

If the Government is concerned about the flexibility of the panel, I can only repeat what I said when I commenced to speak; that is, we are not interfering with the flexibility. We merely desire that four people should be on the panel instead of two, with the Government still retaining the right to appoint anyone else it desires.

I am not quite so concerned about the inclusion of a person recommended by the Western Australian Council of Social Service. Such a member would probably be a lay person and I am not always in favour of the efforts of such people because mostly they have not had any particular training.

I want to point out for the last time that we are not interfering with the flexibility of the panel. We want at least a member of the medical profession appointed and, under the amendment, a representative of the WACSS. The Minister is still in a position to appoint any other person he desires.

Progress

Progress reported and leave given to sit again, on motion by Mr Clarke.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Acting Premier) [5.59 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 5th October, at 4.30 p.m.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 6.00 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 5th October, 1976

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

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

Tabling

THE PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith): Honourable members, I desire to lay upon the Table of the House the Auditor-General's report for the year ended the 30th June, 1976.

The report was tabled (see paper No. 362).

QUESTIONS (7): ON NOTICE

1. TRANSPORT

Road Vehicle Limits Study

The Hon. R. Thompson for the Hon. H. W. GAYFER, to the Minister for Health, representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has the study by the National Association of Australian State Road Authorities into the economics of road vehicle limits

throughout Australia, been completed?

- (2) If so, when are the results of this study likely to be released?
- (3) If not, at what stage is the study, and what is the programming for completion?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The summary of recommendations was released in the Study Team Report R3 of October, 1975, and may be obtained through the Parliamentary Library.
- (3) See answer to (1).

2.

HEALTH

Hairdressers' Salons

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

- (1) Is an inquiry being conducted into the health aspects of hairdressers' salons?
- (2) Has such a report been finalised?
- (3) If so, is the Minister recommending any changes to legislation or regulations for the industry?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Health aspects of hairdressers salons were investigated conjointly with Industry 1971-1972 period. Model Health By-laws were subsequently amended and changed to Hairdressers Establishment Regulations 10th November, 1972.
- (3) Not applicable.

3.

RAILWAYS

Perishables: Cartage

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Minister for Health, representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that a placard in the main street of Gnowangerup indicated to customers a shortage of certain fruit and vegetables due to the railways mislaying a consignment?
- (2) Do such inconveniences often occur?
- (3) Is any compensation paid in such cases?
- (4) Is the consignee expected to pay the cost of locating lost goods?
- (5) What conditions are laid down concerning the ability of a green-grocer to cart his own fruit and vegetables in regard to—
 - (a) types;
 - (b) weight; and
 - (c) frequency of trips?

- (6) What alternatives do Westrail offer for the consignment of perishables to Gnowangerup?
- (7) Is the Government considering changing the present restrictions in the future?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) No.
- (3) Yes. A claim for the value of the goods not received should be lodged with Westrail.
- (4) No.
- (5) Under the Transport Commission Act there are two different licences on issue for the carriage of fruit and vegetables. Details of these licences and conditions regarding the cartage are as follows:—

- (1) (a) Types: Beans, beetroot, brussel sprouts, cabbage, capsicums, cauliflower, celery, cucumber, fresh fruit, lemons, lettuce, mint, parsley, peas, pineapple, rhubarb, spring onions, tomatoes.

- (b) Weight: Unlimited.

- (c) Frequency of trips: Unlimited.

- (2) (a) Types: All fruit and vegetables.

- (b) Weight: 500 kilograms.

- (c) Frequency of trips: Unlimited.

- (6) Westrail offers a twice per week overnight service for perishables to Gnowangerup.

Acceptance days at Kewdale are Mondays and Wednesdays with closure at 1.30 p.m. Transit is per piggy-back truck on overnight freighter train to Katanning—thence by road to Gnowangerup arriving 8.45 a.m. Tuesdays and Thursdays.

- (7) Any further changes regarding the carriage of fruit and vegetables will be considered in light of the present Southern Western Australia Transport Study.

4.

POLICE

South Hedland

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

- (1) What is the police force staff establishment at South Hedland?
- (2) How many officers are currently on duty at South Hedland?
- (3) What is the area currently served by the South Hedland police station?
- (4) What is the population within this area?

- (5) Is it the intention of the Government to increase the staff at this station?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) 1 sergeant, 2 constables.
- (2) 1 sergeant, 1 constable. One constable at present on annual leave from September 6 to October 10, 1976.
- (3) Approximately 80 square miles.
- (4) Approximately 7 000.
- (5) Consideration will be given in conjunction with the requirements throughout the remainder of the State when the current Academy Training Course graduates on November 26, 1976.

5.

BUILDING BLOCKS

Bremer Bay

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Minister for Health, representing the Minister for Lands:

- (1) How many residential blocks in Bremer Bay have been thrown open by the Lands Department in recent years?
- (2) On what dates were these auctions held?
- (3) What prices did they realise?
- (4) Have amenities been provided in Bremer Bay since the last blocks were sold?
- (5) When is the next allocation expected to be auctioned?
- (6) How many will be provided?
- (7) Will consideration be given to ensure that some of the purchases will be from people wishing to live full-time in the area, rather than hold the land for casual holiday purposes?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) 26 lots since 1st January, 1973.
- (2) 24th March, 1973, and 21st August, 1976.
- (3) Auction 24/3/73:

Lot	Price realised
48	\$810.
49	\$850.
53	\$800.
55	\$850.
56	\$825.
57	\$840.
59	\$875.
60	\$800.
66	\$675.
69	\$750.
70	\$625.

Auction 21/8/76:

Lot	Price realised
39	\$1 825.
40	\$1 150.
41	\$2 575.
42	\$2 650.
66	\$1 925.
97	\$2 050.
98	\$2 000.
100	\$1 775.
101	\$1 675.
102	\$1 800.
103	\$1 825.
125	\$2 250.
126	\$2 325.
127	\$2 300.
128	\$2 325.

- (4) None by Lands Department.
 (5) and (6) Not known. The Lands Department is currently considering the preparation of a design of subdivision over vacant Crown land to provide further residential lots in this townsite.
 (7) No. The Land Act precludes such discrimination.

6. HEALTH CENTRES

Construction Costs

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

- (1) Would the Minister provide the information as requested for each of the following health centres—
 (a) Geraldton Regional Health Centre—the contract price;
 (b) South Hedland Health Centre—the contract price;
 (c) Teaching Health Centre, Claremont—the estimated cost of construction; and
 (d) Lockridge Health Centre—the price at which the contract was finalised?
 (2) What were the Australian Government grants for each of the above centres?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) (a) Geraldton Regional Community Health Centre—
 Contract price \$1 129 782 and subject to consultants' fees, Departmental charges and rise and fall clause.
 (b) South Hedland Community Health Centre—
 Contract price \$1 125 580 and subject to consultants' fees, Departmental charges and rise and fall clause.
 (c) Teaching Health Centre, Claremont—
 Estimated cost of construction \$1 200 000 and subject to consultants' fees, Departmental charges and rise and fall clause.

(d) Lockridge Community Health Centre—

These premises are being leased from the State Housing Commission.

- (2) The Commonwealth Government grants to (a), (b) and (c) are based on 75% of the capital cost. The Commonwealth Government grant to the Lockridge Community Health Centre to cover lease is 90% of costs.

7. CAPE LE GRANDE NATIONAL PARK

Dieback Disease

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Minister for Health, representing the Minister for Forests:

- (1) Has die-back been found to exist in the Cape le Grande National Park?
 (2) What flora is affected to date?
 (3) Is it expected to spread to other indigenous flora in that area?
 (4) What introduced species found in domestic gardens and tree-breaks could be affected by this disease?
 (5) Will this park be placed under quarantine in a similar manner to sections of the State Forests?
 (6) If not, what precautions does the Government intend taking to stop or control the spread of this disease?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) Yes.
 (2) Species of *Banksia*, *Dryandra*, *Blackboys* and *Zamia* Palms. Other plant types may also be affected but they have not been identified.
 (3) No. All species likely to be affected will probably already be involved.
 (4) Many introduced, as well as indigenous, species can be host to *Phytophthora cinnamomi*. The Department of National Development, Forestry and Timber Bureau (now the CSIRO Division of Forest Research) published a technical paper in 1969 by J. F. Titze and C. R. Falzer listing some 700 species of host plants. A copy of this publication is available for perusal at the Forests Department head office library.
 (5) and (6) No, but a programme of control of vehicles, hygiene in road maintenance plus advice to the public via the Press and signboards will be instituted to try to inhibit the spread of the disease within the park.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE**IRRIGATION****Dunham River Agreement: Lease Acquisition**

The Hon. J. C. TOZER, to the Minister for Health, representing the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Has the Dunham River pastoral lease in the East Kimberley been transferred to the Aboriginal Lands Trust?
- (2) What financial consideration was associated with this transfer from the name of Goddard of Australia Pty. Ltd. to the trust?
- (3) Is the 34 000 acres which was to be the area developed under stage 2 of the Irrigation (Dunham River) Agreement excluded from such pastoral lease? In other words, is this land still automatically available for agricultural development as and when required or will it be necessary to resume it from the Aboriginal Lands Trust if it is required for agricultural purposes at some future time?
- (4) Are there any insurmountable problems associated with the resumption of pastoral land if it is held by the Aboriginal Lands Trust should it become a requirement for the advancement of an agricultural project?
- (5) Will farms 2, 9, and 10 in stage 1 of the Dunham project become part of the Dunham River pastoral lease held by the Aboriginal Lands Trust when they revert to Crown land as provided for in current legislation?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

I thank the honourable member for providing notice of this question to the Minister for Lands this morning so that he could let me have the following answers—

- (1) Yes.
- (2) \$170 000.
- (3) The 34 000 acres referred to still form part of Dunham River pastoral lease and would have to be resumed if required for agricultural development.
- (4) No.
- (5) No.

BILLS (2): ASSEMBLY'S MESSAGES

Messages from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendment made by the Council to the following Bills—

1. Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).
2. Racecourse Development Bill.

MINING**State Batteries: Correction of Answer**

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) [4.47 p.m.]: Mr President, I desire to make a statement regarding information supplied in an answer to a question.

The **PRESIDENT**: The question is that leave be granted.

Question put and passed; leave granted.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Through you, Sir, I thank the House. In my reply to question 4 on the 21st September, 1976, dealing with State batteries, I gave the House inaccurate information which I now wish to correct. The answer to part (1) should read "16" in lieu of "15". In answer (2) and (3), after "Yarri . . . 5" add the passage, "Sandstone . . . 5".

I apologise to the House for the error, which was due to an oversight.

LAW REFORM COMMISSION REPORT**Tabling: Ministerial Statement**

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Attorney-General) [4.49 p.m.]: Mr President, I seek leave of the House to make a ministerial statement concerning the tabling of a report.

The **PRESIDENT**: The question is that leave be granted.

Question put and passed; leave granted.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: The report of the Law Reform Commission which I have tabled today is the most detailed and wide-ranging account of the commission's work produced since its inception in 1973.

At a recent meeting with the commission and its executive officer I asked them to re-arrange the order of priority of the 32 projects currently before them to bring forward the completion of their reports on several matters of particular concern. These included the review of the matter of bail, consideration of the need to establish a small debts court and the subject of appeals from administrative tribunals.

I told the commissioners I would refer to them only matters on which I believed the Government would be willing to consider legislating.

Some Governments have been known to use such commissions as a kind of 'too hard' basket for controversial issues and to refer these issues simply as a means of putting off legislative action.

However, this in my view is a wrongful use of a law reform commission, wasteful of the taxpayers' money and the commissioners' time.

This annual report shows that by the 30th June this year 64 projects had been referred to the Law Reform Commission of Western Australia and its predecessor, the Law Reform Committee, since the committee's formation in 1967, although two projects were withdrawn in that time.

Although it is not in this report, I take this opportunity to inform the Parliament that three more projects have been referred to the commission since the 30th June.

The committee and the commission have produced 39 working papers since 1967 and invited public and professional comment upon those papers before preparing final reports for submission to the Attorney-General and to Parliament. As at the 30th June this year, reports had been completed on 38 projects. In three cases the commission recommended that no change be made to existing law. Legislation based on 12 of the other reports had been put to the Parliament by the 30th June this year.

I would remind the Council that in the months since then the Government has introduced legislation based on several other Law Reform Commission reports, including criminal injuries compensation and the presentation of medical and technical evidence in court proceedings.

More legislation based on commission reports, including changes to the rules for distribution of intestate estates, will be put before Parliament in this session.

I think it is appropriate for me to add that the Government has recently legislated on several other matters in the field of law reform, without reference to the commission.

For instance, we acted expeditiously to close the gap in the right of appeal which was brought to light by the Pitzer case in July.

The amendments introduced to change the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, District Court and Local Courts is another example.

