a man working at the shearing shed requiring all these facilities and the man driving a tractor around a paddock two square miles in area who must stop every now and again at the corner of the paddock to allow Mother Nature to take her course. As a great friend of mine used to say, "Two wrongs do not make a white". That statement is fairly right in this case.

The Bill proposes a lot of changes to the legislation. I believe, eventually, shearers will be accommodated in the style in which Mr Cooley would like them to be accommodated. However, when a similar Bill was introduced last year it was interesting to see that on Wednesday, the 20th November, 1973, the Farmers' Union of Western Australia criticised the legislation. It is interesting because the Minister when introducing the Bill stated that the Farmers' Union and the pastoralists and graziers had been consulted and agreed with the legislation.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Do not blame me for that; I was not here.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I do not blame Mr Cooley; I am just trying to explain how different last year's legislation is from the Bill we are now considering. I took the liberty of sending that Bill to

the Farmers' Union and it proposed a few amendments, as members will see. A newspaper article relating to the Bill stated—

The union agreed with the general intention to improve accommodation and facilities for shearers, but several proposals would impose heavy and unnecessary costs on some farmers.

One provision was that where a shearing shed and living accommodation were more than 100 yards apart, a farmer had to provide a lavatory, a shower and a hand basin with hot and cold water in the shed.

In agricultural areas a shower in a shearing shed was generally unnecessary.

Many shearers lived in the district and rarely wanted to carry a change of clothing and have a shower before going home.

The union also disagreed with a provision relating to damage done to property by shearers.

A farmer could deduct the amount from a shearers's pay as compensation for damage, but the Bill proposed that this right should be removed.

This meant that a farmer would have to pay for the damage.

In many cases it was difficult for a farmer to track down and take action against a shearers who damaged his property.

It was obvious that because of the opposition to the Bill certain changes had to be made and that is the reason this Bill is before us at present. It contains 29 changes and in respect of those changes there are some very radical improvements in the shearers's accommodation. It is feasible that these will be accepted, but some alterations will have to be made in the shearing accommodation as presently provided. I am all in accord with that. Under the Bill before us, if the shearers agree, the present quarters as erected can be used, whereas under the previous Bill if they were not a certain distance from the shed, they had to be pulled down and re-erected a little closer.

A terrific amount of work has been done in regard to this matter and as a starter on improvements, it is a very good Bill. Even now a few complaints have been rolling in about some provisions, but I am sure that when the employers and the shearers study the provisions they will realise they will be advantageous to the shearers and the industry.

Mr Cooley mentioned that he would like this improved type of accommodation made available for even two shearers or one. I agree that the reference to five shearers is rather a misnomer because that five could represent three shearers and two "picker-ups", because they are all classed as shearers. Nevertheless, this Bill is to

apply as in the past; that is, for five or more shearers. I do admit that the 1973 Bill proposed to make it apply to shearers generally.

Although one or two clauses may need tidying up a little, in general I support the second reading.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) [9.48 p.m.]: I thank members for their comments. I think every query raised by Mr Cooley has been answered by either Mr Wordsworth or Mr Gayfer. Mr Cooley did refer to his amendment, and I think it would be only fair for me to indicate that I would not be able to accept it for the reasons given by the other two members. On the other hand, Mr Wordsworth's amendment is necessary and so I would be prepared to accept it at the appropriate time. I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (the Hon. Clive Griffiths) in the Chair; the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Education) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3 put and passed.

Clause 4: Section 2 amended—

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It seems as though it would be futile for me to weary the Committee with submissions in respect of the amendment I have on the notice paper because the Minister has already indicated that he would not, in any circumstances, be prepared to support it, despite the fact that we have made no submissions in that regard.

I would like to take the opportunity to state that Mr Gayfer in particular indicated that I was in opposition to the Bill, which is not correct.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I did not mean to imply that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: But you did mention your amendment in your second reading speech and I was answering you.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It seems as though if one makes a suggestion which is likely to improve the conditions over and above the standard which the Government thinks is appropriate—and this applies particularly in country districts—the hackles of some people are raised and they make all sorts of suggestions.

Of course not all the facilities are used even though they are provided. There is a lovely dining room in this building, but I did not go there tonight. I went home to dinner; but that does not mean that the dining room should not be kept to a reasonable standard. This applies to the conditions under the Bill. If only a small

number takes advantage of the superior facilities available, they are worth while, and this applies in all walks of life.

I do not think it would be worth while saying any more because the Minister has indicated the Government's intention in respect of my amendment so I will not proceed with it.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I rise merely to apologise to the member who has just resumed his seat, if I conveyed the impression he was against the Bill. He said—and he can check this in *Hansard*—that a similar Bill was introduced last year, and it was on the word "similar" that I joined and locked horns with him. The Bill before us will be acceptable by and large to the community. It is acceptable to me and it is acceptable to Mr Cooley, but this did not apply to the Bill introduced last year and which Mr Cooley described as a similar Bill. It was entirely different from the one before us.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 5 to 7 put and passed.

Clause 8: Section 6 amended—

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I happen to have a shearing shed 10 miles away from the town where most of the shearers live.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I thought we had gone off that clause.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: So I built a house costing \$10 000 for any shearer who wanted to use it. Despite the fact that that house cost \$10 000 it would not comply with the Act. This is how ridiculous Acts can be.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: It depends how they are policed.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: With regard to an oven, before the Bill was amended in another place, it was necessary for enough room to be provided around an oven presumably to enable the area to be swept. When an amendment in this regard was made in another place it did not make sense and the mover of the amendment in another place has asked me to rectify the situation here. I therefore move an amendment—

Page 7, lines 36 to 38—Delete all words commencing with the word "fired" down to and including the word "is" and substitute the following—

"which if fired by wood shall be either sealed against the wall or".

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I do agree with Mr Wordsworth and his comments about some distances. After all, in some cases 2.953 inches are involved and this is pretty ludicrous. Nevertheless, this is the agreement, and I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 9 to 20 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, with an amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Education), and returned to the Assembly with an amendment.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 21st November.

THE HON. S. J. DELLAR (Lower North) [10.01 p.m.]: This Bill seeks to make some major changes and additions to the Fisheries Act, 1905, which was last amended in 1973. I indicate at the outset that generally speaking I support the amendments in the Bill because I understand it is the product of five years' work by the Fisheries and Fauna Department, in conjunction with all sections of the industry, and has been carried out under three different Governments. I believe the study was initiated by the Brand Government and was continued and pushed along by the Tonkin Government. In the major amendments in the Bill now before us we see the culmination of five years' work.

The industry, generally, supports the Bill, and I have no real objection to it. I discussed one query with the Minister before the debate commenced and he was able to satisfy me in that regard. However, I am not altogether happy with some of the provisions in the Bill, but in view of the nature and complexity of the fishing industry in Western Australia—particularly in relation to rock lobster and prawn fishing—I do not intend to oppose any of the amendments. The industry needs protection and I believe it is only through the stiff measures which have been written into the Fisheries Act over the years and which have been continued in this Bill that we will succeed in preserving the industry.

The Opposition proposed certain amendments in another place but they were rejected and reasons were given for the rejection. Because the Government was not prepared to accept any amendments in another place, I have not sought to present them again to this Chamber. Despite the fact that Mr Clive Griffiths says this is a House of Review, I feel I would be wasting the time of the House by trying to move any amendments here.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You have never demonstrated that this is a House of Review.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I am merely commenting on what the honourable member has said.

The three major amendments were explained by the Minister when he introduced the Bill. They relate to limited entry fisheries, fish farming, and aquatic reserves. The Governments which have steered this Bill to its conclusion should be commended for adopting those measures.

Provision is made in the Bill for the appointment of licensing officers and inspectors of fisheries with powers to board and search foreign vessels—about which we have heard a good deal in the last few months—where they are found within State waters; that is, within the three-mile limit. The inspectors are also given power to order any such vessel to proceed to a port until such time as the consequent litigation has taken place.

Many of the other amendments are of an administrative nature and an important one provides for an increase in the membership of the Rock Lobster Advisory Committee by the appointment of an additional fisherman's representative. This has been brought about by the expansion and permanent nature of the industry centred on Jurien Bay and Cervantes. I am not in the habit of commending the Government but in this case I feel it should be commended for appointing an additional fisherman to the committee. It is a very important committee and its members should have a good knowledge of the matters with which they will be dealing.

Another amendment deals with the naming of fish. The different species will be identified and listed in the regulations and it will be necessary for people who either catch, process, or sell fish to make clear the particular species they are handling. I believe this provision will protect the public to a large extent.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It might even resolve the correct spelling of "jew-fish".

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: That may be so. In the past many people would have found it quite easy to pass on to a customer a type of fish inferior to the one he had ordered.

Another important amendment deals with the power to make regulations to define illegal devices used in fishing. This prompts me to digress a little and discuss a problem which has arisen in the Shark Bay area with the illegal use of fish traps for the taking of snapper. The local authority and, particularly, the local fishermen have been greatly concerned about the increasing use of these illegal devices, the consequential effect they have had on the snapper population, and the damage they

have caused to the marine growth and the reefs on which the snapper feed. I sincerely trust the Government will use this provision to impose the strictest conditions on the use of illegal devices because we must preserve our fish population, and the unnecessary and illegal taking of fish—whether it be snapper, King George whiting, or any other species—is not desirable and should be stamped out.

Another provision deals with the imposition of bag limits. Once again I refer to the Shark Bay area and the famous Shark Bay snapper which I believe is one of the most sought after snapper species in Western Australia. In a debate some years ago Mr MacKinnon reminded me that snapper were taken in large quantities from the Shark Bay area. I referred at that time to the supposed holidaymakers who went to the area with mobile freezers and spent two or three weeks fishing for snapper, not with the idea of enjoying a holiday and a snapper meal in the evening after they had perhaps visited the local, but solely for the purpose of paying for their holiday. This has not been illegal. Many people do it and derive great enjoyment from it. I do not want to deprive them of their enjoyment but I also do not want the fishermen operating in Shark Bay to be deprived of their livelihood. They are residents of the area and they rely a great deal upon hand fishing and limited net fishing in order to survive in a rather remote area. They deserve all the protection they can get.

I do not think bag limits will affect the person on a holiday who wants to catch a few snapper and utilise them while he is there. The provision will apply to other areas of the State but the situation at Shark Bay reminds me that local authorities, the local fishermen, and the local inhabitants have not been happy about what has occurred in the past.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Meat hunters.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Yes. Of course, it is a profitable exercise if one can go to Shark Bay, come back with 20 000 lbs of filleted snapper, and knock it off at about 20c a pound at the local on a Friday night.

Other amendments deal with the method to be adopted in the future to obtain finance for research into fisheries. This came about through a recent High Court decision that money formerly raised by levies on the catch of fishermen and the throughput of processing plants was in fact an excise and therefore the prerogative of the Australian Government. The Bill provides for funds for future research, which is most important, to be obtained by means of a direct levy on fishermen, boats, and equipment, and the licensing of processing plants on a basis which I believe will be established in the regulations.

The rest of the Bill has, I understand, been ventilated rather fully in another place and I do not think members would appreciate it if I went through the Bill clause by clause. That can be done in the Committee stage. However, I would like to refer to the three major changes in the Bill, and particularly to the limited entry concept of fishing. While realising this affects the rock lobster industry off our western shores, I would like to refer to the prawning industry in the Shark Bay, Carnarvon, and Exmouth Gulf areas.

As the Minister explained, this concept is not a new one; in fact the concept of limited entry fishing has been carried out for some years in Western Australia under regulations made under the Fisheries Act. It has been found necessary to enforce these regulations from time to time and to expand and broaden them on many occasions.

In his second reading speech the Minister referred to the September, 1974 issue of *Australian Fisheries*. I would like to refer to an article on page 6 of that publication under the heading of "World trend towards limited licensing of fisheries". The following statements were attributed to Dr G. L. Kesteven—

The world was moving towards limited licensing of fishing, Dr G. L. Kesteven told officers of Fisheries Division of the Australian Department of Agriculture in Canberra last month.

It was not only a matter of controlling total fish catch, determining what could be taken from each resource, but also of determining in terms of a country's politics who should participate, Dr Kesteven said.

Free-for-all situations in particular fisheries could not last much longer because of the increase in capital outlay and improved equipment. There were few industrial fisheries in the world which were not grossly overcapitalised, he said.

I will not read all the article. However, I think his concluding remarks are quite appropriate to this debate. They are as follows—

A fishery was not simply a resource. It was a bio, technico, socio-economic system, and a management program could not be effective if it took into account only one of these elements.

There are an increasing number of instances in the world today of controlled participation in fisheries. Dr Kesteven said.

I think it would be readily accepted that the limited entry controls which have been enforced in Western Australia for quite some time have proved to be effective.

As I said, where previously this concept was controlled by regulation, it is now to be included in the Fisheries Act and will be given legislative power. Under the regulations, limits were placed upon the number of licenses issued, the transfer of licenses, the sale and transfer of ownership of boats, the substitution of new boats for old boats, and various other aspects. In particular, seasons were set by regulation for the rock lobster industry. The only difference I can find in the application of the regulations between the rock lobster industry and the prawning industry is that seasons are set by regulation for the rock lobster industry, and these are gazetted and enforced; but that is not the case in regard to prawn fishing.

I am not advocating at this stage that seasons should be enforced for prawn fishing, because most of the people engaged in that industry are responsible people. However, there are cases of boats entering fishing grounds quite a bit earlier than they would normally be expected to, and by fishing at that time they could destroy many juvenile prawns which are on their way to the normal fishing grounds. Although I do not advocate that seasons should be imposed for prawn fishing, I have certain reservations about the present system.

I believe inadequate research has been carried out into the habits of prawns, particularly in regard to their breeding and migratory trends. I say that in all sincerity, even though some action has been taken by various departments.

It is necessary for the skipper of a prawning trawler to complete returns showing the area in which he was fishing, the time of the drop, the time the net was hauled in, and the amount of prawns caught in that drag. Although I would not think for one moment that fishermen are dishonest, because I have a number of good friends engaged in this industry in Exmouth, I do not believe we could expect the skipper of a trawler who finds a new ground within the normal fishing area to pinpoint that new ground. If during a night's fishing he has a bumper catch I think it is only human nature that he will not pinpoint that ground on a form, which subsequently could be transcribed onto a map by his colleagues in the industry.

If he did pinpoint the ground the next night he went out there he would find it would be busier than the freeway at 5.00 o'clock on a Friday afternoon. It is only natural that other skippers, unless they had a good ground somewhere else, would tend to drift towards that area either by mistake or design and attempt to obtain some of the catch for themselves.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They are fishermen, not Father Christmas.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: That is so. Certain areas where prawn fishing may be carried out are defined under the

limited entry concept. I believe that while certain research has been carried out and some nursery areas have been located and roughly defined, there should be a stricter control on the period in which fishing may be carried out close to nursery areas, or in grounds in reasonable proximity to those areas.

I suggest that control should be exercised until research has proven the particular area is not being affected by fishing, and that the juvenile population of prawns is not being affected to such an extent that the number of adult prawns which will subsequently be available for catching as they mature later in the season, is not being seriously depleted.

The prawn fishing industry, as with the rock lobster industry, is a very valuable asset to this State, as an export earner and as the provider of employment not only for the people actually engaged on the trawlers or in processing works, but for those who supply and maintain gear for them. This is an industry which must be protected and adequately researched to ensure that in future the fishing grounds are not denuded as has occurred in other parts of the world.

At present the industry is viable and very successful, although naturally the success varies from season to season just as the success of wheat farmers varies from season to season. They have good seasons and bad seasons.

A person wishing to enter the industry must make a large capital investment, and for that reason I do not think we will find he would be in any position to enter into the limited fishing concept.

If I may, I would like to refer to the history of prawn fishing in the Exmouth Gulf area. It was initially carried out by modified cray boats using more or less home-made gear which went to the area 12 to 15 years ago to explore the possibilities of prawn fishing. It has turned into a very successful operation, with two processing plants established in Exmouth Gulf itself. I said earlier that the limited entry concept has been controlled by licensing. However, if we compare the trawlers which were involved in the early days of prawning with the modern fleet of today, we find the early trawlers were virtually modified cray boats or some other type of craft fitted with a single rigged net, whereas no modern skipper would venture to sea in a single rigged boat. Nowadays the boats are all double rigged, and a few triple rigged boats are now appearing.

This brings me back to the matter of research. We initially had 20 single rigged boats licensed to fish in the area. We now have 20 double rigged boats, and two or three of those are triple rigged. So whereas previously we had 20 nets dragging the ocean floor we now have a minimum of

40. This, of course, has increased the size of the catch, depending, of course, on the number of prawns available at any particular time.

This is one of the reasons I believe more research should be carried out. We have experienced some very good yields in the last two or three seasons, not only from Exmouth Gulf but from Shark Bay and the Carnarvon area; but whether or not these yields will continue depends to a great extent on the protection of our prawning nurseries and research into the breeding and migratory habits of prawns. When we compare the number of nets now used with the number used in the early years we realise the matter should be studied more closely.

I am not suggesting the Minister would have a hope in the world of getting these people to convert back to single rigs. In the first place, it would not be ethical to suggest that because they have invested a tremendous amount of capital in the industry, and they deserve the right to continue under their existing licenses.

