

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am assured when the pressure is on, such as in a case like that, extra assistance is given. I have asked the Minister to submit the honourable member's speech to the Commissioner of Police, and I want a report on it to find out what happened.

Mr T. H. Jones: The employees themselves told me this.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We will be interested to see what is said when they are confronted with the honourable member's remarks.

I have dealt with the comments of the member for Mt. Hawthorn. He does not seem to be able to distinguish between the various phases of budgeting. When my predecessor went to the Premiers' Conferences and was trying to put a case to the Commonwealth, he would have to state that if he did not get the assistance he sought the deficit would be \$X million. It will always be the same situation. I am hoping the margin will be less under the new system, when we will have much more chance of assessing what we will get.

The member for Swan dealt with industrial matters which I will refer to my colleague. Likewise, I have asked my colleague to follow up what was said by the member for Victoria Park.

The member for Mundaring seemed to be upset about the Entertainment Centre.

Mr Moiler: I am upset about the way you saved the people concerned.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I do not propose to go into full details on it at this stage.

Mr Moiler: I am sure you do not.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Any time the Parliament wants full details—

Mr Moiler: Why do you not answer my letter?

Sir CHARLES COURT: We will have a look at the letter.

Mr Moiler: After six weeks.

Sir CHARLES COURT: If the honourable member knows the transaction—and he seems to be very interested in it—most of the sources of funds which were guaranteed and thus made available by our predecessors are related to Government instrumentalities.

Now, if we go into possession under such circumstances, we finish up owing ourselves the same money and owning the premises. For all practical purposes we would then be in exactly the same position we are in at the moment. The people concerned have lost all the money they invested, including the loans they advanced quite separately from the equity capital they introduced. What more can they lose? If the honourable member has any magic, I would like him to let me know about it. I remind him that these people did not intend originally to build at this site at all. The intended site was at the Royal Agricultural

Society Show Grounds and the estimated cost was \$2.6 million. These people were enticed to build in the city at an estimated cost of \$5 million, but with a finished cost of \$8 million, as well as all the associated costs.

Mr Moiler: Obviously they went into it as a business venture.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am very interested to hear the attitude of the member for Mundaring. I am assuming that he, or someone on his behalf, will come forward with a motion on this matter.

Mr Moiler: You might have the decency to reply to my letter.

Sir CHARLES COURT: If the Opposition moves such a motion, we can let the honourable member and the public know just how sensibly, carefully, and responsibly the present Government has acted.

I thank the members for their contributions to the debate, and I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

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

House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 10th August, 1976

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

LIQUOR

Sunday Trading: Petition

THE HON. G. E. MASTERS (West) [4.32 p.m.]: I wish to present a petition from the residents of Western Australia requesting that Parliament change the legislation relating to the purchase of liquor from licensed premises on Sundays. The petition contains 18 000 signatures, and bears the Clerk's certificate that it is in conformity with the Standing Orders. I move—

That the petition be received, read, and ordered to lie upon the Table of the House.

Question put and passed.

THE HON. G. E. MASTERS (West)
[4.34 p.m.]: The petition is as follows—

To the Honourable the President and Members of the Legislative Council in Parliament assembled.

The humble petition of the undersigned respectfully sheweth that present legislation relating to the purchase of liquor from licensed premises on Sundays is discriminative and infringes our basic right to freedom of choice.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that you will present our Petition to the Parliament and the Parliament will change this legislation to permit bottle sales of beers-ales-wines and spirits within the permitted licensed hours, according to the individual choice.

And your Petitioners, as in duty bound will ever pray.

The petition was tabled (see paper No. 285).

WEST COAST HIGHWAY

Servetus Street Extension: Petition

THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [4.35 p.m.]: I wish to present a petition from members of the Cottesloe Golf Club (Inc.) opposing the use of Servetus Street as an extension to West Coast Highway. The petition contains 336 signatures, and bears the Clerk's certificate that it is in conformity with Standing Orders. I move—

That the petition be received, read, and ordered to lie upon the Table of the House.

Question put and passed.

THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [4.37 p.m.]: The petition reads as follows—

To: The President and Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia.

We the undersigned members of the Cottesloe Golf Club (Inc.) of Swanbourne hereby humbly petition the Honourable Members of the Legislative Council of Western Australia to do all within their power to oppose the recommendation that Servetus Street be used as an extension to West Coast Highway.

Your petitioners will ever pray that their humble and earnest petition would be acceded to.

The petition was tabled (see paper No. 286).

LIQUOR

Sunday Trading: Petition

THE HON. R. T. LEESON (South-East) [4.38 p.m.]: I wish to present a petition from citizens of Kalgoorlie, Boulder, Coolgardie, and Kambalda relating to the sale of liquor from licensed premises

on Sundays. The petition contains 563 signatures, and bears the Clerk's certificate that it is in conformity with the Standing Orders. I move—

That the petition be received, read, and ordered to lie upon the Table of the House.

Question put and passed.

THE HON. R. T. LEESON (South-East) [4.40 p.m.]: The petition reads as follows—

To: The Honourable, the President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council.

The Petition of Citizens of Kalgoorlie, Boulder, Coolgardie and Kambalda, hereby strongly protest against the provision of clause seven of the Liquor Act Amendment Bill of 1976, (seeking to amend section 24 of the Liquor Act 1970 as amended). As far as the said amendment will reduce the hours of trading of licensed hotels and clubs in the areas in which we reside from five to four hours on a Sunday.

We urge that the deliberations of the Legislative Council in the above regard shall leave the existing law intact, so that there shall be no diminution of trading hours of such licensed premises on a Sunday in our districts.

We the undersigned, resident of the above districts, pray that the decision of the Government to reduce such Sunday trading hours by one hour will be reversed. The main grounds for our objections to the reductions of such trading hours are:—

1. Detrimental effect on tourist industry, particularly having regard to expected weekend build up of Tourist Trade upon the sealing of the Eyre Highway.
2. Having regard to the size of the population of this remote area is and expects to be, undergoing a traumatic experiencing of a harsh economic time, when the sustenance of jobs is essential. The hotel and club industry in our area is the second largest employer of labour. Any reduction in Trading hours must necessarily result in the reduction of the workforce sustained by such hotels and clubs.

Your Petitioners, therefore, pray that your Honourable House will deal with such Legislation as to your wisdom may seem proper to insure this desirable facility being continued and your Petitioners will ever pray.

The petition was tabled (see paper No. 287).

QUESTIONS (9): ON NOTICE**1. TRESILLIAN HOSTEL***Advertisements: Cost*

The Hon. Lyla ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Health:

Will the Minister advise the total amount of public funds spent by the Government on full page advertisements and other public relations related to the Tresillian issue?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:
\$3 429.73.

2. EAST VICTORIA PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL*New Site*

The Hon. Clive GRIFFITHS, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Would the Minister advise what the current position is in regard to the proposal to move the East Victoria Park primary school from its present site?

(2) Is it intended that a new school be provided for the commencement of the 1977 school year?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

(1) An agreement for the purchase of East Victoria Park Primary School site by the developer has been signed by the Hon. Minister for Works.

(2) The anticipated completion date for the new school is May, 1977.

3. CO-OPERATIVE BULK HANDLING*Local Government Rates: Exemption*

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Attorney-General representing the Minister for Local Government:

Further to my question on the 27th May, 1976, concerning Local Government rate exemptions—

(1) Is the Minister yet aware of the extent to which the ratepayers of Fremantle are required to subsidise the wheat industry of Western Australia by virtue of rate exemptions for Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. at Fremantle?

(2) Would it not be more appropriate for any concession which the State wishes to make to this industry to be provided from Government rather than City of Fremantle funds?

(3) Does the Minister suggest that non-rateable land is spread evenly among municipalities, or would he agree that the demands upon the facilities and services provided by local government to an authority such as the Fremantle Port

Authority, which occupies 350 acres at Fremantle, places an extraordinary and unreasonable financial burden on a small community of 26 000 people?

(4) Would it not be more equitable for the Government to pay rates or its equivalent, to the local authority on the property it owns in the same manner as private property so that the financial burden is shared by all taxpayers and not just the local ratepayers?

(5) What grants has the Government made to the Fremantle City Council for the financial year 1975-1976?

(6) What payments has the Fremantle City Council received from the Local Government Assistance Fund?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

(1) No.

(2) I am not aware that any funds of the City of Fremantle are used for this purpose.

(3) The question of the proportion of unrateable land in a district would no doubt be submitted as a factor when seeking equalisation grants.

(4) The principle of reciprocal exemption from intergovernmental charges has been long established. Disadvantaged municipalities should include the quantification of any disabilities suffered when seeking grants from the local government share of income tax.

(5) State Government Grants to City of Fremantle paid during 1975-76—

Community Recreation Council—Capital Grant—Aquatic Centre	\$3 500
Swimming Pool—Operating Losses Subsidy	\$3 000
Aged Persons Homes—Capital Grant	\$18 667
Pensioners Deferred Rates—Interest	\$11 939
Main Roads—Base Grant proportion of Statutory Grant	\$69 054

(6) Nil.

4.**COMPANIES***Registration and Liquidation*

The Hon. Lyla ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Justice:

(1) Are all of the following companies registered in the State of Western Australia:

(a) Beechboro Properties Pty. Ltd.;

(b) Commercial Timbers Pty. Limited;

- (c) Gavan & Shallala Pty. Limited;
 (d) Kununurra Enterprises Pty. Ltd.;
 (e) Landall Limited;
 (f) Landall Holdings Limited;
 (g) Landall-Fulton Constructions Pty. Ltd.;
 (h) Landall Estates Pty. Ltd.;
 (i) Landall Construction and Development Coy. Pty. Ltd.;
 (j) H. R. Young & Co. Pty. Ltd.;
 (k) Pettitt and Sevitt Constructions Pty. Limited;
 (l) Pettitt, Sevitt and Partners (Sales) Pty. Limited;
 (m) Project Finance Corporation Ltd.; and
 (n) Westmore Homes Pty. Limited?
- (2) (a) Are any of them in the course of liquidation; and
 (b) if so, which companies?
- (3) (a) Have receivers and managers been appointed for any of them; and
 (b) if so, which companies?
- (4) What are the names and addresses of each of the receivers and managers in each case?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) Of those listed, the following companies are incorporated in Western Australia:—

Beechboro Properties Pty. Ltd.
 Kununurra Enterprises Pty. Ltd.
 Landall Holdings Limited
 Landall Estates Pty. Ltd.
 Landall Construction and Development Coy. Pty. Ltd.
 H. R. Young & Co. Pty. Ltd.
 Project Finance Corporation Ltd.

Of those listed, the following company is incorporated in the Australian Capital Territory, and registered in Western Australia as a foreign company:—

Landall Limited.

- (2) No.
- (3) (a) Yes.
 (b) All of the companies listed in (1) above are subject to receivership.
- (4) In each instance, the Receivers and Managers are James Peter Grant, and Desmond Livingstone Nicholl, both of 470 Bourke Street, Melbourne.

TELEVISION

Football to Country Areas

The Hon. R. T. LEESON, to the Minister for Recreation:

- (1) Will the Government make representation to the Western Australian National Football League to arrange for the telecast to country areas for the forthcoming football grand final to be played in Perth?
- (2) (a) Does the Government believe that country people are disadvantaged, particularly in remoter areas, in not being able to view the WANFL grand final; and
 (b) what steps, if any, does the Government intend to take on this issue?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) The Western Australian National Football League is the only league in Australia providing a direct telecast of whole games to country areas for the qualifying series. The WANFL is aware of a body of opinion which feels that a direct telecast of football grand finals should be made to the country, and would be willing to undertake this service with the co-operation of the ABC if remote areas reception could be isolated, however, the ABC can give no such guarantee.

A major source of revenue for the WANFL is through spectator attendance in the final series and it is felt that direct telecast of the grand final to country areas may deter people in closer proximity to Perth from attending.

- (2) (a) Supporters of Australian rules football in remote country areas may be disadvantaged: the disadvantage in this instance, however, must be evaluated in relation to the overall development of the sport.
 (b) The WANFL is an autonomous body which is aware of its responsibility to country football.

6. ALCOHOL AND DRUG AUTHORITY

Mr G. J. Murphy: *Inquiry into Death*

The Hon. Lyla ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Will the Minister table the file containing the details of an inquiry by the Alcohol and Drug Authority into the death of one of the patients, Mr Geoffrey James Murphy, at its Byford Centre in October, 1975?
- (2) If not, why not?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) No. (This patient did not die at the Alcohol and Drug Authority's Byford Centre).
- (2) The file is confidential.

7. WATER SUPPLIES

Doubleview: Notice of Disconnection

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

- (1) Is the Minister aware that property owners in a portion of Scarborough Beach Road, Doubleview, were advised at approximately 3.00 p.m. on Monday, the 2nd August, 1976, that the water supply would be cut off at 9.00 a.m. the following day until 5.00 p.m.?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that among shop owners affected was a hairdresser's salon whose owner was given insufficient time to advise her clients or make alternative arrangements?
- (3) Is it normal practice for the Water Supply Department to give less than one day's notice as happened in this instance?
- (4) Will the Minister take action to ensure property owners are given more reasonable notice in future?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.
- (3) and (4) For planned shutdown normal practice is to advise householders and other users on the day before work is undertaken. Where special problems arise, alternative arrangements are made if possible. Such was the case in regard to the hairdresser who suffered no interference with supply.

8. BUSES

Radio Contact Equipment

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Transport:

In view of increasing attacks on MTT bus drivers on late night duty, will the Government agree to equip all buses with radio control as a precautionary measure against these attacks?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

Consideration is at present being given as to availability of funds.

9.

RAPE

Amending Legislation

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Attorney-General:

- (1) Is he aware of steps being taken in other States to amend the law related to rape trials; in particular the Victorian Government's proposed legislation to—
 - (a) place a time limit on when a case has to be presented;
 - (b) disallow evidence on a victim's previous sexual experience unless specially permitted by the Judge; and
 - (c) allow the evidence in the preliminary hearing in the Magistrate's Court to be given by written statement as far as possible?
- (2) Are similar proposals being considered in this State?
- (3) If not, will he give an undertaking to have them considered as soon as possible, with a view to reducing the distress suffered by rape victims in the present court procedure in Western Australia?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) I have read a newspaper report to this effect.
- (2) and (3) It is not known exactly what the Victorian proposals are but consideration is being given to the papers of the South Australian and Victorian Committees in regard to Court procedures in rape trials.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by the Hon. V. J. Ferry, leave of absence for six consecutive sittings of the House granted to the Hon. C. R. Abbey (West) on the ground of private business overseas.

SUPPLY BILL

Standing Orders Suspension

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [4.52 p.m.]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended so as to enable the Supply Bill to be proceeded with upon receipt of a Message from the Legislative Assembly, and to be passed through all stages at any one sitting.

I would like to give a brief explanation of the motion. Members will be aware that the Supply Bill has been presented to Parliament and that it is not an abnormal practice to seek the suspension of Standing Orders to enable the Bill's passage through the House to be expedited, although there is no tremendous urgency to pass the Bill. However, I am sure

members will appreciate that the suspension of Standing Orders suits all concerned to enable the message to be taken forthwith and the debate to proceed. I hope the House will agree to the motion.

Question put and passed.

BILLS (2): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Law Reform Commission Act Amendment Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by the Hon. I. G. Medcalf, (Attorney-General), and read a first time.

2. Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act Amendment Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by the Hon. Lyla Elliott, and read a first time.

SUPPLY BILL

Receipt and First Reading

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

Second Reading

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [4.56 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This measure seeks the grant of supply to Her Majesty of \$565 million for works and services for the year ending the 30th June, 1977, pending the passage of Appropriation Bills later in the current session of Parliament.

Before turning to the actual provisions of the Bill, I would like to take a few moments to comment briefly on the results of last financial year.

Members will be aware already that the Consolidated Revenue Budget resulted in a surplus of \$594 000. This was a most satisfying outcome, particularly as it was achieved in a year which was notable for its financial uncertainty.

It is the first time since 1967-68 that transactions on the Consolidated Revenue Fund have resulted in a surplus.

When the Budget was introduced last year, it was pointed out that the State was in no position to set aside capital funds to cover a deficit on Consolidated Revenue Fund as we had been forced to do in the previous year. The Government, therefore, aimed for a balanced Budget with revenue and expenditure equalling \$980.673 million.

In the outturn, actual expenditure amounted to \$950.267 million and revenue receipts totalled \$950.861 million.

As mentioned, it was a year of financial uncertainty, and this is reflected in some marked variations in the estimates of both revenue and expenditure.

At the time the Budget was framed, it was estimated that there could be a 21 per cent increase in average wages during

the year ended the 31st March, 1976. This was the figure on which estimates for the Federal Government's Budget and the financial assistance grant payable to the State were prepared, and prudent financial management required us to base our estimates of revenue and expenditure on the same figure.