In conclusion I should like to commend to members the importance of the work of the Law Reform Commission and its staff. The commission occupies an important role as the adviser to Governments and has in its few short years of existence fully justified the confidence of members who approved its formation and establishment. Particularly, I would like to refer to the fact that you, Mr President, when Minister for Justice in the Brand Government, made the first official recommendation for the formation of the Law Reform Committee, as it then was. You must indeed be pleased with the results of the decision then taken and I do not doubt that the State has a great deal to gain from a continuance of the commission's research and industry.

BILLS(2): THIRD READING

1. Western Australian Meat Industry Authority Bill.

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

2. Child Welfare Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. N. E. Baxter (Minister for Community Welfare), and passed.

PSYCHOLOGISTS REGISTRATION BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central—Minister for Health) [4.54 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill is concerned with the identification and regulation of persons who may hold themselves out to members of the community as experts in the knowledge and practice of psychology; and who may seek to offer services to the public on the basis of such expertise under the title of "psychologist".

The Bill does not set out to be a psychologists' practices Act; that is, it does not attempt to define a range of services that psychologists may uniquely be expected to perform to the exclusion of other members of the community. It recognises that many persons who in no way would claim to be psychologists, have legitimate functions and services to perform which are, or include elements, of a psychological nature. Obvious examples are to be found in various duties undertaken by doctors, teachers and ministers of religion. Less obvious perhaps, but no less legitimate, are the supports which one friend gives another in time of emotional crisis, or the prospective employer who seeks to assess the character of the prospective employee.

With this in mind, no attempt has been made to seek a form of legislation which lays down exclusive functions for the psychologist alone. Indeed to seek to do so would be a formidable if not fruitless and impossible task.

Hence the emphasis in this Bill is to seek to protect the public by ensuring that any person who wishes to hold himself out to be a professional psychologist shall have acquired at least the minimum standard of knowledge, training, and experience as set out in the Bill, and will be registered by the Psychologists' Registration Board and so become accountable to the board for his professional conduct.

As registered medical practitioners, ministers of religion and certain teachers may also lay claim to certain psychological expertise, it is necessary to provide certain

exemptions for them under the Act. Registered medical practitioners are, in the ordinary course of medical practice, exempt from the provisions of the Act. Ministers of religion are also exempt except from those sections of the Act which relate to the practice of hypnotism and the professional practice of psychology as such. Teachers of prescribed educational institutions may also be exempt under conditions laid down by the Psychologists' Registration Board.

Exemptions are also extended to students or persons working under the supervision of a registered psychologist under conditions stipulated by the board. The Minister for Health may also, on the recommendation of the board, grant additional exemptions as may be deemed compatible with the public interest.

The Psychologists' Registration Board will have direct responsibility to the Minister. It will be financially autonomous and may appoint a registrar and other officers as may be necessary to conduct the business of the board. It will be composed of five members, of whom three shall be psychologists, one a psychiatrist and the fifth a legal practitioner. The appointment of a legal practitioner is not mandatory, however, as the State experiences some difficulty in finding legal practitioners who are willing to serve on statutory bodies.

Consequently the Bill allows the appointment of some other fifth person. Each member of the board shall have a deputy of like interest who may stand in, in the absence of the member. The board shall have power to co-opt members and to form such committees as it may deem necessary.

The board shall have rights and powers as are considered essential in the performance of its proper functions. These include the authority to register persons whose qualifications are acceptable under the Act; to investigate complaints and alleged offences; to impose the penalties prescribed under the Act when the board satisfies itself that a breach has been incurred; to make rules subject to the approval of the Governor, for the regulation of the practice of registered psychologists; to keep adequate records and to enter into reciprocal arrangements with similar recognised bodies outside the State.

Provisions are included so that appeals may be determined by the Supreme Court against a decision of the board.

The board is accountable to the Minister at all times and shall prepare a report of its operations annually for presentation to Parliament.

The board will have power to conduct examinations in psychology for persons who are seeking to register as psychologists under the Act, and if satisfied may register such persons.

During the first year following proclamation of the Act, registration may be granted to persons who may not have an approved educational qualification but who are able to satisfy the board that they have relevant practical experience, knowledge and skill in psychology and have practised as psychologists for a period of not less than two years. Members of the Australian Psychological Society who have held membership for 12 months or more may also be eligible for registration. This in effect, provides a "grandfather" clause to the Bill.

After a lapse of one year from date of proclamation the board may register only those candidates who meet the examination requirements of the board or hold approved qualifications covering four years of full academic training or its part-time equivalent.

In addition, two years of approved practical experience in the practice of psychology is also required. These standards have been taken from the standards of the Australian Psychological Society, which is the professional society of psychologists within Australia at the present time. The society holds that four years' approved training plus two years' approved experience is essential for basic professional training in Australia today and it sets these standards for full membership of the society.

In order that persons with the approved academic qualifications but without approved experience may gain such experience, a form of provisional registration has been included whereby that experience may be gained under conditions which the board considers appropriate.

Provision also exists for the temporary registration of persons who may not be able to furnish immediate proof of qualifications and experience, but where there is no reason to doubt that such proof will be forthcoming in due course and where delay in registration would cause hardship. Visiting persons of eminence may be given honorary temporary registration.

In addition to the functions of registering and regulating the practices of registered psychologists, the board is charged with the responsibility of administering a section concerned with offences relating to the practice of hypnosis.

This section has been included because of the evidence that has accumulated on the possible harmful effects of hypnosis when employed by persons who are inadequately trained and experienced.

The Bill places no restrictions on the practice of hypnosis by registered medical practitioners, dentists, and psychologists

in the ordinary course of their professional practice. Any other person who seeks to practise hypnosis however is required to obtain a licence from the board as a "prescribed person" under the Act.

Persons eligible to apply for licences as "prescribed persons", are to include those who, for a period of not less than two years immediately preceding the date of the Act, can show to the satisfaction of the board that they have derived their income principally from the practice of hypnosis. The board is also authorised to license the practice of hypnosis by other persons whom the board may consider eligible to practise, subject to such conditions as the board sees fit to impose.

It may well be asked why a Bill for the registration of psychologists should include a section which restricts the practice of hypnosis.

The reasons for this are, firstly, that there is a need to provide a form of protection to members of the community through the regulation of hypnotic practices; secondly, to set up a separate Act and board for this single purpose would be unduly extravagant; thirdly, hypnotism is one subject matter included in the traditional study of psychology and a psychologists' registration board is well equipped to deal with such matters; and fourthly, it is to be noted that the three States of Australia which have so far registered psychologists—that is Victoria in 1965, South Australia in 1974, and this year Tasmania—have seen fit to include sections for the control of the practice of hypnosis in their legislation in much the same manner as it is included here. It is to be noted that the Bill provides for the making of such regulations as the Governor may consider necessary or desirable for the proper administration of the Act.

Finally, and by way of summary this Bill is not held out as an answer to charlatanism or quackery. Such practices have always existed and will continue to exist under various guises and titles. The Bill will however preclude the use of the title "psychologist" by persons who seek to assume it without adequate training and supervised experience.

This Bill offers the public assurances that persons who henceforth hold themselves out to be registered psychologists will have had an intensive preparation in recognised training institutions where their knowledge and skill has been subject to examination and appraisal and has been found to be adequate. In addition the public are assured that registered psychologists are accountable through a board which will regulate in the public interest by providing penalties for contravention of the Act and regulations.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. Grace Vaughan.

CRIMINAL INJURIES (COMPENSATION) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Order of the Day read for the resumption of the debate from the 22nd September.

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. I. G. Medcalf (Attorney-General), and passed.

BETTING CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 22nd September.

THE HON. S. J. DELLAR (Lower North) [5.07 p.m.]: The Bill seeks to make two amendments to the Act. Personally I think the most important one is to allow for on-course bookmakers to operate at greyhound race meetings throughout the State. Of course at the moment we have only one track established, but I am sure that with the introduction of the Bill other clubs will be encouraged to introduce this sport into their own areas.

The second provision concerns the restructuring of the board. In the past the functions were taken over by the TAB, the main aim at that time being to abolish the then available off-course bookmaking facilities, and have betting under the control of the TAB. The TAB also had other functions dealing with the licensing of bookmakers, and so on. However, under the Bill before us these functions will be the work of a board similar to the Betting Control Board we had previously and it will deal with the licensing of bookmakers, with disputes, and with other matters.

It is important to note that when the legislation to allow greyhound racing was introduced into the State by Mr Stubbs, who was then Minister for Local Government and the Chief Secretary, no provision was made for on-course bookmakers. It was felt that the on-course TAB facilities would cater for the needs of the public. In my short and brief association with the industry—including attendance

at a few meetings in the Eastern States—I learned that unless on-course bookmakers are introduced, greyhound racing will not prosper in this State.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Did you say that when we were debating the greyhound Bill?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I do not think I said anything about it at the time.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: I just wondered, because that was a condition of the legislation being accepted.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: That is right. I am not criticising anyone. I am explaining what occurred at the time. Perhaps we did not introduce on-course bookmakers at that time because some of the conservatives here would have thrown the whole project out. Now the conservatives are introducing legislation to provide for on-course bookmakers, and I thank them for doing it. It is about time they did something sensible, but I suppose the honourable member will vote against it.

I am saying that the industry has commenced in this State and the facilities at Cannington are equal to any in Australia. However, I know that had it not been for the foresight of the Tonkin Labor Government, through the efforts of Mr Stubbs who was Minister at the time, we would have had no greyhound racing in this State.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: And look at the thanks the Labor Party have handed out to him recently.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Well of course it is possible for anyone to do anything, if he is in a position to do whatever he likes, and the honourable member knows what I mean by that.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I am afraid I don't.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: How would you know?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: If Mr Masters had been here between 1971 and 1974 he would know what I am talking about.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He will be here between 1977 and 1980.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: He has a rough chance because he has to be here does he not?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is not the same chance you are giving Mr Stubbs. Incidentally is this Mr Stubbs you are talking about the same one in respect of whom applications have been called over his head?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I do not know what that has to do with greyhound racing.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I am trying to determine about which Mr Stubbs you are speaking.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I am talking about the contents of the Bill, rather than the rubbish which is coming from the Minister. I would like to say what I have in mind because I am sure members do not want to stay here all night. However, if they do, I do not mind because I do not have to go back to my province for a fortnight.

The PRESIDENT: I will afford the honourable member whatever protection I can.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I thank you, Mr President, but I can assure you I can handle this mob.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are not making a very good job of it.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: When the Tonkin Government introduced greyhound racing into the State it was not considered advisable to make provision for on-course bookmakers. Because of the attitude of Mr Wordsworth and a few others, the legislation would not have been successful as the conservatives would have knocked it back. Having got over the first hurdle we now have greyhound racing and the Bill before us provides for on-course bookmakers which will make the sport much more attractive to those who participate in it and it will allow the industry to expand. After all it is an industry as was revealed by figures in another place concerning the turnover in Tasmania for trotting and gallop racing.

I support the legislation and I am sure members opposite who may not have accepted it in 1972 will be prepared to accept it now, even though they may do so with reservations. I am sure Mr Wordsworth will say he accepts it because it was introduced by his Government.

THE HON. G. W. BERRY (Lower North) [5.14 p.m.]: In the first place the Bill seeks to place betting under the control of a Betting Control Board instead of the TAB. I cannot visualise the need for this. Why should we have a representative of greyhound racing on a different board instead of continuing as at present? I cannot see any reason for our having a Betting Control Board in respect of on-course bookmakers for racing, trotting, and, now, greyhound racing. It would be just another board—one of the many we establish. No doubt its members will be paid for the time involved.

The other point I wish to raise is that very little explanation is given as to why on-course bookmakers are necessary at greyhound meetings.

In his speech the Minister said—

The introduction of bookmakers for greyhound racing makes it advisable that the interests of greyhound racing are represented on the body that is to be responsible for the licensing and control of their bookmakers.

I do not see any reason stated in the Minister's speech for on-course bookmakers being given facilities to operate at greyhound race meetings. Further in his speech the Minister said—

Whilst generally bookmakers at race meetings for galloping horses have been permitted to bet only on races for galloping horses, and bookmakers at trotting meetings have been permitted to bet only on races for trotting horses, there have been some occasions in the past where trotting bookmakers operating at country daylight meetings have been given permission to bet on galloping races held on the same day at some other racecourse.

This probably refers to morning and afternoon meetings. Now it seems necessary for us to make a similar provision for bookmakers operating on the course at greyhound race meetings. I feel that if a licence is granted to a bookmaker to operate, he should be permitted to operate on any course.

After all is said and done, a bookmaker is a bookmaker, and I can see no reason at all for his not being permitted to operate in this manner. I did not support the legislation for the establishment of greyhound racing, and I am not now more convinced that this legislation is in the interests of greyhound racing in this State.

THE HON. W. R. WITHERS (North) [5.18 p.m.]: My colleague Mr Berry has asked to be given the reasons for bookmakers now being brought onto the racecourse at greyhound race meetings.

There are several reasons for this, the first of which I should have thought would be fairly obvious. To my way of thinking if we have legislation which recognises that gambling is right on any horse racing course and that bookmakers are allowed onto the racecourse—apart from which there is also the TAB on the racecourse—then it is only fair that the bookmakers and the TAB should be allowed to be represented on all those racecourses where legal betting is permitted to be conducted.