In the same issue of *Australian Fisheries* an article appears under the heading, "Commercial fishing is a business". This is an address by Mr A. G. Bollen, First Assistant Secretary of the Australian Department of Agriculture's Fisheries Division, to the National Fisheries Seminar in Adelaide in August. In concluding his remarks he said—

Fluctuations in supply (with the subsequent buildup in stocks this year) and no guarantee of another record catch of banana prawns in the Gulf next year—

He is referring there to the Gulf of Carpentaria. To continue—

—could create difficulties for the owners of prawn trawlers being built. This could also have serious repercussions for the industry generally because of the increasing catching potential of the fleet.

I think in some way that substantiates what I have said about the improvement in the design of trawlers and the number of nets now being used.

As I said previously, there is a need for additional research. I refer particularly to the prawning industry; but I believe research into rock lobsters should carry on *ad infinitum*. There is a definite need for more research, and I am pleased that I have been given to understand that the Australian Government proposes to make available additional funds through its agencies for further research into our fishing needs. I only hope the amount of money made available is substantial, because we must protect our fishing industry.

We all know the world situation in regard to the supply of high protein and we also know that fish are a source of this valu-

able protein. I believe that in the future the fishing industry will become much larger and more soundly established throughout Australia.

As I said before, we agree in general with the provisions contained in the Bill, and I have much pleasure in supporting it.

THE HON. T. O. PERRY (Lower Central) [10.31 p.m.]: I wish to speak briefly on the amendment to section 6 of the principal Act contained in paragraph (jd) on page 9 of the Bill which reads—

regulating the keeping, breeding or farming of rock lobster, prawns, marron and other fish in captivity or confinement, and the sale or other disposal of such fish;

At present the sale of marron in Western Australia is not permitted. I understand if this Bill becomes law it will be possible, by regulation, to permit the sale of marron.

A great deal is not known about marron in Western Australia, despite the research that has been conducted into this type of fish. Many of those people who keep marron in their farm dams are learning all the time. Some farmers feed marron on poultry pellets and similar kinds of food, but others do not feed them at all, and yet, over the years, the breeding or the quality of the marron in the dams in which they are not fed does not seem to be affected.

Some of the rivers in my area are already too saline for marron to survive in them. The Beaufort River, the Hillman River, the Arthur River, and the upper reaches of the Blackwood River are often too saline for marron and only poor catches are now obtained in those rivers.

Going back several years, before Mr MacKinnon was Minister for Fisheries and Fauna, the Blackwood River was closed during certain periods of the year for perch fishing. I do not think any advantage was gained in doing this. The Collie and other rivers that had never been closed for perch fishing today yield greater catches of perch than the Blackwood River. As is known, perch are prolific breeders. They feed on young marron, and in some areas I believe they are responsible for practically wiping out the marron population. I comment on that feature only in passing, because at present one can only fish in the Blackwood for perch at limited periods of the year. My own property is the dividing boundary between the Collie River and the Blackwood River. On one side of the boundary I can fish during the whole of the year, but on the other side I am restricted to fishing only during certain periods. I am speaking now about fishing for perch.

As Mr MacKinnon is well aware, many farmers have been conducting experiments in their dams. I think it is now recognised that the temperature of the water has a great influence on the successful breeding of marron in farm dams. When

a thunderstorm is experienced in any area during the summer months and the ground is very hot, the flow of water into the dams will cause the temperature of the water to rise quickly and in almost all instances this proves fatal to the marron population.

It is amazing to find the number of marron that can be reared in a very small dam. I have seen over 700 marron taken from the bottom of a 3 000-yard dam after it has been drained. In the Jingalup area where a field day was held some two years ago the Minister was present when a drag was made along one side of a 3 000-yard dam and this yielded something like 70 marron.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They were very nice, too.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: Yes, the Minister was very fortunate. I believe there is a future for marron fishing in Western Australia. I do not know of many farmers who are yet engaged in marron fishing but I do know that some farmers who do keep them at present do so to enjoy a feed of the fish from time to time.

At present the Act does not clearly state what a farmer can do with marron produced on his own farm.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The regulations do.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: I am not sure what the regulations say because the wardens and the fisheries inspectors argue on this point. I am told by some that I can fish for marron for 12 months of the year on my own farm, but I am not allowed to take them off the farm.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is correct.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: Some wardens do not agree with that contention. They still maintain that I can take them off my farm to a place where I wish to eat them. I have a farm 14 miles away from my home in the townsite. Therefore, in those circumstances, what do I do? Do I light a fire during the summer months and cook the marron I have caught on the farm, or do I do what has been suggested to me; take them home in the cool of the evening and cook them in safety?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I know what you do, but I thought you asked me what you should do.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: What should I do?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You should eat them on the spot out of season and take them home in season.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: Nevertheless, I support this portion of the Bill which will permit, by regulation, the farming of marron in Western Australia. I believe it will have to be strictly policed, because it would be difficult to establish whether

these fish are caught on a licensed farm, or in many of our rivers and streams, and it will place a great deal of responsibility on our wardens. I support the Bill.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) [10.37 p.m.]: I thank Mr Dellar and Mr Perry for their comments. It has been a happy situation for many years now that there has been almost unanimity of opinion in this Parliament on the basic philosophy on the management of our fisheries programmes. I can recall for a number of years when Mr Ron Thompson was, I suppose, the major spokesman for the Labor Party on fisheries in this Chamber. Over the years I do not suppose we had many arguments and we agreed on most things, and I am delighted that this attitude is continuing, because I think it has allowed us to frame a set of laws and regulations to control fisheries which is the best in the whole of the Commonwealth, and it is certainly a control system which is the envy of many countries throughout the world.

As Mr Dellar has said, this Bill is literally a codification of the laws and regulations which were actually brought into being while I was still Minister for Fisheries and Fauna and these laws have been carried on by successive Ministers.

I am sure the points made by Mr Dellar will be noted by the department; and I refer to his comments on research and the like. It is interesting that Australian research led, to some extent, to the method that is used to enable one to tell where banana prawns may be caught. Until about eight years ago, or a little later, this was something of a mystery, but the methods have been worked out by sheer logic and deduction by two or three CSIRO researchers. One feature about prawns is that they have a life of only about 18 months, so they can be fished very intensively. They are very prolific in their breeding habits. Also their early life is conducted in the tidal areas and in the mud so there is not much chance at that stage of their being destroyed as a result of fishing, because a fisherman could not get a boat into those parts.

I can recall once or twice when the banana prawns were being caught and when they were almost too small because they were running about 40 or 50 to the pound that we had to impose restrictions on fishing operations for prawns.

The comments made by Mr Perry and Mr Dellar are well taken. Several ideas have been propounded with regard to the marketing of marron and as Mr Perry will recall I did make a suggestion that whilst the regulation carapace size should remain at 3 inches, the size of the marron carapace when sold might remain at 4 inches. Not many marron are caught in the rivers these days; however, as Mr Perry mentioned, quite a few are being caught in the

dams. I think it is only a question of solving a few marketing problems. It is interesting to note that these developments are gradually going forward.

I agree with Mr Perry that it may not be possible for farmers to obtain a good living from marron fishing, but it is still a lucrative occupation on many occasions. I thank members again for their contributions to the debate and I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

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

**WUNDOWIE CHARCOAL IRON
INDUSTRY SALE AGREEMENT BILL**

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 26th November.

THE HON. D. W. COOLEY (North-East Metropolitan) [10.48 p.m.]: This is a Bill for an Act to ratify an agreement between the State and Agnew Clough Limited and Mt. Dempster Pty. Ltd. providing for the sale of the undertakings and business maintained and carried on on behalf of the State at Wundowie; to amend the Wood Distillation and Charcoal Iron and Steel Industry Act, 1943-1972; and for purposes connected therewith.

Members representing the Australian Labor Party in this House will, of necessity, be required to oppose a Bill of this nature. It is not only contrary to the policy of the ALP to sell valuable State enterprises, particularly those that are making a profit, but there is also reference in the policy of the ALP to the Wundowie Charcoal Iron and Steel Industry.

We oppose the Bill, because it will bring about another disturbance—and this is the third occasion it has happened—to the conditions of employment in this establishment. We oppose the Bill, because of our very unhappy experiences with the sale of Government enterprises, initiated by Liberal-Country Party Governments in this State in recent history.

We believe that if the Wundowie industry is given a fair go by the present Government it could become a viable proposition. We think it is a potential money earner for the State, if it is given a fair trial.

It is in accordance with the policy of Liberal-Country Party Governments to sell State enterprises; and it seems to be in accordance with their policy even to sell

enterprises that are making a profit. It is also their policy to buy out private enterprises which are making a loss. That was evident in the purchase of the Midland Railway Company, and the bus service systems of the State.

From the Liberal Party's point of view it is desirable to socialise private enterprises which are experiencing a loss, by purchasing them from their friends.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I thought from what you said we did not have any friends.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Liberal Party has plenty of friends all right. I recall the last sell-out of the Wundowie enterprise to Australian National Industries under very generous terms—perhaps even more generous than the terms of sale on this occasion.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Are you not talking through the back of your neck?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Why?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I do not think it was sold at all.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Wundowie industry was sold under generous terms to ANI. It turned out that this venture was not profitable, and so the industry was handed back to the State. It was sold under very generous terms, with repayments of the purchase price spread over 20 years, on the understanding that if it did not prove to be a viable proposition it would revert to the State.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Are you sure it was sold?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: No. Eventually it would become part of private enterprise.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are talking through the back of your neck.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Even if I am making some errors, I am stating the facts.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You have made about 20 errors in five minutes!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Ever since I have been a member of this Chamber it has been the role of the Minister to be insulting and denigrating, for the purpose of winning his argument.

Withdrawal of Remark

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: On a point of order, I request the withdrawal of the remark that it is my role to be insulting and denigrating.

The PRESIDENT: The Minister has asked for the withdrawal of the remark.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I suppose it is necessary for me to withdraw it under some duress.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member has been here long enough to know the Standing Orders. Will he kindly withdraw the words?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I withdraw them.

Debate Resumed

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: As stated in the Minister's second reading speech, the rationale behind this move is simple and is common practice in industry. By combining two marginal operations and sharing administrative costs, infrastructure, transport facilities, and the like, the combined operation achieves economic viability which could not be attained by either of the industries separately.

It did seem that the Minister was making reference to the sale to ANI on a joint enterprise basis, and it seems that on this occasion the sale will also be effected on a joint enterprise basis, having regard to the fact that the industry is at present showing a profit.

I have been told by the Minister that I am talking through the back of my neck; I consider this to be unparliamentary language. I recall that when the Wundowie enterprise came under the administration of ANI, and when it ultimately was handed back to the Government, an arrangement was made whereby the workers missed out on certain conditions. They had to surrender their rights to long service leave, superannuation, and other benefits.

During the period the industry was operated under private enterprise the Government workers obtained substantial benefits in respect of service pay. After it was handed back to the Government, the management pleaded with the unions not to press the question of service pay, because if they did it would damage the economy of the industry. At that time the workers willingly agreed to make a sacrifice in order to keep the industry going. They were fearful that if they did not agree the Liberal-Country Party Government would sell it if it turned out to be an unprofitable enterprise.

It seems that the sacrifice made by the workers at that time, which resulted in the enterprise being turned into a profitable organisation, is being exploited by members of the Liberal-Country Party Government. I repeat that on this occasion the industry is being sold out to the friends of the Government.

I would like to devote a little time to the first schedule to the Bill, and in particular to clause 5 of the agreement at page 11. Clause 5 (1) refers to the conditions of sale. It is as follows—

(1) Subject to the provisions of this Agreement the State shall on the Sale Date for the consideration set out in sub-clause (3) of this clause sell and assign or cause to be sold and assigned

to the Company or to the Nominated Company (as the case may be) and the Company or the Nominated Company shall purchase and take over on a going concern basis as at the Sale Date the Industry and all of its real and personal assets whatsoever and where-soever situate including without limitation the following:—

- (a) an estate in fee simple free of encumbrances (save as mentioned in the First Schedule) in the lands described in the First and Second Schedules together with all fixtures and improvements thereon;

Both the first and the second schedules of the Bill relate to the land that is associated with the industry. Maybe I am talking through the back of my neck, but to the best of my knowledge and belief the land comprises approximately 8 500 acres. The company is to purchase this area of land under the conditions set out in clause 5 of the agreement.

Clause 5 (1) (b) states—

- (b) the plant, machinery, tools, apparatus, and equipment particulars of which or some of which are set out in the Third Schedule hereto;

If we turn to the third schedule we see the plant and equipment that is being sold to the company.

I do not want to read through all the items included in the schedules. Could I have your permission, Mr President, or leave of the House, for the third schedule to be included in *Hansard*?

The PRESIDENT: What is the request by the honourable member?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That the third schedule be included in *Hansard*.

The Hon. R. Thompson: No, you will have to read it out.

The PRESIDENT: The schedule to the agreement is part of the Bill, and will remain so.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: My request is, that in order to save the time of the House, instead of my reading out the details of the third schedule they be included in *Hansard*.

The PRESIDENT: May I ask what purpose the honourable member has in mind in having the schedule included in *Hansard*?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I thought that those people who are interested enough to read *Hansard* would understand the details of what is being sold if they appeared in *Hansard*. The point I am trying to make is that in referring to clause 5 of the Bill I think the action by the Government is very generous in respect of what is being sold.

The PRESIDENT: Those same interested people can read the Bill, or the Act if it becomes an Act.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I thought the details of the Bill should be included in *Hansard*.

The PRESIDENT: I think it is an unusual request.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Well, would you, Mr President, like me to read through them?

The PRESIDENT: It is not a question of what I like. If the honourable member is determined to have the schedule recorded in *Hansard*, the only way for that to be done is for him to read it.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Well, I will read out the details of the schedule so that they are recorded in *Hansard*. They are as follows—

Identification Reference	Item
1A ..	No. 1 Blast Furnace
1B ..	No. 1 Cast House
1C ..	No. 1 Blast furnace stoves—2 off
2A ..	No. 2 Blast furnace
2B ..	No. 2 Cast House
2C ..	No. 2 Blast furnace stoves—2 off
2D ..	Shaking Ladle and Equipment— including 4 Ladle chassis, 7 ladles, 2 shaking ladle stands
2E ..	Shaking Ladle Buildings, includ- ing 50 ton crane
3A ..	Bins at No. 1 Blast Furnace— 12 off, Bins at No. 2 Blast Furnace—20 off, Charcoal Bins O/Head—4 off
3B ..	Scale Cars—4 off (2 only used)
3C ..	Ore Handling Equipment— including conveyors, tippler, screens and Jaques Limestone Crusher, F'mtle crusher and Screens
3D ..	Charcoal Screening Plant
4A ..	Gas Cleaning Plant—including 3 Venturi and 3 Cyclone gas cleaners
4B ..	Gas pipes and Gantry
4C ..	Settling Pits
5A ..	Pig Casting Machine and Equip- ment—including crane O/H
5B ..	No. 1 and No. 2 Pig Casting Machines—including one spare machine
5C ..	Foundry Buildings
5E ..	Foundry Equipment
5F ..	Birlec Induction Furnace
5G ..	Fettling Shop—old
5J ..	New Railway Siding
5K ..	Foundry Extensions—including core making equipment, air compressor (at Power House), sand plant (link belt) and mis- cellaneous equipment
5L ..	Fettling Shop and equipment
5M ..	No. 2 Birlec Furnace
5N ..	Disamatic Moulding Machine
6A ..	Turbo Blowers—3 off
7A ..	Power House—building only
7B ..	Bollers and Ancillaries—4 off
7C ..	Turbo Alternator
7D ..	6RK Diesel Alternator
7F ..	Electricity Distribution
8A ..	Water Supply
8B ..	Cooling Tower and Pipelines
8C ..	Fire Control—1 Trailer and Tanks
9A ..	Compressed air supply—5 Com- pressors
9B ..	Bulk Liquid Oxygen Equipment —includes all pipework after C.I.G. receivers
10E ..	Creek Pollution Prevention
12A ..	Batch Retorts—8 off
12B ..	Transporter
12C ..	Predrier—48 buggy capacity
12D ..	Charcoal Coolers—11 off
12E ..	Wood Buggies—approx. 170 off— and Wood Lines—3 off
12F ..	Buggy Tippers—2 off
12G ..	Charcoal Weigher
13B ..	Lambiotte Retorts—2 off
13C ..	Charcoal Handling Plant— including belts, apron feeders, etc.
13D ..	Waste Products Disposal Plant— including "Action" waste bins purchased
13E ..	Log Docker Mill
14A ..	Power (chain) saw
14D ..	Main Mill
14E ..	Dressing Mill
15B ..	Refinery
15C ..	Refinery Plant in Eastern States —Union Carbide depot
15D ..	Refinery Cooling Tower
16A ..	Fitters Workshop Building— including maintenance office
16B ..	Fitters Workshop Equipment
16C ..	Motor Workshop Building and Parking area
16D ..	Motor Workshop Equipment— including tyre changing equip- ment, greasing equipment
16E ..	Carpenters Workshop
16F ..	Instrument Fitters Workshop
17A ..	Office and Equipment
17B ..	Laboratory and Equipment
17C ..	Stores—2 off— (i) Bulk (ii) General
17D ..	Weighbridge
17E ..	Fremantle Pig Iron Dept.
17F ..	Drawing Office
17G ..	Quantovac and New Leased Quantovac Bldg. Extn.
17H ..	Shiftboss Office
17J ..	Transport Office
18B ..	Koolyanobbing Plant
18C ..	Koolyanobbing Office and Amenities
18E ..	Koolyanobbing Vehicles (see supplementary schedule)
19A ..	Three Staff Houses
19B ..	Shower Rooms and Lavatory Block
19C ..	Ambulance Building
19D ..	Singlemen's Quarters
19E ..	Small Cottages and Huts
19F ..	Security Fence
20C ..	Engineering Spares
21A ..	Vehicles (see supplementary schedule)
A5 ..	Greengrocery Shop
M6 ..	Ford jib crane
M21 ..	Ford jib crane
M42 ..	AEC mobile magnet
M53 ..	ERF cast truck