As it turned out, the actual increase was 16.87 per cent and this improvement had an effect on several aggregates in the Estimates of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

In the first place, the lower percentage meant a drop in receipts from the Commonwealth under the financial assistance grants formula. Members will recall that the State's entitlement was determined by a formula which made allowance for the increase in national average wages from March to March, population increase, and a betterment factor.

Our financial assistance grants were \$12.6 million less than the Budget estimate because of the variation in the wages factor.

The lower-than-expected increase in average wages also resulted in savings in the Budget provision for wage increases. These savings were higher than the reduction in receipts from the Commonwealth. This is because our total wages Bill is much greater than the total amount of general revenue assistance which we receive from the Commonwealth Government.

The resulting reduction in expected wage payments last year provided the opportunity for the Government to introduce an accrual system of accounting for salary payments.

Previously, provision was made in the Budget to meet the wage costs relating to the pay days actually falling in the financial year. On a fortnightly pay basis there are usually 26 pay days in the year but, periodically, there are 27 pays. When this happens, the problem arises of having to find the extra funds in the Budget for the additional pay.

The impact on the Budget and the resulting problem it creates can be substantial. As an example, in the financial year 1976-77 we face the prospect of having to meet 27 fortnightly pays for teachers. That single extra pay is estimated to add \$5.9 million to expenditure in this year without an offsetting increase in revenue.

The procedure followed by most private firms, and by some other States, is to charge to the accounts for the year the wages bill appropriate to the number of working days in the year, irrespective of the fall of pay days. Clearly, this requires that payments in respect of the incomplete pay period at the end of the year be made to a suspense account to be drawn against in the next year when the actual payout has to be made.

Although the accrual approach is desirable as a means of equalising the impact on the Budget of the wages bill from year to year, the problem is when to make the change, as the initial impact on the Budget for the first year can be substantial.

As mentioned earlier, the opportunity was provided this year when wage payments fell short of the estimate and, accordingly, a calculated sum of \$8 million was paid to a suspense account to cover salary payments for which there was an accrued liability to the 30th June, 1976, but which were not due to be made until this year. The Budget for 1976-77 and subsequent years will provide for wage and salary payments actually accruing in the financial year.

The lower than anticipated wages bill last year also resulted in payroll tax collections falling below estimate. Collections from this source were \$1.8 million less than the Budget forecast.

Another major variation between the Estimates and the outturn was caused by changes in the Commonwealth-State Hospital cost sharing arrangements.

The Budget made allowance for the Commonwealth contributions for daily bed payments for public hospitals to be paid to Consolidated Revenue Fund and subsequently transferred to the hospitals via the hospital fund. However, after the Budget was presented, the Commonwealth Government adopted a different procedure and made these payments direct to the hospitals. This administrative action made no difference to the amounts actually received but had the effect of reducing both the revenue and expenditure sides of the Consolidated Revenue Estimates by approximately \$20 million.

The overall savings in payments to public hospitals was \$25.5 million. In addition to the amount of \$20 million, which I have mentioned, delays in opening new major facilities at three hospitals resulted in savings of \$800 000 in operating expenses. A change in the system of payment for pathology services at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital accounted for savings of \$750 000, but these were offset by increased expenditure by the State Health Laboratories. The cost of medical services and other items of hospital expenditure were also below estimate by about \$4 million. However, only one-half of these savings were of direct benefit to the State, as they were offset in part by reductions in the Commonwealth contribution under the Medibank Agreement.

As was pointed out in the Budget speech last year, it had been difficult to estimate what would be the cost of hospital and medical services for the year following the introduction of Medibank. It was hard to know what effect the new scheme would have on the demand for these services and there was apprehension that the estimates may have been wide of the mark. It is

pleasing, therefore, to find that after making allowance for the administrative changes to the scheme the results have been so close to estimate.

State revenue from stamp duties, mainly on real estate transactions, was \$10.2 million above estimate. This highlights the good year experienced by the home building industry.

Revenue from probate duty exceeded the estimate by \$1.6 million, liquor taxes by \$1 million, and other State taxes by \$1.8 million.

Revenue for Commonwealth funded specific purpose programmes was above the estimate by \$1.6 million, but this was offset by a corresponding increase in expenditure.

The Country Water Supplies Department lifted its revenue by \$1.5 million above estimate, mainly because of increased sales of water due to the long dry summer.

Railway revenue was down \$2 million on estimate because of a higher level of outstanding revenue at the close of the financial year.

Mining royalties were \$3.9 million less than expected, mainly as a result of loss in production due to industrial stoppages.

Revenue collected by the Road Traffic Authority exceeded the estimate by \$1.1 million, mainly because a greater number of people than forecast opted to renew their driving licences for a three-year period rather than for the former maximum period of a year. However, the expenditure of the Road Traffic Authority and the Police Department exceeded that provided for in the Budget as a result of an unexpected award increase for police officers and because of heavy overtime costs.

Higher stevedoring costs and reduced patronage of the service were the principal reasons for a deterioration in the results of the State Shipping Service. The loss for the year was \$7.3 million, which was \$900 000 above the estimate despite a freight increase in February.

The Education Department exceeded its salary vote by \$4.8 million. There were two reasons for this. Firstly, an allowance was made in the Budget for a contribution from the Commonwealth Government towards the cost of certain new teaching, clerical, and support staff. However, the contribution did not eventuate, and the Commonwealth made payments for existing staff only. The department therefore had to fund the total cost of new staff in 1975-76. In addition, an error occurred in the department's estimates of salary costs for the year. A recently formed budgeting section in the department will exercise closer control over the preparation of estimates in the future.

The State's sesquicentenary anniversary occurs in 1979. A committee has been appointed to co-ordinate appropriate celebrations for that year, and it was felt

that it would be prudent to budget in advance for the expenditure that is likely to be incurred for that purpose, and so spread the cost over more than one year. An amount of \$1 million was therefore transferred to an appropriate trust account in the Treasury during the year. A similar provision will be made in the Estimates for 1976-77.

To achieve a balanced Budget in 1975-76 it was expected that it would be necessary to bring into Consolidated Revenue an amount of \$6.479 million from moneys earned by the investment of the State's cash resources on the short term money market during 1974-75. However, by exercising tight control on expenditure throughout the year, it was found possible to avoid having to draw on this reserve in 1975-76. It is intended to draw on this balance to support the State's capital works programme in the coming year.

As I previously mentioned, the 1975-76 financial year finished with a small surplus, and we now face the task of framing the Budget for 1976-77. This will be no less difficult than in the year just passed, but we have a sound base from which to start.

The new tax sharing arrangements between the Commonwealth and States came into operation from the 1st July, this year. Under this new scheme, Western Australia will receive \$44.4 million in 1976-77, an increase of \$6.9 million compared with the amount we would have received had the former financial assistance grants formula applied.

No doubt the Premier will have more to say on this development when speaking to the Consolidated Revenue Fund Estimates later in this sitting.

The State will receive \$126.3 million under the 1976-77 loan programme, which is a 5 per cent increase on the programme of \$120.3 million approved for 1975-76. Of this amount \$42.1 million will be received by way of a capital grant, compared with \$40.1 million received in 1975-76.

I now turn to the provisions of the Supply Bill before the House. An issue of \$500 million is sought from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and \$50 million from moneys to the credit of the General Loan Fund. Provision is also made in the Bill for an issue of \$15 million to enable the Treasurer to make such temporary advances as may be necessary. The amounts have been based on needs for the existing level of service, and no provision has been made for new policy decisions which must await the introduction of the Budget.

I commend the Bill to members.

THE HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [5.11 p.m.] : Mr President, it is the normal procedure to introduce the Supply Bill at this

juncture. Its purpose is to provide supply to the Government pending the passage of the appropriation Bills later in the current session of Parliament.

I want to deal with the problems of a wavering economy, rising unemployment, and unfulfilled and broken election promises. Let me examine what has happened since 1974, when we heard these words—

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

The answer to inflation on the home front is to get back to government in Western Australia.

Those words appeared in the policy speech made by the present Premier in 1974.

The average man in the street is of the opinion that the Court Government gave a definite undertaking to beat inflation in this State. In view of that Government's failure to arrest inflation it has completely dishonoured its promise to its electors and the people of the State of Western Australia.

It is even more disturbing that during the last three months the rate of inflation in Australia as a whole has slowed down but in Western Australia it has quickened. Between the end of March and the end of June this year the national inflation rate dropped from 3 per cent to 2.5 per cent but in Western Australia the inflation rate increased by a further 3.4 per cent. I suppose one may say they are only words but the people of this State really did expect the Government which was elected in 1974 to be able to carry out at least some of the promises it made to the electorate.

Let us have a look at page 2588 of *Hansard* for the 16th August, 1972, where, at the end of a very interesting speech, the then Leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Court) said—

They are the people who are saying to us, "Get rid of this Government."

That was the Tonkin Government. He continued—

All my colleagues can vouch for the fact that no matter where we go, even in some of the so-called militant types of industries, we hear it asked, "When can we get rid of this Government and get back to the prosperity we had?"

I submit this motion in all sincerity.

The then Leader of the Opposition was saying there that in 1972 the people were clamouring to get rid of the Tonkin Government so that this State could get back to some kind of illusory prosperity. That just has not happened.

We had a situation where it was quite fashionable to blame the then Australian Government—the Whitlam Government. That Government is no longer in office, yet we find the same kind of story being trotted out. Let us have a look at what has happened since 1974, apart from the mental and mathematical gymnastics which took place in respect of the extra \$8 million—but enough has been said about that in another place.

Let me quote from some of the figures I have here to indicate the increases that have taken place between March 1974 and July, 1976. We find that water rates in the metropolitan area have increased by 60.3 per cent; in the country the increase shows an average of 55 per cent. Excess water charges have increased by 111.4 per cent,

and sewerage rates by 95.2 per cent. Apart from this, drainage rates have increased by 33.3 per cent; State Government hospital fees increased by 100 per cent, and electricity charges by 66.5 per cent—incidentally I do not think we have, as yet, seen the end of this charge—and drivers' licence fees increased by 66.6 per cent.

This is not at all bad for a party which, we were told, the people of Western Australia were clamouring to establish as the Government, in order that we might return to the prosperity about which we were told!

There are further increases which include motor vehicle registration fees which increased by 65 per cent, to which was added a \$4 recording fee. The table below shows other increases that have been made in rates, taxes, and charges. These are as follows—

Rate, Tax or Charge	Percentage Increase
Vehicle Transfer Fees	50.0%
State Housing Commission Rents—	
New Homes	53.2%
Older Homes	49.8%
Inferior Homes	41.2%
Plus a \$60.00 Management Fee levied on all purchasers of S.H.C. homes prior to 1st January, 1974	
Metropolitan Bus and Rail Fares	60.3%
Shipping freight rates (State)	50.0%
Land Title Transfer Fees	50.0%
Rent on Government owned dwellings (ex C.P.I.)	60.4%
Gazetted W.A.G.R. Rail freights	38.0%
Gazetted W.A.G.R. road freight	38.0%
Gazetted Country Train and Railway Bus Fares	17.5%
S.G.I.O. comprehensive vehicle insurance	25.0%
	Premium Rise
Natural Gas Rates	20.0%
Stamp Duty on Cheques	33.3%
Payroll Tax	4½% to 5% (increase of ½%)
Companies—	
(a) Registration Fees	
Rates on capital Value up to \$200 000	25.0%
Rates on Capital Value over \$200 000 but not exceeding \$1 million	50.0%
(b) Transfer Fees	84.6%
(In 1974, 'Notice of Resolution Fee' was \$26.00. On 1st July, 1975, a 'Reserve New Name' Fee was introduced with a charge of \$10. In addition, the Resolution Fee was increased to \$38 giving a total charge of \$48.00.)	

Seeing that the Labor Government had left the Treasury benches in Canberra and in view of what we were told of the calibre of the Premier, Sir Charles Court, one would imagine that all these things would be fixed up overnight. Presently I will be quoting from some quotable quotes which have been made in the past.

During the term of the Brand Government the then Minister for Industrial Development was painted as some kind of genius; as the driving force behind the Brand Government; he was the power

behind the throne; he worked 27 hours a day and achieved the impossible!

Nobody denies, of course, that there was a certain amount of development in those years, but Sir Charles Court, as he is now, was a very lucky Minister for Industrial Development, because that happened to be just the period when the embargo on iron ore exports was lifted. Anybody who studies politics will know that there is a great deal of luck associated with politics. It just happened that Sir Charles Court was in the right spot during that period of time.

Now, however, that things have returned to normal in Western Australia, what do we find? We find all the increased charges to which I have just referred. We find we have no superman in the guise of Sir Charles Court; we find a myth, a mirage, someone who cannot cope with the very difficult problems that beset not only Western Australia but the whole of Australia and, indeed, the majority of the western world.

The Hon. N. McNeill: You would describe the present conditions as normal? That is how you appear to describe them.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: These are the normal conditions prevailing throughout the world today. There is no boom period and, at least in my opinion, we have returned to the normal type of growth situation. The great leap forward that we were told about is no longer with us, and the State on the move is over.

The Hon. N. McNeill: How can you explain that as normal?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: What do we find? All I can assume now is that this image of Sir Charles Court that was created was created by the "ad" men and the public relations men. I will begin to disbelieve that when the Premier starts to perform in the present economic climate.

Let us now consider the question of unemployment, bearing in mind that we were told inflation could be beaten State by State; that there were really no problems at all; that all the electors had to do was to get him back into power and everything would be all right.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Did he say there were no problems?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Later on in this debate Mr Pratt will have ample opportunity to demonstrate his grasp of the situation. Let me quote now from the Liberal Party policy speech which was made in 1974. This may answer the question asked by Mr Pratt. I quote—

A State Liberal Government will have a programme of strong, well-planned economic growth. It will give Western Australia economic financial strength to achieve a better total way of life for its people. The objectives will be—

Raising the standard of living.
Security against unemployment.
A broader range of career opportunities in existing enterprise, and new projects selectively encouraged for the purpose.

Those are indeed lofty ideals, and when they were put forward in a policy speech I presume the people of Western Australia believed quite sincerely they would be achieved. But this just has not happened.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Where does it say there were no problems?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: As I have already said, Mr Pratt will have an opportunity to make his own speech; I have not yet heard him make a good one. Let us now consider the unemployment situation. I now propose to draw a comparison between what was described as the inefficient Tonkin Government and the super Government, the Image Government, created by the "ad" men and the public relations men.

In 1974 the unemployment figures for Albany showed that there were 241 unemployed; whereas in July, 1976—and despite all these lofty ideals about which we have heard—there were 659 unemployed, an increase of 428 or 185.2 per cent. In Bunbury during 1974 there were 535 unemployed—

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: How many employed?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: In July, 1976, however, there were 1 146 unemployed.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: How many employed?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The interjection made by Mr Griffiths demonstrates the barrenness of the Government's thinking in connection with unemployment.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It does not, you know; it is a sensible question.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I repeat that as long as there is one person who is looking for a job and is unemployed—and he cannot get employment—this means we have unemployment.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Western Australia had the highest unemployment rate in the Commonwealth during the majority of the Labor Government's term of office.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: In July, 1976, we find that in Mr MacKinnon's area—that is in Bunbury—there were 1 146 unemployed, which constituted an increase of 611 since March, 1974.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is in the region of Bunbury.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I thank members opposite for helping me with my homework. Further figures indicating the rise of unemployment between March, 1974, and July, 1976, are as follows—

	No. registered unemployed March 1974	No. registered unemployed July 1976	Increase	% Increase
Esperance	78	169	91	116.6
Geraldton	251	538	287	114.3
Kalgoorlie	264	560	296	112.1
Kwinana	441	1 057	616	139.7

And so we go on—Manjimup, Merredin, Northam, and Port Hedland all tell the same sad story. We find now that there is an average of 4.01 per cent of the work force which is unemployed in Western Australia; there is a total of 21 419 people unemployed in the State at present—which is not a bad record for people who were going to put things right; who told us that if we could only get rid of the Whitlam Government and the Tonkin Government, we would get back to the good old days of the iron ore boom.

I have already quoted the career opportunities. We also find that the price of milk has increased, as has the price of meat and bread. So the dreary price spiral continues.

The Hon. J. Heitman: What about wages?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Yes, wages have certainly increased but so have prices. On this question of inflation I might say that I have read recently a speech made in another place in which a responsible Minister of the Government said the best indicator of economic prosperity in this country is the Stock Exchange. I happened to receive from the ANZ Bank a little pamphlet which shows that there are 10 indicators. So it would appear the responsible Ministers in the Government do not have any idea how the economy works. I ask: Why do they not have an idea? The answer is that the Premier has what can be commonly described as a cargo cult mentality? I draw this analogy between the Premier and his Government and the people in the Pacific islands who, after the war, would sit on the beaches waiting for large fleets of American ships to come in carrying the necessary goodies—such things as Coca-cola and other goodies. The people in the Pacific Islands sat on the beaches and waited for years.