For this reason it has always puzzled me why legislation was brought down requesting Parliament to consider the legalising of a particular sport at which gambling is recognised and at which bookmakers were not allowed to operate, while in the same State bookmakers were allowed on other courses—such as those associated with trotting and horse racing—and where the TAB operated. That is one reason for legislation being introduced; to allow for all such sports to be fairly treated—and I now refer to trotting, horse racing, and greyhound racing.

The Hon. G. W. Berry: That argument was not used when the measure was introduced.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I daresay the Minister would have considered it to be obvious when it was introduced. We are asked to judge matters in fairness, as legislators, and if the situation that existed before was unfair we should recognise it was not necessary for the Minister to give those reasons. Another aspect is that it is necessary to have bookmakers to keep the sport of dog racing buoyant in Western Australia.

We were faced with the position of a track having been established at Cannington Central and up till this point it has not been a financial success. There are many reasons for this, one of which is that there was very high capital input; far too high for the early stages of the sport. The facility provided is of a very high standard and while this is appreciated by some of the patrons, the end result is that the facility provided at Cannington has been a financial disaster, particularly in its early stages.

One of the reasons for its having run down financially is that bookmakers were not operating at the track. The followers of the sport were denied the facility of on-course bookmakers and accordingly the professionals in the sport were not able to get prices for the dogs which they happened to be following and on which they were betting. This led to several complications. I ask members to bear with me, because while this may appear to be unrelated to the matter before us, it is important that it be understood.

As the situation exists at the moment, we have only one race track which means that it is necessary for a dog to win a race or to be placed in a race before the owner of that dog can obtain nomination for the race meeting to be held the following week. If the dog does not win or run a place, the trainer or owner has to wait at least six weeks before that dog can again race on the track.

As is the case with horses, dogs have their followers. Strangely enough, there are usually more followers per dog than there are followers per horse, and I will explain the reason for this.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You would have thought it would be the other way around.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: One would have thought so, particularly in the case of those who happen to be gardeners! But that is not the situation as it relates to dogs. Usually a dog is trained by a family, whereas a horse is generally trained by a professional trainer and, generally speaking, the horse in question is known only to the trainer and his family as a likeable animal; they generally regard it as a pet.

With a dog, however, it is quite different. A dog is generally brought up and trained by the entire family. It is trained and looked after by the trainer and his spouse, and also by the trainer's children. Apart

from this, the friends of the trainer's children also have an interest in the dog.

The Hon. R. Thompson: And the dog loves the family cat.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: And sometimes the family canary. The friends of the trainer's children generally visit the trainer's home to have a look at the racing dog he happens to be training. The dog is usually given a name such as Joe, which is known to all the children in the street—they know the dog by that name; they know he is going to race on Saturday night and they take an interest in the dog, and tell their parents that Joe will be racing on Saturday night.

This is where dogs and their training are different from horses. Horses do not have the same following. A horse is generally known to only its immediate connections and those who may follow the horse; it is possible that people may back the horse because they like the jockey who is riding it, or they may like the name of the horse.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You think it is a good thing that children should be encouraged in this?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I do. Usually those children who take notice of greyhounds grow up into fine upstanding citizens.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You are talking about yourself again.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: When the children tell their parents that Joe will be racing on Saturday night, more often than not the parents will say, "Let us go to the dogs and see Joe run". So it is possible that a third of the people on the street will go to the races that evening. What I am saying may appear to be rather disjointed, but I am trying to explain the position.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You say that a child can reach up to a bookmaker, but not to the window of the tote?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: That is not so. What I am saying is that because dogs can only nominate if they win or run a place—

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: How can a dog write out an application for nomination?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: What I mean is that the owner of the dog can seek nomination only if his dog wins or runs a place. If the dog does not run a place it means the owner will have to wait six weeks before he can again race the dog. If nominations are accepted only every six weeks, and if it is not possible for the owner to nominate his dog we will have less people attending these meetings.

The Hon. T. O. Perry: But other dogs will take their place.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: If nominations can be accepted more regularly, and within a lesser period than six weeks, more people will attend greyhound race meetings.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Perhaps the Minister will tell us something about racing frogs before long.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I have explained in rather a disjointed manner why it is necessary to have bookmakers on the course. This is very necessary if professionals are to be encouraged to attend the sport. I will now explain why it is necessary to have bookmakers as this relates to nominations being accepted only every six weeks.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: But if a dog did not run first, second or third, you would not be interested in seeing a bookmaker.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: That is not so. Quite often an owner might nominate his dog and find the dog is out of his class. If there were more frequent nominations there would be a greater possibility for the dog to enter a race in which he is not outclassed. It would then be possible for an owner or others to benefit from a bookmaker.

People in other areas also have been interested in setting up race tracks for dogs, but they have not done so because they are waiting to see whether or not the course at Cannington Central is a success. Those in other areas have not been able to convince their local shires and other sporting clubs that another track would be a good thing. They have not been able to do this because everybody is waiting to see whether Cannington Central is a success.

If we allowed the present position to continue Cannington Central would collapse and dog racing would fade out of the picture. Now that bookmakers are to be allowed onto the dog racing track at Cannington Central we will find that in a year or so Cannington Central will begin to improve; its financial losses will decrease and it will receive more patronage at the course; because of this and other factors other race tracks will be set up in Western Australia.

When that takes place, if a person is not able to obtain nomination for his dog at Cannington Central he will be able to do so at some other track. If there are two other tracks apart from Cannington Central it is possible that people will be able to obtain nominations for their dogs every fortnight, instead of every six weeks which is the case at the moment, and accordingly the sport will progress.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Are you anticipating that this Bill will go through?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I certainly hope so.

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

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I hope the Bill is passed because if it is not it will mean that those who vote against it are agreeing that things should not be equitable and that they do not agree with fairness. Everyone should at least realise that this Bill is fair; it means we recognise a betting facility that is Government owned as well as a betting facility which comes under a free enterprise system. Of course, my party supports a free enterprise system.

One might ask why this sport will spread, and there are several reasons for this. People who follow greyhounds actively—and I mean that in the literal sense, that they follow a greyhound when it is walking on a leash—are usually very healthy people because they get a great deal of exercise. We find that the families of greyhound owners become involved as well, and it is not uncommon to see a husband and wife out walking one or two greyhounds, or perhaps father, mother, and the children out walking greyhounds. We all know that walking is very good for the health. Also, when money is being expended from the family budget for the training of greyhounds, it is not being spent in other avenues. This can be a good thing, as long as the family does budget for training greyhounds, and it can keep people away from the hotels if they have been drinking from sheer boredom. Everyone here recognises that drinking can be a socially acceptable pastime.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: And a very pleasurable one too.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: It is a great pity that when people drink from sheer boredom their health deteriorates, and they are potential alcoholics. However, people who become greyhound trainers spend a great deal of time with their dogs and they find that their health improves.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Tell my wife that and she may buy me a greyhound.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: All potential alcoholics should be issued with a greyhound!

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: As far back as I can remember I have been associated with greyhounds, and honestly I cannot remember an active greyhound trainer who was also an alcoholic. People who have been drinking heavily usually cut down their alcohol intake when they become involved with their dogs.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You will have the jockeys, trainers, and owners of racehorses after you.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I would think it keeps the weight down as well.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Is the honourable member suggesting that I need this?

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I was not suggesting that you need a dog.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: An Opposition member mentioned that this is a recognised industry and that statement is true. I think it was Mr Dans who made this comment.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: No.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Our Government recognises that this is an industry.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I am the only one who had a chance to say anything.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Greyhound racing is a very big industry in New South Wales. I have here two reference papers; the first one is entitled, "An economic valuation of the greyhound racing industry in Australia", and it was compiled in 1969 for the Commonwealth Greyhound Association. The other reference paper is titled, "An economic analysis of the racing industry in New South Wales, 1975". In this second paper we see that the greyhound industry in New South Wales contributed something like \$14.3 million of the gross national product. We see also that the TAB income from the greyhound industry in New South Wales represented 32 per cent of the total TAB turnover for all sports in that State.

The Hon. G. W. Berry: How much was it?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I am sorry, I did not write down that figure. I am quoting here from my notes but anyone could refer to these papers to obtain the figures.

This small industry is important to Western Australia at this time. There are over 3 000 greyhounds in this State at the moment and the dogs consume approximately \$1 million-worth of food per annum. The dogs consume 730 tonnes of meat alone.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Is that each dog?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Not each dog, but 3 000 dogs all chomping together. I have displayed an interest in greyhounds since I was a boy, but I have had a particular interest in them since I became a legislator for the province I represent.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: That went to the dogs in 1971.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Members will be aware that in some of the isolated areas of Western Australia there are race-tracks at which two-day meetings are held once a year. At some country tracks two-day meetings are held twice a year.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Things are better in the Lower North Province.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Yes, the Lower North Province is closer to another form of civilisation.

With these racetracks where there is limited racing throughout the year, there are also limited facilities. This makes sense because if there is to be a race meeting only once a year, there is only limited money coming in from the patrons to provide facilities. So generally in the north we find that the racetracks are graded ovals of earth with bush timber fences around part of the track. If the people are lucky, there is also a whitewashed corrugated building with very crude facilities. Such a set-up is reasonable when a meeting is held only once a year, and in fact, it is quite fun to attend such a meeting. However, as more and more people move into the north, they want slightly better facilities. Because of the small number of patrons they have no hope of obtaining facilities such as those available in the city. However, if we can find some other sport which can be conducted more regularly on these racetracks, more money will be available for better facilities. Of course, a greyhound track could be graded alongside the racetrack, with both tracks becoming tangential to each other opposite the grandstand. If such a course were followed, races could be held more regularly and more income would be derived from them. Therefore, the facilities could be developed for the patrons of both greyhound and horse racing.

Another factor is that the introduction of on-course bookmakers will allow the setting up of a circuit of bookmakers travelling to the north on a more regular basis than that operating on remote racetracks at present. Although it is very expensive to transport a horse one does not need a complicated float to transport a dog from one point to the next. A utility or a panel van is quite suitable to carry the animal.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: It must be suitably ventilated.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Yes, such vehicles must be suitably ventilated. In New South Wales, Victoria, and Tasmania, airline companies have developed special lightweight kennels so that the dogs can be flown from point to point at a relatively low cost. This would allow country towns to hold fairly regular greyhound racing events.

I am very pleased that the Government has brought this Bill forward to allow some fairness to the industry. I am pleased the Government has recognised the need for bookmakers at greyhound racetracks, and I will let my colleagues comment on other parts of the measure.

THE HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [5.40 p.m.]: I did not intend to speak to this Bill, but after listening to Mr Withers, I have come to the conclusion that a dog is a dog for all that. I support the Bill, and I support the introduction of bookmakers to greyhound racing. However, I would like to make a few comments, because it is amazing to me that it is only in Australia and the United Kingdom that racing generally needs the support of on-course bookmakers.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Also Ireland.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Mr Heitman mentioned Ireland, and I admit that I was thinking of Ireland as part of the United Kingdom. Of course, that is a mistake.

Racing in all its forms flourishes as a large industry in all parts of the world without the support of on-course bookmakers. In 1972, when the Bill to set up greyhound racing in Western Australia was introduced, all members of this Chamber were subjected to a great deal of lobbying from all kinds of people—some of whom did not appear to be as good as they should have been. We have now reached the stage where we are told that if Cannington Central is to be a success and if greyhounds are to be raced on other tracks as well, the support of on-course bookmakers is necessary. We have yet to see that, although I must remind the House that I am supporting the Bill.

I do not oppose greyhound racing, but as I said in 1972 when the earlier legislation was introduced, I am not a fan of this sport. At that time one of the arguments advanced in support of the measure—and I may have advanced it myself—was that greyhound racing would bring another form of relaxation and sport to remote and country areas. We were told it would be fairly simple to set up greyhound racing tracks. This simply has not happened. It is all very well to say that people in country areas are watching and waiting to see what happens. Mr Withers mentioned the biggest problem connected with greyhound racing in Western Australia, and it is not the lack of on-course bookmakers, but rather the fact that there has been one track only. People wishing to race their greyhounds sometimes have to wait from six to eight weeks to get a start because the sport has contracted into that one area.

I agree that in the first instance probably too much money was put into the development of Cannington Central, and this is the reason that we have not seen the establishment of racetracks in the North Province, the Lower North Province, or in some of the country towns in the south-west. I have seen greyhound racing in other parts of the world, and indeed, in other parts of Australia, and

nowhere have I seen facilities such as we have at Cannington Central. In fact, as Mr Withers probably knows, dogs were once on the Wollongong Oval on one night while on the next day rugby was played on it. I am not going into details about how many children follow dogs and how many children follow horses, but I would like to say that I hope this amending Bill is a success.

I would rather see not only a Bill to amend the Betting Control Act but also a Bill which, in effect, said, "We are going to ensure beyond a shadow of a doubt that, having established greyhound racing in this State, and having received guarantees from certain country centres or remote areas, similar tracks will be installed throughout the State."