Identification Reference	Item
M57	Foden tip truck
M59	ERF shovel/magnet
M62	Austin tip truck
M68	International tip truck
M69	International tip truck
M73	International prime mover and semi trailer
M74	International table-top truck
M75	International tip truck
M76	ERF cast truck
M77	Fire truck
M78	International tip truck
M82	MAN prime mover and semi trailer
M83	Mercedes prime mover and semi trailer
MT10	Harman excavator and magnet
MT11	Rushton Bucyrus RB19 magnet
MT19	Caterpillar road grader
MT24	Simplex diesel locomotive
MT29	Clark fork-lift tractor
MT30	Fiat 550 Tractor
MT31	Chamb. end loader
MT35	BHB fork-lift tractor
UQK731	Holden one-ton truck
UQL529	Falcon XA utility
UQM457	Falcon utility
UQN317	Holden utility
UQN417	Holden utility
UQN672	Dodge utility
UQO608	Dodge utility
UQL377	Torana sedan
UQL539	Falcon XA station sedan
N1468	Cortina sedan
N1473	Falcon sedan
N1341	Torana sedan
N312	Falcon sedan
XDE510	Falcon sedan
N1435	Falcon sedan
UQO442	Holden station sedan
N1779	Fairmont sedan
UQP907	Torana sedan
UQP572	Holden station sedan
UQO357	Mercedes Benz prime mover
UQT026	Bosich semi trailer
UQT027	Bosich semi trailer
UQC600	Allis-Chalmers log loader

**SUPPLEMENTARY SCHEDULE FOR ITEM 18E
VEHICLES AT KOOLYANOBING**

C.I.S.I. No. or Registration No.	Vehicle
KM1	22R.B. shovel
KM2	Le Tourneau 15-ton dumper
KM3	Le Tourneau 15-ton dumper
KM4	Caterpillar front-end loader
KM5	AEC 4-wheel drive truck
KM6	Mack 8-wheel tip truck
KM9	Chamberlain rear-end loader
KM11	15-ton Euclid dumper
KM13	Holden 1-ton cab and chassis
KM10	Holden 1-ton van

In addition, the company will take over the stock on hand and on consignment; stores and raw materials on hand; the rights and obligations of the board pursuant to clause 12 of the BHP agreement and the board's plant and equipment installed on and about the leased areas mentioned in that clause; and the benefit

of the contracts or agreements relating to the industry, particulars whereof are set out in the fourth schedule.

I will not list all of the additions because I do not think they are important. However, two sales contracts are included. One concerns a pig iron sales agreement for the Eastern States of Australia, and another concerns chemical products sales. There are also contracts with regard to debtor control services, transport of chemical products, cleaning, and logging.

The liabilities associated with the deal are contained in the seventh schedule, which sets out the loans in existence from several State Government instrumentalities and private finance companies. They are, the State Government Insurance Office, \$100 000 repayable on the 30th June, 1992; the National Bank Savings Bank Limited, \$200 000, repayable on the 31st July, 1992; another from the National Bank Savings Bank Limited, \$100 000, repayable on the 4th August, 1992; the Australia and New Zealand Savings Bank Limited, \$100 000, repayable on the 15th August, 1982; and the Rural and Industries Bank of Western Australia, \$200 000, repayable by 50 half-yearly repayments commencing on the 15th February, 1974.

All those items which I have read from the schedules have been sold to the company under the provisions of clause 5(3)(c) of the agreement, for the princely sum of \$390 000.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is actually \$2.5 million.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The purchase price is repayable over a period of six years, free of interest. I have referred to the loan of \$700 000 guaranteed by the State. So, one can see it is a reasonably good deal for the companies which are involved in the purchase of the enterprise.

I would now like to refer to the Minister's second reading speech in another place, and compare it with the Minister's second reading speech in this place. I might be talking from the top of my head, again, in this case, but I think the Minister's speech in this place was a take-off from the Minister's second reading speech in another place.

On Thursday, the 21st November, of this year, the Minister uttered the same words as those uttered by the Minister in this place in respect of negotiations with unions. Some explanation is required because I do not think what was said was in accordance with the facts of the matter.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: To which page of my notes are you referring?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: To pages 9 and 10, where the Minister states—

In addition to accepting these obligations, the company has undertaken, under clause 9, to accept re-arrangement of all present employees of the

industry on identical wages and salaries and on terms and conditions which, quite obviously, must, and will be, no less favourable than those available under appropriate awards in private industry.

The point I make is the Minister said negotiations with the union had already reached an advanced stage, and it was quite likely the employees would be retained on conditions very little different from those they have always enjoyed. That statement was made in another place on the 21st November, 1974.

I was personally involved in the negotiations with the employees. On Monday, the 25th November, 1974—the day before the Minister made his second reading speech in this place—I introduced the union officials associated with this industry—some 15 of them—to the principals of Agnew Clough Limited. Representatives of the Government, and the Employers Federation, were present. That was the first negotiation entered into with the unions in respect of this takeover, or sell-out whatever it may be.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Why not call it a sale?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It was stated that the negotiations with the union had reached an advanced stage when, in fact, there had been no negotiations at all.

I believe some explanation should be given in this place about that aspect of the statements made. The arrangements made with the company taking over this enterprise are far superior to arrangements made on the sale of other Government enterprises. In the past, the workers in the industry have been well and truly sold out along with the enterprise itself. The arrangements do not go all the way to satisfying us, but we are reasonably happy that in some ways the workers' interests will be protected. However, it does not take away the fact that next Monday morning every employee will again be given a month's notice of termination of service.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Are you saying that your negotiations had no effect on the provisions in the Bill?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: No.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: It was all over before your negotiations took place.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The agreement was signed on the 14th November, and the first real negotiations in respect of the conditions of the sale were on Monday morning last, the 25th November.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: So in spite of that you are still happy with what is in the Bill?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We are not completely happy with it. We do not like seeing workers dismissed from a job where

they have been reasonably secure. They will lose their superannuation benefits—possibly they will have to be paid out. We do not like to see their long service leave entitlements being reduced to the point where it is possible for them to take pay in lieu of actual leave.

This has been the history of the sale of Government enterprises. Some workers in the State Saw Mills had 25 years' service and they never had the benefit of long service leave.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I think you ought to explain that in fact they were paid for it.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: But they did not have the chance to take the leave.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They may well believe it is better to take the money. It is up to them and not the President of the TLO. Do you want to be Big Brother and tell the workers that they must do everything you say?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I have had discussions with workers and with those in Government employment who are entitled to long service leave after seven years' service. We have fought about this provision for a considerable time. Many people in high places do not take their leave.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is their business.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is not.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is a dictatorial attitude coming from you.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: In some respects taking cash payments in lieu of long service leave is a fraud because some workers have let it go for more than three periods.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I can visualise many workers who are glad of the money. A cash payment would be a lot better for them individually.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: People in senior government positions?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We are talking about the workers at Wundowie.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Some people save up their long service leave entitlements until they retire.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is their business.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Do you want to tell them when they should take their long service leave? Do not they have rights of their own?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am not telling them. The workers enter into industrial agreements and awards in relation to this leave. The point I am making is that some people take their leave at a rate applying 14 years later than the time at which their leave should have been taken. The other aspect is that workers who take their leave when it is due pay

taxation at the full rate. However, a cash equivalent on retirement attracts taxation on 5 per cent of the amount only.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: How many people in Wundowie have done that?

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I know of many.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Can you name one?

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: The Chairman of the MTT (Mr Ivan Thomas) retired and took a cash settlement.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I am talking about Wundowie.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: And I am talking about people in high government positions.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You make it sound as though Mr Thomas were a criminal. He is a nice fellow.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I know him and I like him very much.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Then why put him on a pillory like this?

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I am simply giving an example. He paid taxation on a lesser amount than he should have done.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Are you saying he broke the law?

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: It is not the right principle, and the Government is encouraging workers to do this.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: If it suits both parties to the agreement, that is quite all right.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: It is not unusual to have an option in this regard.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I would like to ask the Minister to clear up this situation about the negotiations with the union.

I conclude by saying that the ALP is opposed to the concept of the sale of this enterprise as it is opposed to the concept of the sale of all government enterprises, particularly those which were sold under conditions completely acceptable to the company concerned, but not acceptable to the people of the State. These enterprises are being sold at the cost of our people. I oppose the Bill.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central—Minister for Health) [11.22 p.m.]: It is rather amazing to listen to the honourable member's comments about the sale of Wundowie. I happen to know the area fairly well. I have a property near the works, and I have lived there for some years. I know the people of Wundowie, and I often talk to them. People have a right to take money in lieu of long service leave.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Do you believe in industrial arbitration?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I know the rights of people who have regularly taken their long service leave, but some workers have young families and probably they cannot afford to take their leave for one reason or another. They have been very glad to be able to take the money instead.

I assure the House that many people in Wundowie are very happy that the works are to be purchased by private enterprise. They have often asked whether the vanadium deposits will be developed in conjunction with the works. Over its many years of operation, this industry has shown a big loss, and nobody is more cognisant of this than I am. Over the years I have fought to see that Wundowie is kept going. Members in this House have strongly opposed my efforts to keep the works operating. I felt this was important because of the township that has grown up there.

A year or two ago the State was faced with permitting Wundowie to borrow money to start a foundry. A lot of debate took place in this House as to whether the works should be allowed to borrow \$700 000. I defended the industry because of the set-up in Wundowie, the people who had purchased their homes in the area, and the businesses that have been built up. I represent the area and yet I have not received one letter of complaint about the sale of the industry.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: They have not had a lot of time.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: It is rather strange that I know many people there, I represent the area, and yet I have not received a letter.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I did not at any stage of my speech say that the workers in the industry were opposed to the sale.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I know that, but Mr Cooley implied that although he was satisfied with the agreement, he was not satisfied with some of the conditions appertaining to the workers. Apparently the people of Wundowie are fairly satisfied, because they have not complained. They must have been assured that the conditions are all right.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I am not being facetious when I say they have not had a great deal of time to write to you.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: It is laughable to say that the industry has made a profit. It has shown a profit this year, but for many years it made a loss. The commitment of the State is a high one—about \$5 million. We must remember that as well as the fact that a great deal of the cost to the State has been written off.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That figure includes the write-off.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: It includes some of the write-off.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It includes all of it.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The situation today is that everyone in Wundowie will be happy. Over the past few years I have been often asked when the Government will do something in regard to the development of the vanadium deposits. I am sure the people are happy with the situation.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) [11.26 p.m.]: I thank members for their comments. I would like to point out a few facts of the situation. If we look at the debts incurred by the works which will become the responsibility of the company, its actual cost will be closer to \$2.5 million than to \$390 000, which is the cash settlement. Another fact which ought to be made known to Mr Cooley is that he should examine how quickly any particular branch of the union may report to him as President of the TLC in regard to negotiations.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: They cannot report if there have been no negotiations. There were never any negotiations with the union.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That is the opinion of the honourable member.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You would not know.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Mr Cooley referred to this as a profit-making organisation. Let us look at the figures supplied by the Auditor-General. The total cost since inception is shown as follows—

The figures for 1972 were—

Capital Loss—	\$
Assets written down on revaluation	3 408 248 (a)
Revenue Loss*	2 225 484
	<u>\$5 633 732</u>

This is the profitable organisation the spokesman for the Opposition mentioned to us. To continue—

* Dealt with as follows:—	\$
Written off	1 868 312 (b)
Commonwealth Grant for experimental purposes	60 000 (c)
Contribution from Consolidated Revenue Fund	477 820 (d)
	<u>2 406 132</u>
Less profit as per Balance Sheet	180 648
	<u>\$2 225 484</u>

To adjust these figures to 1974 it is necessary to take account of the change in the accumulated profit since inception which at 1974 stood at \$14 412 profit. (Note: this is only operating profit).

The figure corrected for 1974 becomes—

Total write-off and write-down	\$ 5 276 560
(Items (a) and (b) 1972 Commonwealth Grant Item (c))	60 000
Contribution from Consolidated Revenue Fund (Item (d))	477 820
Sub Total	<u>5 814 380</u>
Less accumulated profit since inception to 1974	14 412
Total loss from inception to 1974	<u>\$5 799 968</u>

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Not exactly a profit!

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: On those figures, one gets the impression that if one had given it away, one would have been in front. Mr Dellar asked what sort of notice the local people had had of this sale.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: That is not what I asked.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Mr Dellar was aware, even at this distance from Wundowie, of the rumours and, indeed, the knowledge that was held by members of both parties representing the area. If that knowledge was as easily available as that, I am quite sure the honourable member could have worked out for himself that probably everyone, including the dogs running around the streets in Wundowie, knew about the takeover.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: That is right.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: My colleague, who represents the area, confirms my statement.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: That is still not what I asked. I did not want to pursue it, but that is not what I asked.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I ask Mr Dellar to repeat what he asked.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: A member said he had not received one letter since the announcement was made, or words to that effect. I merely asked whether they would have had time to write to you before the Bill was received here. That question has not been answered.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Well, the honourable member has got his answer now.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: He has not said "Yes".

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I will say "Yes" on his behalf.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: They would have had plenty of time.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Mr Dellar now has had the answer twice. Some sort of accusations were also made about other industries transferring to private enterprise in this State. The granting to local authorities of the power to issue vehicle licenses was worth a great deal at that time, because they were showing a pretty substantial loss to the State and receiving no license fees in compensation for their efforts.

One could look up in *Hansard*—because it was mentioned in this House—the contribution made to local authorities throughout the south-west by virtue of this authority that was granted to them. These responsibilities were taken off the taxpayer's back, which I think is a worth-while proposition. I believe the Wundowie sale as a business proposition is a good one, but I would like to spend a minute or two talking about it as a humanitarian operation.

If we had to choose between the two in importance, I doubt whether one member in this Chamber would not choose the latter. I am delighted to hear Mr Cooley say that the conditions under which the transfer of staff will be affected on this occasion are better than anything that has ever been done before.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Mr Cooley acknowledged that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I just thanked Mr Cooley for his acknowledgement.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: With respect to takeovers.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: With respect to sales. Fair-minded people complimented the Government led by Mr David Brand, as he then was, when the same sort of fair and equitable sale was contracted for the State brickworks, the State building supplies, the State hotels, and the like. The Government was complimented on its humanitarian considerations to the staff of those enterprises. The union chiefs may not have been too happy.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: The staff was not too happy, either.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: In the main, the staff was quite happy. Indeed, the actions taken at Collie were favourably commented upon. You would remember, Mr President, all the trouble you went to as Minister for Mines of the day to ensure that the displaced workers were well looked after. On top of that, Mr Cooley has assured us—and I thank him for his assurance—that this time we have excelled our previous good record.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I did not say that; I did not say you had a good record.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I know we have a good record; you would be aware of our good record, Mr President, because you were a member of Cabinet for the entire 12-year period.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: This sounds like an exercise in boosting your self-confidence.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I think it is the first time anyone has said he thought I needed a little more self confidence. Mr President, you would be aware of the very favourable comments that were directed to you, personally, and to the Government in general over your handling of the Collie situation and for other activities at that time. So, I am pleased that on the humanitarian aspect, this agreement—the legitimate and fair sale of Wundowie—is accepted by the Opposition as being first-class.

That is a very satisfactory situation and I am delighted. It is a pleasure to us, I am sure, to know that we go from good to better; that is a very pleasing situation and I thank Mr Cooley for bringing this to the attention of members because it is a matter that is frequently overlooked. This is not just a business deal in which no consideration to the humanitarian aspects has been given.

As a business deal it is also a good deal. It is, of course, only possible because of the proposal to combine the vanadium and charcoal iron operations. It is not an unusual thing for business to buy in a loss partner at some advantage to itself. There is certain equipment at Wundowie, which Mr Cooley did us the favour of recording in *Hansard*. Many of the items would have literally only a token value, and little else; some, of course, would be worth more.

Of course, the equipment is worth money only to the company which is going to operate a joint venture incorporating vanadium with the iron ore, the milling and the like, because to this State the industry has been a lamentable loss totalling \$5.7 million—and that figure was arrived at after deducting operating profits for the entire lifetime of the industry.