The Premier is no doubt still dreaming and hoping that someone or something will drop in from overseas and spark off another iron ore boom. This sort of thinking is disastrous to say the least, because it just will not happen. Such thinking only displays a fundamental lack of the knowledge of things that are going on around us.

I do not honestly believe Sir Charles Court would like to see unemployment; I really do think he felt he could do what he said he would, but he did not realise that when things return to a regular pattern people do not come across here and ask the Government of Western Australia to give away its resources.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You think things are normal now?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Yes, if we are talking about the dictionary definition of "normal". When I look around other parts of the world I find that Western Australia

is following the same pattern that is operating in those areas, particularly in so far as increased wages and prices are concerned.

There is, however, a further ingredient which has come into the picture and which will make Sir Charles Court's life even more difficult. We now have a Federal Government which is pursuing a policy based on an eighteenth century economic theory; inasmuch as it feels that if it can get rid of inflation and have no deficit everything will be all right. It does not seem to care how much unemployment occurs as a result of this policy; it feels that things will be better.

The Hon. N. McNeill: No-one made any comment about that.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I am making it now. This policy has been tried in other parts of the world—notably in West Germany—and the action will have to be reversed very quickly.

Unemployment is one of those things which is very difficult to contain; once it starts to move it is difficult to know just where to stop it. There used to be a theory known as the Domino Theory which applied to South-East Asia. It is now being used by businessmen. One business collapses, which in turn causes another business to fail and they all go down like a pack of cards.

Despite the fact that we are all wont to talk about multi-nationals and the other big companies, it is still a fact that the majority of businesses employing probably the greatest number of people in Australia are the small businesses. Recently, I spoke to a businessman in Melbourne who had just had to lay off 600 workers from his plant.

The *Chamber of Manufactures Journal* is delivered to my home, and across the top of a recent issue was the heading, "Broken election promises". Forecasts have been made that by the end of this year there will be some 500 000 people out of work, but I hope those forecasts are very wrong.

I shall not use the word "normal" again because it seems to upset some members opposite. The point I am making is that in the conditions prevailing today, the present Government with its cargo cult mentality is staggering from crisis to crisis, and is bringing forward no sane, or sensible alternative for the people of Western Australia. In addition, the present Federal Government is making things even more difficult through cutting funds for welfare housing and road works.

I do not want to dwell now on the subject of double taxation or, rather, the new federalism; there will be ample opportunity to explore that little exercise later this session when the Appropriation Bills are before this Chamber. I believe it will be a very interesting debate.

It is indeed unfortunate that the Government of the day is not an innovative Government. It is unfortunate that it believes in its own infallibility. It is also unfortunate for the people of Western Australia that, at present, the Government continues to stagger from crisis to crisis. It uses the age old device of trying to talk the economy up.

On almost every day there are yards and yards of rhetoric but no action. If anyone dares to mention that perhaps we could do something, or makes an assertion that something has not been done, that person is hit with a virtual wall of abuse. It is said that he is stupid and does not know what he is talking about. The Government also blames the ALP and the demands by the militant trade unions for increased wages. I notice that the term is no longer "militant unions" but "left-wing unions". There are not many more things the Government can blame.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: You should have seen Bob Hawke on television today talking about left-wing unions.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Mr President, not only can Mr Pratt not speak but also he cannot hear. I did not disagree with Mr Hawke.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: I suggest you should listen to him.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I can read about it. I have no doubt that Mr Hawke acquitted himself very well on television. However, I am making this speech, and I would prefer to make it in my own way.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You are robbing this coach, so get on with it.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: As I look at Mr Griffiths with his collection of pencils in his top pocket, I think I am at Randwick.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the Leader of the Opposition to address his remarks to the Chair!

The Hon. D. K. DANS: It is a very sad tale—the tale of a discredited Government which does not seem to have the wherewithall to do anything. In fact, when I read some of the statements which appear in the Press, and I see the Minister's name attached to them, I believe the Government is so panic-stricken that it does not even read the material prepared for it by its own research officers, because so many mistakes are made.

I should like to dwell for a few moments on matters which are closer to home. I was very disturbed to read an article in *The West Australian* of the 5th July, 1976 where, under the heading, "Move for BP to pay wharfage" the following appeared—

The State Government is negotiating with BP Australia to have the company pay the Fremantle Port Authority for services provided at the Kwinana refinery wharf.

Under the agreement that set up BP's refinery in the early 1950s, the company did not have to pay wharfage charges.

The Premier, Sir Charles Court, said yesterday that the Government had been conferring with BP for several weeks on ways in which the agreement should be varied in the light of changed conditions.

I thought that was very good, but then I read on. Again, this comes back to the amount of rhetorical nonsense put out by this Government. The article continues—

His statement came after a call in the weekend by the Opposition spokesman on transport matters, Mr K. F. McIver, for the agreement to be renegotiated.

Mr McIver said that wharf charges should be imposed on ships calling to discharge oil at the refinery to help defray increasing losses faced by the State Shipping Service and the FPA.

The Premier was reported as follows—

Sir Charles said that Mr McIver and the ALP were behind the times.

I might add that that includes me. The article continues—

The talks had been held for several weeks and any amendments to the original agreement would be the result of sensible and fair negotiations and not on a "gun at the head" basis.

"The State's good name as a place that meets its contracts is at stake when matters of this kind are being renegotiated," he said.

In that article, the Premier implied that what we were suggesting was that we would go down to the refinery, stick up the BP company and say, "Renegotiate the agreement, or else!" I take strong exception to that implication.

I have spoken in this House on a couple of occasions on the need to discuss with the company the possibility of its making some contribution towards port charges. The Leader of the House knows that to be a fact, because I am recorded in page 20 of Hansard No. 2 of the 30th March as saying exactly that. I stated there was a need to talk to the industry on this matter, and we should all recognise that fact. The *Hansard* report states—

I agree that to offer inducements was necessary to get the refinery under way, but I believe the time has arrived for the industries there, as an act of good faith and confidence in the future, at least to meet some of the costs of pilotage. Perhaps then it would not be necessary to incur a loss of \$1 million and the 3 per cent levy may well be able to remain and generate some income for the State.

The Hon. N. McNeill: You are not specifically talking of the refinery?

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I mentioned the refinery.

The Hon. N. McNeill: That was the one that was the subject of the contract?

The Hon. D. K. DAns: If the Minister recalls I mentioned them all at first. I did not want to go through them one after the other. It is a real problem. I am sure the Government knows as well as anyone else that it is a problem. The Government would be more aware of it than I am.

I do not intend to read the entire debate; any member who wishes to may refer to the record. I simply say I did not suggest we hold a gun at their heads, but merely that we should enter into discussions with the company on the basis that perhaps it could re-examine its situation. I do not think this suggestion is original to me; the Government must have been thinking about it.

I resent most strongly the Government implying that because someone on this side makes a perfectly valid suggestion, somehow or other he proposes to go to the refinery and threaten to tear up the contract unless the company agrees to pay all the wharfage costs. It is common knowledge that the Fremantle Port Authority may lose a lot of money this year. A 3 per cent levy has been placed on the port, and if we do not bring in some additional revenue, there may be a need to increase port charges.

Such an increase could have the effect of encouraging the container ships to bypass the Port of Fremantle, and of increasing the use of the land bridge system of transport; namely, the railways, from the Port of Fremantle.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Yet you were going crook about rail freights and everything else. You are now advocating increased charges in this field.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I think Mr Gayfer should wash out his ears! At no stage did I advocate such a move. Let me repeat what I said, for the benefit of members who may not have heard me: We should avoid the necessity of increasing port charges.

The Hon. J. Heitman: That is not what you said.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: If port charges do increase, the container vessels may bypass Fremantle. Mr Heitman should read the newspapers, because such a move has been mentioned already. The companies operating these vessels have said they could bypass Fremantle and go direct to Melbourne. Increased charges of this nature have very deleterious effects on the economy of our State, particularly on the rural section.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Why did they wipe out Albany—for the same reasons?

The Hon. D. K. DAns: Mr Wordsworth should know that Albany is not a container port; it is in his electorate. I hope he would be able to tell me quickly why the container ships do not go to Albany; they have no container crane at that port. However, I do not believe Mr Wordsworth would know because he has not visited the wharf at Albany.

I believe that if people were to examine the figures relating to the tonnage loaded and discharged by the waterside workers at the Port of Fremantle, and compare them with the rates applying elsewhere in Australia and the world, they would be pleasantly surprised; as Mr McNeill probably knows, they are very good.

I refer now to the continual complaints made by parents of children attending the special school in White Gum Valley. The children who attend one part of that school are retarded. In the Stevens Street area of the school, the school is extremely modern, well equipped and up-to-date. However, in the other part of the school—known as Noalimba—the conditions are atrocious.

Let me qualify my use of the word "atrocious" by saying that I believe the teachers are well trained and attentive to the children, to the best of the staff's ability. However, the facilities for trying to teach these children, and to salvage something from their lives—some of them can be salvaged for the future—are very bad indeed.

The parents allege that in October of last year, funds were made available for the rebuilding of this section of the school. I have not yet had the opportunity to go fully into the matter and assess the situation for myself—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is a fairly sweeping accusation for someone who has not done his homework.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I have been so busy in studying what this Government is doing to the economy of Western Australia and trying to work out how the Government arrives at its Budget proposals—I refer to the \$8 million which now we see and now we do not—that I have not had the time to pursue all these matters. It is, however, creating a great problem in the minds of the parents. It is further alleged—

The Hon. N. McNeill: I would be surprised if you were not able to work out the \$8 million situation and did not understand the position.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I have dealt with the matter.

The Hon. N. McNeill: You did not want to deal with it for very long.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: What are you dwelling on?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: On the special school at White Gum Valley.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Why did you not dwell on the other matter?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: It is further alleged that a Minister of this Government at a meeting of teachers made the statement that the present Government did not intend to waste funds on retarded children.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Cut that out.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I found that hard to believe. However, a statement was made, and it sounds as though it came from Ayn Rand. The reason was that they were nonproductive units.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You ought to be fair enough to say that you do not believe that any member in the Labor, the Liberal, or the National Country Party of this Parliament would say anything like that.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: That horrified me. I had to think about it because it tied in with the same kind of attitude that had been expressed in respect of the children at Tresillian. This is a Canute-like attitude of trying to roll back the waves; of saying "I am right." The reason I am raising this matter is to give members the opportunity to get up and refute the allegation. I have not found out whether it is true.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You did not try to find out, but you did not mind repeating this gutter filth. I would not have believed it if someone had told me that a Labor member had said that.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The Minister does not think we would say a thing like that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Of course you would not. You would not be that stupid.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: This matter was raised with me, and the statement was probably made at a public meeting. The Minister can say that is untrue and tell members of this Chamber what will happen to that school.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: If you wanted to know you could have phoned me today.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: We have the show place at Chidley.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You have made the statement and it is on the record, whether or not it be true.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I think I was kind enough to say it was an allegation.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You were not kind at all. You were disgraceful.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I was kind enough to say it was an allegation.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is a typical scurrilous trick.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I think I have canvassed the matter sufficiently.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are working the old trick of throwing a bit of mud and hoping some of it will stick.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: You have not done that?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We do not do that.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Some of the problems that are facing the people of Western Australia have been brought about through the inactivity of the present Government, which promised so much before it was elected. As far back as 1972 the present Government said, "Put us back in power, and we will return you to prosperity." I have no doubt that other members will expound further on the non-performance of the present Government.

I do not wish to say anything more. I am duty bound to say that I support the passage of the Supply Bill through this House.

THE HON. R. T. LEESON (South-East) [5.49 p.m.]: I was not going to speak in this debate.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You were left breathless after the comments of your terrible leader.

The Hon. R. T. LEESON: In his second reading speech the Minister mentioned many things, and no doubt the theme was the revenue that has been and is to be collected. Regarding the State instrumentalities and the cost involved in providing the services, one that interested me was the high stevedoring cost of the State Shipping Service which brought about a loss to that instrumentality. The Minister said the loss for the year was \$7.3 million which was \$900 000 above the estimate.

A few weeks ago I was in the northern part of the State, and I took particular notice of the operations of the State Shipping Service. I spoke to some of its employees. At that time they had a grievance; however, the waterside workers were unloading the vessel. I talked to quite a number of these people, and I heard many statements from them. Some of these statements astounded me. As with all statements some were true, some were not true, and others were a little hazy.

On that occasion I was interested to learn that Government departments were not using to the extent they should the service provided by the State Shipping Service. Every week we read in the newspapers about the huge loss sustained by one or another Government instrumentality, and we have read about the loss suffered by the State Shipping Service.

We have learned that this Government prefers to use road transport, and wants to give the State Shipping Service away. It might be all right for one to give away a shipping service, if one wants to engage in the road transport business. If we compare the freight rates of the State Shipping Service with the charges of road transport, we find that many people living in remote areas will be better off to have their commodities transported by the State ships. It would be a catastrophe to the State if the State Shipping Service was curtailed, or, as mentioned at one stage, completely discarded.

I was very interested to learn about one incident which occurred in Broome. I think about 70 air conditioners were sent to that town to be installed in a school or in State houses. When they arrived on the site it was found they were not needed immediately, so they were taken down to the wharf where they were stored for several weeks. The people working on the wharves, who depend on shipping for their livelihood, were very upset over this matter. They pointed out that this type of thing was quite common and occurred frequently. They could not understand the attitude of the Government departments. I suggest that heads of departments should look closely at the manner in which their departments are transporting goods around the State. Perhaps as a result of their investigations they will make some alterations. It seems to me to be stupid that instances such as the one I have mentioned should be allowed to continue.

In his speech the Minister also referred to the fact that mining royalties were down by \$3.9 million, compared with last year's figure. He stressed that this loss was brought about mainly as a result of loss in production due to industrial stoppages. That was not made very clear by the Minister in his few words. However, there is a lot more to it than that.

While I am on this subject I feel it incumbent on me to mention the gold-mining industry once again. It was only about four months ago that I stood up in this Chamber to make an appeal to the Government on behalf of the gold-mining industry. I was referring to the assistance that was promised by the Government in December, 1975. We found only four months later that not only was that assistance not forthcoming as promised, but the Federal Government decided to abolish the tax exemption that had been granted to the goldmining industry; for what reason I do not know, and nor, do I think, does the industry.

If we look at the state of the industry, particularly as a result of what happened in February last, we find that about three companies remain in operation in Western Australia. If the trend continues it will not be very long before Western Australia will not be mining any gold; it will be importing its requirements from

overseas. In time to come who knows how much that will cost? At this stage it is ridiculous to tax the goldmining companies which are struggling to exist.

Only the other day it was reported that the Mayor of Kalgoorlie (Mr Finlayson) who is well known to members opposite, said that once again Kalgoorlie had received a kick in the teeth. A person who puts his boots into somebody who is down is not a nice type; he is like the present Federal Government. The goldmining industry feels that is exactly what has happened to it; it received two blows on two different occasions within the last six months. It is about as much as the industry can take.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Nothing like what your Government did in the previous three years!

The Hon. R. T. LEESON: What a ridiculous statement for the Leader of the House to make. That statement astounds me. I suppose the Minister is referring to the action of the previous Labor Government at Canberra.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Yes.

The Hon. R. T. LEESON: The Minister should have remained in the south-west and attended to his cows, because in making a statement like this he is entirely out of touch with what has been happening on the Eastern Goldfields over the last four years. That statement astounds me, and it seems to reflect the thinking of the people who made the sort of decision recently affecting the goldmining industry. That is what the 22 000 people living at Kalgoorlie have to contend with. They do not understand the situation.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Will you tell this House what assistance the Labor Minister (Rex Connor) and the Whitlam Government gave to the goldmining industry?

The Hon. R. T. LEESON: I, as well as other members, have made speeches on that matter in this House. We all know what assistance has been given; and we also know the assistance that has been forthcoming from the present Federal Government over the last eight months! There has been absolutely no assistance. I know how the Federal member for Kalgoorlie (Mr Cotter) feels about this matter.

The Hon. N. McNeill: You also knew how Mr Collard, the previous Federal member for Kalgoorlie, felt about the situation. He made public his views on the actions of the Whitlam Government.

The Hon. R. T. LEESON: That is correct, but the Whitlam Government did not do what the Fraser Government has done to Kalgoorlie. The Fraser Government has completely destroyed the goldmining industry. Once upon a time that industry was the biggest employer on the goldfields, but today it is not. I suppose

there are more men employed in nickel mining than in goldmining at the present time.

As I pointed out in a petition which I presented today, the second biggest employer in Kalgoorlie is the hotels and clubs, and not the goldmining industry. It is a crying shame to see the goldmining industry being crushed.

That industry is supposed to be on a care-and-maintenance basis. To anyone who knows anything about the goldmining industry, that is a ridiculous assertion. There are no ropes around the poppet heads on the mines, and a mine cannot be put on a care-and-maintenance basis without these ropes around the poppet heads.