What better place to put this into operation than in the North Province, where people react in all kinds of ways to all kinds of situations from sheer boredom? This would provide them with an outlet. I do not know how dogs perform in sub-tropical or tropical conditions. However, horses race in Singapore and other parts of the world with similar climatic conditions; therefore I assume the dogs would readily acclimatise themselves.

I support the Bill, but I am not convinced that simply by having 10 or 15 on-course bookmakers at the Cannington greyhound track there will be a proliferation of dog-racing venues throughout the State. I hope this will be the case, but nothing which has been said by Mr Withers or anyone else has convinced me this will occur. I still do not know how on-course bookmakers will help bring about such a situation.

I am also still perplexed that only Australia, England, and Ireland require the assistance of on-course bookmakers to enable patrons to enjoy racing. Perhaps this is a tradition with us. I admit I like going to the races occasionally, and I do not like going to the races when I cannot hear the roar of the ring or see the colour bookmakers inject into the sport. Perhaps that is why we have on-course bookmakers.

If the conclusion I have drawn is a fact, bookmakers may indeed attract more people to Cannington Central. However, I sincerely hope we will see other tracks established, because it is my firm belief this is the only way greyhound racing will be a success in this State. If other tracks are not established quickly, I am concerned that the sport may die on the vine. As you would remember, Mr President, this is not the first attempt to introduce dog racing in Western Australia. When I was a very young boy in Kalgoorlie, whippets were raced regularly behind the Kalgoorlie trotting track. I think that died a natural death, despite the fact

that, as I understand it, several bookmakers did operate at those races, and people were able to invest sixpence or one shilling on the races.

The Hon. N. McNeill: This Bill alone is not meant to be the saviour of greyhound racing.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I take the point made by the Minister; I understand and appreciate his interjection, because it is precisely the point I have been making. The Government plans to allow bookmakers to operate at Cannington Central, and we hope it will engender an expansion of the sport into country centres and remote areas so that people may have access to this form of relaxation. The only way this will occur is by the enterprise of the people in those areas, if they seriously desire to introduce dog racing in their areas. I do not think we should expect the Government to provide financial assistance to every area which wants to establish a greyhound racing track. However, I only hope this Bill will encourage people to establish such facilities by themselves.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Or to put it another way, unless there are on-course bookmakers there will be less likelihood of having country tracks established.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I agree with the Minister's interjection, and with those remarks I support the Bill.

THE HON. I. G. PRATT (Lower West) [5.49 p.m.]: In expressing my support for the Bill, I must say that I am considerably saddened by the lightheartedness with which this Bill has been treated not only by people within this House but also by the community at large. It is not an earth-shattering Bill, but it is a significant piece of legislation to people who are vitally interested in dog racing, and I believe such people deserve to be treated with dignity and consideration by the rest of the community. I do not think their aspirations should be made a point of mirth, because to them this is a very serious business.

This Bill has been brought before us at the request of the people involved in dog racing; they feel it will be of assistance to the sport. I must admit that until recently, I had not taken much interest in greyhound racing; it did not matter to me whether or not there were on-course bookmakers at the greyhound track. In fact, I have never attended a greyhound race, although I may do so in the future.

In my electorate there is a considerable number of people actively interested in dog racing and over the past few months I have received representations from those people and have learned a bit about dog

racing; I understand now why they feel they have a need for on-course bookmakers, and I cannot find fault with the reasons they have advanced. These people say that without on-course bookmakers, greyhound meetings lack the colour and activity one finds at trotting and horse racing meetings. When one thinks about that statement, it is hard to fault; on-course bookmakers certainly do add colour to race meetings.

They also claim that, as a result of not having on-course bookmakers, they do not attract the type of person who likes to pit himself against the bookmaker. Betting on the tote is a very impersonal activity.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: So are some bookies!

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I would agree with the Leader of the Opposition that some bookies probably are very impersonal. However, the person who is making the bet is very personal; often he feels he is pitting himself against the bookmaker and it becomes a personal man-to-man confrontation. I am told that such a person would be attracted to dog racing if there were on-course bookmakers. Again, I cannot fault this reasoning.

The Hon. G. W. Berry: They did not lack it when the Bill was first introduced.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: That interjection is easily answered by saying, "Did they have it?" If they did not have it, they must have lacked it.

Another reason advanced in support of on-course bookmakers is that the present system makes it very awkward for an owner who has a well prepared dog which is ready to win, because he must rely on the tote for an adequate return on his wager. If he had the option of betting with an on-course bookmaker, he could bet at predetermined odds, rather than simply having to rely on the eventual price paid out by the tote. Again, I find this argument hard to fault; it seems to be logical common sense.

Horse racing has long been looked upon as the sport of kings and it is rather unfortunate that this attitude towards horse racing has led to an unhealthy attitude towards dog racing, and those involved in the sport. These people are worthy of being treated with dignity, and we should accept they have a right to partake to the full in their sport, just as do people who race horses.

The physical difference between a horse and a dog is so tremendous that one tends to think of horse racing as something impressive and, therefore, perhaps better and on a higher level than dog racing.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: It is higher if you get on a horse.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: Possibly it is; but it could also be lower if one was bucked off a horse. I am interested in the personal approach in matters such as this. I am not concerned as to whether or not a horse looks more impressive than a dog but rather that the people involved in both sports should be treated with the same consideration, and viewed equally by the law.

Many people could not be involved in horse racing if they wanted to, due to lack of finance, space, or facilities. But let us face it: Many people do not want to become involved in horse racing simply because they are not interested in horses whereas, very often, they are interested in their dogs. I feel this Bill will give the people interested in dogs equality of opportunity and, as a Liberal, I believe this is something which should be considered. I believe in equality of opportunity, and the person who chooses to pursue a certain interest, such as dog racing, should be allowed to do so.

I know that at present, the law does not stop him, but these people genuinely believe that for their sport to continue, they must have bookmakers operating at the course. They may be right or wrong; the legislation may be the salvation they think it will be, or it may not.

In the past, a rather paternalistic attitude has been adopted towards the dog racing fraternity. It has been considered—perhaps based on figures—that greyhound racing would do better financially out of the TAB than from on-course bookmakers. However, I repeat that these people believe the legislation will assist their industry. The Government is giving them a chance to find out whether this will be the case. After this Bill is passed and becomes an Act, it will be up to them to prove their forecasts were correct. I believe they should be given the chance to find out for themselves.

THE HON. CLIVE GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [5.56 p.m.]: I should like to say a few words in the debate on this Bill, particularly in view of the fact that Cannington Central is located in my electorate. At the outset, I want to say I support the Bill. However, I hark back to the days when we debated the original legislation introduced by Mr Stubbs, to establish greyhound racing. At the time, I was not terribly enthusiastic about supporting such a measure because, frankly, I did not believe there was a great need for the introduction of greyhound racing in Western Australia. It seemed to me we were providing for another industry which would compete with existing industries and that the capacity of people in Western Australia to support another facility such as this would be limited.

However, we were assured by the numerous people interested in the sport that this would not be the case. You will recall, Mr President, that during the days and weeks the original legislation was being debated the galleries were full of all sorts of people who suddenly were interested in the welfare of the members of Parliament of the day, and showed a great desire to enter into deep discussions with them on all sorts of subjects, including greyhounds. However, it is interesting that since we have been debating this Bill I have not noticed anybody from the industry showing any concern about whether or not the Bill will be passed. I make those comments only in passing.

To return to the point I was making, I was not at all enthusiastic about the Bill. However, we were assured by the people interested in the sport that the industry could survive and, subsequently, after representations had been made to me by the various bodies, I decided to support the Bill. I was not convinced, but I believed we should at least give those people the opportunity to put into practice their particular sport.

I was also persuaded by the assurances given at the time that the industry would be able to survive without the necessity to introduce on-course bookmakers. This was another reason I decided to support the measure; namely, that it would not introduce another area in which bookmakers could operate. As a result of the passing of that legislation, we saw the building of the Cannington Central greyhound racing facility. A tremendous amount of money was invested in the fantastic facility at Cannington Central. I understand from people who profess to know something about greyhound racing that this is the finest greyhound racing facility in Australia, if not in the southern hemisphere. In any case, it is an excellent facility.

Because the establishment of this facility provided work for a large number of people at the time, it did some good for the community. We cannot always measure the benefits of a project by the direct returns from it. Indeed, we should take into consideration some of the indirect benefits that are derived.

The estimate for the construction of the facility at Cannington Central varied from time to time, because it took longer to build than was anticipated, and as a result the escalation in costs increased the estimate. I understand that the figure was about \$1.5 million for the construction of this facility.

That provided a great deal of work for the people engaged in the building industry, which at the time was feeling the effects of a downturn. The Cannington Agricultural Society which had been established there for many years was confronted with the extension of suburbia

all around it, and consequently the use of and the need for its showground was becoming less and less apparent. The society was looking for some diversification to enable it to continue to operate the showground.

The introduction of greyhound racing at Cannington Central thus turned out to be another indirect advantage. Whilst initially I had some reservations about the success of the greyhound racing industry, I came to the conclusion subsequently that the facility at Cannington Central would benefit the district, over and above the benefit resulting from the direct involvement of the people engaged in greyhound racing.

The fact that Cannington Central has not been able to operate as an economic proposition has caused a great deal of concern to many people. Obviously it caused concern to the people engaged in the industry, but it also caused concern to others.

There was a need to service the loans which financed the project. The people involved came to the conclusion that they had to do something to prevent the venture from going bankrupt. So, they approached the Government and requested that greyhound racing be conducted on Saturday nights instead of Thursday nights. I am looking around the Chamber for some member to nod his head, because I am not sure whether racing was to be changed to Friday or Saturday nights. I am not familiar with the facts, as I do not attend greyhound racing regularly, although I have been to greyhound race meetings a couple of times.

Greyhound racing was changed to Saturday nights because the people involved made an attempt to stem the flow of the losses encountered by the industry. The people connected with the industry asked the Government for other assistance, and the Government was able to grant that. Those people were very grateful for that assistance.

Whilst the change to Saturday nights was of some advantage to the industry, it certainly was not sufficient to stem the flow of the losses. So, the situation which many of us foresaw initially, and which became more evident recently, has arisen. I refer to the request for the introduction of bookmakers. I am sure that everyone in this House is aware this request has come forward, and as a result of the approach to the Government we have the Bill before us.

Sitting suspended from 6.05 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Prior to the tea suspension I mentioned that the proposal now before us for the introduction of bookmakers at Cannington Central is the result of approaches made by people interested in greyhound racing.

I am not sure that the ills of greyhound racing will be solved by the introduction of bookmakers at the course and this opinion has been expressed by other speakers. The only way—the principal way—for Cannington Central to increase its income is for it to increase its patronage at the greyhound racing events. For that reason, it is necessary for those interested to encourage more people to attend greyhound racing.

It will be recalled that prior to the introduction of greyhound racing there was considerable publicity in the media. Greyhound racing was hailed as a brand spanking new sport which would provide entertainment and enjoyment for thousands of people who would otherwise not be able to afford to participate in a sport. In general, it was expected that a tremendous number of patrons would attend greyhound racing. I believe that attendance on the first night was free.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Was that the reason you attended?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: As a matter of fact, it was one of the reasons.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You are renowned for honesty, so why not admit it?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I did.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Not very loudly.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Loud enough for my comment to be recorded by *Hansard*. I did not attend the first meeting simply because it was free, but because I received an invitation from those involved with greyhound racing. I suppose a similar invitation was extended to many other people, but the racing complex happens to be in my province so I assume my invitation had something to do with that.

The point I am trying to make is that after several months of intensive publicity, and the fact that the entrance was free on the first night, a total of approximately 15 000 people attended the meeting. After probably 12 months of intensive campaigning, lobbying, and publicity—and allowing free entrance at the first meeting—the attendance was 15 000 men, women, and children.

I immediately gained the impression that perhaps greyhound racing would not be as popular as we members of Parliament were led to believe it would be. I realise that some people would not have attended on the opening night because of the expected crowd. However, subsequent racing events have not proved that to be the situation. I understand that prior to the changing of the night from Thursday to Saturday, attendances were down to as low as 1 000 people on some occasions, and maybe even less. So, in order to make greyhound racing a viable proposition it will be necessary to increase its patronage considerably.

I am not suggesting that an attendance of 15 000 people at each meeting would not be highly profitable. Judging by the attendances at trotting and racing meetings, I imagine the attendances at greyhound racing meetings would need to be approximately 6 000 or 7 000 people in order to make it a profitable venture.

The Hon. G. W. Berry: How many attend now?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I do not know, but I believe the attendance is only about 2 000. However, I do not believe the introduction of bookmakers to greyhound racing will make a sufficient difference in attendances to overcome the leeway. I agree the introduction of bookmakers will probably make up some of the leeway.