To get anything at all for this industry is good business. To get \$2.5 million for the industry is superlative business. To be able to ally with that the humanitarian standards which have been accomplished is a wonderful effort indeed. I believe that we, the workers at Wundowie, and the people of Western Australia owe a debt of gratitude to the Minister for Industrial Development (Mr Mensaros). I propose to pass that expression of gratitude on to the Minister and I support the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (the Hon. J. Heitman) in the Chair; the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Education) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3: Ratification of Agreement—

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Before we ratify the agreement, we are entitled to have an answer to the several questions I asked during the second reading stage. It is obvious that we are dealing with a *fait accompli* in the true sense of the phrase, because the agreement was signed on the 14th day of November, 1974 and merely requires the ratification of Parliament. Will the Minister indicate the current value of the assets of the Wundowie works? I refer to the plant referred to in the third schedule and the items under clause 5 (1) (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) and (h). I think we are also entitled to know the area of land contained in the first and second schedule and the approximate value of the land.

The CHAIRMAN: I would suggest to the honourable member that these matters would be more properly dealt with when we discuss the schedules.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: As we are called upon to ratify the agreement, I think the Committee is entitled to know what it is ratifying with respect to costs that are involved to the State. It is a condition of the agreement that it will not come into force until it is ratified and I believe this would be the appropriate time for such discussion.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It would be extremely difficult to provide an accurate, unarguable answer to Mr Cooley in regard to the valuation of the items he specified. A great deal of this material would be worth its weight as scrap metal if the Government—any Government—decided that “sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof”; that it would fund Wundowie no more and close it down.

A great deal would be literally of no value at all. I do not know the present set-up of the plant very well, but I take it that some of the foundry equipment would certainly be saleable.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You mentioned you had the Auditor-General's report. Could you give us the book value in that report?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I will look for it. Incidentally, the land is about 8 500 acres the value of which is really limited to its productivity, because it is part and parcel of the deal for the growing of timber. That is the condition on which the deal was based. Whether that will remain so forever will depend on successive Governments.

The Hon. R. Thompson: When it becomes freehold or owned in fee simple, anything can be done with it as long as it is of a rural nature.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No. I gather there are some restrictions. I cannot find the figure requested, but I will keep on looking. All I can do is repeat that as far as the value is concerned, I do not know how this could be worked out on a realistic basis. There is its close-down value, and the company involved has estimated that it is worth \$2.5 million to it of which the cash payment is \$390 000. I can give no further information at this time.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It seems extraordinary that the Minister in his second reading speech should say that the State had achieved an extremely good deal when he does not have any information in respect of the value of the plant other than to say that if the industry closed down it would have value as scrap metal. I do not know the price of a dismatic engine which is an advanced piece of machinery. Perhaps the Minister for Health could tell me how much it would cost because he has been involved with the industry. It seems the number of vehicles I read out from the third schedule would certainly have a value other than as scrap metal. I do not know how it could be said—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The current assets are \$1 386 927; the fixed assets less depreciation are \$1 145 188, making a total of \$2 532 115.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Most of the land in the first schedule is land on which the works are established. The land in the area would be worth approximately \$100 an acre except for one small farm of 180 acres adjacent to the works.

The second schedule refers to the land upon which the club in Wundowie is built. Even though the company will take over the land, it would not take over the club which will still operate as a club.

I am not too sure what the other locations are, but they probably involve some small locations in the town such as a few shops etc. or land which belongs to the industry outside the area on which the Housing Commission houses are erected. There are odd bits and pieces.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: There is one other set of figures which would be of interest to Mr Cooley. It is as follows—

Liabilities taken over and assumed by the Company:	\$	\$
(1) Repayment of capital sum as back-to-back for private loans by O.I.S.I.		700 000

	\$	\$
(2) C.I.S.I. current liabilities per latest balance sheet (30/8/1974)	449 715	
less accrual for annual leave treated separately in (4) below	132 312	
		317 403
(3) Other deferred liabilities		4 388
(4) Assumption of employees' benefits (including contingent) estimated @ 31/12/1974:		
Long Service Leave—accrual	260 000	
Annual Leave—accrual	200 000	
Superannuation Pensions	185 000	
Sick Leave—accrual	340 000	
		1 085 000
		2 108 791
Cash to be paid by Company		390 000
		2 498 791

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4 put and passed.

Schedule—

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: With reference to subclause (3) at the bottom of page 5, have the deposits been proved, and, if so, in what quantities? It does not appear that the feasibility study has been completed.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Again I have been given the answer, but I cannot locate it. The company is prepared to buy Wundowie at a very fair and reasonable price and enter into an agreement. I will try to find the information for the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Clause 28 of the agreement on page 30 deals with the exemption from paying stamp duty. In view of the \$5 million which the works are currently worth as far as the Auditor-General is concerned—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No. That is the write-off. The current assets are worth \$2.5 million.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: All right. On \$2.5 million the stamp duty would be considerable, but it is being given as a gift to the company. That is what it is.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I cannot find the figure with regard to stamp duty.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It does seem to be a really good Christmas present.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is a Government proposition and it seems reasonable to grant the exemption.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: For the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition, I would say that for a number of years the Agnew company had been carrying out a great deal of feasibility testing of the deposits at Wundowie. Vanadium is contained in very hard material.

The Hon. R. Thompson: How far away is it from the plant?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The main deposit is about two to three miles away. The reef runs right around the back of Wundowie on the northern side. As a matter of fact it runs right down, then it curves south for about two miles west of Wundowie. A great deal of drilling and blasting would be necessary because the material in which vanadium is found is very hard.

The Hon. R. Thompson: How is it mined—on a quarry face?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I do not know. Probably it would be on a quarry face. I do not think it will be deep mining.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I can only suppose the company is keeping that information to itself. I do not have the information. As far as the stamp duty is concerned, I will refer the question to the Commissioner of Taxation and ask him to send the appropriate answer to the Leader of the Opposition.

Schedule 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 the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Education), and passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL (GENERAL LOAN FUND)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 21st November.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [12.02 a.m.]: The purpose of this Bill is to finance certain capital expenditure from moneys paid into the fund consisting of borrowings approved by the Australian Loan Council, repayments to the fund of sundry advances made in previous years, and grants from the Commonwealth for general capital purposes.

The Minister said in his introductory speech that in June the Loan Council approved for 1974-75 a 10 per cent increase on the 1973-74 figures. The Minister also pointed out that in August an additional 10 per cent was agreed to. Although we have heard considerable criticism of the Australian Government in

relation to the provision of finance for this State, if members study the various papers which have been made available and papers which can be obtained from the library, they will find this is the greatest amount of money in loan funds, capital grants, and specific purpose grants the State has ever received.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: The greatest amount of money with the least purchasing power.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: This is the first of three money Bills. The next Bill will deal with the Loan Fund itself, and the third Bill, which is still being debated in another place, deals with the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

It is interesting to see how much money is being made available to the State. It is also interesting to look through the Estimates and see how the Government has tangled them up and put into the Estimates for 1974-75 large amounts of direct grant money from the Commonwealth.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Which Estimates?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Consolidated Revenue Fund Estimates.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Where would you put those amounts?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I will explain that because I will be speaking to three Bills relating to finance. The point I am trying to make is that we will find a hospital being built at Fitzroy Crossing, for instance, at no cost whatever to the State. The money for that hospital was provided by a direct grant for Aborigines in that area. We also find 45 houses being constructed at Roebourne, which were the subject of a separate grant to the State Housing Commission which is not included in the \$25 million made available to the State because that money was provided last year. This illustrates the confusing and cunning manner in which the Minister's second reading speech was drawn up to make it appear the State is making all these moneys available.

We can then look at the direct cost to the Australian Government for resource centres. In the Minister's second reading speech the Government takes the credit for the construction of resource centres which were financed by a direct grant from the Commonwealth Government. The State has not put any money into them.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Did you say the money for the hospital at Fitzroy Crossing was made available last year?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: No. I said the money for the houses at Roebourne was made available last year, but the Commonwealth also funded the moneys for the hospitals at Fitzroy Crossing and Warburton Range.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: They have to be shown in the Estimates.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It is tangled up in the Estimates. This was a direct grant. I have been through the Estimates and I know what is in them. I am talking about the confusion. Anybody reading *Hansard* would think the Liberal Government was responsible for and was funding the construction of these various items, which run into millions of dollars. However, the money was made available directly from the Australian Government for these specific purposes.

I will go further. I will begin with the hospitals at Fitzroy Crossing and Warburton and the houses at Roebourne. If the Government had wanted to confuse the issue more it could have included the houses being built at Luma, but that was evidently overlooked. The other works were funded directly by the Australian Government and should not have been mentioned in the Minister's speech. I do not think they should appear in the Estimates because the Australian Government is funding the State for capital works, but to read the Minister's speech it would appear they are being funded by the State Government.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Do you suggest this is a departure from normal procedure?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I think it is, and if the honourable member reads the speeches of the Minister in this House and the Treasurer in another place, he will find no reference is made to specific grants but it was stated they would be dealt with under another item. That was a valuable interjection because one will not find all the specific grants in the Estimates. One has to go to the library to obtain the publication relating to Loan Council borrowings by the States from the Australian Government for 1974-75 and ferret around to find out what has been made available. This is what the Treasurer said, and it was also included in the speech of the Minister in this House—

It is true that the Commonwealth assistance for specific purposes is increasing but funds so provided are to finance new developments. More often than not it is a condition on the grants that the State maintain its existing level in the area.

He goes on to say—

These grants do little to help the State meet rising costs of existing services and the day may come when the States have to refuse specific purpose grants even for very desirable developments because of the recurrent costs involved.

That is nothing but political brainwashing because when we look at the purposes for which specific grants are paid, we find interest on the State debt \$947 000, interest on sinking fund on State debt, \$3 005 million, debt charges assistance \$5 528

million, universities \$24.176 million, College of Advanced Education \$27.842 million, technical education \$1.681 million, schools \$16.943 million, child education \$224 000, education research \$55 000, community health \$433 000, and Aboriginal advancement \$4.660 million. I hope I am reading these figures correctly; they are in very small print. When we add them up, they run into a great deal of money.

It is in relation to those items that the Premier and the Minister say the time might come when we will not accept specific grant money. I say that is political hogwash.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: We did not get any money for Aboriginal advancement. I don't know where you got that figure.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I said that we received a specific grant for Aboriginal advancement of \$4.660 million. I think the Minister would know that was made available to the States for housing projects.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You didn't say it was for housing; you said it was for Aboriginal advancement.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It is for Aboriginal advancement; it comes from the Department of Aboriginal Affairs. The document to which I am referring is a Commonwealth publication.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: That is a specific housing grant, isn't it?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: To the best of my knowledge, yes; but it could also be for other purposes. It is listed under "Aboriginal Advancement". I am a bit disgusted because I have studied the three money Bills and I find the same figures are used in connection with each; the same items are mentioned in the second reading speeches. When one studies the three speeches one finds one is making three studies of the same subject because although the amounts are not mentioned in the Bills they are mentioned in the Minister's second reading speeches. If members care to check the speeches they will find what I am saying is truthful.

I think it is dishonest, to say the least, when reference is made to these things as though they are being provided by the State. These grants are mentioned in the Bill we are discussing, and also in the Loan Bill. The same comment is made that the States may refuse specific grant money. I think the Government is being less than honest.

I know Mr Wordsworth would be most interested in the next item. It refers to bovine brucellosis and TB eradication. In 1973-74 the first grant was \$188 000. That is a specific grant. It is not repayable, and it is given freely.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Nor should it be repaid. There is a penalty on beef sales.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I did not say it should be repaid.

The Hon. J. Heitman: I am telling you where the money comes from; it comes from the growers.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I did not say it should be repayable. I am saying the State Government is being dishonest by mixing specific grant money with its finances in this way. Although the Government has made no mention of brucellosis, this year \$45 000 will be made available from the Commonwealth Government for that purpose. I am not saying the money should not be made available; there is no argument about that. However, I think it is dishonest to take specific grant moneys which are funded direct from the Commonwealth and imply they are funded by the State Treasury.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: There is no attempt to do that.

The Hon. N. McNeill: There is no suggestion of that. Whatever confusion you may find in it, it is not dishonest nor is it intended to be dishonest.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If the Minister reads the speeches in respect of the three Bills he will find I am right. I would like all members to take the time to read those speeches, and they will find the items which I have picked out were referred to in each of the speeches.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: With regard to the matter you referred to a moment ago, the State has to match the Federal money.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: No it does not; this is a specific grant given to the State Government. If the State wishes to match that grant it may do so.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: I understand the money is made available on condition that the State matches it.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It is not. It is a specific purpose grant to the State.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Sure, that part is a grant, but the State also has to make a grant.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If the State is going to make a grant, as Mr Wordsworth suggests, the amount of money made available by the Commonwealth together with the amount made available by the State would exceed the total Budgets of this State Government. Mr Wordsworth claims this is matching money, but I say it is not. It is a specific grant for a specific purpose. I referred a short while ago to the fact that every resource centre built in a school in Western Australia is financed totally by the Australian Government. No matching money is connected with those centres. The State contributes to libraries, and so does the Australian Government. That is why I say the Government is being dishonest.

The Hon. N. McNeill: It is not a dishonest exercise.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Of course it is dishonest when specific grant money is made to look as though it is part of the finances of the State. Credit for this money should be given to the Australian Government.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Once the money comes to the State it becomes part of the State's finances. It is not in the original allocations, but it is State finance when it comes to the States. In most instances it is programmed for under the new obstructionist policy of the Federal Government.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: As he is also the Minister for Community Welfare, the Minister would know that the Community Welfare Department took over from AIM the Warburton Range mission as from July, 1973. The Commonwealth Government funded that takeover long before the present Budget was announced. It also provided money for a hospital there because the State Government could not find sufficient finance. This has been on the drawing board for months. Probably the money was made available before we went out of Government. The present Government is not putting a cracker into that. The money has been made available by the Australian Government, and yet the State Government includes it in the Budget as a State enterprise.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The money was available since the 30th June this year.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That could be true, but it was earmarked before that. Money was promised for the takeover of the Warburton Range mission and the construction of a hospital at Fitzroy Crossing long before that. I can tell the Minister when it was first mentioned. It was in February, 1973, at a meeting of Federal and State Ministers in Parliament House in Adelaide. I happened to be the person who mentioned it. That is when the money was earmarked.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You realise that money not spent by the 30th June had to be reprogrammed?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That is right, but there is no programme as far as the State is concerned because it is a specific grant made available to the State Government for the benefit of Aborigines in those two places.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: On application to the Department of Aboriginal Affairs.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That is right, I do not argue with that.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I will tell you about it afterwards.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: As far as I can ascertain these specific grants total \$77.575 million. Would the Minister tell me that any Treasurer would say he does

not want specific grant money and that it should be refused in the future? The interesting point is that last year the amount was \$31.294 million; so that represents an increase in the grant from the Australian Government of only \$46.281 million! Of course, that fact is glossed over in the specific items included in the Estimates. My attention has been drawn to a question asked by the Hon. S. J. Dellar, on the 31st July, 1974. Mr Dellar asked the Minister for Health the following question—

With reference to the advice forwarded to me on the 1st July, 1974, by the Minister for Works, that a new hospital is to be constructed at the Warburton Ranges at a cost of \$729 796, what will be the source of the funds for this project?

The Minister replied—

Australian Government Grants for Aboriginal Advancement.

Yet we find this item appearing in the Estimates as part of the responsibility of the Western Australian Government. Let us study the specific grants made available in previous years. They are as follows—

	\$ Million
1962-63	4.736
1963-64	5.026
1964-65	5.591
1965-66	5.872
1966-67	6.525
1967-68	7.889
1968-69	8.479
1969-70	11.550
1970-71	15.128
1971-72	21.399

Of course, then there was a change of Government and the Australian Labor Government took office. In 1972-73 the amount jumped to \$35.065 million, and in the next year it was increased further to \$57.834 million. I have already said that to the best of my knowledge the figure this year is in the vicinity of \$77.575.

The Hon. N. McNeill: This figure should be on pages 8, 9, and 10 of my speech notes as the Leader of the Opposition would have seen.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: They are summarised as well.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: On page 8 of the Minister's speech notes the following appears—

Commonwealth specific purpose payments of a capital nature by the Federal Government are not subject to Loan Council approval and because they are fully described in the Commonwealth publication "Payments to or for the States" I do not propose to deal with them in any detail.

In 1963-64 the figure was \$5.50 million.

The Hon. T. Knight: It should be \$5.026 million.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Page 8 of the speech notes shows the following—

Certain of these advances are paid to the State for direct transmission to various authorities such as the Main Roads Department, the Rural Reconstruction Authority, the several tertiary education institutions and the independent schools, and for this reason they are not included in the Estimates.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Yes, they are not included in the Estimates.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Of course, the items I am quoting have very little reference in the Estimates. On the next page of the speech notes the following appears—

Other payments to the State form part of the funds available to finance the works detailed in the Estimates and these have been listed under appropriate headings. The total of the sums so listed is \$77.575 million—

The Hon. N. McNeill: Which is the figure you just quoted.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I do not dispute that.

The Hon. N. McNeill: These are our Estimates. This is the money made available by the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Let me go on; I am not in a hurry. The speech notes continue—

—for 1974-75, compared with \$31.294 million for last financial year.

Although the 1974-75 Commonwealth advance for welfare housing purposes was set initially at \$22.9 million, it is expected that a further amount of \$2.1 million will be made available to the State during the course of this year.

The Hon. N. McNeill: That is a further acknowledgement, is it not?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That is a specific grant. The money allocated to welfare housing is not a specific grant; it is a Commonwealth advance payable over five years. The Minister should know that.