I understand that a meeting is to be held in Canberra concerning the goldmining industry, and a deputation from the goldfields comprising the Federal member for Kalgoorlie, the Mayor of Kalgoorlie, and several other people will wait on the Federal Government. I wish those people luck, because they will need a lot of it.

The Premier of the State (Sir Charles Court) must consider himself to be very lucky at the present time in having Mr Doug Anthony as Federal Minister for Natural Resources, because he can attack Mr Anthony to his heart's content—as he has done over the last few months. There will be a great deal more of this criticism in the months to come.

There is no doubt that Mr Anthony is being used as a scapegoat by this State Government. It is unfortunate that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr Stan Dellar, is not here today. He had to visit a specialist. However, Mr Dellar has been fighting for the Town of Mt. Magnet for a number of years. The people in Mt. Magnet have been suffering the same trials and tribulations as those now being experienced by the people in Kalgoorlie. They do not know where they stand as a result of the last onslaught by the Federal Government.

I have previously mentioned that the limited resources of the State Government do not allow it to provide very much by way of assistance, but the present decision was taken some weeks ago and does not involve assistance. It is a straightout Taxation Department decision made by the Federal Liberal Government. The decision is completely unacceptable to the people of Kalgoorlie, and it is a decision which they will never forget.

Sitting suspended from 6.01 to 7.30 p.m.

THE HON. J. HEITMAN (Upper West) [7.30 p.m.]: I would like to congratulate the Government on the result of last year's budgeting. Nowadays it is not very often that we see anyone finish up with a surplus. It is very gratifying to know that with all the trials and tribulations it

facled last year, the Government finished with a surplus—something very few of us anticipated.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: What about the trials and tribulations of the people paying the increased rates?

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: I would expect a remark like that from the honourable member. We heard from him a while ago one of the poorest speeches to which I have ever had to listen.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: We will hear another one now.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: He told us about nothing except the trials of Kalgoorlie. Many places are in a worse situation than that town. At least Kalgoorlie is not facing a drought as are many other country places.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: Let us hear about it.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: No, I will not be sidetracked. We must keep going and we must try to ensure that everyone gets a fair crack of the whip.

When we look at the result and see what the Government has accomplished—as well as what it hopes to do during the coming year—I notice that some items have brought in more revenue than could have been anticipated. The revenue from probate duty exceeded the estimate by \$1.6 million, and I believe we could hand some of this back. I notice most of the other States are doing something in this direction, and I do not believe that over the next year we should be looking for increased taxation in this field.

We see that liquor taxes brought in an extra \$1 million, and other State taxes an additional \$1.8 million. We should expect the revenue from liquor tax to be up because most people are drinking more today than they were last year, and possibly they will go on drinking the same amount over the next few years.

The Country Water Supply Department lifted its revenue by \$1.5 million, and possibly this is a result of the drought. The revenue from the Railways Department is down \$2 million on the estimate, but I point out that the department has done a pretty good job considering the increases in wages it has had to meet. Freight charges were not increased to a great degree, and more wheat was shifted last year than ever before.

We see that even the Road Traffic Authority brought in a little more than anticipated and it is pleasing to know that I helped a little in this regard. I suppose quite a few other people assisted with this revenue, although possibly they did not smile at the time of having to pay over their money.

I repeat my congratulations to the Government on its handling of the State's moneys. In the areas I represent, I believe we have been given a fair share of

the money available. At Mullewa a water supply system was commenced last year and completed this year at a cost of something like \$2 million. Police stations have been built at Jurien Bay and Kalbarri, and we know that such establishments are costly to erect. A new company has installed a rubber plant at Geraldton to recap car tyres, tractor tyres, and the like. We are pleased that Geraldton was chosen for this venture as it will help lift the labour force in the area.

A new hospital has been built at Northampton and we are very pleased about this.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: It will open in September or early October.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: Yes, the hospital should be opened then. I do not want to disappoint the Minister but I must point out to him that hospital extensions are urgently needed in other places.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I realise that.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: I think the Minister knows of the shortcomings of the Three Springs Hospital, particularly in the children's section. After looking at the plans for the extension, I feel sure we will be proud of that particular hospital when it is completed. The Mullewa Hospital is in need of extension, and I think this matter is on the drawing board also. I hope that when finance becomes available we will see an uplift in hospital services in that particular area.

I did not mention the fact that it is proposed to set up a Silver Chain nursing post at Eneabba. This is a very important venture as the people at Eneabba have to travel 43 miles to seek medical attention, and there are three mining companies operating in the district.

Before leaving this area I would like to refer to a meeting at Dongara which was attended by a large number of people and at which there was discussion on the matter of a safe anchorage for crayfishermen using that port. After looking at all the designs and costings which had been prepared by engineers, the meeting decided that the \$2.2 million should be spent on providing an absolutely safe anchorage over an area of 17 hectares of water. On the west coast there are many places where crayfishing vessels can shelter behind reefs, but they are not really very safe. In the case of a severe storm, the vessels must go out to sea as the only safe anchorage is at Geraldton. It is nice to see the Government is prepared to spend \$2.2 million on this facility. So, looking at that part of the Government's programme, and bearing in mind the assistance promised for these areas, we have nothing to growl about.

I would like to mention some of the schools in my province. I recently visited the school at Kalbarri. At the present time 29 students are accommodated in one

small room, and 21 younger children in an Army disposals hut. This is not a transportable schoolroom, but an Army hut that was actually dumped on this location. I use the word "dumped" advisedly, because no consideration was given to the fact that this is a very hot area and the children would benefit from windows opening in a westerly direction.

The windows on the west side of the building are stationary. The only moveable windows face the south, and even then, only the centre portion of the window can be moved up and down. Very rarely is there a southerly breeze in this area, so members can imagine how difficult it is for children to learn in a room of that size and in temperatures of up to 106 degrees. Every hour or two the children are sent outside under the gum trees so that they can survive the day. This is one of the worst buildings that I have ever seen used to accommodate school children. The windows could be taken out and changed around so that at least the ones on the west could catch the breeze. I hope the Government does something about this problem. After having a good look at the school, we decided the only move possible was to build a new three-room cluster school and to use the old school as a library and storeroom. There seems to be a shortage of funds for school buildings this year, but I hope the Minister will look at this problem and ensure that some relief can be obtained before the summertime.

We also looked at the school at Mingenew. This is quite a nice school, but with the number of children in the area, a few more rooms are needed. There is a transportable classroom at this school, and although better than an Army hut I feel we should not rely on such make-shift measures for donkeys' years without endeavouring to make some improvement. Extra rooms at this school would enable the staff to move around a little more easily and the classes could be kept at a reasonable size.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: We will send you some Bristol pre-fabs if you like.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: I hope that we can have something a little better.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I hope the Minister has that in mind when he is looking at the accommodation at Laverton.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: We also visited the Mullewa and Wyalkatchem Senior High Schools. An attempt has been made to extend these schools to cater for year 11 and year 12 children, and we have been told that it is too expensive to do this. It takes some time for a school to become established and for parents to plan on their children using it. This is a different proposition from that of an entirely new school, such as the one built

at Moora, where hostel accommodation was provided in order to get the school off the ground.

Many parents in this area have planned ahead to send their children to Perth schools at a certain age, and it takes some time to prove to parents that schools in the country can look after their children's needs.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What school is this one?

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: I am presently talking of Morawa and Wyalkatchem. I think these are the only high schools which cater for year 11 and 12 children. The whole point is that next year these schools will probably have the smallest intake of year 12 children that they will ever have. However, from now on people will have had time to study the situation and I feel sure we will see an increase in the number of pupils continuing to year 12. For this reason I would not like to see the Education Department take away any of the teaching staff who are very keen to do well and to ensure children in these country areas a top-class education. I feel sure that if we can keep the teachers there for the next 12 months, we should have plenty of children to carry on to year 11 and year 12 in the future.

One other point I would like to mention is the availability of some agricultural education at Morawa. I do not mean the establishment of an agricultural high school, but rather some agricultural education embodied in the present framework of the high school. There is 400 acres of land adjoining the town site and this would be adequate to teach agricultural subjects to children who may be interested.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: They will probably build the north-west university there.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: The whole problem at the moment is the lack of accommodation for students. I point out to the Minister that the Morawa Shire Council at one time built staff quarters for female school teachers. At the time it was hoped to accommodate seven teachers. Eventually, the GEHA took this over, and we have five teachers using the facilities at the moment. I feel that with transportable accommodation going into the area possibly 15 or 16 students could be housed, and these students would be only too pleased to have the opportunity to use the educational facilities available at the Morawa High School.

I hope the Minister is not upset about my mentioning these things. I am sure he is very keen to see his educational system go ahead. He must understand that for a year or two, and until the facilities are established and used, we have in these places to put up with a cost which is higher than that experienced in the metropolitan area.

In my opinion what I would like to see done in this area would not cost more than \$3 million. I am sure that if our Ministers could obtain \$3 million to be spent in the Upper West Province over the next 12 months, everyone in the area would be jubilant and their minds would be taken off the present drought situation. I hope the Ministers will do their utmost to see that this is done.

I support the Bill and trust we will experience a much better time in the coming season.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Minister for Education) [7.47 p.m.]: I rise tonight to say a few words about some accusations levelled by Mr Dans. At the time I said by interjection that I was heartily disgusted about what happened. In effect, Mr Dans said he had no proof and that he did not know whether there was any justification for it whatsoever, but that he had been told by somebody that someone made a certain statement; and then he proceeded to tell us of an absolutely disgraceful statement, and one which I do not believe anyone in this Parliament would make.

Mr Dans made the statement in the almost certain knowledge that it will be repeated. He made it in the hope that it will be picked up and repeated by the media. Probably he is hoping to see a headline, "Minister says so-and-so" says Dans". As frequently occurs, the bulk of people would read the headline and the next paragraph which is in heavy type. Presumably Mr Dans hopes that paragraph would say something like this: "During the debate on the Supply Bill last night, Mr Des Dans, the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council, stated that he had been told that someone said so-and-so." That is about as far as people read; we all know that because this is what many of us do in respect of matters that do not interest us very much. The bulk of the people would not read the rest of the article and ascertain that it is purely hearsay.

Sir, that headline ought to state, "Dans ignorant", because he referred to the school as Noalimda, which is a migrant hostel and not a school at all. Yet there is every possibility that that statement will be repeated on news services and in the media. The hallmark of its verisimilitude is that the name given to the school was "Noalimda" and to the best of my knowledge that is the migrant camp and is not a school at all.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What is the name of the school?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: White Gum Valley.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Go and look at the name on the old half.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Until 12 months ago the White Gum Valley school was on premises which belonged to the crippled children's association. It stayed that way, in very poor condition, until last year; and the Administration of this State last year was the coalition Government led by Sir Charles Court. For the period before that the school was known as the Fremantle Special School, and it was near the South Fremantle High School.

I have been there, at the invitation of the staff; and the senior girls served my lunch. It was very nice. Certainly, the conditions were not very good. What did we do? As soon as we got some money we built stage one.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: A lovely school.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The documentation for stage two has already been drawn up, but probably it will not go ahead this year. However, it is ready to proceed as soon as we have the money, and if it does not proceed this year it will probably proceed next year. So at least half the children there have been provided with good accommodation by this Government.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Didn't I say that?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: No. The Leader of the Opposition was busy making unsubstantiated statements and starting rumours. He forgot what he said and became all mixed up with the migrant camp.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: No I didn't. You had better look at the name on the old half of the school.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: As I was saying, documentation for stage two is completed, and when that stage is built all the children should be accommodated.

I pointed out that I attended there and was served lunch by the senior girls, who did a very good job indeed considering the degree of handicap from which they suffer. It was a touching experience, but I enjoyed it as much as one can enjoy such an experience. I suppose one is eternally grateful that one is not in the same position as the parents of those children.

I sensed no unhappiness amongst the staff there. I never cease to be amazed at, and be full of admiration for, the way in which staff handle these children and carry out their work. This occasion was no exception, and the staff seemed to be very happy. Certainly they said they were looking forward to the completion of their new premises, but they realised these were coming.

I believe it is absolutely deplorable to suggest that anyone would make the sorts of statements which Mr Dans suggested somebody made. Then he went on to say he was not sure if the statements were made. As I said, he raised the matter for one reason: to get headlines.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Let me tell you something. If you stop one of your Federal members stirring up parents and teachers with this kind of thing, perhaps you will not get this kind of comment.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: If that is Mr Dans' vindictive attitude, that is well and good. That is one thing; but to accuse a Minister in this Parliament of saying, he does not want to spend money on children who are handicapped is entirely a different matter.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I said "alleged", and I said you may refute it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am aware that Mr Dans said that; but how does one refute such a statement? It was suggested that behind some door in some dark and secret spot, somebody made this sort of outlandish statement.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I did not say "dark and secret spot".

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That is the attitude the Leader of the Opposition engendered.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You look at my statement.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I will; and I will put my case and leave it to the judgment of this House.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I didn't name you.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am aware of that. Let me point out that a couple of things have been done in this State with regard to mentally handicapped children, and the people of this State should take justifiable pride in that action.

The first was the building of Pyrtton, which I opened. Following on that there was a change in the pattern of financing of all mentally handicapped children in this State, with the exception of the cerebral palsied—and that was at the wish of Mr Michelle. I did that.

Mr President, you would remember that I brought a case to Cabinet, and that I was able to go to the annual general meeting of the Slow Learning Children's Group and state that Cabinet had changed the pattern of financing mentally retarded and slow learning children in this State; and Tom Burke was in the Chair. The meeting was stopped because there were so many people crying with relief and gratitude.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Who is looking for headlines now?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Okay; I will come to that. I am leading up to it because of another statement made by Mr Dans. In those days I had a book printed which is probably still around. It concerned a five-year plan which was prepared by Dr Guy Hamilton, Dr Arch Ellis, Prof. Bill McDonald, and some others.

They worked out a five-year plan for the housing of retarded children, and it was printed at the factory at Claremont which was subsequently burnt. Unfortunately—and disastrously—before the 1974 elections we had three years under the Tonkin Government in this State, and all work on that plan stopped. It was resurrected when we came back into Government, and the Premier promised to carry it on and to house the handicapped children of this State. A plan, based on that original plan, was drawn up.

We started on that, and there was a concerted plan in respect of Tresillian. We all know what happened. Nevertheless, when the history of that affair is told five years from now, we might be able to view it with truth, clarity, and common sense. The tragedy of these situations is that one becomes tremendously involved in emotional things. I have spent six years dealing with people like this, and emotional situations cannot be avoided.

I used to take two or three weeks visiting Pyrtton and the other establishments because I just could not stand it. Although I am normally hard to live with, in those times I was unbearable because everyone I met was drawn thin like a tight piano wire. We cannot expect anything else of the parents and relatives of these children. Yet Mr Dans saw fit to bring up that matter, and he knows as little about it as he does about the previous matter when he referred to Noalimda as a school.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You ought to be very careful.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Mr Dans said he had done some research.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You don't know the name of the school.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The name of the school was the Fremantle Special School.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Would you like to get in a car and have a look at it now?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Certainly not. There might be a name on it. The name of the school is White Gum Valley Special School.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I know. That is what I would call it, but I am looking at the name on the front of it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I felt constrained to speak tonight because, although Mr Dans talks rationally and sensibly to me privately, I am alarmed that he took such an irrational turn tonight. I am disappointed because this sort of attitude does not do Parliament any good and it does him less good.

Mr Heitman made some comments about the schools in his area, which comments I have noted. I admire the airy fashion in which he accepts that we can lay our hands on \$3 million to make good a few matters which need attention in his area!

Nevertheless, the points are well made. We are all anxious to get the best possible conditions in all our schools and we are pushing ahead as rapidly as we can towards that end.

Mr Heitman mentioned expense. Agricultural education is the most expensive of all general forms of education; it is tremendously expensive. But it is worth it if one can afford it. The experiment being conducted at Wyalkatchem, as Mr Heitman knows, is to see whether it is possible to run such a senior high school where there are very few numbers. This is proving equally expensive; it is far and away the most expensive school of its type in Western Australia. It is not altogether certain that the education is as good as one would desire for the children.

The Hon. J. Heitman: It does affect a lot of children who cannot get away from the area.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: We have moved into a field which would be of interest to Mr Heitman and I hope that at sometime I may be able to arrange for an exhibition to be set up so that members can see it at their leisure. It was shown at the Royal Show last year, but perhaps a lot of people did not see it. It has become known as the "Isolated Matriculation Programme".

The programme uses the modern equipment which is now available such as tape players—they eliminate the problem of wiping anything off because they only play and cannot be recorded on—projectors for films strips and modernly produced books. Currently there are 10 core subjects and the system is being used in six high schools at present. They are district high schools with library facilities where special books are available. Mr Gayfer has probably seen this working because it is operating successfully in his home town of Corrigin.