Someone asked what difference it would make to have bookmakers on the course, and what influence they would have on people attending the meetings. Bookmakers cater for gamblers. Incidentally, I am not a gambler but I do not mind other people having the opportunity to gamble. I am not saying I would not be prepared to gamble if I went to a greyhound racing meeting; I would probably put a couple of dollars on a dog. Although normally I am not a gambler, I am not against gambling. The point I am getting at is that the average Australian gambler wants to know what return he will get from a bet.

The true gamblers will not attend greyhound racing meetings because they are not able to know, in advance, what return they will receive from their bets. The sort of people who require bookmakers to induce them to attend racing meetings are the sort of people who bet on trots, races, or blow flies crawling up a wall. I do not make that statement with any disrespect to the people who gamble; I am simply pointing out what attraction bookmakers will have with regard to greyhound racing.

The introduction of bookmakers to greyhound racing will attract those gamblers who want to know what their return will be when they make a bet. Indeed, the owners referred to by Mr Withers also want to know what their return will be. They want to know that if they invest \$100 on their dogs they will get a certain return, whatever the odds might be.

The present situation is that the more a person invests on a greyhound race the less the return. A patron is able to calculate roughly from the totalisator barometer, but the more money he invests the less will be his return. The average gambler in the community is not prepared to accept that means of gambling, and he will patronise some other activity. They are a different group of people and they will not be induced to go to greyhound racing unless they have the facilities of bookmakers on the course. That is the

essential attraction those people are looking for. The bookmakers add some glamour, and some activity and colour to the proceedings, but that is only a minor consideration.

The Hon. G. W. Berry: But the gamblers are in the minority; they will not increase the crowd greatly.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: That is the point I am making. I agree with what Mr Dans said earlier; I have grave doubts whether the provision of licensed bookmakers at greyhound racing meetings will attract a sufficient number of people to make up the leeway in patronage which is necessary for Cannington Central to be able to pay its way. I think the introduction of bookmakers will go some of the way towards attracting additional patronage—those people who want the facility. However they are in the minority and I do not believe the current attendances will double.

I am not particularly fussy one way or the other about greyhound racing, and I am certainly not particularly fussy about having bookmakers on the course. However, I am a realist. We have greyhound racing, and we have a facility which is alleged to be second to none in the nation. An industry has been allowed to develop and it is because of that I am prepared to support this Bill. At least, it will be another means of assisting the greyhound racing industry to become viable. It will be able to expand and go into other areas, as has been suggested by previous speakers.

For that reason alone I believe we should support the Bill. We should ensure that those people who have invested money in the industry have an opportunity to be involved in a profitable and paying enterprise, rather than be placed in the situation which is facing them at present; that is a bankrupt industry with all its facilities down the drain.

I want to make one final point in regard to the facility at Cannington Central. As I said earlier, I do not think we should necessarily measure the good of a project on only one facet of it. Another feature of Cannington Central is that it has provided in that district a very nice, modern facility which is used for public functions. Organisations hold dances, dinners, and so on there, so it is providing a facility which did not exist in that area, in addition to its proper function as a greyhound racing centre. Also, it is the intention of the Agricultural Society, possibly in conjunction with the Town of Canning Council, to develop the centre as an arena for sporting events for young people and so on. It must therefore be looked at on a wider plane than merely greyhound racing.

I support the Bill for all those reasons.

THE HON. R. H. C. STUBBS (South-East) [7.46 p.m.]: At the outset I wish to say I also support the Bill. It will allow betting by bookmakers and I think it will give the sport the shot in the arm which it badly needs. It will be welcomed by the industry, by the Betting Control Board, and by the public who keep the sport going.

I rise to my feet to relate my experience. It has been said that when we were in Government we did not legislate for bookmakers because such legislation would not have passed through this House. That is not correct. When I was the Minister I went to the Eastern States several times and talked to people involved in greyhound racing. We took the best advice available, which was not to have bookmakers but to try the totalisator first. It was said bookmakers were taking a lot out of the sport and putting nothing back into it, so we were advised to try it without bookmakers, which we did. We legislated for the totalisator only, and perhaps in the light of nearly two years' experience it has been found bookmakers will give the sport a boost. I think it needs a boost.

I want to refute the statements which have been made. The only reason we did not legislate for bookmakers is that we were strongly advised not to, and we took the best advice from all the people connected with greyhound racing in the Eastern States. Not only will we now have bookmakers but perhaps we will also have some lady bookmakers as they have in the Eastern States. I saw some lady bookmakers when I was over there and people were queuing up to place bets with them.

Mr Dans spoke about the whippets in Kalgoorlie. I can remember them in Kalgoorlie and Collie, and I can also remember that the man who sold pies did very good business because if people did not want a whippet to win they would fill it up with pies and water. But greyhound racing is more honest than that. It is an honest sport and the dogs are kept away from people, so that makes the people honest, too.

With those few remarks I support the Bill.

THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [7.50 p.m.]: As members may recall, I was opposed to the legislation when it was originally introduced because the community in which I lived in Tasmania was involved with greyhound racing and I saw what it had done there. I considered it would be of no benefit at all to the community. Perhaps I also had personal reasons in that I am aware of the disease aspect with dogs, and I pointed out to the House at the time that a dog can spread a very dreadful disease without the owner being aware of it. I felt if we were to have greyhound racing we should have some control for the disease of hydatids.

That was a personal reason because a daughter of mine nearly died from the disease.

When it comes to whether or not we should have bookmakers on the course I find myself still disagreeing. The Hon. Claude Stubbs is quite correct when he says at the time this legislation was introduced bookmakers were deliberately excluded because they would not really do anything for the industry. I do not think they will do anything for the industry at this stage. Perhaps people have a faint hope that bookmakers will save the industry. As the Hon. Claude Stubbs said, they take a great deal out of the industry and do not put anything back. In many other parts of the world racing survives without bookmakers; they are not necessary for a successful racing industry.

I will not support the legislation and I say quite openly that I see little need for it. I think a gambler should be able to derive satisfaction from putting his money on the tote. I am not quite sure why bookmakers are needed. Perhaps one of the advantages is that the owner can put his money on and know the returns he will get, and others will not benefit from the knowledge that an owner has put his money on a dog in a certain race but not in others.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: The people know. They follow them around.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: But the public cannot follow the owner when he bets with a bookmaker and get the same odds; the odds drop straightaway.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: It is not always the owner who gets the best price, either.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: The odds fall on the tote for the owner as well, but with the bookmaker they do not fall, so the owner will pay the bookmaker if he has any knowledge of the way the contestants will run.

I do not see any need for bookmakers and I do not believe they will save the day. Nevertheless, I have a certain amount of sympathy for those who have invested their money at Cannington and in greyhound racing. I think it would have been better had we not passed the legislation in the first place and had we put these people out of their anxiety. I wish them well with their bookmakers—I can see the legislation will pass through the House.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central—Minister for Health) [7.55 p.m.]: I thank members who supported the Bill. There is not a great deal to cover in replying to the debate.

The Hon. Mr Berry raised a couple of queries. He asked why the original legislation for greyhound racing did not

include the operation of bookmakers. The Hon. Claude Stubbs has explained the reason for that. Mr Berry also raised the matter of bookmakers being able to bet on other racing events. We have had very little of that type of betting with bookmakers in this State. There have been occasions when trotting meetings may have been held in the afternoon and bookmakers have been able to bet on that type of racing as well as horse racing. Under the Bill this can be done when there are dual meetings in the State on one afternoon. Trotting is usually held at night, horse racing on Saturday afternoons, and dog racing on Saturday nights. There are not many occasions when two types of racing are being conducted at the same time, so the opportunities for bookmakers to cross-bet from one course to the other are not very frequent. Cross-betting takes place when bookmakers bet at a special ring on Eastern States racing and such events as that.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Do you think bookmakers will be as good supporters of the tote as the dogs as they are at the races?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: They may be. Mr Wordsworth said he did not support the original legislation. I also did not support it because I did not think there was room for greyhound racing in Western Australia, but we now have it. A big investment has been made at Cannington. The introduction of bookmakers might lead to the opening up of other dog racing venues, say at Northam or Pinjarra, which might give the sport a little impetus. Perhaps some advantage will accrue to the Greyhound Racing Association through the introduction of bookmakers, and greyhound racing may go ahead. It is in a fairly parlous position at the present time without bookmakers. This is an attempt by the Government to see whether it can save greyhound racing in this State and the investment which has been made in the venue at Cannington.

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.

PAINTERS' REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 22nd September.

THE HON. S. J. DELLAR (Lower North) [8.01 p.m.]: This Bill seeks to place beyond doubt the situation which exists in respect of industrial spray painting and signwriting. The first matter refers to the process of applying protective coatings

to and the sandblasting of materials which are to be used in constructions other than dwellings. The second part of the Bill deals with signwriters.

It is not necessary for me to say a great deal about the Bill. I have discussed it with the industry at various levels. Whilst mainly the industry agrees with the Bill, it is noted that the Painters and Decorators' Union is not very happy with its proposals. The objections of that union have been mentioned in another place and have been recorded on page 2615 of the current *Hansard*. The objections have been noted, and I believe at this time the legislation should be proceeded with. We should give it a try and see what happens; perhaps in the future it may be necessary to consider it again to see whether or not the objectives of the Bill are in fact working and covering the situation they are designed to cover.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Thank you.

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.

**TRANSPORT COMMISSION ACT
AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 22nd September.

THE HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [8.05 p.m.]: This Bill contains several amendments which are desirable in order to facilitate the administration of the Transport Commission. The Act is in three parts, and deals with the licensing of omnibuses, commercial goods vehicles, and aircraft. An amendment is included in respect of the submission of evidence by affidavit, and this has already been done in other legislation in respect of taxi-cars and in relation to the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act.

The Bill also removes responsibility from a driver who may be apprehended by a Transport Commission inspector, and places the onus squarely where it should always have belonged; that is, on the owner of the vehicle. In addition, it tidies up certain aspects of charter aircraft; and if one reads the Act one finds the commission has had very little power in this respect.

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.

**IRRIGATION (DUNHAM RIVER)
AGREEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 22nd September.

THE HON. J. C. TOZER (North) [8.08 p.m.]: It surprises me that Mr Claughton or some other member of the Opposition did not rise to speak to this Bill—

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: We thought we would give you a chance.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: —because this is a matter of some significance, not in what is achieved by the measure, but the implications it has for the Kimberley region of Western Australia.

The very fact that we have before us this Bill to amend the Dunham River agreement indicates there has been an apparent failure of the project in the Kimberley. However, I do not think we should necessarily regard ourselves as losers because of this. No taxpayers' funds have been expended on this project; and while the project has not lived up to the high hopes we may have had for it a few years ago, I feel a great deal has been learnt from what has been done at Dunham River to date.

The concept of the pilot farm scheme was first class. In his speech the Minister described the nature of the project, and he explained that the second phase was completely dependent upon the success of the first phase. The first phase has not been as successful as was expected, and so it is not surprising that the Goddard corporation has come to the State and requested amendments to the agreement in order that the corporation may be relieved of its responsibilities in respect of stage 2 of the agreement, and also that considerable changes be made to that part of the agreement relating to the stage 1 development.

I believe that Bob Goddard has made a major contribution in our region as a result of his efforts at Dunham River. He has proven certain crops very effectively. Of course, there have been trial plots at the research station for many years, but Bob Goddard has been able to indicate that sorghum for both grain and forage can be grown successfully on a broad acre basis. Pangola grass has been grown extensively on the farms in the stage 1 area at Dunham River; and in point of fact Bob Goddard introduced a machine to plant pangola. This machine is unique as far as we in Western Australia are concerned. You are probably aware, Sir, that pangola grass must be planted by runners, and Goddard brought with him from America a machine that can do this. The machine is now in operation on the project at the Ord.

The Hon. G. W. Berry: Do you harvest pangola grass?

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: It certainly makes excellent hay. Tropical legumes have been grown on these farms and have been proven to be successful. These include Townsville stylo, siratro, and phasey bean, and others which are excellent fodder crops. In addition, several pasture grasses have been grown under irrigation at this project, and these include buffalo and other commendable types.

Despite the apparent problems associated with this project, very good crops have been grown at Dunham River, and the results have provided evidence that in fact the soil types in the Dunham Valley are probably superior to those found in the Ord Valley at Kununurra.

Bob Goddard developed feed lots on his project at Dunham River, and from these he produced first-class stock. Not only has he provided storage facilities, but also drying equipment to dry the grain for storage. In the time he has been at Dunham River he has spent \$4.5 million, and he has proved that a great deal can be done in the area.

However, I think we must take into consideration factors other than agriculture which have probably been the main contributors to the apparent failure of the project. First of all we have to look at engineering considerations, to which I will refer in a moment. It is a question of costs, and particularly the cost associated with transport. Farmers in the southern part of the State would be interested to know that it costs in the order of \$200 a tonne to get urea onto a farm at Dunham River. The lack of facilities—particularly grain handling facilities at Wyndham—has created real problems and has inhibited development of grain crops in the area.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: There are grain facilities at Wyndham. What are you coming at?