The Hon. N. McNeill: That is right.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: As I said, this is not a specific grant; it is money that is made available from General Loan Funds. Therefore I think the argument put forward by the Minister is up to mud. I am not misquoting what the Minister said. I was merely showing how the whole issue has been confused.

The Hon. N. McNeill: What you are endeavouring to say is that we have not been prepared to acknowledge that these funds are coming from the Commonwealth, but this has been spelt out in my speech.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: They are shown in the Estimates, too.

The Hon. N. McNeill: The relevant parts are shown in the Estimates.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If the Minister reads all his speech notes he will find that previously those amounts were not shown in the Estimates, but this year they are included.

The Hon. N. McNeill: We are not trying to cover that up, but your Government was.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: No, the Minister's Government is trying to take the credit for making this money available. On the one hand it blames the Commonwealth Government for the advances it is making in the construction and other fields, and on the other—

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Whose money is it? Is it Mr Whitlam's or does it belong to the Australian people?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am not arguing about that. The money belongs to us. I have not said at any stage that I deny that, but I do not like deceit; I do not like the deceitful way this has been done. Anybody who reads *Hansard* would be led to believe that everything is being done by the State Government and all the credit is due to it. However, when it comes to giving credit the Australian Government is not mentioned. The Minister cannot convince me that the true position has been made known to the public. According to the figures that are quoted the public is led to believe that all this money is being made available by the State Government when, instead, it is being made available by the Australian Government.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: After all is said and done, is it not being done by the State Government?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: No, the Minister's own Treasurer does not want to give the Australian Government any credit. I quoted what he said on page 9 of the speech notes. What he said appears on page 8 of the financial statement for 1974-1975, and for the information of the Minister I will make this quotation again—

It is true that Commonwealth assistance for specific purposes is increasing but the funds so provided are to finance new developments. More often than not, it is a condition of the grants that the State maintain its existing level of expenditure in the area.

Consequently, specific purpose grants do little to help the States meet rising costs of existing State services.

Is it not better to have a specific grant for hospital services? Of course what the Premier does not like is money being made available for specific purposes. He just wants the lump sum which possibly means

that the Aborigines at Warburton Range could be deprived of a hospital and the money could be spent on some other undertaking to satisfy the whim of the Government of the day.

The Minister for Community Welfare knows this, and during his three-year term as Minister he will be making many approaches to the Aboriginal Affairs Department. Although that department will be responsible for the welfare of Aborigines as from the 1st July, this year, by the same token the Minister will be asking for money from the Australian Government to assist him as Minister for Community Welfare to spend on other services that will have to be provided through his department.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Fair enough.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I have no argument about that. But that money will be made available for a specific purpose. Therefore for a Minister to say that he does not want specific grants is simply hypocrisy. All States receive specific grants and all States want them. More specific grants money should be made available to this State for the purchase of land.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Occasionally the acceptance of the money depends on what strings are attached to it.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Of course, it is made available for the purpose of buying land so that it can be sold at a reasonable figure to lower the price of land. I would not consider that any strings were attached to that grant, and that is not the only money that is being made available to this Government.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: With no strings attached?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Of course there are no strings attached.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: No strings attached?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: No.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: No conditions are applied?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Of course, the land that is purchased has to be serviced, developed, subdivided, and sold virtually at cost to people who wish to purchase homes.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: And bought under conditions similar to those which applied to the Salvado development?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Would the honourable member not agree with that?

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I certainly would not, and especially where the Government, of which the Leader of the Opposition was a member, wanted to develop the Salvado scheme.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I did not mention the Salvado scheme. The honourable member asked me about the conditions.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: What about spelling out all the conditions? The people who were to live there would have had no rights or privileges and no rights of appeal. They were conditions applied by the Government of which the Leader of the Opposition was a member.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am pleased the honourable member fell into the trap because his Government has accepted the money from the Australian Government and is spending it.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: On the same conditions?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: In the same way as I pointed out; it is required to buy the land, service it, subdivide it, and sell it virtually at cost.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: The Leader of the Opposition knows perfectly well that he is playing with words.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Government has to buy the land, service it, subdivide it, and sell it without making any profit. I did not mention the Salvado development.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I mentioned Salvado and the Leader of the Opposition said "Yes" in reply to my question.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I did not mention Salvado.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: The Government, of which the Leader of the Opposition was a member, put up the Bill last year.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I was talking about this Government. I did not mention the Salvado development that was mooted last year. I am dealing with the Budget this year and the operations of this Government.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: With no strings attached?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The honourable member's Government has accepted this money. Did not the honourable member know that the details were published in the Press about three or four weeks ago? I am very pleased to know that an Opposition member is able to advise a Government member on something he does not know anything about; something that is being undertaken by his own Government.

Of course, in the Minister's speech notes—and this is also to be found on page 5 of the Estimates—the following information is to be found—

Borrowings approved by the	\$
Australian Loan Council	64 278 000
Commonwealth Capital	
Grants for General Pur-	
poses	21 641 000

By no stretch of the imagination could it be denied that this is a large amount of finance that is coming into the State. If members care to look at the total figure budgeted for this financial year, they will find that it amounts to something like \$1.5 billion. Most of this money was not raised in Western Australia, but was made available by an understanding and very helpful Australian Government.

The loan repayments in 1973-74 amounted to \$11 463 187, but the total for 1974-75 will be only \$8 085 686. Last year there was a deficit in the State Budget of \$2 555 314, but this year with the increase in revenue the Government has budgeted for loan repayments totalling only \$8 085 686.

It was mentioned by the Treasurer in the previous Labor Government last year that the State had budgeted for a rather large deficit amounting to \$5.731 million, but because of the increased revenue from taxes that deficit was reduced to \$2.555 million.

In looking at the other items we find there is an expected shortfall in loan funds, and the Government is to transfer \$8 million to service the probable shortfall. If the Treasurer is not able to raise the revenue from other sources it is estimated that he will have to transfer \$8.784 million from capital funds to balance the Budget.

It is just and proper for the Minister to spell out in his second reading speech details of the assistance that has been given. No useful purpose is served in creating delusions and levelling criticism at the Australian Government. I agree with what has been said many times in this Chamber that it is our money; I say that at least the true picture should be presented so that Western Australians will know how much money is being made available by the Australian Government. That is preferable to Ministers of the State attending conferences of Ministers, and on their return complaining that insufficient money has been provided by the Commonwealth.

On examination we will find that the funds made available by the Australian Government this year represent a record amount. If the Premier of this State and the Premiers of other States expect the Australian Government to heed their advice to cut back on Government spending, then I suggest they themselves should prune the expenditure of their Governments.

According to Press statements, in certain fields the Budget has been pruned and pruned again; and in this respect I am not criticising the Loan Estimates. It is necessary for the Treasurer to bring down a Budget within the funds that are available. If the whole position had been spelt out in detail I would not now be

standing up at this late hour to criticise the manner in which it has been presented to us.

In regard to other specific purpose grants, we find that the amount for metropolitan sewerage has been increased from \$3.8 million last year to some \$15 million this year. The Minister said in his second reading speech that proposals for the provision of other funds from the Commonwealth for certain programmes had not yet been finalised; so, all the specific purpose grants have not yet been made to the State. However, the works will be carried out, and they will be paid for.

The Hon. N. McNeill: There is nothing deceptive about that.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am referring to the amount for metropolitan sewerage which has been increased from \$3.8 million to \$15 million.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I stated that when I introduced the second reading.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I do not know whether the Minister referred to it as a specific purpose grant. The Minister went on to say there were other proposals for the provision of funds from the Commonwealth for programmes not yet finalised. If the Government believes other moneys will be available for works of a specific purpose nature the Minister should have told us.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: We hope there is.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The amount has not been finalised. Taking all this into account, I think this Government is very fortunate in respect of the money that has been made available by the Australian Government, and in the programme it has put forward. Irrespective of the political party to which a member belongs, we all want to see the maximum progress made in Western Australia, so that we can service the needs of the public and ensure the money is spent in a proper manner.

I referred to a classic example of misrepresentation, and the item appears at page 43 of the Loan Estimates. The item is—

Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority

The expenditure on this item is lumped together with the expenditure for community welfare. Of course, there is no Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority in Western Australia.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: There is.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Not in the State sphere.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: There is still a Western Australian Act.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority does not exist in this State. It is a department of

the Australian Government. This is a classic example of misrepresentation. In the Loan Estimates we see the amount of money that is being spent in Western Australia; this amount is spent and funded by the Australian Government which has assumed the total responsibility. Here we find an instance of confusion and illusion being conjured up.

It is also shown at page 43 of the Loan Estimates that the Commonwealth contribution of grants last year was \$5.347 million, and the amount is to be \$8.08 million this year. The amount of \$8.08 million together with \$1.677 million for internal funds and balances is deducted from the total amount shown against the item "Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority". However, the Minister did not point that out in his speech.

The Hon. N. McNeill: What does it matter if I did not spell out that particular item?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Commonwealth grants totalling \$8.08 million would include the expenditure for which the Australian Government is liable in respect of hostels for Aborigines and homemakers.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: There would be no expenditure for homemakers.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It is shown in the Loan Estimates. The cost to the State would be for the provision of homemakers, because all the hostels for Aborigines are now directly funded by the Australian Government.

If we turn to individual items of assistance we find that the Aboriginal is placed on the same footing as other citizens in Australia, and is entitled to the same conditions.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Except in the north of the State where the Department for Community Welfare does more work for the Aboriginal population than for the white population. It is a little unbalanced.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Only in some instances. The Minister should not generalise. In places like Fitzroy Crossing and Halls Creek Aborigines would comprise 95 per cent of the population. Naturally if there are more Aborigines in a town more work is done for them by the Department for Community Welfare than for the white population.

On the other hand, in a city like Fremantle the Department for Community Welfare does more work for the white population than for Aborigines, because there is a much larger proportion of white people in the population. That is no argument at all.

This Government has been very fortunate. With the amount of money that has been made available to it, it should be appreciative of what has been done by the Australian Government for Western

Australians. The people of this State should not be subjected to hearing the carping criticism which the State Government levels at the Australian Government.

Unfortunately, other people do not have access to the various documents to which we sometimes have access in private. With those remarks, I support the measure.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central—Minister for Health) [1.01 a.m.]: I rise only because of the remarks made by Mr Thompson. I differ a great deal in my view with regard to the situation of loan capital finance when he refers to the grants from the Commonwealth Government. In the early days of the Commonwealth-State relationships, the States were given the money and they worked out their own destinies.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I think the Minister has to be fair. I said it was our money.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I agree the honourable member said it was our money. The situation is not quite as was stated by the honourable member, for the simple reason that a large proportion of the money which is coming from the Commonwealth in the way of programmed money for which we have a programme from the Commonwealth Government is money which should come normally to the State but which is held back from the State in the General Loan Fund allocation.

The annoying part is the obstructive policy of the Federal Government and to illustrate that point I will refer to funds for hospitals. It has been necessary to programme for additional funds for hospitals to the tune of some \$4 million on top of the amount of loan money available to the State from State sources to carry out works which were in progress and approved by the previous Government. That means that nothing is left for new works.

I recently received advice that the Commonwealth Health and Hospitals Services Commission had agreed to the \$4 million programme for works in progress, but a programme for an additional \$4 million for new works was not to be considered until 1975. That means that even if the money is allocated early in January, 1975, it will probably be the end of March before tenders can be accepted for any new work. Thus three-quarters of the year will be gone before anything can be done.

This is where the situation becomes so ludicrous and so frustrating. The Commonwealth Government can be obstructive in its provision of finance because one cannot possibly carry on in this manner. Another factor is that with the passing of each month costs escalate and it is found that when one programmes for a specific item, with regard to a hospital, the costs escalate further by the time the money is available.

I am not the only Minister who is frustrated in this way. I suppose that so far as Ministers are concerned I would be in the worst position. I understand education received a fair sort of allocation earlier in the year. Health involves the next largest total amount spent on capital projects in the State but if money is not available for new works I am not able to do anything with regard to planning for the various areas of the State where new hospitals and improvements are required.

It is all very well for Mr Cooley to say that we have received more money than was made available previously. Of course, more money is going into the Federal coffers than was the case previously.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: The previous Government did not provide one cent.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: The money belongs to the Australian people. We want only our fair share.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Mr Thompson claimed that we were trying to hide things and his premise is entirely wrong. Every cent associated with Commonwealth grants is shown in the Loan Estimates. It would be ridiculous for the Government to make claims, as was said by the honourable member opposite, when all details are included in the General Loan Fund Estimates. With those remarks I support the Bill.

THE HON. GRACE VAUGHAN (South-East Metropolitan) [1.06 a.m.]: I rise to take the opportunity to speak to the Appropriation Bill and to comment on the statement made by the Minister for Education last night. His statement illustrated his lack of knowledge with regard to the gathering of information, and his lack of knowledge of what can be obtained for the people of Western Australia with regard to child care services.

Our Minister for Education showed an abysmal ignorance of what is happening in the field of early childhood services. He made some unbelievable statements. I must admit I am not being purely objective but I know from a previous occasion the way he feels about statements made in this House. One matter which certainly touched me was the statement that his subjective observation of what went on in his electorate, and from what he understands from here, there, and everywhere, showed that the sorts of reports which the social workers are giving to the Australian Government are without foundation and are not to be considered.

If the Minister were to consider the history of this matter of attention being given to early childhood services he would recognise that some of his rather sneering remarks—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Your statements reflect your wild exaggeration which does you no credit. I did not say those words at all.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: If I might address the House without being interrupted, I was about to say that the Minister's abysmal ignorance of the history of this surge—and a commendable surge—to cope with early childhood services is an area in which there should be co-operation between the Australian Government and the State Government, and the result can be very beneficial to the children of Western Australia.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Which plan are you talking about?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The Australian Government has now formed an interim committee which will become eventually the children's commission.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: This has been taken over from Beazley.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The children's commission will interest itself, and the people of Australia, in the matter of all forms of early childhood services. The Minister does not seem to be able to differentiate between pre-school education and child care. He does not seem to know what child care means. He says, "whatever that means".

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Sarcasm does not show in *Hansard*.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I know, as do most other people, the meaning of child care but it seems rather odd that the Minister, who is probably more associated with education than are other members, does not understand the meaning of child care.

In point of fact, what is being done in the way of child care grants—which the Minister says is inadequate and not easily understood, etc.—and the sorts of things which were supplied—

Point of Order

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: On a point of order, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: Order. Would the honourable member resume her seat.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: On a point of order, I do not mind the honourable member saying rude things about me but I think it ought to be my right to be quoted correctly. During the last few minutes I have been misquoted about four times and I ask you to request the honourable member to stick to some semblance of the truth.

Debate Resumed

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I am sorry the Minister is upset by this sort of talk.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I do not like untruths.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I think the Minister made it clear last night that he had very little regard for the sort of information that had been supplied to the

Australian Government. I am attempting to point out that, in fact, child care is receiving a lot of attention.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Good.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The child care legislation was passed by the Liberal-Country Party Government just before the election. I would not be so uncharitable as to say that child care was brought in in an effort to gain a few votes. I do not believe it was, but it could have been helpful.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Then why bring it up?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The matter was introduced because of pressures from those people who had something to do with early childhood services. The position with regard to children in need of pre-school care was such that some legislation had to be introduced to cope with the problem. For the Minister to say that the need for child care is grossly exaggerated is, to say the least, evidence of an abysmal ignorance of what is going on.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is a complete misquote of what I said. My remarks can be read in *Hansard*.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The Minister said the matter was grossly overstated.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I said nothing of the sort.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The Minister said the position had been overstated in Western Australia, and in every other State, by social workers and others, including myself. I do not know what would impress the Minister. I think he has made up his mind that there is no real problem. How are we able to cope with the problem when the Minister will not admit that the problem exists? How on earth can one cope with that situation?

I feel this is such an important matter it should be brought to the attention of members even at this ridiculous time of the morning.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Your ridiculousness is matching the time of the morning.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: This is, indeed, a very real problem and, furthermore, we claim the problem is worse in this State than it is in any other State of this nation. I refer to the number of women who go to work, and who have children under the age of six years. The percentage of those women, in this State, is greater than the national average.

Another problem is that the number of places available for children is lower, on a population basis, than in any other State. This is a situation which is gradually being improved and, as the Minister has said, the private sector is becoming more and more involved. The private sector is well

and truly involved and, furthermore, the private sector as represented by the Australian Federation of Child Care Associations is very keen to be involved in the children's commission, and very keen to advise the Government and be asked for its opinion.

The idea of the interim committee's investigation is not, as the Minister said, to set up government schools which may not be as efficient as private schools. In point of fact, the interim committee is to find out as much as it can about what the community wants and how many alternatives are to be offered to people who want their children cared for while they are at work, or those who want their children to associate with others in play groups. This is the type of investigation to be made. If the Minister says he does not know what is going on, I feel it is evidence of what the Leader of the Opposition was talking about when he said government members had their heads in the sand, and refused to co-operate with the Australian Government. This attitude means the people of Western Australia are getting less than they should.