I met a deputation from Corrigin this morning and those people have expressed very great satisfaction with this course. It looks as though it will be a real answer to the situation in which children of 16 or 17 wish to carry on at school but do not want to go away when there are not sufficient numbers in the town to allow for a total school. I have an idea this is being done at Exmouth. Am I right, Mr Dellar?

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Yes.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It looks like being very promising and filling that gap. I support the Bill.

THE HON. S. J. DELLAR (Lower North)
[8.05 p.m.]: I rise to speak to the Supply Bill and I apologise to the Chamber for not being here earlier. I note that we are asked to supply out of Consolidated Revenue the sum of \$500 million. Mr President, I recall your words from many years ago when you said that that is quite a lot of money.

Had I known that I would be back in the Chamber this evening I would have had a longer dissertation to present. However when I rudely interjected on Mr MacKinnon he did welcome me back. I am glad to return here tonight because I did not think I would be doing so. I have been to see an eye specialist, but that does not mean that I cannot see or read.

I would have covered many subjects tonight, but I will confine myself very briefly to one issue, which I believe Mr Leeson has covered quite adequately in his speech. That issue is the situation regarding the decision made by the Fraser Government last week to discontinue the tax exemption on gold producers. In the last six or eight months we have seen two decisions by the same Government which have had a dramatic effect on the prosperity of the goldfields in this State. I believe Mr Leeson mentioned Mt. Magnet and I shall touch on that subject only briefly. That town was given a decision earlier this year that meant the closing of the Hill 50 Gold mine and a subsequent reduction in the availability of employment.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Known as Lynch's kiss of death.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I suppose that Lynch's kiss of death is probably as good as Court's charges. We have heard in the last few months about the Fraser Government's policy of encouraging overseas investment. I find it hard to believe that anybody would bother to bring in outside funds to invest in the Hill 50 Gold mine now; and surely the decision made last week will sound the final death knell for the town of Mt. Magnet. I know the people of Mt. Magnet and I am sure they will not die but will continue in one way or another. Hopefully in the future when a more stable Government returns to Australia we will see some of the assistance that was promised prior to the last Federal election.

The only other point I wish to touch on is that made in the Minister's second reading speech when he referred to the State Shipping Service. He indicated that the loss for the year was \$7.3 million, which was \$900 000 above the estimate despite a freight increase in February. I wonder whether the freight increase matched the lack of support for the State Shipping Service by the Government itself. I understand that Mr Leeson mentioned this point also.

Recently I visited Broome, Derby, Wyndham, and Kununurra in company with Mr Leeson and the Hon. T. D. Evans, M.L.A. Within two hours of arriving in Broome it was made clear to us by people who know—that is, the people who unload the ships—that during the past two years freight being carried to the north-west—I am referring particularly to the ports of Broome, Derby, and Wyndham which service the inlying towns from there—has

dropped remarkably. This was not idle gossip. This has proved to be even more apparent in the last nine or 10 months.

We made some investigations. They were not idle-handed investigations. We asked a lot of people what the situation was. Members of this Chamber would be aware that I am not one for making many Press statements mainly because if I do so they are not printed. But on this occasion I issued a Press statement from Broome. Mr President, with your indulgence I shall read it to the Chamber. It appeared in *The West Australian* of the 8th July, 1976, under the heading, "Government to check claim it ignores its ships". It continued—

The State Government will investigate an allegation by a senior Labor MLC that it is not using its own shipping service to move cargo to the north of WA.

The claim was made yesterday by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council, Mr S. J. Dellar, who is now touring the Kimberley.

He claimed that the Court government was not using the State Shipping Service despite the concern it frequently expressed about the service's big losses.

"It is hypocrisy of the worst sort for the Government to bemoan the parlous financial condition of the SSS while not using methods it has immediately at its disposal to help alleviate the financial position," he said.

"The Government can hardly expect private businesses to use the service to send goods to the north if it is not prepared itself to use the service.

"Businesses cannot be expected to have confidence in the SSS if its owner—the Government—does not use it."

Mr Dellar said he had been appalled to discover that in the past two years few of the goods freighted to Broome for government departments had been carried in State ships.

I shall give a few examples later. The article continued—

He had been told that in the past eight months the amount of government freight carried in State ships had fallen to virtually nothing.

Most of the goods being sent to Broome for the Government—including materials for the State Housing Commission—were going by road.

In other cases goods had been sent to Derby by road and then stored on the wharf.

I shall give examples of that later also. The article continued—

"It is bad enough that the service should not be used by the Government when it is proving such a drain on taxpayers' funds, but it is even worse when the possible implications for people living in the north are examined," Mr Dellar said.

The increases in losses could surely be curbed if the State Government was to use the facility provided by its own organisation.

The Premier, Sir Charles Court, said yesterday that there was a long-standing directive for all government departments to make the maximum possible use of the SSS and Westrail.

I do not know what that has to do with the State Shipping Service, but I presume it was an overall instruction. To continue—

This directive had been repeated only three weeks ago.

That was three weeks from the 8th July. To continue—

"Mr Dellar's complaints will be investigated but it is my guess that there will be good reasons why other means of transport have been used in certain circumstances.

"In any case the total volume of cargo involved in breaches of the directive, if any, would not affect the adverse economics of the SSS operations very much overall.

"The SSS loss problems are much more serious than that."

I agree with that. We have the case of the M.V. Beroona which is now operating to the Eastern States, and concern was felt in Broome and Derby at that time.

In Broome there is a permanent work force of 35 people employed on the wharf. They are on a retainer and are retained to service the State Shipping Service and any other vessels they are allowed to handle. A maximum limit of 60 people can be employed if there is a requirement on any occasion. As we talked to the people of Broome and Derby it became obvious that what I had said in the newspaper could be substantiated.

On the 8th July the heading in the newspaper indicated that the Government would check claims that it ignored its ships and an investigation would be carried out. It took only until the 12th July for that investigation to be completed because in *The West Australian* on Monday, the 12th July, was the heading "Court rejects SSS criticism". I will read the article and then refer back to a few points it contains and a few I made.

The article reads—

Allegations that State Government departments were not using the State

Shipping Service had been found baseless, the Premier, Sir Charles Court, said yesterday.

"Yesterday" must have been the 11th July and, I repeat, the article containing my criticism did not appear until the 8th July. The article continues—

The rejection of the allegations was the result of an investigation by senior government officials into statements by a senior member of the State Opposition.

Sir Charles said a directive issued in 1971 for State Government departments to use the State Shipping Service whenever possible had been observed.

It was not possible or feasible in all cases to use ship transport.

On that point, I could not agree more. I might say that, having been a resident of the north-west for 14-odd years, I have a rough idea of the transport problems in the north-west of our State. The article continues—

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council, Mr S. J. Dellar, claimed last week that the Court government was not using the State Shipping Service despite the concern it frequently expressed about the service's big losses.

The concern was also expressed in the Minister's second reading speech tonight. I apologise to the Minister for my not having been present. The article continues—

He accused the Government of hypocrisy of the worst sort to bemoan the financial condition of the SSS while not using methods it had immediately at its disposal to help alleviate the situation.

Sir Charles said yesterday that urgently needed supplies, such as spare parts—

I know all about that aspect. To continue—

—that in some cases could be vital to the success of a town or project must be sent by quicker transport than ships.

"Perishables can go by ship in some cases but there are often some perishables suited to other types of transport such as road or air," he said.

"If Mr Dellar expects all goods to go by ship he is failing to consider the total question of transport to the north and the needs of the people who live there."

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: That's right.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: If the honourable member had been in the north-west as long as I have, he would know what he was talking about. To continue—

Sir Charles said that Mr Dellar had also ignored the needs of towns distant from ports.

COST FACTOR

Costs could rise astronomically when sea and road were combined.

"In certain cases it is not feasible to send goods by ship if they are bound for inland towns like Newman and Tom Price," Sir Charles said.

"The Government has to ensure that people in the north and the projects that employ them have more than one supply line.

I will come back to that point later. To continue—

"It also has to closely watch the deadlines and cost structures that dictate the success of the great projects that mean so much to WA."

Sir Charles said that the investigation showed that Government Stores—one of the biggest consignors of goods—sent 60 per cent of goods by ship.

Half the balance went by rail and half by road transport.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Who wrote your speech?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I would remind the honourable member that I am reading from a newspaper article. To continue—

The only specific example given by Mr Dellar was when he named materials for the State Housing Commission.

"Mr Dellar should have first checked that State housing in the north is built by private contractors," he said.

"The names of the contractors are given to the SSS so that its sales department can bid for the business.

"Mr Dellar has tried to score a political trick with his ill-founded claim.

"If he does have factual examples to back up his words then let him bring them forward for examination."

As I said earlier, I have been a resident of Carnarvon and Exmouth for 14 years. When I first went to Carnarvon the State Shipping Service did call there, but no regular service to Exmouth was made by the SSS. It called there only about three times in the last 10 years. The reason the State ships discontinued calling at Carnarvon was that the road was bituminised and it was more convenient for the pastoralists, and the vegetable and fruit growers on the Gascoyne River to send their produce by road as they had

done for many years. Mr Berry would back me on that point. As a result the demand for SSS ships to call at Carnarvon was so low that the service was discontinued, as one would expect.

Under the previous Liberal Government the SSS was withdrawn from Carnarvon because of the economics of the operation of the port, which was left with only one supply line. Of course, Exmouth had road transport. In the first place one company had an open go with road transport and it virtually charged what it liked. It was a good company, and then someone else obtained a licence and so undercutting followed and a little bit more than was necessary was paid in order to keep everyone happy, particularly the operators. The SSS did not operate to Exmouth and so that port had to rely entirely on road transport.

As I have said, the information came to me while I was in Broome. I did not treat the matter lightly or accept hearsay or gossip. Investigations in Derby confirmed what I had heard.

I do not think my first news release requires any comment. I merely reiterate that if the SSS is to continue to operate to ports like Broome, Derby, and Wyndham—not the iron ore towns such as Mt. Newman, Tom Price, Paraburdoo, Karratha, and so on, which towns are serviced by a sealed road and naturally the economics of road transport are perhaps more efficient—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I doubt it.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I used the word "perhaps". I repeat, that if the SSS is to continue to operate to ports like Broome, Derby, and Wyndham, the Government must stop using road transport and patronise its own SSS.

I wish to come back to a few of the points made by the Premier after the searching investigation was made by senior officials—an investigation which lasted from the 8th July to the 12th July. He said—

... a directive issued in 1971 for State Government departments to use the State Shipping Service whenever possible had been observed.

Without giving anyone reason to have me thrown out, I will say that that is not absolutely correct. Sir Charles said—

It was not possible or feasible in all cases to use ship transport.

I could not agree more. I repeat that as a resident of the north-west I know what I am talking about. I am only sorry that members like Mr Withers, the Assembly member for Kimberley; and the member for the North Province (Mr Tozer) who, incidentally held a senior position in the Government in that area before he became a member of this Chamber—

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Did a good job, too.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: According to some people, but not according to me. As I was saying it is surprising that the members in the area have not even been advised of the situation or perhaps they speak to the wrong people because they do not seem to know that the Government is not using its own service.

It surprises me that in six hours in Broome I could ascertain certain information which led me to believe that I should investigate the situation further, particularly when the member for the area (Mr Withers) who is always quoting facts, figures, and costs is not aware of the situation. Perhaps the Government should get Mr Withers to do a cost assessment on the SSS. It is obvious he would know more about it than the Government.

I stated that I agree it is not always possible or economic to use shipping and rail, and I wonder, in view of the condition of the road between Port Hedland and Broome, whether it is economic for any truck driver to operate over that road. I do not lay the blame for the condition of that road directly at the feet of the State Government. Perhaps some of the blame should be placed on the Fraser Government. The article continues—

Sir Charles said yesterday that urgently needed supplies—such as spare parts—

Naturally if a person is on holiday in Broome and the water pump in his nice motorcar packs up, he would not want to wait for the part to be shipped to the area, but would desire a replacement pump to be flown in. This always applies in emergencies, but not in instances to which I will refer later. I know, as a shire clerk trying to run a shire council in the north-west, all the trouble I had trying to get spare parts even when relying on road transport. The only way to get the parts is to have them sent express by MMA which means that the parts are sent on the same plane as they would be if the normal freight rate were paid. However, the rate is doubled just to make sure the parts are placed on the plane.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Express has preference. I operated equipment there and sent it express.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: And over-charged.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I was there before you were.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: The honourable member did not stick it out, but I did.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I built half the place.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Only under direction. The article continues—

—that in some cases could be vital to the success of a town or project—
That is a fairly wide statement which could have some implications.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You have not told us of one point in the article with which you disagree.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: The Hon. Clive Griffiths knows what it was like to obtain spare parts.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I paid air express.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I still found it difficult to get spare parts.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: What are you complaining about then?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: The article continues—

—that in some cases could be vital to the success of a town or project must be sent by quicker transport than ships.

"Perishables can go by ship in some cases but there are often some perishables suited to other types of transport such as road or air," he said.

I could not agree more.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What are you worried about then?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I am complaining that the Government does not use its SSS.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: So we heard, but you did not justify your complaint.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: The article continues—

"If Mr Dellar expects all goods to go by ship he is failing to consider the total question of transport to the north and the needs of the people who live there."

I reiterate that I have lived there for 14 years and I have a rough idea of what the people must put up with and what the transport situation is.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You are getting excited.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Go back to Esperance.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You have agreed with everything Sir Charles said.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: How could one disagree with a statement like this?

The Hon. G. E. Masters: We all agree with you.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Why not keep quiet for a minute and let me get down to the nitty-gritty?

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: We could do without your help.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: The Press statement continues—

Sir Charles said that Mr Dellar had also ignored the needs of towns distant from ports.

I know what are the needs of towns distant from ports. To continue—

Costs could rise astronomically when sea and road were combined.

That is true.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: It is a good job you have those paper cuttings.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: If Mr Masters ever gets his name in the paper, he will quote what is said. This is not a report of my statement but of a statement made by the Premier.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Government members should not go on record as being sick of listening to that.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: The Premier's statement continues—

The Government has to ensure that people in the north and the projects that employ them have more than one supply line.

What about the Premier fixing the road between Minillya and Exmouth so that we do not have to rely on road transport when the road is cut at the Lyndon crossing? I think it is called "Court's folly". The statement continues—

It also has to closely watch the deadlines and cost structures that dictate the success of the great projects that mean so much to WA.

In the last 2½ years we have seen a decline in the use of the State Shipping Service by the Government, and this has been matched by the success of the great projects which mean so much to the State of Western Australia. I have not seen any yet but I suppose they are in that pipeline. To continue—

Sir Charles said that the investigation showed that Government Stores—one of the biggest consignors of goods—sent 60 per cent of goods by ship.

I would like to have had time—and I will do this as the session goes on—to ask a couple of questions to see if clarification can be given on whether 60 per cent of the Governments stores going to the north-west of this State are sent by the State Shipping Service. I will confine those questions to the ports of Derby, Broome, and Wyndham. The statement goes on—

The only specific example given by Mr Dellar was when he named materials for the State Housing Commission.

"Mr Dellar should have first checked that State housing in the north is built by private contractors," he said.

What an observation!

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: We would have thought after 14 years you would know that.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I am well aware of that fact. I know the situation regarding tenders for Government departments, the State Housing Commission, and anything else. I would like to make the suggestion—and I hope the Minister for Justice will consider it—that if the lifeline to the north-west—the State Shipping Service—is to be continued—perhaps at a loss, but surely we can cut that loss, particularly if Government departments use the service more often—the Government write into the contracts that successful tenderers will be required to transport their goods by the State Shipping Service, even at a reduced rate. Let us confine it to the ports which are not serving inland towns. I know there are a lot of difficulties associated with this suggestion.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Are not the shipping rates already competitive?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: They may be competitive but I have not had time to look at that situation.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I think the Leader of the Opposition has already indicated something like that.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: My suggestion and request to the Government is that at least it has a look at the situation where supplies for Government departments in the north-west are let out on contract, with a view to writing something into the contracts to enable the goods to be sent at a competitive rate. I know full well that contractors in various parts of the State have brought materials up from Adelaide to Alice Springs on the trans road, and then to Kununurra and other places.

It is imperative that the State Shipping Service be retained, and for its retention it is imperative that it be used by the Government. I repeat that the Government is not using it to the fullest extent possible.

The Premier's final comment in his statement is—

Mr Dellar has tried to score a political trick with his ill-founded claim.

If ever I have seen a Premier who tried to score political tricks with ill-founded claims and unsubstantiated statements, it is the Premier we have now—Sir Charles Court.

My stay in Broome and Derby was quite short and many people employed in positions where they could have supplied information were not in a position to do so; and I respect them for not giving me the information. However, perhaps the Premier would like to investigate a couple of matters I have before me. I will not implicate anybody because I do not have to.