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: Of course, the main problem associated with the failure of this project is the depressed beef market at the moment. The meatworks has not been able to pay premium prices for higher grades of beef, and thus there has been no outlet for the high quality beef that has been turned off in the area.

The beef from the Dunham River has been supplying the retail market in Darwin for quite some time and other cattle have been shipped to Adelaide and other Eastern States capital markets. No-one can ever say that the apparent failure of this project has been due to lack of effort. The effort has been colossal and the results quite spectacular.

I should like to refer now to the engineering problems associated with the Dunham River project and particularly with the dam on Arthur Creek. I think the

very nature of the Kimberley is reflected in these difficulties. The Minister has told us that only seven of the 10 x 1 000 acre farms that have been developed can be adequately watered from the resources of the Arthur Creek dam.

In the Kimberley there are two types of wet season. One year the monsoonal depressions will move further to the south and the Kimberley will receive 40 to 60 inches of rain. For two months or more we will have rain every day. In other years the rainfall is of the order of 15 inches to 25 inches. During the times when the monsoonal depressions do not come so far south the level of rainfall is dependent upon the occasional thunderstorms or in some cases is associated with cyclonic depressions. Thus the rainfall in the Kimberley is not predictable.

I have spent five so-called "wets" in Derby. During some years I have had to water my garden on 360 days of the year and on the other days we would have had a few thunderstorms.

The trouble is that the Ord catchment area is contiguous with the Dunham catchment area; they have a common watershed. Therefore, there has been a tendency to interpolate results on the Ord catchment area and apply them to the Dunham area. In fact this is not possible. The Ord catchment area covers approximately 20 000 square miles. The catchment area of Arthur Creek is quite small. While the runoff was calculated to provide a certain amount of water, clearly in the dry years these odd thunderstorms are likely to miss the restricted catchment and, therefore, the runoff into the Arthur Creek dam would be minimal.

I point out that the Moolchalabra dam which supplies the town water for Wyndham and which was constructed by the Public Works Department suffers from exactly the same deficiency—some years there is a very good intake and some years there is almost nil. There is a great problem for that supply but a redeeming feature is that the King River is right next door to give a supplementary supply.

It is interesting to note that the Arthur Creek dam is not much smaller than the diversion dam on the Ord at Kununurra. That in turn is much the same in size as, say, the Canning Dam in Perth. We find that even the Canning Dam does not fill up every year.

To illustrate the amount of water that flows into the Arthur Creek dam it is interesting to look at the records that have been kept by the Public Works Department. In 1969 some 23 million cubic metres flowed into the dam. In 1970 the figure was 1 million cubic metres. In 1971 it was 4 million cubic metres; in

1972, 24 million cubic metres; in 1973, 2 million cubic metres; and in 1974, 36 million cubic metres. Members will quite readily see that if that sort of inflow occurred every year the Arthur Creek dam would be consistently full and there would be no problems associated with the water supply to meet the stage 1 requirements of the Dunham River project.

When he was planning his project Bob Goddard actually envisaged using sprinkler irrigation. Of course this would have used less water, but he found in practice that it was also far more expensive. Whenever water had to be pumped there were the additional costs of fuel and the high costs associated with our area. This was just one of the many lessons that he learnt.

It became apparent then that the water per acre which was required to irrigate these 10 farms was more than had been planned for when the feasibility for the project was worked out. Bob Goddard was warned, and was well aware of the fact, that one season in three he could expect a restricted water supply. He took a calculated risk, pointing out that he would adapt his cropping procedures to the water available. For example, with a wet season rain would provide most of the watering required for a sorghum crop but supplementary watering only would be required from the scheme.

The rest of the story is now history and it would appear that only seven farms can be adequately watered on a year-by-year basis. Goddard of Australia Proprietary Limited now wishes to relinquish all hold over three of the 1 000 acre farms.

I think it is very important that we recognise the benefit that accrues from the free enterprise projects that we see in the north and that pioneers such as Goddard be given every possible encouragement. It does not matter whether agriculture, mining, fishing or any other project is concerned; our part of the State is tough country. People come from more established industries elsewhere in the world and are not educated to the fact that they have to adapt their schemes and way of operation to the peculiar needs of our district.

I hope that entrepreneurs such as Bob Goddard will always come to this country, and I hope they will be encouraged by sympathetic Governments. I do not attach any criticism to the Government for completing the agreement in 1968.

In looking at the agricultural projects in the Kimberley which many people would describe as failures, we see that it was 1950 when Associated Rural Industries first looked at Camballin. Peter Farley was the person concerned. Subsequently by agreement with the State in, I think, 1957, Northern Developments was created and Kim Durack was brought in to grow rice crops in the area. There was success

in many instances and apparent failure in many instances. But the project kept on going and we learnt more and more.

Subsequently the Australian Land and Cattle Company, headed by Jack Fletcher, moved in. This company also had its ups and downs; and I think most of us would accept that generally they have been downs. However, that company is still there and still has the potential to make a major contribution as time goes on.

At Anna Plains we saw the best part of \$1 million spent by American entrepreneurs Linkletter and Chase when they used sub-artesian water to spray irrigate broad acre crops. It was a very spectacular sight to see that operation. The State agricultural advisers told them they could not use the highly mineralised waters but these fellows had to try to prove the project.

While our own agricultural advisers had made their recommendations as a result of control plots these fellows showed us that there were still deficiencies and that we had to have something better than spray irrigation with highly mineralised water if we were to succeed. That was another case of a lot of money being spent, a failed enterprise but a lot learnt from it.

Now we have the Dunham River project and I do not need to tell members more about that. It was Alan Chase who first of all went there and he introduced the Goddard corporation to the project. What has occurred has been explained to us.

If we look at the Ord River we see that that project started with the elementary stages of the research station when Kim Durack was again involved. Of course Mr Frank Wise, a former distinguished member of this House, was also very much involved as a young man.

We then came to the pilot farm stage and then the 30 000 acres of stage one. Of course in this case there was Government sponsorship but we found again that there were American entrepreneurs among the people who came to the area. Here again the amount of money spent has been great but the cumulative store of knowledge is considerable.

I remind members of the Chaffey brothers who approached the Victorian Government in the 1890s with a foolhardy sounding project concerning the Murray River at Mildura. They approached the South Australian Government concerning a project at Renmark which sounded equally foolhardy. The Chaffey brothers were bankrupted as a result of their activities, but we have to look at the long-term results and we can now see the tremendous number of irrigated industries along the Murray River including citrus, all sorts of orchards, vines and the wine

industry. In fact if one goes to Mildura now one will find statues of the same Chaffey brothers who lost all their money. It is interesting to note that the Chaffey brothers were also from North America.

Although in 1976 we might view these agricultural projects in the Kimberley as apparent failures, they will turn out to be the successes of the future. The major problem, which I have little doubt applied to the Murray River years ago, is the absence of any economy of scale. We just have not been big enough to develop transport, the infrastructure needed and the processing mills associated with such industries which would then bring the people so that public utilities and social amenities could follow.

There is a strong body of expert opinion that if someone had been bold enough to authorise the full 200 000 acres of irrigable land in the Ord project in the first instance there would have been no halt in the project, it would have progressed and would have made the grade straightaway. But there is no doubt at all that as time goes on we will see success in this and all other projects.

The association of the Ord and the Dunham is very important. Obviously the facilities, the services and the processing plants that are going to be placed on the Ord will be of major assistance to the Dunham area.

Of course if the Ord should develop with a monoculture, perhaps sugar cane, then the next 34 000 acres under stage 2 which has now been cancelled will come into their own with other crops. Perhaps we will have a statue in Wyndham to Bob Goddard. By the way, already we have unveiled a plaque to Kim Durack on the banks of the Ord where he carried out his initial experimental work.

All of us should be reminded that no irrigation project services the capital involved in its establishment. This applies anywhere in Australia and, perhaps I am safe in saying, anywhere in the world. In the south-west we have the Wellington Dam, Stirling Dam, Logue Brook Dam, and Waroona Dam, but farmers in that great productive irrigation area are not expected to service the capital cost on those projects. This also applies in connection with the Murray River and the locks which have been established to control the flow and provide water for irrigation projects and in connection with the Hume Dam and the mighty Snowy River project. No attempt is made by any Government to stipulate that the farmers must meet the capital repayments on the work done to provide the major engineering structures necessary to ensure that the industries dependent on irrigation can survive. The same can be said of the cotton areas at Namoi and Wee Waa and the cane sugar industry on the Burdekin

River in Queensland. The farmers involved there do not service the capital involved.

We must recognise that the major water storage projects are the responsibility of Governments; they are part of the development of our nation. It seems essential that at some time in the future the Government will become involved in capital works for projects like Camballin and, possibly, the Dunham River. Frankly I hope it does not become greatly involved, but the capital associated with these projects makes it almost inevitable that it will.

Incidentally it will be noted that under the amending Bill provision is made for the establishment of what we might describe as a local water board to control the use of the water. The Government will provide the chairman for the board.

Reverting back to the Dunham River project, I wish to say that the whole concept of moving cattle from the rangeland to improved pastures—improved by the use of legumes or other introduced grasses—and then onto irrigated pasture or feedlots for finishing is all right. There is no doubt that this will be the pattern for the future. The beef cattle industry is the whole basis of the economy of the Kimberley, and always will be. There will be cash crops grown on the irrigation projects, but essentially the important industry of the region will be the beef cattle industry.

I am quite sure that stations such as Bedford Downs, Bow River, Springvale, Lissadell, Texas Downs, and Mabel Downs will take up these farms in order that they might move their range cattle from the range onto fenced-in and improved pastures and then onto the irrigated areas of the Dunham River en route to the meatworks. This will be the pattern of the future.

Bob Goddard is a cattle man and all his activities on the pilot stage of the Dunham River were oriented towards the development of cattle outputs. His ambitions were blocked primarily because of the disastrous fall in the price of cattle and, under those circumstances, his inability to fatten cattle to provide the prime quality beef which can be produced.

Under the parent Act, when freehold title was granted for five farms the person entitled to such farms was not able to sell without ministerial approval. This is unusual and I wonder why Goddard's attorneys did not realise it in 1968.

Today I received some information from the Minister for Lands in reply to a question I asked. It is interesting to note that the Dunham River pastoral lease has now been transferred to the Aboriginal Lands Trust and, specifically, the Doondoon Pastoral Company has taken up the lease. That company comprises the Gidja Aboriginal group, and the cost of the lease was

\$170 000. I hope the group can develop a workable cattle operation on Dunham River and that in due course it will have access to part of either the 10 000 acres or the next 34 000 acres the development of which is at present in mothballs. I hope it will thus be able to produce a better quality beef on its property.

One of the important pieces of information in the answer to the question was that there is no impediment to the development of the next 34 000 acres and I certainly look forward to the day when we have another agreement before us under which we will again reverse the situation to that which applied under the original agreement of 1968 so that we ensure the additional agricultural land can be released. This is part and parcel of the overall development of agriculture and particularly irrigated agriculture in the Kimberley region.

I support the Bill before us. I am sorry it had to be presented, but I acknowledge that although it is necessary under the present circumstances, there is no doubt that we will see better things from this and similar projects.

THE HON. S. J. DELLAR (Lower North) [8.29 p.m.]: I rise to support the Bill and to put at rest the mind of Mr Tozer who was rather surprised that no-one from the Opposition side spoke on the second reading although the Opposition had obtained the adjournment of the debate. Unfortunately, the Opposition's member who is in charge of the Bill is not able to be present.

We did not rise to speak because we knew very well that Mr Tozer was particularly interested in the area involved and that because of his vast knowledge of the subject he may have been in a position to provide us with some information. He did so and I thank him for that information, because the Minister's second reading speech told us very little. In fact it took approximately five minutes of the time of the House for the Minister to impart the contents of the Bill. However, Mr Tozer has now explained it to us.

Mr Tozer has expressed sorrow that the project will not enter the second phase of development and that the people concerned in the enterprise have lost a considerable amount of money. I wonder whether this was another ill-advised, ill-founded, and hastily-drafted agreement of the boom years of the 1960s when agreements on various projects were coming from right, left, and centre. Now we find that the projects under some of the agreements are not coming to fruition and that people like Mr Goddard, about whom Mr Tozer spoke, are losing their money.

I reiterate that I am grateful to Mr Tozer for his having provided some of the background of the agreement.