There is plenty of material available about this matter. If the Minister likes, I can supply him with information, although I am sure his department could do so. Many worthy people in the department are interested in the subject and they have material of which the Minister could avail himself. He would then be *au fait* with what is happening in early childhood services. As it is, he is hiding his head in the sand, and saying that none of these things happen.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: None of that is true.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The Minister said the conditions pertaining in Western Australia have been greatly exaggerated by people who have undertaken methodologically designed and scientifically observed studies. It is astounding to find that he respects the one study which agrees with what the Minister believes.

I thought I should bring this matter before the House because it greatly concerns me and my party. I hope it concerns others in this House.

The Minister also said he is sure that mothers in Western Australia are conscientious and worry about their children. I am glad he had the grace to say that because it is very true. It is all too easy to blame mothers because of the shortage of child-care facilities. A mother, particularly if she is working, is a very poor member of a pressure group. She does not have the time to bring pressure on Governments or on anyone else. She cannot press her case for the need for early childhood services. I am glad that this is one of the bases of the Minister's thinking.

In a very garbled way the Minister referred to the fact that the commission is being placed under the Special Minister of State as Minister Assisting the Prime Minister. He said it was now a fight between Mr Bowen and Mr Beazley. However, he had this mixed up as he also mixed up the amount of money involved.

I could go on to mention the other inaccuracies the Minister raised when speaking on the education legislation. However, I have put the record straight on that one point. It was surprising to me that studies brought to the attention of both this Government and the Australian Government should be ignored and considered to be trivial, not well thought out, and not well designed. It is a little early to tell because no piece of research can be considered until it is concluded. It is very dangerous to talk about findings before a piece of research is finished.

I remind the Minister that because of his preconceived ideas he has been confused by this child-care legislation which his own party introduced in 1972. It needs some tidying up, but this will be done. The commission started off with some excellent moves to cater for the early years of childhood.

I want to raise another matter in this debate because I am concerned about the way money is likely to be spent, and the waste of time and effort, by our Police Department raiding the personnel associated with the Abortion Information Service in this ridiculous and reprehensible way. The raid was quite unnecessary. The Abortion Information Service is quite happy for everyone to know what it is doing. In fact, this publicity may be the best thing that has happened to it.

At least this body is offering a counselling service to people, to show them the alternatives when the business of an unwanted pregnancy hits a woman and she does not know which way to turn. In the main, a backyard abortionist would be involved.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Isn't this against the law?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: No, it is not. However, it was treated as though it could be against the law. The abortion information clinic has been seeking co-operation and, in fact, has obtained co-operation from many organisations, people in the Government, and from the semi-Government hospitals, in order that these desperate, unhappy women can receive some counselling instead of all the gobbledygook that normally goes on in regard to the question of whether a woman is able to decide upon her own fertility.

I do not intend to enter into that question. What I am saying is that this information service is of great value to the community. The women who give their time voluntarily to this service have been

subjected to great indignities and treated almost as criminals. I think this is a shocking waste of our manpower and I am sure the police were not very happy about it. I would certainly like to know how many backyard abortionists have been raided in the last few years; I have not heard of any arrests being made, or of any convictions.

Believe me, there are plenty of instances of people being admitted to hospital and, indeed, there have even been some deaths in the last couple of years as a result of backyard abortions and self-induced abortions by desperate women who have nowhere to turn. It is considered to be beyond the pale, firstly, to be pregnant when one does not want to be and, secondly, to have the temerity to think that one might be able to decide whether or not one wants to have the child.

I felt this matter should also be brought to the attention of the House; to my mind it represents a backward step into the nineteenth century. It is a reprehensible move and one that indicates the Government's lack of awareness of what is going on in relation to the social conditions of the people of Western Australia.

THE HON. A. A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [1.25 a.m.]: I am sorry that the Hon. Grace Vaughan's professional raw has been touched. I do not know whether it is her professional social worker's raw or her politician's raw. In all the times I have been listening to parliamentary debates, I have never heard a greater misinterpretation of a Minister's statement, at such length, than the one given tonight by the Hon. Grace Vaughan.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You have not listened to too many parliamentary debates, then.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I have listened to parliamentary debates for a great number of years. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition wants to say something let him stand and make a contribution to the debate. Never have I heard somebody try to twist statements to fit an ideological belief like the Hon. Grace Vaughan has just done. Of course, by the sound of what the Federal Government is doing, and the way the Hon. Grace Vaughan talks, it seems that she wants to use the females of this country as breeding machines, and to take the children away from their mothers as soon as they are born and put them into some institution so that they can be brought up under the umbrella of social services and be pressured by people who want to brainwash them from the start.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: What a lot of rubbish!

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is not a lot of rubbish; it is spot on.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Those of us who listened to the Hon. Grace Vaughan go on in this vein, and who also had the privilege of hearing the Minister last night giving a very reasoned answer, without any of the highly emotional sort of stuff we have heard tonight, would know that what the Hon. Grace Vaughan said is not in accordance with the facts. The Minister said the preliminary reports on the research that was being done in this State—

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Do not misquote the Minister; quote his words.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Does Mr Claughton have anything more to say? He has been asleep most of the night. The Minister said the preliminary survey of the reports that have been given to him show there may not need to be as much concern for certain of these areas as was previously thought.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: That is a euphemistic interpretation.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I think that is what the Minister said.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: It is not.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The honourable member has had her chance to tell us what she thought the Minister said and the only reason I rose to my feet was, firstly, to sympathise that her professional raw has been touched and, secondly, to correct what I thought was a completely unwarranted attack on a statement of the Minister.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: The Minister should be able to look after himself.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Yes, that is true; but when somebody has been in the House listening to a debate, he feels inclined to make a contribution to the debate, especially when an effort like we have just heard from the Hon. Grace Vaughan takes place. I believe what the Minister tried to imply was that certain studies of information that have gone to the Federal Government have either not been looked at or been completely ignored. The Hon. Grace Vaughan is in a very vulnerable position here.

That honourable member spent the whole of last year going around the countryside saying things to certain representatives of shires and certain groups of people as to what the Commonwealth would do with one scheme, and of course what some of us explained to her in a theatre in Hay Street has occurred. Here she is rising in her place tonight and hitting out at the Minister's statement, not understanding it and not making any attempt to understand it. She is trying to make the Minister appear to be an ogre. According to her, the Minister was to condemn females for the rest of their lives to a sort of concentration camp in their own homes without giving the kids a go at all. What rot!

I conclude on that comment, because I believe the honourable member may be excused because of her lack of understanding of the English language, as the Minister was perfectly clear in what he said.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: In that case the honourable member should not get down to her level.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr Claughton has not risen to his feet as yet, but I hope he does. I am prepared to sit in this House until 5.00 a.m., but I would hate to see the frowns on the faces of members if he does get up to speak. However, obviously he had nothing to add to this debate in view of the unseemly interjections he has been making while I have been speaking.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) [1.32 a.m.]: I am grateful to Mr Lewis for his comments because they were factual and, indeed, closer to the truth than those made by the Hon. Grace Vaughan. It is a tremendously sad situation in which we find ourselves when statements are made, and then, as Mr Lewis has said, twisted in the way that the Hon. Grace Vaughan has twisted them. In saying that, a reference to my statement will show what I am saying is true. As Mr Lewis pointed out, the Hon. Grace Vaughan twisted my statements purely for an ideological purpose.

For a long time, prior to the commencement of this session of Parliament, I was interested to meet the honourable member because I had heard her name mentioned from one end of the south-west to the other. The farmers in the south-west had received booklets on the Australian assistance plan and they had attended meetings to listen to the Hon. Grace Vaughan who was drawing a great deal of publicity at that time by travelling around the country to explain the programme that had been laid down by the Australian Government and which was publicised in the booklet I have mentioned. I understand that the Hon. Grace Vaughan played some part in its composition.

The general consensus which I heard expressed on a number of occasions was that she was the only person who could speak at length, fluently, and leave the people who were listening to her more confused than they were when she first started. That was the opinion expressed by the people from one end of the south-west to the other.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Who is being personal now?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am. I have every justification to be personal.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You are making us sad the way you are speaking.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That will make two of us, and I feel I am entitled to have a companion or two, because my

statements were true, but they were twisted by the honourable member. Indeed, I was painted, as Mr Lewis said, as an ogre, and I am certainly not an ogre. I understand the situation and I have been in the position to deal with the problems of many people for the last 20 years, not unsuccessfully, and I repeat that I am not an ogre.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: I did not call you an ogre.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Yes, the honourable member did; she implied it with smart verbiage; with a sort of implied sarcasm. There is no doubt that that is what the honourable member did and with absolute deliberation. I said last night that it was my firm belief that the problem with regard to the child creche situation was grossly overstated and from what I have heard on the subject it is grossly overstated. I believe that the large percentage of mothers want to stay home while having their children, and I believe that trend should be encouraged. The indications that were given to me when I happened to visit the research centre of the Education Department were along those lines, and at that stage I did not know who was financing the scheme, and I did not know that Mr Thompson was responsible for its commencement.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I was partly responsible for its commencement.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The honourable member started off the scheme with Federal money, but I did not even know that. However, in a conversation with the gentleman in charge of the research, he told me that the problem in regard to the parents of the so-called latch-key children is also overstated, and from my observations of the problem I believe that to be a fact.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I do not think it is overstated. I believe there are problems in obtaining suitable instructors and providing suitable facilities for holding these children.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: If the honourable member cares to refresh his memory he will know that last night I said that I appreciated the problems and I quoted the classic case of a man who was left with children to look after and, in my opinion, the problems of a man in such circumstances are much more serious than when a woman is left to care for children, particularly, as I said last night, if the man happens to be a shift worker. He finds great difficulty in obtaining a woman to look after his children when he has to leave his home to be at work by 6.00 a.m.

There are obvious difficulties and this problem is yet to be resolved.

I also referred to the child care commission. I know that the legislation was introduced by the McMahon Government.

I am fully aware of that. I am also aware, from correspondence and from information I have gleaned, of what happened when there was a transfer of administration from Mr Beazley to Mr Bowen. Further, I mentioned that I am alarmed that government activity has deteriorated to the point where I find myself being informed by people who have no association with government at this time. It is a pity to find a Government deteriorating to that point.

I define a Government as the elected Cabinet and the Executive of any particular Parliament, no matter what Government may be in office. I find I am being told about matters by the Hon. Grace Vaughan who assures me that my department knows all about them, but that is not true. Dr Mossenson has been conducting negotiations on this problem and it would appear that he does not know as much as the Hon. Grace Vaughan. Yet he has met the representatives of the Minister who have visited Western Australia to tell us what will happen. The Minister is a man of high intelligence and deep erudition. So that statement that was made by the Hon. Grace Vaughan is not true either. The information is simply not available and she is not the only one who is able to inform me about the intentions of the Commonwealth Government in this connection.

That is not good enough; and that is not the way in which Governments traditionally have behaved. I have no doubt that in the fullness of time I will learn about the whole position, and I will be as well informed as a Minister in charge of the Education, Cultural Affairs, and Recreation portfolios should be. At this point of time I have not been as well informed about this as is Mrs Vaughan. I have discussed this matter with the officers of my department in conferences as early as eight o'clock in the morning. I do not believe that is the way Governments ought to be conducted.

Furthermore, I do not think that such secret information as Mrs Vaughan has received ought to be used as a means to level criticism at me or to accuse me of incompetence in not being in possession of information about a department of which I am in charge.

I would like to deal very briefly with the comments of Mrs Vaughan in respect of the Police Force. There is only one implication inherent in her remarks; that is, the Government ought to instruct the Police Force on the action it should take in crime prevention and investigation, and for protecting the welfare of the citizens of the State. That is the only conclusion which one can draw after listening to the speech of the honourable member, because surely her suggestion is that the Government considers that course of action should be taken.

We heard Mr Gayfer asking whether the matter was illegal, and I think Mrs Vaughan replied that it was; but I am not sure. We do know there is some degree of confusion, and the confusion does not apply only to this aspect. I well remember the time when Mr Claughton was President of the Abortion Law Reform Association.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I was only a member.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: At that time the honourable member played a leading role in setting up a birth control clinic at which contraceptives were displayed and advice on their use given. At the time I asked a question of the then Minister for Police as to whether or not this was contrary to the Contraceptives Act.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I was not Minister for Police at the time.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The Minister for Police, (Mr Dolan) for personal reasons was upset at the question. At that time he did not know that as Minister he was in control of the Contraceptives Act. I told him he was. At that time I believe the actions in which Mr Claughton and the birth control clinic were involved were contrary to the laws of this State.

After the matter was brought to his attention Mr Claughton made some investigation and brought down an amendment to the Contraceptives Act. The police would have been entitled to investigate that matter, as they are entitled to investigate any matters they believe to be contrary to the law. Any Government which interferes with the police officers in the execution of their duties is acting reprehensibly. In that connection the previous Administration of this State was not without fault, because the sole implication of the reference of Mrs Vaughan to police action was that the Minister for Police should have said to the commissioner, "Do not take action". What would be the end result of that type of action by any Government?

Mr President, you were Minister for Justice for many years and you know how disastrous that sort of action would be to the administration of the Police Force and the welfare of the community. I believe that in respect of the two aspects touched on by Mrs Vaughan, she would have been well advised to remain in her seat.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [1.46 a.m.]: I am not surprised by the tone of the remarks made by Mr MacKinnon in respect of the two aspects he dealt with. I thank him for his acknowledgement of the activities I undertook in the past. It is unfortunate that some remarks made in this Chamber become personal at times.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I'll say they are!

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Ministers of the Government are placed in a special position, and their statements are

regarded as authoritative indications of the policy of the Government. Mr MacKinnon has had long experience as a member and a Minister, and he is used to having his opinions criticised. By the same token we would expect him to defend himself.

However, when the remarks touch on personalities it is a matter of regret. Mr Lewis in particular has used this sort of attack. He did that, for instance, in making the statement that I was asleep in my seat during most of the evening. That is patently untrue.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You appeared to be.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: For several hours this evening I was not in the Chamber, because I had to attend a function. That demonstrates how inaccurate Mr Lewis can be in his statements. Very little credit can be given to the matters he raises or to their importance. Obviously, if one examines the contents of his speeches one will see that is about all his statements warrant.

I shall not be speaking at length in this debate. I feel the Government should be a little more up to date on the financial scene. In his second reading speech the Minister said—

Although semi-governmental authorities in this State were able to raise their full quota of loans in 1973-74, there must necessarily be reservations at this stage about the prospects of filling the larger programme approved for this financial year.

We do know that in the first six months of 1974 in particular great difficulties were experienced by the Government in revenue raising, because of the tight liquidity position.

However, now the bank liquidity has eased dramatically and one would have expected the Government to adopt a much more optimistic tone than it has adopted in the Minister's speech.

I notice that on the same page the Government indicates that it is following the example of the Australian Government in seeking funds overseas. It was announced in the paper recently that the Australian Government was doing this, and I suppose it is to the State Government's credit that it is copying the Australian Government.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Do you mean that Governments have never sought money overseas before?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: One would think so because the Minister made a special point of mentioning it.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: So has the Australian Government made a special point of mentioning it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Yes.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Why not?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I agree that it is hardly a matter worth mentioning because this country has done it ever since the establishment of Governments in the country. That has been the major source of funds, so it is nothing new. The Australian Government is doing the same thing.

It is revealed on page 24 of the Loan Estimate that the Government proposes to spend \$250 000 on pre-primary centres. I find this extremely startling. The Government has not even commenced its experimental programme, and yet it proposes to spend this amount on the construction of new centres. That hardly seems to be the action of a rational Government. It is embarking on a programme which it states is new and imaginative and in regard to which it has no idea of the consequences, and yet it is intending to dash in headlong to construct a large number of centres throughout the State.

When I spoke on this matter the other night, I suggested that the Government should withhold any further action until it had had an opportunity to assess the results. I hope that good sense will still prevail and the Government will discover that what it has undertaken is not a wise approach to the matter, even though we know it has been the approach in other States.

I should have thought the results in those other States would show the Government here that it was not the best approach to the education of our pre-primary school children. It is very difficult to understand the reasoning of the Government in going ahead in this pig-headed way, not taking any notice of the opinions which have been expressed to it.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Do you think the public are not generally in favour of it?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: If the Government told the public precisely what it intended to do, they would know whether or not they were favourably impressed. If the Government asks the public whether they want children to have pre-school experience, which is what they understand as kindergarten experience, they would say they did. They have been demanding this for years, and that is why the ALP has put funds into this area.

I agree that the public want this, but is this really what the Government is after? What is the purpose of placing these buildings on school sites? The intention seems to be something quite different.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: It has already been explained three times in this House.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I prefer to ignore Mr Lewis.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Too factual.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Perhaps one day he will speak some sense and then I might take notice of him.

I rose merely to draw attention to the fact that these funds are provided under the Loan Estimates, and this can only mean that it is the Government's intention to press ahead at some speed to implement the scheme it has said is experimental.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You are reading "experimental" for "pilot"?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: That is right, because that is the general sense of the term.

THE HON. D. W. COOLEY (North-East Metropolitan) [1.56 a.m.]: Almost from the moment this session of Parliament opened and the Governor sat in the Chair you occupy, Mr President, the attitude in this House has been one of general criticism of the Federal Government. It really culminated in that very abortive motion Mr Lewis moved several weeks ago. Some members have indicated here tonight that they are rather sad about certain things. I do not intend to become personal in this respect, but I feel rather sad that the Minister has presented this Bill which contains a great deal of evidence of what the Federal Government has actually done in respect of the allocation of grants to this State, but not once has he acknowledged what the Federal Government has done.