The Broome Regional Prison holds three months' supply of frozen perishable, for obvious reasons; but surely an establishment like that could use the State

Shipping Service in the wet season. The Broome Regional Prison gets all its perishables by road transport, and the claim was made that one cannot rely on the State ships. The Broome Regional Prison carries three months' supplies and it cannot put an order in for transport by State ships once a month.

Two semi-trailer loads of air-conditioners for Government departments were carted up to Derby by road and then stored on the wharf in the warehouse. I am not sure I am correct about this but I think they were for the Derby Regional Hospital or the high school. The air-conditioners had been in the warehouse for some time and were still there when we visited Derby. I would need a lot of convincing that it was a case of emergency. Where was the need for road transport in that case, when the State Shipping Service could have transported them?

As an interesting sidelight to this, certain items of furniture for the Harbour and Light Department at Derby were carted by road transport. One would think a department which is closely associated with the State Shipping Service would use that service.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Was it office furniture?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: Had the Minister for Health been listening, he would know I said it was office furniture.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You said "furniture".

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I am glad the Minister for Health interjected because the point was also made that departmental employees on transfer to the southern parts of the State could opt to use whatever form of transport they desired for the removal of their furniture and valuables to Perth, and they had to obtain tenders from road transport firms and the State Shipping Service. Perhaps the Minister can advise me on how many occasions in the last 12 months furniture for Government employees has been transported by State ships from the ports I mentioned to Perth.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You would have to ask the State Shipping Service. I would not have that information and you know it.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I was referring to the Minister for Justice.

I do not believe a full investigation was carried out by senior officials, as claimed by the Premier. If it was a full investigation, those who carried it out must have had something up their sleeve or they must have been scared someone would ask a question about the matter. I made the claim in Broome on the 8th July and it was printed in *The West Australian* on the 8th July. I arrived at Broome on Tuesday, the 6th July, and in *The West Australian* of the 12th July the Premier is reported as having said—

Allegations that State Government departments were not using the State

Shipping Service had been found baseless, the Premier, Sir Charles Court, said yesterday.

The rejection of the allegations was the result of an investigation by senior government officials into statements by a senior member of the State Opposition.

The Hon. N. McNeill: And if I may say so, in the same statement the Premier invited you to come forward with specific examples. It has taken you from the 12th July to the 10th August to do so.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I could not agree more but I have had them all the time. I still make the claim that it could not have been a very thorough investigation if it took only a weekend to carry out.

As the Minister for Justice has pointed out, I have not previously presented the claims I am making. I was not waiting for more but I am sure I could get more.

The Hon. N. McNeill: In actual fact, you were just waiting to make this speech.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: I was not. I had not intended to be here today. It was fortunate that my sight has been saved and I am here.

It is obvious the Bill will go through. I hope the Premier can show more concern for people in the north-west, and perhaps members who represent the area will put some pressure on the Government to support the State Shipping Service, which it is obvious to me the State Government wants to get rid of.

THE HON. Lyla ELLIOTT (North-East Metropolitan) [8.44 p.m.]: The Bill before us tonight is designed for the purpose of obtaining a supply of funds to enable the continuation of certain services in this State pending the presentation of the Budget later this year.

I am very concerned about one organisation, and I want to speak about the continuation of funds to that organisation to enable its services to continue to be available to the women of this State. I am referring to the Family Planning Association of Western Australia. Members no doubt saw in today's issue of *The West Australian* a statement headed, "WA family plan group in danger," which stated—

The Family Planning Association in WA is in danger of closing because the Federal Government will not renew annual grants totalling more than \$100 000.

At the annual meeting of the FPA last night the president, Miss R. Denny, said its funds would last for only two months.

Seven clinics in the metropolitan area, which saw more than 1 000 patients each month, would have to close.

Members will no doubt recall that back in May they received a letter from Miss Denny, President of the association, informing them of the services offered by the association to the public and seeking the support of members for continued funding for its activities by the State Government.

This is a very serious question and I hope members will take it seriously, and prevail upon the Treasurer of the State to provide the association with the necessary funds not only to enable it to carry on but also to help it expand its services.

I am very concerned that the necessary and excellent services provided by the association could quite easily be lost, because the Federal Government—if it is true to form—will cut its source of funds from October.

In the last financial year, from July, 1975, to June, 1976, the association's budget was in the vicinity of \$160 000, of which just over \$137 000 came from the Commonwealth and only \$6 500, in cash, came from the State—added to this rent was paid for its headquarters in Adelaide Terrace.

I believe the State contribution to this point of time has been parsimonious, if we are to compare it with the contribution made by the South Australian Government—which amounted to \$120 000—to the branch of the Family Planning Association in that State.

Accordingly I do not think it will hurt the Government of this State to increase its contribution to ensure the continued existence of the association. Last year, because of the greatly expanded funds made available by the Whitlam Government, the association was able to increase its services to the women of the State.

Previously it was seeing 400 patients per month—that is, in the last financial year—but in the past 12 months it has been able to increase this number to 1 000 patients per month at its seven clinics. The association has been able to employ a considerable number of staff, most of whom are working in a part-time capacity. It has now an executive officer, an education officer, a medical director, 10 other doctors, a clinic supervisor, nine other nurses, eight receptionists, and a stenographer, all of whom work part-time with the exception of the education officer, the clinic supervisor, and the telephone receptionist at Koonwarra House.

When we consider the services provided by the association I think we will agree the Government is getting very good value for its money. With the staff I have just mentioned the association is able to run, throughout the metropolitan area, seven clinics which conduct 22 sessions per week. At Koonwarra House three sessions are held each day—one in the morning, one in the afternoon, and one

at night; that is five days a week. One session is also held at the university each week; two at South Bentley, one is held at Melville, one at Fremantle, one at Eden Hill, and one at Balga.

We may well ask what will happen to these sessions if the supply of money runs out. The association will have to close or severely restrict its activities. In addition to the clinics there is a very fine community education programme being run by the association in relation to family planning and human sexuality. I believe the association is performing an outstanding role in this area.

The duties of the education officer include community education, the organisation of doctors and nurses' courses on family planning and human sexuality, staff workshops, and the development of educational resources, including library and film facilities which are all available to the public.

In February of this year the association arranged a training course for doctors which was attended by 19 doctors who received special training in contraception and sexuality—in theoretical and practical work in clinics.

In March of this year the association held a course for nurses which was attended by 20 nurses. In the case of both these courses the applications exceeded the numbers placed by 100 per cent—the association could only accommodate half the number of applicants who wished to attend.

Quite apart from the above services the association supplies speakers on request for schools and many organisations; and speakers and assistance are given to such institutions as Ngala, Riverbank, and Nyandi. Lectures have been arranged for student secondary teachers and there is available through the clinic a wide range of pamphlets dealing with contraception and VD. The association also has a good selection of films available free of charge; and I might add that these are being taken advantage of by schools and other organisations from all over the State; even as far afield as Halls Creek and Paraburdoo.

In-service programmes organised by the College of General Practitioners, the Family Medicine Programme, and the Community Health Department, include workshops arranged by the medical director of the Family Planning Association. The association has also been asked to run sexuality and family planning seminars and in-service courses for the College of Nursing at WAIT. It also provides speakers for the Community Health Department monthly orientation programmes and for the new nursing staff.

From all that I have said I am sure members must realise that there is a growing awareness in the community of the

need for more education and more information on the questions of family planning and human sexuality, and it is quite obvious that the Family Planning Association is playing a very fine and important role in this area. I feel that not only should the services of the association be maintained, they should be expanded.

The association is continually receiving requests from all over the State—and this should concern particularly the country members from this Chamber.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: We are very interested and I am listening to you most intently.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I am glad of that, because there are many women in the country who are at a disadvantage in not having access to family planning services.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon. Do you mean in the country areas?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The Family Planning Association has received requests from Bunbury, Northam, Collie, Busselton, Mandurah, Kalgoorlie, Manjimup, Midland, Katanning, Merredin, Maddington-Kelmscott, Mt. Barker, Burracoppin and Quairading.

These are some of the places in which women and women's organisations have been contacted the FPA and asked it to establish some sort of clinic or service for the women of the area concerned; but unfortunately, due to a lack of funds the association has had to say, "Sorry, we do not have the funds to extend beyond the clinics we have at the present time".

Another aspect that should interest country members is that I had a look at the child birth figures for the whole of the State of Western Australia. I got these recently from the Statistician's Office and they show a very interesting picture.

The latest figures available are for the year ending the 31st December, 1974. I did a quick calculation on this by adding up the various figures and obtaining a percentage, from which I found the number of women of childbearing age in the country areas represents only 28.6 per cent of the total of childbearing women of the State. The number of country births registered each year is 34 per cent of the total.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: We have always been recognised as having 2 : 1 on everything in the country.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Because of limited forms of recreation!

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The number of ex-nuptial births in the country represents 47 per cent of the total for the whole of the State, including the metropolitan area. So we have 28.6 per cent of women in the country who are of child-bearing age and the ex-nuptial births in the country represent 47 per cent of the figure for the entire State.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What do you work out from that?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I believe it is not unreasonable to assume that in areas where family planning services are not available there is a higher rate of unwanted pregnancies.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are suggesting that women who have babies in the country do not want them. What a horrible thought!

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: This is a serious matter and I am sure the Minister is being facetious.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I am not being facetious.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I am sure the Minister is being facetious. He is not seriously suggesting that every child born in the country is a wanted child or a planned baby.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You are not suggesting they are not wanted?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I am suggesting that in the country there is a higher percentage of unwanted pregnancies.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: A lot of people in the country want planned babies.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: There is no reason for you to think that way.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I will ignore the Minister's remarks because I do not think he is serious. I will continue in my belief that there is a larger number of unwanted children in the country areas than in the metropolitan area. This is quite clearly shown from the statistics.

I want to suggest that unwanted pregnancies have proved to be very expensive not only in financial terms, but also in the human misery that is caused to both the mother and the child. So often does an unwanted child become neglected, abused, and deprived of love and affection. As an adult such a child generally ends up on the human scrap heap. Such children often become delinquents, alcoholics, and drug addicts; and many of them suffer mental ill health or become social misfits generally.

I do not suggest that this happens only to unwanted children born in the country, because many of those born in the metropolitan area end up in this way as they are unwanted when they are born. I hope Mr MacKinnon will not be facetious about that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I was not being facetious in the first place. I was doubting the validity of your conclusions; they were too shallow.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: So I would say again to our conservative Governments that they should appreciate the fact that humane preventive health measures are important and the most economical

in the long run and more consideration should be given to money being spent on social services.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: We have embarked on a big programme in that direction; we are not cutting back.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I would suggest that the great proportion of these projects have been possible only because of the generosity of the previous Whitlam Government. However, we will see a very different story now that the Fraser Government is in office, and is cutting back considerably in the areas of health and social welfare.

The Hon. N. McNeill: You were the person who advocated going into huge deficit.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I did not advocate that; I suggested that deficit funding would be reasonable economic management in times of high unemployment, and I am not the only one who has made such a suggestion. However, I do not see what that has to do with this debate.

In addition to the matter to which I just referred, we are always hearing about the increasing incidence of rape. I have previously stated that there is a great need for more information to be made available in schools; more courses should be available in human sexuality and human relationships so that young people can be encouraged to exercise responsibility and respect for each other in their relationships. I believe that if we have this sort of education in our schools, starting at the primary level, we might have a few less rapes and sexual crimes.

In addition to the general community education which is being carried out by the Family Planning Association, it has been found that more and more patients are seeking sexual counselling and that many people have psycho-sexual problems and can be assisted by doctors at the Family Planning Association. I would suggest that probably quite a few marriages have been saved as a result of such counselling.

What will happen to all these programmes if funds are reduced or withdrawn by the Fraser Government? This community service which is of great assistance to people of all age groups is in danger, unless this Government—which proclaims to be all in favour of federalism—makes up for any shortfall in funds which may occur as a result of the policy decisions of the Fraser Government. I hope funds do not dry up in this important social area, and jeopardise the services which are in existence in many areas.

The work of the Family Planning Association has earned widespread respect, a fact which is obvious from the increasing number of requests which are made not only for the establishment of more

clinics throughout the State but also for speakers and all forms of educational material for schools and organisations. It would be a great tragedy if, after all that has happened, such a service which is available to the people of our State should go out of existence due to a lack of funds.

It is extremely important to the women of Western Australia that the Family Planning Association remain in existence, and I hope the Government will see its way clear to ensure that any curtailment of funds by the Fraser Government is made up by the State Government.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central—Minister for Health) [9.05 p.m.]: I support the Supply Bill and enter this debate to challenge the statement by the Hon. D. K. Dans that no progress has been made by this Government. I should like to point out to the House the progress which has been made in the last few years, particularly in the field of hospital and health care. Nobody could deny that the programme currently being embarked upon by the State Government is one of the most ambitious in the State's history.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Didn't Charlie include you in his book of promises?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: It is all contained in our policy booklet, if the honourable member cares to read it.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I have read it.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The honourable member cannot have read the booklet properly. However, it cannot all be put in the booklet, because our programme is too comprehensive.

Let me refer first to the progress made in the province represented by the Leader of the Opposition. He must have seen a fair sized hole in the ground over the last few months, which represents the commencement of major additions to the Fremantle Hospital. After years of requests, demands and entreaties by the people of Fremantle, this work now is under way. I believe the Leader of the Opposition thought he would never see this day for years.

In addition, a new extended care block has been completed, a school of nursing commenced, a three-tier parking area constructed, and another under construction at Fremantle Hospital. Mr Dans talks about a lack of progress; he must have been walking around his own province with his eyes shut!

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I was referring to the economy.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Let me refer to the progress the Government has made in the metropolitan area. There has been a complete review of the programme for the entire metropolitan hospital system, and we have arrived at a basic 15-year programme.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Are you complaining that you did not have enough money from the Federal Government?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The amount contributed by the Federal Government has not been nearly as great as that contributed by the State Government for hospital building programmes. Last year, some \$21 million was provided by the State, while only about \$11.5 million came from the Commonwealth. This year, the figures will be about the same. The money does not all come from the Commonwealth Government. However, after all is said and done it is still the taxpayers' money and must be met by the taxpayers in the long run.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: When are you going to get on with the Lakes Hospital?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: In three years' time, as planned, when funds are available. That hospital does not concern the honourable member, as it is not entirely within his province. His province will be served by the Fremantle Hospital.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The Lakes Hospital will be in my province.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: My understanding is that it will be close to the edge of the honourable member's province, but that the hospital will not serve his area.

In addition, the Rockingham Hospital has been completed, an extra block of 108 beds has been constructed at Osborne Park, commencement has been made on the foundations of the north block of Royal Perth Hospital, work is going on at KEMH, and work has commenced on one of the biggest building projects ever contemplated in Western Australia at the Perth Medical Centre.

Let me refer now to country areas. A new hospital has been commenced at Bridgetown and another at Busselton; extensions have been built at the Wagin Hospital and the Northampton Hospital has been completed, as was pointed out by Mr Heitman. I could go on and on referring to the progress which has been made in the hospital building programme and health service area in this State, yet the Leader of the Opposition had the cheek to say no progress had been made.

This Government has made remarkable progress, bearing in mind that when I took over the portfolio of Health, during the year 1974-75 not one cent was available for new works; all available finance was allocated to works in progress. I am not decrying that; it was necessary to expedite the works in progress. However, in the last year, quite extensive new works have been undertaken.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I agree. This is public spending. I have always said that the public dollar is no more inflationary than the private dollar.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I am not talking about inflation but about the performance of my Government.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Would you confirm that it was not your Government which commenced the regional hospital at Carnarvon?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I did not mention Carnarvon.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You went right around the State. Would you confirm that?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Yes, I would; that was one of the works which was in progress when I took over.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You have still not finished it; you have a long way to go.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: If the honourable member had listened he would know I mentioned that in 1974-75, the only money available was for works in progress, and the Carnarvon Hospital was included in that programme. I did not claim this Government commenced the Carnarvon Hospital.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I appreciate that you agree you did not start it.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: As I said, I did not claim we did. I am talking about what was started in 1975-76.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I did not say you did make such a claim; somebody else did. I am satisfied now.

The PRESIDENT: Order! My record indicates that the Hon. S. J. Dellar has made his speech.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Not a very good one, but he made it.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Another area which has not been touched upon is the provision of facilities for patients in hospitals catering for paraplegics and quadriplegics. This Government has made it possible for many of these people to leave the institutions and return to live amongst their families in their own homes, by the allocation of several hundred thousand dollars to instal special equipment in their homes. Thus, to say this Government has made no progress is completely erroneous.

The Leader of the Opposition also referred to the Canute-like attitude of this Government over the Tresillian issue. He said that the Government like Canute, sought to part the waters.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I did not say that. I said the Government had a Canute-like attitude. Moses was the one who parted the waters.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: But what about the Canute-like attitude of the Labor Party in this issue? Members of the ALP were behind the scenes, working like beavers. Neither I nor the Premier and Cabinet are so naive as to not know the machinations entered into in regard to Tresillian.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Oh?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The honourable member says "Oh?" Who was the member who sent a telegram to the matron of Tresillian?