On page 5 of the Minister's notes we find that an interdepartmental committee, headed by Mr Hamilton, Director, Office of the North West, was established and as a result of the deliberations of that committee certain recommendations were made. The Minister's notes read—

These recommendations are reflected in the executed agreement, as set out in the schedule to the Bill, and may be broadly summarised as follows—

Authority for the sale by Goddard of Australia Pty. Ltd. of five of the 10 farms, for which Crown grants have previously issued. (Farms 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6);

I will admit that I have not studied the schedule, but nowhere does the Minister give any indication of the conditions of the sale or the way in which Goddard can dispose of the farms. To continue—

provision for the amendment of the boundaries of farm No. 8;

provision for the issue of Crown grants for farms 7 and 8;

provision for the retention, for the time being, by Goddard of Australia Pty. Ltd. of farms 7 and 8 but with the right to lease for any term not exceeding three years;

provision for the surrender to the Crown of existing leases over farms 2, 9 and 10, with the intent that alternative leases be issued enabling the land to be utilised solely for dry land holding areas for stock;

consideration of acceptance of responsibility for the control and management of Arthur Creek dam, the drainage channels, the water distribution system and farms 2, 9 and 10 being passed to Arthur Creek Irrigation Company Pty. Ltd., the shareholders of which would comprise the respective registered proprietors for the time being of farms 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8;

consideration of assignment by Goddard of Australia Pty. Ltd. of a significant part of the agreement to Arthur Creek Irrigation Company Pty. Ltd.;

recognition of the fact that phase 2 development will not proceed.

We do not oppose the Bill. Like Mr Tozer I am sorry the developers are not in a position to continue. As I said before I wonder whether this is one of those agreements which was hastily written and ill conceived—

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I think that is very unfair.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: —in the alleged boom days.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: That is very unfair both on Mr Goddard and the Government of the day.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: As Mr Tozer said, Goddard is an entrepreneur and an investor and perhaps he did not go into the project with his eyes closed. He thought there was an area in which he could make an investment and obtain a return.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: That is right. So why do you say it was ill conceived?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Whether it was ill conceived or hastily conceived—

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You said it was.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I said it might have been.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You were criticising a previous Government for an ill-conceived agreement.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I did not say it was ill conceived. I said I wondered whether it was another of the ill-conceived agreements written in haste.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: What are the others?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I am sure that if this Government stays in office much longer we will have more Bills under which we will be told that certain proposals cannot proceed.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Another of those ill-conceived agreements!

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: The Opposition does not oppose the legislation. Mr Tozer said he was surprised no-one on this side spoke to the second reading. I do so now merely to point out that at least Mr Tozer gave us some knowledge of the Bill because the Minister's speech gave us very little information on which to work.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central—Minister for Health) [8.45 p.m.]: I would like to express my appreciation to Mr Tozer for his contribution to the debate on this Bill and for the information he has given to the House.

I do not know why Mr Dellar complained that he got very little information on the matter. If he reads the second reading notes again he will see they refer specifically to what is in the Bill; he will see they set out all the details of the amendments proposed to the agreement with the company and the transfer from Goddard Holdings to Wee Country Development Corporation. It also refers to the terms under which the new company may assign or transfer any of these properties; in other words, according to the terms the Minister is prepared to agree upon.

Had the honourable member read the second reading notes properly he would have found sufficient information.

Mr Tozer gave us quite a lot of the history of this matter, and I agree with him.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: What are the conditions?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Goddard of Australia Pty. Ltd. will retain the management of three farms, but the other farms—Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 may be transferred to Wee Country Development Corporation and it will be possible under the terms agreed to by the Minister to dispose of these properties.

As Mr Tozer said, it is a pity that this Bill had to come before the House, but it is one of those unfortunate things. If one were to consider the development of the Kimberley over the many years past—from the time of the first settlers—one would realise what it takes to develop an area of country like the Kimberley.

I recall when I was a boy in 1919 and my father was Minister for Agriculture that the Wyndham meatworks was opened to assist the cattle growers of the Kimberley and help them market their cattle rather than ship them to Fremantle for slaughtering. Apart from this, it was necessary to walk the cattle some hundreds of miles before they could be put on board ship. Accordingly, it would be appreciated just how long it takes to develop country of this nature.

So when people talk about this being a failure and that being a failure they should look to posterity; they should consider the future and reflect that in years to come this development will provide the foundation, and produce in the Kimberley area something to which future generations can look forward.

As I have said, while it is a pity that this Bill had to come before Parliament, we must appreciate that farming and grazing is an up and down business. From your experience, Mr President, you will know that things are not always rosy—in some years we have good seasons and are on the crest of the wave, while in others we have bad seasons and more often than not we finish in a trough. This has always been the case with farming. I have known it to be so all my life.

We know that in 1968 the price for cattle was fairly good. This has gone back at the moment, but I can see a time when cattle prices will again come good, and we will probably go ahead to better things. I again 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.

HIRE-PURCHASE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

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

Second Reading

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central—Minister for Health) [8.51 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The first licences to credit providers issued under the Hire-Purchase Act expired on the 30th June, 1976 and on the 25th June, the tribunal heard over 100 applications for renewal of licence. This necessitated the attendance of applicants who naturally were occupied for some time in the process. The Act, as it stands, requires a "hearing" of application whether contested or not.

Arising from the renewal hearings, some applicants lodged letters of complaint about the time-wasting activity in appearing before the tribunal, simply to answer as to name and company, when no other evidence had to be adduced, and have the licence renewed.

This Bill is therefore designed to streamline the procedure before the hire-purchase licensing tribunal, so as to obviate time-wasting appearances by applicants, when initial applications for licences or annual renewal of applications for licences are being determined by the tribunal.

The amendment will alter the law so that the appearance of applicants can be dispensed with, not entirely, but at least in cases where there is no evidence to be adduced, no submissions to be made, and no questions to be put by the tribunal. This will allow the tribunal to reserve only matters, as necessary, for formal hearing when attendance of parties will be required.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the Opposition).

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [8.54 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Robb Jetty Meatworks: Industrial Dispute

THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [8.55 p.m.]: I would like to speak on this adjournment motion because I feel that while many may think we have been debating rather inconsequential legislation in the form of the registration of psychologists, registration of painters, legislation dealing with security agents, and that giving compensation for criminal

injuries, at the same time the general public and the farmers in particular are being raped and ravaged by rather ridiculous, inconsequential, and irresponsible union executives.

I wonder what sort of priorities we have in this country when Parliament literally sits back while this sort of thing is taking place. We have a small group of men who are sabotaging and blackmailing what is probably one of the major sectors of our economy—and I refer now particularly to the dispute at Robb Jetty with its consequent repercussion to the whole of the livestock industry.

We appear to be in a position where we are forced to sit back and debate these trivialities while farmers associated with this very important fat stock industry are being greatly affected by what is happening today—and not only the farmers but all those associated with the industry, whether they be connected with the transport of cattle or with the Midland Junction Abattoir; whether they be traders in the rural areas or in the city, whether they sell fuel or groceries.

We seem to have become accustomed to trying to dodge these disputes hoping they will not affect us personally and that we will pick up enough business and survive, whether we be an employer or an employee.

People have been heard to say that the matter has gone too far; that it must crack, but we seem to go from one dispute to another and the situation gets more and more difficult for the State and the country; it gets more difficult particularly for the industry I represent; the livestock industry.

There seems to be one big difference in the dispute we are discussing at the moment. Principally disputes seem to concern the worker and probably one large company, but in this particular case it affects a vast number of people; for while perhaps the Clausen Steamship Company is the company actually concerned in the dispute, the dispute itself has a great effect on all the woolgrowers and the livestock producers of this State. Undoubtedly the feeling of a large section of our public is that the slaughtermen are being just too greedy in seeking an increase from what I gather is an average of \$260 a week—what they are receiving currently—up to nearly \$300 a week by seeking to have the darg adjusted. As we all know, one person alone will have to pay for this increase and that is the primary producer, because we will not get any more for our livestock overseas, and someone along the line will have to foot the bill.

Undoubtedly the primary producer is getting more and more worked up about this and I can see a great disturbance taking place because of it. It appears that because the union has been unable to make

its point in the abattoir the dispute has overflowed into the livestock export industry; because it is quite easy to affect that industry.

The position has been reached where the *Atlas Pioneer* has been turned literally into a floating cemetery with sheep lined up in plastic bags which cannot be unloaded because of quarantine regulations. I understand these are sitting now on the upper deck of the 10-deck carrier; they are under tarpaulins. I hope these bags do not blow up and emit an obnoxious smell and thus stop the loading of the ship with livestock if and when there is final agreement to load.

We hope that tomorrow will see an end to the dispute. The *Atlas Pioneer* is only the first of the tankers to be converted to this trade. Wesfarmers—which is a co-operative made up of the growers of this State—has another two ships which will be coming onto the line in the near future.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Do you think they will?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Unfortunately, probably Wesfarmers is committed to charter these vessels regardless of whether or not they can export livestock. This is one of the reasons that the producers of this State are becoming so concerned. The company developed a sheep trade with the Persian Gulf and farmers are being paid a minimum of \$8 each for these export wethers. Sheep killed here and exported as carcasses are worth about \$3.50 only.

Many people believe that this dispute has blown up suddenly, but I believe it has been in the melting pot for months and that it was well and truly planned for the arrival of this ship. I would like to quote from *The West Australian* of the 12th September, 1974, as this will refresh the minds of members about what happened in the past, as we are apt to forget it. The article is headed, "Live-sheep exports to be debated", and it reads as follows—

A conference in Sydney on Monday could have an important bearing on future live-sheep exports from WA.

The conference has been called by the Minister for Agriculture, Senator Wriedt, to consider the matter on a national basis.

Several industry representatives from WA, including the secretary of the Meat Industry Employees' Union, Mr M. Burns, and the Director of Agriculture, Mr E. N. Fitzpatrick, will attend.

The question of live-sheep exports has been controversial in WA over the last few months because unemployment among meat workers has risen with a slump in meat exports.

A working party of representatives of the Meat Employees' Union, exporters and the sheep industry, under the chairmanship of Mr Fitzpatrick, spent weeks in delicate negotiation seeking a compromise solution to an export ban proposed by the union.

The article went on to explain that there was an agreement about the type and weight of stock to be exported. The article continues—

In the meantime, the federal body of the MIEU came out with a ten point plan for future live sheep exports. However, the restrictions placed on exports made the plan unacceptable to exporters.

Basically, it wanted the exporter or importer to buy the equivalent of 15 sheep or lambs in boneless or carcass form for every live sheep purchased.

The processed meat was to be prepared in the State from which the live sheep came.

If a particular country failed to buy the equivalent of processed meat, an embargo would be put on the export of the live sheep.

These conditions would apply till June 30, 1975. The ratio of processed meat to live sheep would then be increased by 100 per cent.

Of course, we have passed that year. The article then says the union proposed that the export of live sheep or lambs for slaughter should cease from July, 1976. That was the 10-point plan which the unions had decided to go for at that stage, so it is quite evident that this dispute did not blow up suddenly and that the meat industry union is determined to put an end to the trade and to have a monopoly on the livestock grown in the State.

So at that time we had the same problem on the waterfront at Port Adelaide, as we had here last Thursday when the waterside workers were quite willing to load the stock and yet the meat industry union picketed the railway line so that stock could not be put aboard the ship. In that particular case in South Australia the farmers threatened to have 2 000 people on the wharf and undoubtedly they were organised to do so. Under the conditions prevailing, the union withdrew its objections and the pickets were withdrawn. This is the sort of thing that will happen in this State if we do not see this ship loaded immediately.

Contrary to the argument put up by the meat industry union, the export of livestock is very necessary to our State, and the trade is particularly labour intensive on the waterfront. I hope that the waterside workers appreciate what this dispute will do to them.

I understand that over 36 000 hours were worked by waterside workers to load livestock from the Port of Fremantle. A simple calculation will show that that amounts to the employment of 99 men every day of the week and every week of the year for seven hours a day.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: They must have only just started it—livestock was never loaded from Fremantle by them.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Livestock is loaded at Esperance and Albany by waterside workers.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: In Albany yes, and in Geraldton.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: This provides work for many people. If the sheep are killed and become carcases, there will be a great deal less work involved in loading the containers. It is about time that some other unions appreciated what will happen to them if this ban continues and the overseas shippers are frightened off. These shippers can go elsewhere, and when the dispute occurred in 1974, the Middle East countries purchased sheep from Rumania, the Argentine, and elsewhere. In spite of that, the trade was rekindled, and yet here we see another major dispute—in fact, a dispute of greater magnitude than the one of 1974.

We do not have our own abattoirs at Esperance, and it is something special for us to be able to export live sheep. This means we can keep work within our own district. I do not know whether or not the waterside workers in Fremantle will be put out of work if we are not allowed to export livestock, but certainly they will be put out of work in Esperance and Albany. The Esperance branch of the waterside workers union is exceptional—it is the spearhead of a move to continue the export of livestock and the development of a completely new trade in the export of cattle. This may be because many waterside workers in Esperance are either farmers themselves or they understand the problems of the farmers in the area. It is a great pity that the *Atlas Pioneer* was not taken into Esperance. I understand the reason was that there were insufficient tugs to bring in such a large ship and it would have been very expensive to bring in a tug from Albany for one ship. I am quite sure that had this ship come into the Port of Esperance, we would not have seen anything like what has occurred here.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It is not the waterside workers holding up the ship in Fremantle.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I am not saying for one moment that they are. Indeed, from reading the Press cuttings one finds that the waterside workers have said they will load the sheep. The ridiculous thing is that the sheep were in

rail trucks on the wharf and had to be taken only 100 yards. It is very fortunate that the farmers did not go to the port and take on the meat industry unionists there. It is fortunate that the farmers were persuaded by their various organisations to hold back and to let good sense prevail. However, I wonder how long this will continue.