The amount of general borrowings approved for the larger authorities is \$2.723 million more than the amount borrowed last year. Something like \$25 million has been allocated for welfare housing. In the very vital area of hospitals and health, an amount of \$7.049 million is provided for this year, while last year it was \$1.595 million. This is the picture throughout the Estimates which indicates the funds allocated, the way in which they are being programmed, and the benefit they are giving to the people.

For instance, \$24.4 million is being spent on a sewerage programme which will benefit 11 suburbs. All this is a consequence of the attitude of the Federal Government.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Are you referring to the Treasurer's speech?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: No, I am referring to the speech of the Minister for Justice. I have indicated that in this Chamber criticism has been levelled at the Federal Government and that in the Minister's speech there is no recognition of some of the good things the Federal Government has done. I have said before that no Government is infallible, not by any stretch of the imagination, but credit ought to be given where it is due.

Regardless of our political philosophies, that ought to be the criteria. I think the attitude adopted by the Government during this session, in respect of money matters, highlights the difference between the philosophies of the Labor Party and the

parties in Government at the present time. When we look at the manner in which taxes have been levied on the people of this State we can appreciate the difference between the philosophies, particularly when compared with the taxes in the Federal Budget.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: The first, second, or the one coming up?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: This is not something which does not affect people such as Mr Lewis. I do not know whether he was born with a silver spoon in his mouth, as was his brother. However, I do not expect he would appreciate that there are people on lower incomes who have to pay the charges levied by the present Government at the same rate as he pays them. I am trying to point out that the underprivileged people have been recognised by the Federal Government in a substantial way.

The present State Government does not believe in our philosophy at all. It does not believe in granting concessions to pensioners. When motor vehicle license fees were increased by 65 per cent, recently, the leader of our party requested that certain concessions be granted to pensioners on the basic rate but the Government moved against the proposal.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What concessions did the Tonkin Government grant to pensioners?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The people have had to face a 30 per cent increase in State Electricity Commission charges, but the underprivileged people pay on an equal basis, regardless of their income and regardless of their standing in the community. I know the truth hurts, and it hurts when these matters are driven home. It is not part of the Government policy to have regard for people who are underprivileged.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: That is a lie.

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

The Hon. W. R. Withers: And keep to the truth.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I ask the honourable member to withdraw that remark.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member concerned is not on his feet. You, Mr Cooley, have the floor and I would ask you to please address the Chair.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is in the keeping of the policy of the Government to impose levies such as those I have mentioned. It has even reached the stage where a levy will be imposed on liquor licenses. The people on the lower incomes should be able to enjoy life on an equal basis with other sections of the community.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Would the honourable member enlarge on his remarks regarding the State Electricity Commission charges? Is he suggesting that they should be levied according to the level of income?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I suggest that the people on the lower incomes have to pay at the same rate as those on higher incomes. The Government has had no regard for the interests of the underprivileged people.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What concessions did the Tonkin Government allow to pensioners?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Tonkin Government went out of office, in this State, carrying the highest regard of the people on pensions and low incomes.

The Hon. J. Heltman: The Tonkin Government still increased SEC charges.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Members opposite are aware of the welfare programmes established by the Tonkin Government.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: If the people did not put the Tonkin Government out, who did?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If the member opposite does not understand how the Tonkin Government was defeated I do not intend going to the trouble of explaining the position to him. He should know already.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Can the honourable member clarify his remarks regarding SEC charges? Is he suggesting that charges should be according to income?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I do not think the President will allow me to answer all the interjections. I am here to make statements related to the Bill.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You can answer through the Chair.

The PRESIDENT: While speaking to the Appropriation Bill the honourable member can speak on any subject, as long as it is within Standing Orders.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Well, what about clarifying the position regarding SEC charges?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Now that you, Mr President, have given me an opportunity to speak on any subject, I will touch on another matter. I was talking about liquor licenses.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What about the SEC charges?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The people will be called upon to pay increased prices on an equal basis. I think back to statements made earlier this year regarding "jobs for the boys" and I also think of a person who has just got one of those jobs. When Mr Dunstan made a Press statement recently—

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

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: —he mentioned that the levy would not be passed on to the public, but that the public can anticipate a new year present in respect of an increase in the price of beer.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I think you are being grossly unfair.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: No comment came from the Government members. Government members do not understand that the increase in liquor licenses is the kind of levy which must affect the low-income earners.

The attitude of the Liberal-Country Party to the Australian Government, in respect of sewerage, housing, Aboriginal welfare, and social welfare, shows that members opposite do not know what is going on. They do not know the meaning of the words, "Aboriginal advancement" because they have done nothing for the Aborigines since they have been in Government. For a period of 23 years a Government such as that represented by members opposite, did nothing at all in respect of Aboriginal people.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: The honourable member has set himself up as having a greater perception than anybody else in this House.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Just wait a while and observe how your Aboriginal advancement policy works out.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I would now like to touch on the hypocritical attitude of members opposite with regard to their failure to recognise some of the actions which the Federal Government has taken. Members opposite are ungrateful.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You will get into trouble referring to the Federal Government.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I was referring to the Australian Government.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Your instructions are not to use that term.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Throughout this session of Parliament we have heard continual criticism of the Australian Government. Why not direct the blame somewhere else?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: We believe in sheeting the blame home to where it belongs.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Let us look at the blame associated with the Liberal Party policy—with which we could include the Country Party policy. While the parties opposite are able to win the greatest number of seats, they do not obtain the greatest number of votes.

Late in 1973 the Federal Government recognised that there was a solution to some of our economic ills and attempted

to deal with inflation. It suggested there should be a referendum to control prices and incomes. However, the conservative Liberal and Country Parties, combined with the employers and the unions, opposed the proposition. The unions did not totally oppose it, but opposed it as far as it related to incomes.

Only six months after that referendum we had a Federal election, and the party represented by members opposite advocated that very thing. The leader of the party said he would impose income or wage controls, and prices controls if elected. Therefore, let us lay the blame for our ills somewhere else.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Tell the truth.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Members of the parties opposite were responsible for the rejection of the proposal to control prices and incomes. The employers were responsible for the rejection of the referendum, and to some extent the unions were responsible for it. If the Government parties had their time again they would favour such a proposition now.

The Australian Government made a serious effort to control interest rates in the Finance Corporations Bill. What did the Liberal and Country Parties do? They blocked the Bill. The horse got through the gateway and interest rates soared; and the Federal Opposition let the Bill go through Parliament at a later time.

In a speech introducing a Bill such as this, it should be recognised and acknowledged that blame is attachable to others rather than to the Federal Government which has endeavoured to control prices. We saw in this State a disgraceful attitude adopted by a responsible organisation; I refer to the Australian Hotels Association. Mr Dunstan, the President of that association, said he would give us a New Year present by increasing the price of beer. In February, 1974, the Swan Brewery made an application to the Prices Justification Tribunal to increase the wholesale price of beer in this State. Almost in the same week the Australian Hotels Association increased the price of a 7-ounce glass of beer by 2c to 20c.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Do you realise we are losing business in this State because the hotels are not making a profit comparable with that made by hotels elsewhere in the world?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: In May of the same year, on the eve of the decision in regard to the application made in February, the Australian Hotels Association increased the price of a middy by another 2c, taking it to 22c, or an increase of 92c a gallon on the pre-February price. The Swan Brewery, in its application to the tribunal, was subsequently granted an increase of 5.6c a gallon. That went by unnoticed and uncriticised. When I asked

that an inquiry be held into the matter, the Minister representing the Minister for Consumer Affairs assured me an inquiry would be held, and when I asked a second question in regard to the matter Mr MacKinnon indicated to me that the inquiry would be completed at the end of that week. My second question was asked six weeks ago, and to the best of my knowledge that inquiry has not yet been completed.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You are behind the times because even Mr Crean and company have recognised that a company must make a profit to survive.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am not criticising the Swan Brewery. The Swan Brewery increased the wholesale price of beer by 5.6c a gallon and the Australian Hotels Association increased its price by 92c a gallon, yet the parties opposite presented the president of that association with a job on the Licensing Court.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You are saying the hotels are not allowed to make a profit.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Even the Federal Government says it is essential to make a profit to survive. If you do not make a profit you go broke.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I want to make a few comments in respect of statements that have been made about the unions.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Jobs for the boys. That crowd of yours are the greatest masters at it. Jobs for the boys but no jobs for anybody else—200 000 out of work.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: This time last year the present Government parties were blaming the State Government for unemployment.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Not total blame, only partial. They aggravated the situation.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You blokes would not be able to make speeches if you did not have that little book.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It has been very handy. I only wish its pages were numbered, like every other book. I want to make a few comments in regard to the Liberal Party's attitude towards "the Federal invasion". The policy states—

The plight of this Government is unenviable. Whatever its wishes, it must bow to the superior authority of the Federal Party.

That refers to the Labor Party when it was in office. It goes on to say—

As the Federal Labor Government advances into Western Australia the State Labor Government must retreat.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. There are far too many interjections and I would be obliged if they were broken down.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I now quote from *The West Australian* of the 4th November. The headline is, "Sinclair: W.A. is not dominant", and the article reads—

The Court-McPharlin government in Western Australia had failed to emerge as a dominant force in Australia, the deputy leader of the Country Party, Mr Sinclair said in Perth yesterday.

The State Government was going to put the Federal boys right. The article continues—

As a result, the position of the States vis-a-vis the Federal Government had worsened, he suggested.

Eastern States observers were disturbed that the WA Government had not been able to penetrate Federal policies and establish a new image of government, he said.

People saw Sir Charles Court more as opposition to Canbarras than as a Premier in his own right.

The WA Government was seen as negative rather than the positive force Sir Charles and Mr McPharlin wanted it to be.

I resume quoting from the Liberal Party's policy—

The basic solution is to put an end to State Labor Government and restore State Liberal leadership that can stand up to Canberra, win back lost ground, and continue the progress of Western Australia on our own terms.

It is interesting to go through this booklet and read the headings—"Stop land price inflation", "Stop the housing prices"—

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Are you sure that is what Mr Sinclair said? You are quoting from a newspaper.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Would the honourable member like me to read it again?

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I know it by heart. Are you sure it is not taken out of context? You would not know.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: He is the honourable member's leader. He should know what his leader said.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: That is what I am telling you.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Read some more from the blue book.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Other headings are "Controlling crime" and "New goals for Education". The Liberal Party has failed to do anything set out in the book. This interests me—

We are seriously concerned about industrial unrest.

The whole community is realising that the tactics now used by the militant left wing unions constitute a form of industrial civil war against our community . . .

Last year, Western Australian workers lost 90,000 days work and 90,000 days' pay because of strikes.

The Liberal Party makes great play of this fact in its policy speech but what has it done in regard to accident prevention in industry? While the Liberal Party was lamenting the fact before the last election that 90 000 days' work and 90 000 days' pay had been lost through strikes in Western Australia, six million days were lost through accidents for which workers' compensation was payable. This is something like five times more than the time lost for strikes. These are the things that the Liberal Party said it would correct and it has not done so. It said—

We will encourage regular, meaningful consultations between unions, employers and Government . . .

In my experience the Government has not made one attempt—

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I suggest you look at the cover. It says, "1974 to 1977", and this happens to be the first year.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The only thing we can give credence to in the book is the statement, "Back to the people".

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You seem to be confused because you say we have failed—

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: We will hear you in a moment.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I bet you would not like an election at the moment.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: We would, and we would get back in.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I will conclude with a reference to the situation pertaining at this time last year when Parliament was winding up, and what the Tonkin Government achieved in its period of office. The wage rates in Government service were superior to any known before. Pensioners were in really good shape—indeed, the whole community felt it had never been in better shape. I speak for the metropolitan area because I know the effect of the country vote on the election.

The Hon. T. Knight: And inflation was roaring upwards.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We had good industrial relations, consultation between unions and Government, and unemploy-

ment was at a low level. We were on the threshold of better things and about to develop a policy which would have carried on our outstanding programme.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Such as the fuel and energy legislation.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We did not bring that in—the member's Government did.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: It was approved by the Tonkin Government.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We did not introduce it into Parliament and bring the State to the verge of industrial chaos.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: It seems extraordinary that you were swept out of office!

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You know what the difference was.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: They know what the difference was but they will not acknowledge it. The majority of the people of Western Australia voted for the Australian Labor Party as they always do.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You went from a one majority to a seven deficit.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The coalition parties could not match the vote of the ALP but despite this they are in Government and we are not.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: It was called a clean sweep.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I will show you the figures later on.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: In view of the hour I will conclude by saying that time and time again we have asked members opposite what the coalition Government has done since the 30th March of this year and we have never been given a satisfactory answer.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You have not asked that question.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We have not been told of one beneficial piece of legislation which has been passed since the Government took office.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You have not put that question to any Minister who can answer it.

The HON. I. G. PRATT (Lower West) [2.24 a.m.]: I rise to comment very briefly on Mr Cooley's criticism of the Government in relation to increased charges. He criticised the Government very strongly and mentioned electricity charges amongst other things. He also said that the attitude of the Government showed the difference between the philosophies of the Government and of the Opposition. He said that the increase in charges was the same for people on low wages as for those on higher wages, thereby implying that

the use of electricity should be charged at different rates. When I asked him to clarify his statement he was either unwilling or unable to do so.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Perhaps he did not hear you.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: He heard most clearly.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: How do you know?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: He said that the President would not let him answer it.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: We always abide by the ruling of the President.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: In implying that there should be a different charge for people on different wages for the use of a commodity like electricity, Mr Cooley has brought in an entirely new concept in the matter of Government charges. I said he would not clarify his statement—

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: He does not have to clarify it.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: —for members of this House and the people of Western Australia. He will have to be careful if the Opposition considers itself to be an alternative Government for this State. I would like to hear Opposition members clarify the position of the Labor Party about this matter. I invite, no, I challenge Mr Cooley—

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You have been listening to Mr Withers; I am sure of it.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: —to issue a Press statement so that the people of Western Australia can understand just what the Labor Party's attitude is in regard to charges for electricity in Western Australia.

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [2.26 a.m.]: We have heard a great deal about a vast number of subjects during this debate tonight. I suppose I should commence with the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition. I am sure in his address the Leader of the Opposition intended to devote his time and attention to one particular topic in the Estimates, but what he was really trying to do was to satisfy his qualms, his own sensitivities, and those of the Labor Party, about the attacks made by this Government and by the people of Australia generally on the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I exposed what you have said in second reading speeches.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: It exposed his own sensitivity, because he went to some length to try to hoodwink this Chamber and its members by saying that in the speeches introducing the Appropriation Bills, the State Government did not

acknowledge the contributions made by the Commonwealth Government. Of course, that is completely and absolutely untrue.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Read out the acknowledgment.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I reminded the Leader of the Opposition that this matter was referred to on pages 8, 9, and 10 of my notes, and on page 12 of the Estimates, and in fact it is contained in the General Revenue Fund document which he had available to him.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Do not confuse what I said. The pages made available to me are not printed in *Hansard*.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I repeat that the Opposition is sensitive about the attacks made on the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I asked you to be honest in your speech about it.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I am being honest; in fact, I am probably being a great deal more honest than is the Leader of the Opposition when he spoke about the speeches made by me and by the Treasurer in another place. Let us look at the Estimates; a printed publication.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I would rather you look at your speech notes which I was criticising.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: My understanding was that the Leader of the Opposition was criticising my speech notes.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That's what I said.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: It is spelt out on pages 8 to 10, and this is the part he read to the House when he said there was deception in my speech.

The Hon. R. Thompson: And there was deception.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I regard the speech as a very objective study of the Estimates on the General Loan Fund.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That might be your point of view.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: It certainly is my point of view and it is a valid one.

The Hon. R. Thompson: If you had written the speech notes they would have been more objective.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: The Leader of the Opposition took exception to the term, "Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority", and he was clearly unwilling to accept that these matters appeared in the Estimates. On page 43 we see an item—"Commonwealth Grants \$5 347 807."

We could go through page after page of this document and see where it spells out the means by which all these estimates are to be financed.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I have every one that I mentioned marked.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Yes, but the Leader of the Opposition did not see the necessity to refer to this during his criticism. He said we were not making an appropriate acknowledgment of the contributions of the Commonwealth Government. Be that as it may, I believe we have every justification for maintaining our criticism, because it is not only our Government which is doing this, as the Leader of the Opposition well knows. Let him ask his colleague, the Premier of South Australia, how he feels about the matter. Let him ask the Premier of Tasmania how he feels.

I could recount to him the attitude of the Attorneys-General of South Australia and Tasmania on the question of a legal assistance scheme. This is a matter of which I have some knowledge. Are those gentlemen satisfied with the way the Commonwealth Government is handling the distribution of funds for that purpose? Indeed, they are not, and they have made that abundantly clear.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I know nothing about that.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Well, I am acquainting the House of the fact. Of course, the criticism is not merely confined to matters of that sort; it is spread over a whole range of activities. We acknowledge that funds are coming from the Commonwealth.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Record funds.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Indeed, they need to be record funds.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The Commonwealth has collected record taxation.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: We listened to yet another attack from Mr Cooley in regard to the charges imposed by this Government. Is he prepared to acknowledge the charges made by the Commonwealth Government on all people, including the low and moderate income earners, by way of income taxation?