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: I did, and I am proud to admit that I was right outside with her views.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: On what basis were such telegrams sent?

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: I admired their stand.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: In addition, telegrams were sent by the honourable member's colleagues, such as Senator Wilkinson and Senator Wheeldon.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Did Ray Young send a telegram?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: No, he did not. On what basis were the telegrams sent? They were sent with the aim of undermining everything that was done at Tresillian. Pressure was put on the staff at Tresillian by these people, yet the accusation was made against the Premier and me that we were the ones placing pressure on these people. Nothing was further from our minds.

This pressure was exerted by friends of the Labor Party—very close friends who are well known to the Hon. Lyla Elliott, such as the Hospital Employees' Union, Mrs Pat Giles and Mr Owen Salmon. These people were constantly at Tresillian endeavouring to undermine the staff there. One incident that occurred was disgraceful.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: What? The Minister for Health turned up!

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: No. This related to a letter that was purported to have come from the staff at Tresillian in response to a request of the Director of Mental Health Services who conveyed the request on my behalf to the staff as to whether they were prepared to transfer to Ross Memorial at Forrestfield; if not whether they were prepared to work somewhere else in the department, or whether they wanted to remain in the department.

I received a telephone call one Thursday afternoon from a journalist of *The West Australian* asking me about my attitude to another matter. He asked me whether I would speak to another reporter. That reporter told me he had a copy of a letter to the Minister for Health, and it was in reply to a request made to the staff at Tresillian. I asked what was in the letter, and I indicated that I had not seen any letter along those lines. I told him that I would check on the matter. Earlier that afternoon I had been out on other departmental business, so I checked, but I found no sign of such a letter having been received.

I asked the reporter what was in the letter, and he read it out to me. It commenced with the words, "In regard to a request made by the Minister for Health". I said I had not seen it. He said it had been passed on to him, and it came from Tresillian. It was supposed to have been posted to me at Parliament House. I do not know why it should be addressed to Parliament House, because the Hospital Employees' Union and the staff of Tresillian know that my address is No. 57 Murray Street, Perth.

The West Australian of the following morning contained a report indicating I was annoyed by the fact that publicity had been given to the letter. It did not mention that I had not received the letter, but it set out the clap-trap contained in the letter which was not factual, particularly the part dealing with a supposed plan of priorities. This did not exist.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Where did it come from?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I shall tell the honourable member where it came from. On the following morning I asked my secretary to phone Parliament House, to inquire whether a courier had a letter addressed to me, and how long it would be before I could expect to receive it. My secretary rang Parliament House and was told that a courier was on his way; that there was a letter marked "Confidential"; and that the courier would arrive at about 10.00 a.m.

In the meantime I had to go out to perform some official duty. When I returned to my office I found the letter, but it was not from the staff of Tresillian. It was from somebody else. I told my secretary that the best thing to do would be to phone the Mental Health Services and check with Tresillian to find out where the letter had been sent.

My secretary did as I requested, and it was 2.00 p.m. when he got the information. The information that was passed on to me was that Mrs Pat Giles, the organiser of the Hospital Employees' Union and a great friend of the Opposition,—

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: She is a very good woman.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: A dedicated woman.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: —had taken the letter from the staff at Tresillian to pass on to me at Parliament House. That was at 2.00 p.m. on the Friday afternoon, but the Press had a copy of that letter the previous afternoon. I asked my secretary to phone Mr Salmon, the Secretary of the Hospital Employees' Union, and ask about the letter Mrs Pat Giles brought from Tresillian. My secretary phoned me later in the afternoon and said the letter had finally arrived.

The letter consisted of a quarto sheet on the union letterhead, and contained three lines. It stated that attached was a letter from the staff at Tresillian, and it contained a few other remarks. Attached to that letter were a couple of foolscap sheets still on the union letterhead, addressed to me at Parliament House, and purporting to be a reply from the staff at Tresillian. That was not received at my office until 3.30 p.m. on the Friday afternoon.

I was staggered to find that somebody had the effrontery, the cheek, the nerve, and the indecency to take what was supposed to be a letter from a place like that, but did not have the decency to send it to me at Parliament House, or my office. I had my secretary find out what had taken place. Finally I received the letter on the union letterhead. That was the sort of thing that went on in respect of the Tresillian issue.

On the day in question I was delayed at the Community Welfare Office until 6.40 p.m. Later I picked up that letter. On the following day, the Saturday morning, I went to my office and drafted a statement for the Press. As it did not have to be sent to *The West Australian* before the following Monday I kept it in my possession, because I was to have a conference with the Premier on the Sunday regarding the Tresillian issue.

I discussed the letter with the Premier. I said I had a statement which I wanted to send to the Press. I produced the statement to the public relations officer, and asked him to edit it. He did, and later he phoned me at my home. He read the edited statement to me.

Lo and behold, my Press statement got 3½ inches of space in a column of *The West Australian*; the comments of Mrs Pat Giles also got 3½ inches; and Mr Salmon's comments got 5 inches. The Press report left out the essential details of timing and other factors relating to the trick over the Tresillian issue.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You do not think the Press is biased?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The Leader of the Opposition should not make me laugh. Never had I seen such an exhibition of bias as I saw over the Tresillian issue.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Towards whom was the Press biased?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Biased towards the Labor Party which was organising this very clever issue over Tresillian. Behind the scenes the Labor Party was working through Dr Harry Cohen.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Is Harry Cohen a member of the Labor Party?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: He is well and truly connected with the Labor Party.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Do you think the residents of Dalkeith and Nedlands are members of the Labor Party?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: It makes no difference whether they come from Dalkeith or Timbuktu. We find the white ants wherever they are. This is one of the cleverest schemes that has been worked out by the Labor Party in Western Australia. It continued to receive publicity and Press coverage in *The West Australian* and *Daily News* while downgrading the Government. Never before had the Press performed so badly as on this occasion. I am aware that *The West Australian* will not print an inch of the comments I am making. It is not game to face up to the position.

The Leader of the Opposition in his contribution to the debate talked about a Canute-like attitude, but surely he was talking with tongue in cheek. With those remarks I support the Bill.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) (9.24 p.m.): We now have a new term in our language. It is no longer "Canute-like"; it is the "Tresillian attitude" that this Government has displayed. Labor members are extremely flattered that the Minister should attribute to them all the things that went on in association with the Tresillian affair.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I always give credit where credit is due.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I know that the Labor Party out of respect for the parents of the children concerned kept its involvement in this affair at a very low level. It was an extremely trying affair for the parents.

It did the two Ministers very little credit in adopting the attitude they did adopt on this issue. The Minister for Health implied that the Labor Party has even infiltrated the Liberal Party. I should point out that some members of the Liberal Party came out and severely castigated the Government on its attitude. Does the Minister for Health suggest those members were conned by the Labor Party and the Press, and that they did not know what they were doing in the action which they finally took? It is unbelievable that the Minister for Health has convinced himself along these lines. It is beyond comprehension that he should have convinced himself the Labor Party organised the whole affair. That is far from the truth.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You do not think I am that naive.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I do not believe the Minister is naive.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I am not naive by a long shot.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I do not believe the Minister is doing himself justice by making statements of that sort. If he is a reasonably sensitive person he

must be aware that the parents were concerned about what was taking place; and the final outcome certainly demonstrated that.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: They were stirred by people behind the scenes, and you know that very well.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: If that is the view of the Minister, he should seriously reconsider the opinion he has arrived at. It was not the Labor Party behind the scenes at all. Members of the Labor Party, such as Mrs Pat Giles, were involved; and inevitably she should be involved, as she is an organiser of the Hospital Employees' Union.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Tell me one reason that she should be involved.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Because the staff of Tresillian are members of that union.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Did she have a right to come in on this issue?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Yes, if they had a union meeting over it.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: A meeting run and conducted by Pat Giles.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It was an official letter to the Minister and one would expect it to be on the union letterhead.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I would not. I would expect it to be from the staff. You should not try to get away with that.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It is incredible that the Minister should think along those lines.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: It is incredible you think the letter should be on the union letterhead.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: If it embarrasses the Minister I shall leave the matter.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: It is not embarrassing me.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: To people who are listening it is embarrassing the Minister.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I know you are embarrassed, because of what your party did.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Why do you think the Minister received the letter 48 hours after the Press did?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: We have the facts from the Minister's side, but not from the other side.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Do not give us that guff.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: A person who wants to get the true picture does not listen to the story from just one side. I hope that is not the way the Minister tackles the problems brought before him.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Do you say the Press coverage was one-sided or two-sided?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Minister is implying that the newspapers were on the side of the Labor Party.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: They were, and the member is very well aware of it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I would prefer to believe they were on the side of the parents.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: On the side of right.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The stories were doing the Liberal Party a great deal of harm.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The Opposition was making sure of that.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: We were not worried about that aspect.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You engineered it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Very few statements were made by Labor Party individuals about the Tresillian affair. If the Minister was reasonable he would agree that was so.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The member was very careful to keep in the background.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: We are aware that finally some of the Liberal members—and I think they included Mr Clive Griffiths—dissociated themselves from the actions of the Government.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: That had nothing to do with the issue, in any way.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Is the Minister saying that the action taken by the members of the Liberal Party had nothing to do with it?

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Nothing at all.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Why take the matter up?

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The member opposite mentioned them, not I.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Mr Cloughton has the floor, and the President will not allow me to speak.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think sufficient interjections and cross-interjections have taken place, and I encourage the honourable member to get on with his speech.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Thank you, Mr President. I intend to raise a number of matters, and the first follows a question I asked this afternoon concerning the bag limit on jewfish. I hope my comments will be conveyed to the appropriate Minister.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Did you say there was a limit on jewfish?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: A bag limit of three applies to amateur fishermen. When my remarks are conveyed to the Minister they will qualify the question I asked this afternoon.

When jewfish are caught and brought to the surface the air sack of the fish is expelled because of the decrease in pressure, and the fish dies as it reaches the surface. Fishing parties usually go to a great deal of trouble when they go fishing for a day. If they catch their three jewfish during the first quarter of an hour they probably will not turn around and return to shore. They sometimes go out for a distance of 20 miles, and they cannot control the type of fish which are caught on their lines. If a fish dies on being brought to the surface, what is the sense in returning it to the water?

The amateur fishing organisations have made it quite plain that they consider the regulation with regard to the bag limit on jewfish to be quite ridiculous. The professional fishermen to whom I have spoken concur with that opinion. An amateur fisherman who has caught his three jewfish during the early part of the day will not turn around and return to shore.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Do you think they should be regulated by scales and weight?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The fishermen believe the limit should be increased, or removed. The fishermen could quite easily keep to the bag limit when they return to shore, but it is quite likely that a considerable number of jewfish would return to the water to rot.

The amateur fishermen who travel to the deep water to catch this type of fish are usually well equipped with freezing facilities. When they return to shore their catch is usually cleaned, frozen, and kept for consumption over an extended period. The fish is not thrown away or wasted. It seems that in the interests of good sense the limits in respect of jewfish should be removed.

I do not quarrel with the limits that apply to other types of fish because they can be returned to the water without any problem. However, we all recognise that jewfish is extremely delicious, and highly prized. It is ridiculous that such highly sought after fish should be wasted.

One suggestion was that there should be a combined limit for jewfish and snapper. That alternative might be more acceptable to the fishermen; I do not know. It has also been pointed out to me that in professional fishing operations many hundreds of young jewfish are brought to the surface and destroyed. There does not seem to be any regulation or supervision of that aspect at all. If a species is to be preserved then all aspects of conservation should be looked into. I trust my remarks will be

referred to the appropriate Minister and that serious consideration will be given to the particular regulations.

Several long letters have appeared in the Press recently from Mr A. J. Walsh, of Graylands, who has made serious allegations against the Police Force. His original letter was dated the 1st July, and was replied to by a Mr John Dalton, President of the Police Union. The first reply was printed on the 17th July, to which Mr Walsh responded on the 29th July.

It is extremely important for the preservation of a free democratic society that its Police Force be of the highest standard possible. There are several fundamentals in a free society, and amongst these are freedom of speech, freedom of movement, and freedom of association.

Just recently one of the police commissioners called for the law to be changed to provide for greater control over public demonstrations. I do not believe that is the sort of control we require. Anything which prevents the free expression of views in public makes our society less free and democratic, to that extent.

We recognise that a police force operating in our sort of society has a very difficult and delicate job. If its powers are too great we tend towards a dictatorial community. On the other hand, if its powers are not strong enough we tend towards libertinism and uncontrolled freedom. This is a sensitive area and we need an extremely competent police force to handle this sort of situation.

It is a simple matter for the public to demand tighter controls and restrictions when the Police Force is faced with some difficulties. However, I suggest that is against the best interests of the community and works against the sort of society which we believe is desirable.

We should pay a great deal of attention to the type of allegation made by Mr Walsh. In his first letter, which appeared in *The West Australian* on the 1st July, he raised several points as follows—

- Many members of the legal profession in my opinion are not motivated by justice, but are self-seeking.
- Many policemen perjure themselves on some aspect of their evidence. When the facts of the case or the applicable rules do not match the legal elements necessary in the various cases, often the policeman concerned will alter his evidence. Few will knowingly give true evidence if it means losing the case.
- Many detected crimes would go unpunished if policemen did not commit perjury.
- Verbal admissions of guilt are often fabricated by police.
- Physical evidence is often tampered with.

● Confessions are sometimes improperly obtained.

These are extremely serious charges and should not be taken lightly. As he indicated in a letter, Mr Walsh was a former member of the Police Force with more than 14 years' experience in Victoria. He said he had a close knowledge of how the Police Force operated.

Mr Walsh referred to a situation in this State where a senior officer had gone to him and complained because he had not got what he believed to be a fair share of the rake-off of collections made by the Police Force.

It was recently alleged to me that in this State—in Perth—where there are gambling houses operating, the police in fact make a levy on those establishments, and it is then divided amongst them. The person told me that earlier when he operated a night club he had to make a fortnightly payment to a police sergeant. It is quite easy to see that if these things actually exist the temptation to exercise the law unfairly would be extremely great. I hope the Government will take the letter as presenting a substantial case for some action on its part to attempt to determine whether there are areas in the administration of the Police Force which need further attention.

Another quite local incident was brought to my notice and it shows a laxity in the administration of the Police Force. Perhaps the officers to whom I refer were following what they believed to be the best method of finding out the culprit responsible for a particular incident. They went into a private home and took away a number of young lads whom they believed to be involved. Although the parents were inside the house, the officers did not advise them that they were taking the boys away. The boys were interrogated and the police officers managed to obtain a confession from one of them in relation to some particular damage that had been done—I might say this was a rather minor affair. It turned out in fact this youth had not done the damage.

This incident is an example of the sort of problem Mr Walsh was talking about. Of course in this case the parents were most incensed, particularly as the police officers spoke to the youths on the edge of the veranda and only a few steps were necessary for the officers to knock on the door and advise the parents of what they were doing. The parents did not even receive a phone call from the police station to say that the boys were there.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I am sure you will conclude this speech with some remarks about the very good things the police do. I am sure you will balance your speech up that way.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I know, as would Mr McNeill, that the police have a very difficult job. It is not very easy in

certain circumstances to determine just who is responsible for what. However, these lads were on the veranda of a house and the officers did not bother to take a few steps to the door to advise the parents of what was happening. That is not a reasonable way to go about things. One of the boys confessed, although eventually it was shown that someone else was responsible.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Have you conveyed these views to the Minister for Police, his department, or the commissioner?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: No.

The Hon. N. McNeill: You have known about this for some time but you preferred to make it public again for the record in the Parliament.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I do not think the Minister is taking a reasonable attitude to what I am saying. I will quote what Mr Walsh said—

Finally, as to reporting instances of perjury etc., to whom does Mr Dalton suggest one goes? A senior police officer? He would have to be joking. A politician? Maybe, but how do you choose one with the required honesty, motivation, ability and influence?

The judiciary, though somewhat burdened with imperfections itself, does seem to hold the most hope.

There Mr Walsh says: Just how far would he have got if he had gone to the senior police officers?

The Hon. N. McNeill: Are you prepared to acknowledge that those remarks impugn the integrity of every police officer and also every member of Parliament?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I would say that as far as members of Parliament go the opinion expressed by Mr Walsh would be commonly held throughout the community.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I quite disagree with that.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: If the honourable member mixed with the public to any extent—

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I mix to a greater extent than you do.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Some do try to use things for political advantage.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Mr Wordsworth would probably know about that.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I made an observation a while ago that I am sure you will balance this with some comments about some good things the police do. I am still waiting to hear that.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: If I had gone to a senior police officer, maybe he would have carried out some examination of the matter. However, I do not think it would have gone much further than that because there is no higher authority asking

that the matter be taken seriously. We would be told, "We have inquired about this matter; these are the facts." The file would be closed and the matter finished and things would go on just the same as before. Although he may not say it here, I think privately the Minister would agree with me that very likely that is what would happen.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I would disagree absolutely and entirely with what you are saying, and I believe it is quite improper for you to make allegations of this sort.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: This place has been set up by the community so that politicians may have a chance to have such matters debated. I am airing this here because I believe it is the proper place to do it. The Minister may not agree with me, but I will proceed with my speech as I believe it is my right and my duty to do so in the interests of the people of this State.