It is not just the waterside workers who gain employment from the livestock trade. The company involved in the dispute—Clausens—during the last 12 months has undertaken some 5 000 road transport movements to get the livestock from the holding paddocks to the ship. There have been some 6 000 rail movements and 6 500 trucks full of fodder have been carted down to the wharf. This is a big business, and it is completely in jeopardy in this State. We are told that the buying of wethers has now ceased completely. Clausens has spent \$1 million a month on this trade. It is certainly big business for us in Esperance where we usually have just one ship on the run, the *Linda Clausen*, which has moved 90 000 sheep in 60 days and which has brought about \$500 000 a year into Esperance to the few producers in this area. As I say, these sheep will be valueless without this important trade. Once they get to Perth they would be worth \$3 to \$3.50 each, and it costs at least \$1.50 a sheep for transport to the nearest abattoir.

I rose to speak on this adjournment motion to point out to the House and to the State the importance of the industry to us and the serious consequences that will follow if the dispute is not ended immediately.

THE HON. J. HEITMAN (Upper West) [9.11 p.m.]: I would like to support my colleague, the Hon. D. J. Wordsworth—

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: The start of an election campaign, is it?

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: —about the way things have developed in the Fremantle zone in regard to the export of live wethers. Apparently the whole matter commenced about the 22nd of last month, and one thing led to another until the slaughtermen refused to allow live sheep and wethers to be shipped out of the country. I do not suppose there is any other community in Australia which is told just how many live sheep it can export.

It appears to me to be most unfair that farmers have held these wethers back until they weigh 60 to 80 lbs, dressed weight, only to find that enough wethers have already been shipped out of the country and the unions refuse to allow any more to be exported.

In many cases the farming community has gone to a great amount of trouble to bring sheep up to the stage where they can be shipped out only to find that because some union does not agree with the set-up it has imposed these restrictions. I doubt whether any other community in the world would put up with this sort of thing.

I have been a farmer in the past and my sons are carrying on at the present time, so I find it hard to believe that in a drought year, where farmers have saved sheep until they can obtain about \$7 or \$8 each for them, they cannot send them overseas because the unions will not allow the sheep to be loaded. We cannot blame Clausens for not buying any more sheep. The company has been a tremendous boon to this country because of the number of sheep it has exported to other countries, and also, it has purchased many tonnes of hay each year to cater for this business. We will find that some other country or the Eastern States will get this business, and it will be lost to Western Australia altogether.

From time to time a tremendous effort has been put into obtaining these markets and ships have been chartered to send live sheep to Kuwait or some other country that likes its meat hot and not killed by the exporting country and then frozen. In some of these countries butchers like to kill the animals themselves, hang the meat, and cut off portions as the customers desire. It is a shame that this trade will be lost to Western Australia if we have any more strikes.

A lot of planning and work is necessary to get this export trade under way. I know the people of whom we have been speaking have tried to set it up in the past but have not been able to manage it. The sheep must be fed throughout the journey, and the ship must be kept in a clean condition. One must know the areas that will cut hay so that it can be picked up and used as feed for the sheep.

It is a shocking thing to see sheep dying on the ships in Fremantle because of the actions of a certain section of the community. I do not know whether they hate the farming community, but it appears they must vent their spite on somebody. This is occurring at a time when the farming community is suffering, and Clausen's is in difficulties—a firm which has done a tremendous amount of organising in this area.

I have plenty of Press cuttings which indicate how the whole dispute developed to this stage. There does not appear to be an end in sight, unless the meeting this afternoon resolved the dispute. When the men decided they would load the ship,

the TLC came into the picture and said, "No, you will not load them." It seems to me that the TLC has no thought for anyone else, except the unions it represents. It like to throw its weight around and destroy the living standard enjoyed by Western Australians and the life of those who work hard and endeavour to send live sheep overseas.

This is a disgusting situation. It is very aggravating and annoying and I think it is about time something was done to let the people know that this is not the Australian way of life; this is not allowing people to obtain a decent standard of living. I support everything said by the Hon. David Wordsworth, and only wish that my voice was a little stronger so that I could battle on for another hour.

THE HON. T. KNIGHT (South) [9.17 p.m.]: I support my colleagues, the Hon. David Wordsworth and the Hon. Jack Heitman in everything they have said. Looking at the situation over the last few months, I believe a strategic plan is in operation by some secret organisation—

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: This is the Premier's Russians again.

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: —to cripple the economy of this country, to stop exports, and to bring to their knees people who really care and want to work. Nothing can be gained by these strikes. I believe the worker who is forced to go on strike by an irresponsible militant union hierarchy is being penalised. If he strikes for four weeks, in effect it costs him and his family their annual holidays. He can never catch up on his hire purchase or mortgage payments because of the time lost through going on strike; that time can never be regained.

The whole economy of this country is at stake. The people who want to work are unable to do so, and nothing is being done to assist them. I believe a stand must be taken somewhere along the line, or this country will be slowly crippled. I do not know what the stand should be, but unless we talk about it and get down to doing something, the effects of these strikes will be drastic.

A similar type of dispute is occurring at the moment in our iron ore industry. In fact, such disputes are occurring in nearly every export industry in Australia. Unless a country can export what it produces, it surely must die.

I speak to workers every day in Albany. I have listened to what the Hon. David Wordsworth said. I can say that the waterside workers in Albany are a very responsible group. Perhaps, unlike other waterside workers, they are also farmers or work part-time at some other occupation. They are well aware of the present

situation which has been created. They want to work; they want this country to go forward.

Everything is being crippled by these strikes. We are not able to compete on the world markets through our rising costs. Our country is a young country which over the years has expanded rapidly. When one considers the low population of this country, I believe the quantity of goods produced for export represents a magnificent effort on the part of the people, including workers belonging to trade unions, farmers, and business people. We have set a high standard on the world market and we must maintain that standard to exist. I fully support all that my colleagues have said.

THE HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition [9.20 p.m.]): I do not want to enter into the rights or wrongs of the dispute surrounding the particular vessel in Fremantle, because I do not know a great deal about it. I have a number of other things to think about without thinking about that. However, I should like to correct some of the statements made by Mr Heitman and Mr Knight. I understood Mr Heitman to say that although the workers were prepared to conclude the stoppage, the TLC entered the dispute. I find that very hard to believe.

Mr Heitman: It is quite true.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I am not saying that Mr Heitman is wrong; I am saying I find it hard to believe. The TLC is an organisation very similar to the Confederation of Western Australian Industry in that it is a group of people, and not a union. Certainly, it acts for and on behalf of a very large body of people but it cannot enter a dispute unless a particular organisation asks it.

Mr Heitman: Maybe they did ask it.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: From my experience, if the meat workers said they were prepared to allow the ship to be loaded, the TLC would have no legal right to instruct the union not to load the ship. However, I will take it upon myself to find out more about the case. As I say, I find it very hard to believe because the ordinary mechanical workings of such a situation would not allow it to happen.

I do not think the remarks made by Mr Knight go anywhere towards solving these very difficult problems. I do not believe there is any secret organisation. All over the western world, countries are suffering from this kind of disputation. When Mr Clive Griffiths was in Canada, the airline pilots, air controllers and ticket girls all were on strike. I believe he travelled by bus to the City of Detroit, and got out only just in time, because the next day the entire Police Force of that city went on strike.

Let us be fair about these things. I understand the plight of the farmers as do most of the waterside workers. I must admit I have not had a look at the plight of the meat workers. But we are always looking at the manifestation of the disease in industrial relations, and it is about time—whichever political policy we support—we had a look at the period when the germ enters the body, because the need exists for such an examination.

It is just not good enough for Mr Knight to make an inflammatory speech about overseas influences, and secret organisations because the cold hard facts are that, not only in this country but around the world, there are many, many workers who have never been on strike and who never will go on strike. This is the situation in Australia, where thousands of workers have never even thought about striking. The situation in the United Kingdom is often adverted to in this place, but millions of workers there have never been on strike, and never will. I try to understand these problems, but I do not think we can get anywhere by making such statements, because we become divisive and all kinds of things happen.

As a matter of fact, there are far less disputes on the waterfront now than there used to be before the Woodward inquiry. As Mr Heitman would know, disputes were rife in the coalmining industry before the Gallagher inquiry, but that situation has improved drastically since that time.

The Hon. J. Heitman: The biggest thing to iron out the problems in the coalmining industry was the fact that most industries switched to oil burners.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Mr Heitman should not start talking about oil-burning power stations, or I shall tell him about the cost of producing power in Western Australia. We are producing more coal now than we ever did; coal production has shown a steady increase over the years, despite the fact that oil burners have been used. I am not talking about what type of burners are used; I am talking about the dramatic reduction in disputes on the coalfields since the Gallagher inquiry. The coalmining industry used to be a place of intense disputation; in fact, it was referred to as an "island industry".

I believe we should be looking at some of the deep, even psychological problems which are besetting people in certain areas. We should look at ways of averting stoppages. I agree there is certainly a need to do this. However, we will not get anywhere by striking a match and saying, "I hope it does not cause a fire, but it might be to my advantage, so I will fan it."

The Hon. J. Heitman: That is exactly what the unions are doing.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I will talk about a vessel about which our rural members have not seen fit to talk, namely, the *Harvest Gold*. Because of the congestion in the freezer and the inefficient methods of loading meat at Fremantle, a claim for damages of probably \$100 000 will be made upon the firm about which Mr Heitman was talking. The workers cannot be blamed for this; this is a management problem. The waterside workers had to unload 2 000 carcasses of meat, and the vessel sailed leaving an additional 500 carcasses behind. Let us have a look at that little incident. This is another area which must be examined, because it is germane to this discussion. It causes the same kind of damage to the rural industries as the dispute now taking place. The problem was caused when the top section of the refrigerated cargo was loaded first. Is that the waterside worker's fault?

The Hon. J. Heitman: Are you in favour of them stopping live exports?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: At no stage did I say that; it is a disaster, as Mr Heitman knows full well. We need to find some solution quickly. What I got up to say was this: I intend to verify the statement about the TLC.

The Hon. J. Heitman: It is quite true; I am not one who tells lies.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: In all seriousness, I would be the last person in this Chamber to suggest such a thing. However, a misunderstanding may have occurred; I will make inquiries to see whether the statement is correct.

The Hon. J. Heitman: It was the TLC. That was mentioned this afternoon.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: As I say, I find it hard to believe, but I will check. I realise the meat workers and the farmers are losing wages.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: As you know, the waterside workers are employed at 10 o'clock on Friday morning and are receiving double time—

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The wharflies at Fremantle never used to handle livestock, whereas in other ports they always did. I do not know whether they have taken over the loading of livestock at Fremantle. However, the cold hard facts are there are people in Fremantle who handle livestock. It does not matter what kind of handle one puts on them—whether they are wharflies or whatever—because everyone is losing.

Finally, I do not think we will get anywhere by making the sort of statement made by Mr Knight, because it serves only to fan the flame. I have pointed over the years to great areas of disputation where a proper approach has been taken by people skilled to do the

job. Members have heard me say many times that I am a great believer in using properly qualified people—judges, rather than amateurs—to examine these areas of disputation, and where this has occurred, a great deal of good has been done. Perhaps this course should be followed in the future. We live in difficult times, where every manjack of our population—whether he be a farmer or an ordinary working man—does not know what lies around the corner.

I understand the concern of the farmers; and I understand the concern of the meat workers who are anxious to preserve their jobs, although I do not know all the details of the dispute. I also understand the concern of the coal miners and the waterside workers. I have looked at the situation at the wharf. No doubt, Mr Clive Griffiths is aware that the waterside labour force is down to probably half of what it was a few years ago. That was brought about quite amicably, and there was no dispute. Technical advances were introduced at the wharf, and by approaching the matter in a correct manner no heartburning was caused by the change. As a consequence, no industrial stoppages occurred when the labour force was reduced by approximately half.

The same thing happens in other industries in these times. The workers in them do not know what will happen. One of the difficulties in dealing with the people engaged in an industry is that no-one sees himself as being the one to suffer through the introduction of an automatic device. Like two workers involved, I might look at Mr Dellar and he might look at me. He thinks I will lose my job, but I think he will lose his. It is not until we are both outside the gate that we know what has really happened. The same thing has occurred over and over again in these days, and there is a certain amount of fear abroad. It is about time that collectively we got together to resolve these matters.

In reply to the comments of Mr Heitman I assure him that I will certainly make the necessary inquiry. I can tell him that at Fremantle we have the interests of his industry at heart. I have intervened personally in a small way in disputes, but on this occasion I have no intention of upsetting the workers concerned. I cannot believe what the honourable member has said is correct. I wish that Mr Knight and other members had not made the statements that they did.

The Hon. T. Knight: You are opposed to my bringing up the issue.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.31 p.m.