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: They discriminate in favour of low income earners.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Mr Cooley can tell that one to the birds; they are the only ones likely to listen to him, and certainly they would be unable to understand him. But the people can.

How many additional thousands of millions of dollars has the Commonwealth Government received from income tax as a result of inflation? How is it spending that additional money? Irresponsibly. If it is not spending the money irresponsibly, why did Mr Whitlam make the statement a few days ago in Queensland that, "Nobody told me"? What do the posters say? They say the Prime Minister is going to

take the reins himself. I could almost use some coarse expressions to describe that. After the two years he has been in office we find ourselves in what has been stated authoritatively as one of the worst economic periods in Australia since the depression of the 1930s.

The Hon. R. Thompson: And in the world.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: All right; I will accept that because the Leader of the Opposition is acknowledging the position in Australia is the same as the world position, if not worse. After two years or more in office the Prime Minister said last week he will take the reins of the economy. What a fine time for him to say that. How appropriate and apt was the cartoon in the Press recently which depicted the Prime Minister sitting in a collapsed bed with everything fallen in ruins about him and saying, "Why didn't somebody tell me?"

Of course, he resorted to tactics to which we are not unaccustomed in this place when he blamed his officers. He blamed his Treasury officers and said they did not tell him the danger signs were there. Who is the Prime Minister? Who is the Treasurer? Who is supposed to be running the country?

That reminds me again of something Mr Cooley said. He said when the Tonkin Government left office before the 30th March it did so with a tremendous record of welfare services and consultations with the unions. We know about the consultations! On how many occasions were Ministers of the previous Government called to Trades Hall to answer for their stand in this Parliament? On how many occasions have members of Parliament been called upon to answer to the unions?

On how many occasions has the President of the Trades and Labor Council in this House resorted to the familiar practice of speaking for the unions? It has been aptly stated by Mr MacKinnon on at least two occasions that Mr Cooley is still representing the unions, and is not acting as a member of Parliament at all. The discussions between the previous Government and the unions were really directions from the unions, and everyone knows that.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You have a great imagination.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: As the matter of fuel and energy was raised, perhaps Mr Cooley will recall that during the debate in this House the statement was made that it was the previous Government which authorised the drafting of the fuel and energy Bill. I will not concern myself with that argument at the moment. However, it was claimed by members opposite that the previous Government would not have introduced the Bill. The answer to that

claim came by way of interjection from Mr Cooley. As I recall it he said the Bill would not have got past the Caucus. So who was running the previous Government?

The Hon. R. Thompson: Caucus.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Who runs Caucus?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Did we or did we not have a Government? Of course, it is no different in the Federal Parliament. How many embarrassing budgetary situations has the Federal Government been placed in as a result of Caucus reversing a decision, disagreeing to a provision, or directing an amendment?

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Thank God it did, too.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Maybe so. I am one of the old-fashioned kind in this Parliament. I have always been led to believe that when a Government announces and introduces budgetary items it is a vote of no confidence in the Government if those items are altered by one jot, and it must resign. But that is not so with the sort of Government we have in Canberra. It can play around with this.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: You are not telling us anything new in respect of Caucus.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Those rules went out the window years ago.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: If they ever existed.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: They went out the window like every other rule. I cannot help but make reference once again to Mr Cooley. He had the temerity tonight to use the expression "jobs for the boys". Can members believe his remarks after what our splendid Federal Government has done in regard to "jobs for the boys"? Let us talk about Al, and let us talk about 50 or 100 others who have received their share. I take the strongest exception—and I say that deliberately—to the reference made to the appointment of Mr Arthur Dunstan to the Licensing Court. There is absolutely no substance whatever in the accusation made.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You are saying that.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Indeed, as the responsible Minister, I am saying that. Once again, I say what temerity, what darn cheek, has Mr Cooley to refer to "jobs for the boys" in respect of the appointment of Mr Dunstan after the recent appointments to, and the management of, the Licensing Court by the previous Government. Right; let members opposite say something now.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: The court has the best chairman it has ever had.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You are joking.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Have members on that side of the House never used that expression?

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: The chairman is costing the public millions of dollars.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: If Mr Cooley wants to talk about the Licensing Court I am prepared to do so; and I know you, Mr President, would be prepared to talk about it in another situation. Let us talk about the removal from office of Mr Herb Robinson, for instance. Let us talk about other appointments to the Licensing Court.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: What about talking about the appointment of Mr Watts?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Yes, we could talk about his appointment.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: One of the best chairmen ever to be appointed to a Licensing Court.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Mr Dunstan's appointment will take effect from the 1st January. He is a person with a lifetime experience in the hotel trade, 10 years as President of the AHA in Western Australia and the first and only national president from Western Australia of the AHA. Yet Mr Cooley would try to denigrate him in that fashion and says, "Jobs for the boys".

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Disgraceful!

The Hon. N. McNEILL: It is disgraceful.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Shame!

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Indeed it is.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I feel very sad about it.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I can see that Mr Cooley does feel sad. We have heard him interject so many times before with that same cynicism.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: He does not care about the public.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Of course he does not. But it comes very facily to him to criticise the AHA for the increase in beer prices.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You could not justify that.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I have no intention of trying to justify it; I do not have to. What I am saying is that Mr Cooley likes to make his criticism in this House about that situation. Of course, he attributes it to the Swan Brewery, which increased its prices by only 5.6 per cent. What does Mr Cooley think contributes to the cost of beer served over the counter in an hotel?

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: There is a big difference between 5c and 92c a gallon.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: This is a further example of the lack of knowledge of economic management of members opposite which, apparently, is shared by everyone in the party, from the Prime Minister down.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I think I would know a little more about the brewing industry than you would.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Perhaps Mr Cooley would know something about the brewing industry. Perhaps he knows more than I do about a great many other industries; perhaps he knows more than I do about everything. I am not prepared to argue with him on that. But I am not without a little experience; and, for that matter, I am not without a little experience in the hotel industry. Probably, I have a darned sight more experience than Mr Cooley; however, I am not making a claim on that.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: There was a rakeoff and you know it.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Let me pass to the comments of Mr Claughton, who rose to make a couple of observations. The first thing to which he referred, of course, was loans. In effect, he said, "I suppose it is to the credit of the State Government that it has copied the example of the Federal Government and indicated its intention to borrow money overseas." What a giggle! This is a further display of the tremendous economic knowledge of members opposite.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: What is your statement supposed to show?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I will tell the honourable member. The comment was made in this speech by the Treasurer, quite obviously prior to the Federal Government's statement of its intention to borrow money overseas; that is the first point. In fact, we expressed the possibility as nothing of great advantage or some superior achievement. We said it with regret and sadness, and why? It was because as I indicated when I spoke on an earlier Bill in relation to raising funds from public authorities, the funds are not available in Australia for loan raising purposes. We believe that in order to raise the sorts of funds we will have to resort to overseas borrowing. What a sad thought that is.

Who was I to believe that the same view would also be shared by the Commonwealth Government, with all the financial resources available to it? It has said, "Because of the lack of capital inflow we may find it necessary to go overseas for borrowing". What a shocker! The lack of capital inflow has been created by its own policies. We are to be a mendicant country! We have to go and borrow overseas.

I know in the past we have borrowed overseas. I can recall the instance not many years after the war when we were tremendously elated that we were able to secure a loan from the World Bank. That was a tremendous achievement, but why? It was because we had a security value in Australia that could sustain us in an argument for badly needed funds from the World Bank for capital development in Australia. But this was a long time ago.

In recent years, we have seen the tremendous capital inflow in this country, a tremendous overseas balance situation and the strong balance of trade enjoyed by this country, as well as the great resources development going on in this country which has been able to provide a tremendous amount of internal funds for our own internal borrowings shattered in a matter of a couple of years in what must be one of the most tragic two-year periods in our history.

Well do I recall not long ago the Leader of the Opposition saying in this House that the Whitlam Government was the most virile Federal Government we have ever had. Boy, were they virile! They certainly got on with the job; that Government has been effective in destroying and absolutely shattering the economic fabric of this country. Yet members opposite dare to argue in this House on a piece of legislation like our Appropriation Bill!

I repeat: What an incredible thing for Mr Claughton to make an observation about, as though the Federal Government ought to claim credit for announcing its intention to borrow overseas. What a shocker! If this is another example of the sort of lack of understanding members opposite have, is it any wonder that this country is in the mess it is in today?

In the absence of the Minister for Education, Mr Claughton referred to an item in the Estimates of some \$250 000, set aside in 1974-75 for pre-primary centres. We really cannot win! It was only the other day that we were debating the Road Traffic Bill in this House. A tremendous amount of time was wasted by the Leader of the Opposition and others in discussing the fact that they could not find in the Estimates a provision for this authority which is part of our policy and for which we were legislating.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I said there was \$700 000.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Oh, yes, the Leader of the Opposition eventually found only \$70 000.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I said, "From memory". Do not get nasty and tell lies.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I was not quite sure of the last word.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I said, "Do not get nasty and tell lies." I said from memory that I thought it was \$70 000.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I am not likely to tell a lie in this House, Mr President, and I take the strongest exception to the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition that I might tell a lie. I am not a person who uses that expression in this House; I am certainly not one to resort to those sort of tactics.

However, let us return to the point; there was a great deal of controversy because there appeared to be no provision for the authority in the Estimates. As Mr Lewis observed after Mr Claughton made his statement, it has been explained in this House three times. It was only last night—24 hours ago—that the Minister for Education explained the pre-primary centres. There are to be six pilot pre-primary centres established.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: At a cost of \$250 000?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I do not care what it will cost; this allocation is contained in the Estimates. I believe the Minister for Education stated that these centres will be available by the 1st February, 1975. If we did not make any provision in the Estimates for these centres, what would Mr Claughton have said then? He would have gone through the Estimates with a fine tooth comb and said, "I do not see any provision for pre-primary centres."

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: How many centres will be established with this money?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You have been told; it will build six centres.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: A sum of \$250 000?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Yes, and we will have some change left over.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: All I can say is that probably it is a violent exercise on the part of members of the Opposition, but it is most unconvincing and, in fact, it is so unconvincing I do not think they have been able to convince themselves. I do not think they even expect to convince themselves, but probably it is an exercise they had to go through.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Of course the \$250 000 comes from the Australian Government.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: It is money that comes from the Australian taxpayers, as we all know. The Commonwealth Government merely happens to be one of the machinery measures through which that money is collected and distributed.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: I am glad to hear the Minister is learning.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I am learning, all right. I am learning some simple things tonight, even, if I took notice of the statements made by members of the Opposition.

Let me return to the point I was making that the Commonwealth Government is handling this money only as an agent for the Australian people. That is the true position.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: That has been so since 1952.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Despite all that has been said during this debate it is clear that nobody is prepared to indicate his opposition to this Bill, and I commend it to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice), and passed.

BILLS (3): ASSEMBLY'S MESSAGES

1. Machinery Safety Bill.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendment made by the Council.

2. Skeleton Weed (Eradication Fund) Bill.

3. Shearers' Accommodation Act Amendment Bill.

Messages from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendments made by the Council.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [2.56 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill does not seek to give effect to any major change in policy but rather to overcome several deficiencies and anomalies in dealing with the administration of the marketing of agricultural products, particularly in respect of fruit and eggs.

Increased emphasis is being placed by the fruit industry on the need to stabilise the local fruit market. This is markedly so in respect of apples due to the continued decline of the export market with consequent pressure of supplies on the local market. As a result, stricter policing against the sale of inferior fruit may be necessary.

There is no provision for the appointment of inspectors under the Act and this Bill provides for such appointments. Recourse has been necessary, in the past, to

their appointment under the Plant Diseases Act, which is quite inappropriate, particularly in the matter of appointment of officers for the inspection of products such as eggs, wool, etc.

Most inspections carried out under the Agricultural Products Act relate to the marketing of fruit particularly since the establishment of the various fruit sales committees; namely, the Apple and Pear Sales Advisory Committee, the Citrus Sales Advisory Committee and the Stone Fruit Sales Advisory Committee. These committees were set up as a result of the report of the Royal Commission on Apple Growing in 1962 which recommended the setting up of committees to advise on the prescribed grades and sizes of fruit which should be marketed. This legislation was enacted for a limited term to enable the industry to assess its value in improving the marketing of fruit and was subsequently endorsed as a permanent Statute after an experimental period in the industry. It has continued to receive the full support of the fruit industry.

Fruitgrowers are particularly concerned about the plight of the apple industry as a result of the loss of traditional export markets. Their attention is therefore being directed more to maintaining the stability of the local market threatened, as I have mentioned, by increasing pressure of supply.

The marketing of fruit is dealt with under both the Agricultural Products Act and the Fruit Cases Act, the two Acts being required to be read in conjunction. It has become apparent that several deficiencies can be corrected by amendment of definitions and wording in the principal Act now to be amended to conform with the Fruit Cases Act.

Eggs are required to be marked individually as prescribed under the egg grading regulations. However the Act provides only for the marketing of packages or lots of products as distinct from the product itself. The inclusion of the word "marked" under section 3 (1) (b) overcomes this anomaly.

It is hoped that the proposed amendments may help in policing the measures which may need to be taken to assist in stabilising the local market. The provisions have been discussed with and have the support of the fruitgrowers' executive.

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

LOAN BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 26th November.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [3.00 a.m.]: This is the second of the Bills that deal with the finances of the State.

The Bill makes provision for the raising of \$60.45 million for the purposes listed in the schedule.

At this late hour I shall not speak at any great length. In speaking to another Bill Mr Baxter levelled a criticism regarding money which flowed forth from time to time for the construction of buildings, particularly hospitals. We can agree with such criticism that arises under the system adopted by the State Government.

Money is made available under the Loan Bill usually at the end of the year just before Christmas. After it is passed plans and specifications have to be drawn up, and tenders let.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Plans for the proposed works have already been drawn up.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: After the tenders have been let the construction commences. From time to time certain departments would rather use the money available on other projects, and that is how the Government can be put out of gear.

This is the system under which the Government works, and as a Minister I did not like it. Anyone who is involved in the system is stuck with it; it is difficult to effect a change. No improvement will eventuate until we can introduce a system to pass the Estimates earlier in the financial year.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: It is pretty grim when Estimates and finance Bills are passed near the end of the year.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: This is not a good method for the Government to adopt. Even though provision is made for carrying over of unspent money to the next year, the system still leaves much to be desired. This Bill deals with the expenditure for extensions to the Longmore institution which were to be effected last year, but because of the system those extensions were not started.

The Department for Community Welfare acquired a property in Marine Parade, Geraldton, but because of the system the work cannot be carried out under this year's Estimates.

It is amusing to see the works for which money is borrowed through the Loan Council—works such as those to be undertaken by the Metropolitan Water Board which has been allocated \$15 million of loan funds. The next is the State Electricity Commission which has been allocated \$5 million and the Coastal Shipping Commission has been allocated \$500 000.

Recently the Government imposed a levy of 3 per cent on the gross revenue of these three instrumentalities, and now they have to borrow money for certain works for which they have to pay a high rate of interest.

I could go through the schedule to the Bill, but that would not achieve anything. It is essential to obtain this money to enable the works programmes to be implemented. The loans have been approved by the Loan Council, and on this occasion the amount is \$700 million for Australia as a whole, of which Western Australia is to receive \$60.45 million.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Not half enough.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I agree it is not half enough. No Government will ever agree that it has enough money. It might be a bad thing if Governments got all the money they wanted, because they might become careless in their expenditure. However for essential projects, such as projects for education and health, funds should be provided. With those remarks I support the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice), and passed.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [3.09 a.m.]: I move—
That the House do now adjourn.

THE HON. A. A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [3.10 a.m.]: I shall make the shortest speech on the adjournment debate on record. Because through my own fault I did not get certain petitioners to sign duplicate copies of a petition for the transfer of the Bridgetown railway depot which was tabled in another place today, I urge members to read and digest that petition.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 3.11 a.m. (Thursday).

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 27th November, 1974

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

NICKEL (AGNEW) AGREEMENT BILL

Message: Appropriations

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

RAILWAYS

Closure of Bridgetown Depot: Petition

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [2.17 p.m.]: I have a petition which is addressed as follows—

To the Honourable Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned residents of the Bridgetown district in the State of Western Australia do herewith pray that Her Majesty's Government of Western Australia will oppose any closure or removal of the Railway Depot at Bridgetown.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Honourable House will give this matter urgent consideration and your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

The petition contains 1 107 signatures and I certify it conforms to the rules of the House.

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

The petition was tabled (see paper No. 399).

WATER SUPPLIES

Rates at Denham: Petition

MR LAURANCE (Gascoyne) [2.19 p.m.]: I have a petition which is addressed as follows—

To the Honourable Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned residents in the town of Denham do herewith pray that Her Majesty's Government of Western Australia will review the recent increases in water rates and charges as they apply to Denham in view of the poor quality water supplied to the Town. Your petitioners feel that the increases are unjustified until such time as the proposed Reverse Osmosis Desalination plant is installed to provide a satisfactory Potable Water Supply.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Honourable House will give this matter urgent consideration and your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

The petition contains 60 signatures and I certify it conforms to the rules of the House.

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

The petition was tabled (see paper No. 400).