I believe it is very likely that all Mr Walsh said happened, and if the Minister feels that Mr Walsh's statements impugn the whole Police Force, I must disagree with him. I believe that a senior officer would make an inquiry but he would not feel obliged to take it any further. Perhaps he might reprimand the officers concerned if the allegations were justified, but that would not resolve the problem that I am saying possibly is endemic to the Police Force—the problem about which Mr Walsh is making this serious charge.

I have given here the example of a recent experience of mine with a constituent. The problem was brought to me and I advised the constituent what to do. So I know the facts of that particular case, and I must add that it is not the first such charge brought to me. I would say that other members of Parliament have had similar experiences.

The Hon. N. McNeill: As a matter of fact, what did you tell this constituent to do?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I would say that Mr Walsh, as a former policeman, is well aware that such things actually take place in the Police Force.

The Hon. N. McNeill: What did you tell your constituent to do?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I told him that he should go to the police station for a start, to ensure that the youths were released. I cannot quite remember the procedures, but I believe charges were actually laid, and of course they were thrown out as being unsustainable.

The Hon. N. McNeill: You are not answering me very confidently, if I may say so.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I did not come here with all the details of that particular matter.

The Hon. N. McNeill: It is a pity that when you make such an allegation you do not come here supported with every factual detail.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I gave the Minister the details that were relevant to this discussion. I did not come along to talk about all the things that happened in a particular case between my constituents, the court, and the youths. The important thing is that these police officers apprehended the boys on a veranda of the home of one of them, took them to the police station without advising the parents, and exerted such pressure that one of the lads confessed to an offence for which he was not responsible.

Of course, Mr Walsh was referring in his letters to the remarks of Mr Justice Wickham who, in his court, criticised the Police Force and questioned seriously the truthfulness of the evidence presented to him. The Minister is charging me with impugning the Police Force, but one might say the judge was impugning the whole Police Force.

What I am saying is that the remarks of Mr Justice Wickham and Mr Walsh, together with my own experiences, indicate that there is a problem which requires Government attention. I do not say that we should take the Police Force apart to find the guilty parties, but I do suggest that the Police Force should be asked to look at its role in the community to ensure that, in carrying out its duties, a proper balance is kept between the need to exert authority and preserve order, as against the need of a society such as ours for the greatest measure of freedom of expression in assembly and all the other things that go to make up what we believe to be a democratic society.

The Hon. N. McNeill: In other words, only the police are wrong.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Who said the police are wrong? The Minister is as bad as Mr Baxter with the extreme attitudes he adopts. I thought I was taking a very reasonable attitude about this.

The Hon. N. McNeill: You are saying only the police are wrong.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am saying that from my own experience quite demonstrably there is a problem. From the evidence given in Mr Walsh's letters and confirmed by the remarks of Mr Justice Wickham, there is a problem. The Minister might say that we are police bashing but he is impugning us far more than anything we have said is impugning the Police Force as a mass.

I am not saying that we should get rough with the Police Force, but I am saying that police officers should be asked to consider their role in the community and that if we are to have a reasonable society, it is necessary for them to understand the sort of role they should play.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Do you think it is reasonable to suggest the community ought to consider its role *vis-a-vis* the police?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I would say it the other way around.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Wait on—there are two sides to the question.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Police Force is an organisation.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: So is the community an organisation—it is an organised community.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Police Force runs courses—the Minister should not show how ignorant he is for the second time in one night.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I am fully aware of what it does.

The PRESIDENT: Order! During the whole of his speech the honourable member has not been addressing the Chair. Would you kindly address your remarks to the Chair?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Through you, Mr President—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I will help you; there is a responsibility on the community also.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am addressing the Chair. The point I am trying to make and which some other members of the Chamber apparently feel should not be made, is that the Police Force does run courses to educate its officers. I suggest an important element of those courses should be instruction along these particular lines. I must confess I have never looked at the curriculum of the Police Force.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Neither have I, but I bet they do just that. Without doubt, they do just what you suggest.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It would be interesting to see what element—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: This lack of research is disgraceful.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: From the evidence we have, it appears that if this instruction is included in the curriculum, then it is insufficiently dealt with. I am sure most members here have had other such examples brought to their notice. Like many other groups in the community, police officers should attend refresher courses to remind them of the role they should play in our community.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Why don't you take it up with the Commissioner of Police?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Such refresher courses would be far preferable to the Government's proposals to bring in more restrictive legislation to prevent the gathering of people to discuss and demonstrate on what they believe are

important issues in the community. We should not try to keep things under wraps, because if we do they accumulate and build up an explosive potential. It is far better that such matters should be brought up in a satisfactory manner. People should be able to talk out their problems rather than be brought to the point of violence.

We have heard members of the Liberal Party and Country Party complaining about taking politics into local government and some recent examples have been given. In the last local government elections in this State in May, a full advertisement was taken in the *Independent Gazette*, a local newspaper distributed in the Bassendean area. This showed a photograph of one, Mr Rob Carter, who was at one time an endorsed Liberal Party candidate for the seat of Ascot. He was promoting himself and his team to contest seats on the Bassendean council. He was not particularly successful, but that is one example of the involvement in local government of Liberal Party members.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: It was not an example at all.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Is the honourable member saying that Mr Carter was not a member of the Liberal Party?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I never said anything about it. I never said that at all.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Is the honourable member saying the fact that a person is a member of a particular party does not mean the whole party is involved?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: That is exactly what I am saying.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The honourable member has a different story from some other members of his party because we had—

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I have the right story—you can bet your life on that.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: We had a recent episode at the City of Stirling where the Labor Party was accused of taking action in respect of the Deputy Town Clerk. His dismissal was claimed to be a political act and two endorsed Labor candidates, who are councillors, were named as being the proof of this. Mr Griffiths apparently would not agree with that sort of proposition.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I never said anything about that. I will have something to say about it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Either the story holds for one case or it does not. It either applies to both cases or it applies to neither. It cannot apply to one and not the other.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: It is indeed one or the other.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I agree that Mr Griffiths will take the story that suits him.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I am taking the facts.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It was subsequently shown quite plainly that that was not a political act on the part of the Labor Party.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Who said it was?

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: Is the matter not still *sub judice*? Should you be talking about it?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The member for Karrinyup (Mr Clarko) made this sort of claim publicly.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What do you mean by "this sort of claim"?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Claiming that the sacking was political. He was prepared to name those members of the Labor Party on the council.

The Hon. N. McNeill: When you were introducing this subject you said, "We had an episode in the Stirling Council".

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: We?

The Hon. N. McNeill: I think you used that pronoun.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Only in the sense of "We had a discussion on the Police Force tonight".

The Hon. N. McNeill: That is all right.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It is not the Labor Party that had the discussion. I had reason to contact the Deputy Town Clerk, as he was, before he was dismissed. He had been demoted several months previously and his salary had dropped approximately \$2 000, which I would have thought was a fair—

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: I do not know whether you should be talking about this matter. It is still *sub judice*.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: There is no court case about it.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: It is still up for appeal.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: These statements have been made that it was a political action and it has not been refuted by Mr Clarko. He has not said publicly "I was quite wrong, it was not political at all".

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: Is not this case still under review by the Minister concerned?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I am not sure that Mr Clarko said it, but you are saying that he did.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I can believe at this stage that the honourable member would not want to believe that he said these things.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: It makes no difference to me whether he said it or not.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The clerk had been demoted from a senior status and his salary had been reduced by about \$2 000 which I would have thought was a fair indication to a person in his position that things were not quite right with his performance. It is not the usual thing for a person at his level in local government to be reduced in grade in that way. Last July a ratepayer in Mt. Lawley inquired of the shire when Alexander Drive construction was likely to be completed. Mr Prince signed a reply which said—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Is the dismissal of this man a matter of application to the Minister for Local Government?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am not sure, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: Assuming that it is, I do not regard that you are breaching the *sub judice* rule; but if the man's position is to come before the Minister for Local Government as a matter of fairness I would have thought the matter should be left there.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Mr President, I would not quarrel with your judgment.

The PRESIDENT: If the Minister is to review the decision that has been made by a shire in respect of the dismissal of a member of the shire staff, in my opinion it would be fair if the matter were left there and not debated in this Chamber. I know that you are not infringing the *sub judice* rule.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: That may have been a reasonable attitude to take except that the gentleman concerned had made public statements before he saw the Minister for Local Government and it could be seen that he had little concern that remarks made publicly might prejudice his case with the Minister.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: That is his prerogative.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: That is right, and it is my prerogative to debate in this Chamber.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: With a degree of discretion.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: In the circumstances that surround this case I believe the members of this Chamber should be made aware of some of the matters that took place in respect of my dealings with the man.

I have spoken of these matters previously in the Chamber. I would simply go into them in a little more detail. The Deputy Town Clerk, who was the Acting Town Clerk at this time, replied to the ratepayer in these words—

Reference your letter of 22nd July, 1975, addressed to the Mayor, Councilor G. A. Venville.

The reconstruction of Alexander Drive between Bradford Street and Rookwood Street is scheduled to proceed within the next two months.

The work, which is financed by the Bureau of Roads Funds, has been delayed by the non-allocation of funds to this State.

Because the gentleman concerned had read in the Press that funds had been allocated for the construction of this road he contacted Mr Jamieson's office expressing concern. He could not understand precisely what was going on and the matter was brought to me to follow up. Subsequently I wrote to the Town Clerk asking whether he would clarify the statements made by Mr Prince. I received a reply on the 1st September, again with Mr Prince's signature, in which he said—

We are currently negotiating with the Main Roads Department for the allocation of additional funds in order that this work may be carried out under the Bureau of Roads auspices, and it is expected that work will start, subject to negotiations being successful, within the next four weeks.

There is nothing wrong with that but I was not satisfied in respect of his original statement that the work had been delayed because of nonallocation of funds. I asked in this Chamber for the programme of works that had been approved for the City of Stirling and the Minister for Local Government said that he did not keep the records in his department and I could get them from the City of Stirling. That was a very informative answer!

Following that on the 4th September I asked a question of the Minister for Transport and the information came back to me that the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads has no authority to grant financial assistance for roads. So that made the Acting Town Clerk's statement wrong to that extent. He claimed that funds had not been allocated by the Bureau of Roads.

The Hon. N. McNeill: What is the purpose of your comments?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: If the Minister will bear with me a little longer—

The Hon. N. McNeill: I should like to know now actually, inasmuch as you have not needed some advice that the President has given you.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Acting Town Clerk wrote to the ratepayer and said that the work had been delayed because of the nonallocation of funds by the Bureau of Roads. We knew that funds had been allocated so the statement was wrong. I did not accuse the gentleman of not telling the truth. I wrote to the council to get more precise information to satisfy the ratepayer. It was only as this information built up that it showed that the Acting Town Clerk was not being

straight with either myself or the ratepayer. Funds had been allocated in April, 1975, and this letter was dated the 30th July, which was several months later.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I think you have already answered my question. What you are really doing is setting yourself up as a prosecutor in this case.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am not setting myself up as a prosecutor. I am giving the Chamber the information that caused me to write in other terms subsequently to the council.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: He is proving that Mr Clarko's comments were perfectly correct.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: On the 10th September I wrote to the Mayor saying—

The enclosed letter to was forwarded to me because of his concern as to the information it contains. That is, that work on Alexander Drive has been delayed by the non-allocation of funds to the State and reference to the Bureau of Roads Funds.

I would appreciate your explanation of this statement, particularly in the light of the answer given to me by the State Minister for Transport, a copy of which is enclosed.

There was no urging there that action be taken against Mr Prince. It was simply a request for clarification of the information provided.

A longer reply was received from the City of Stirling, again under the hand of Mr Prince. I had sent one letter to Mr Easton and another to Mrs Venville, and on each occasion Mr Prince replied.

In his letter of the 15th September he referred to a number of things about which I will not go into any detail. Then he said—

Due to a substantial escalation in costs, it was necessary to immediately approach the Main Roads Department for more funds for this project. Approval was received on the 8th September, 1975, and work is to proceed within the next two weeks.

This is a reason different from the one he gave in answer to the original inquiry. If he had said at that time that there had been a substantial increase in costs, and that was why further road funds had to be sought to ensure the completion of the road, none of the other correspondence would have been entered into. The pity is that he did not say it at that time.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: You are splitting straws a bit, aren't you?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: There is a substantial difference between saying that no funds have been allocated and saying that application had to be made for more funds because it will cost more than was originally anticipated to complete the road. Those are two different answers.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: I still think you are splitting straws.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I believe the ratepayer was entitled to receive the correct information. Why should he be misled, as it appears he was, by the local authority?

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: I think you should produce the evidence. You are prejudging this man, and that is pretty crook.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Nothing I say here will affect his case.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: Then why are you saying it?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: That surely would have been fairly well tabulated by the council which confirmed his dismissal.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: There is still the process of appeal.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Are you not saying it will affect his case?

The PRESIDENT: If the honourable member is appealing to me for an opinion, I have already expressed my opinion.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Thank you, Mr President.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You did not take much notice of it though, did you?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Subsequently I was given certain information, including some from the Minister for Transport in respect of Pearson Street, which subject I had introduced into the discussion because the fact that funds had been allocated only in April had not prevented the council proceeding immediately with those works, but it was apparently delaying on Alexander Drive.

I asked when the estimates of the cost of the reallocation of services in Pearson Street had been sought by the council. The information I received was that they had not been sought until that April, the month in which the funds were allocated. Therefore the shire had no idea at that time what it would cost to relocate the services in Pearson Street; yet it ran headlong into that project. That led me to believe that because the applications for funds for the two roads had been lodged at the same time, no request for an estimate from the various authorities had been made for the relocation of services in Alexander Drive as well.

It seemed to me that extreme incompetence was being demonstrated in the estimation of the cost of the works. We know that the cost of the reconstruction of Pearson Street rose from \$470 000 in April, 1971, to in excess of \$750 000 which was the amount given to me earlier this year in reply to a question I asked in this House. That seemed to me to be quite incredible. The cost of relocation by the MWB was \$24 000. No matter how much the cost escalated in that respect it would not

reach anything near the thousands involved in the difference in the two estimates. The SEC advised that an estimate of \$39 000 was given.

I again wrote to the mayor and indicated that I believed the answers were most unsatisfactory and that the officer involved deserved a reprimand for what had taken place. On the 22nd September the mayor replied and, far from showing any political bias about the man, she said—

I cannot agree under the circumstances that Mr. Prince has not been entirely honest with you or Mr. Vine. That hardly demonstrates that she was politically motivated to dismiss the man. She was doing what we would expect a mayor to do; that is, to defend her officers.

I wrote to several councillors and told them that I had no intention to pursue the matter further but that, on the evidence in the correspondence exchange, I thought the man was not fit to hold his job. I have not given details of the whole affair.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Would you clarify that point?

The Hon. N. McNeill: So you conveyed that view to the council on a domestic matter affecting the City of Stirling and—

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Minister for Justice may not know that the City of Stirling comprises the bulk of my electorate, so anything which affects the ratepayers also affects my constituents and I attempt to give them the best representation I can. I do not attempt to interfere with local authority affairs. I contacted the mayor and that was as far as I pursued the matter. It was not my job to hound this man, but merely to convey to the mayor and councillors the facts as they had been given to me.

On the 10th October, last year, I expressed grave doubt about this man's fitness to do the job, and I believe that subsequent evidence has substantiated my contention.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: What you are saying is absolutely disgraceful bearing in mind—

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: There is only one conclusion at which I can arrive and I am concerned about the charge of political involvement. It was a Liberal member and Liberal supporters who leaped to the defence of, and packed up behind Mr Prince. That can lead me to only one conclusion; that they saw him as one of their own and they were accusing the Labor Party of dismissing him on political grounds. That is the only conclusion one can draw.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Is it?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Of course it is.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I can tell you it is not the conclusion I draw.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: When it is acknowledged that the vote in the council was 9:4 it means that nine out of the 13 members believed there was evidence to justify the actions of the council. This condemns those members of the Liberal Party who attempted to interfere with the internal operations of the council.

It is shocking that the attempt was made and it makes a mockery of the charges so often levelled by members opposite that it is the Labor Party which interferes. On the evidence, it is the other way around. It is the Liberal Party which attempts to interfere in local government.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Are you prepared to clarify one point?

THE HON. CLIVE GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [10.25 p.m.]: I wish to make a few comments on several subjects, but firstly I believe I ought to remark on the statements made by the previous speaker.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You surprise me.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I commence by saying that his initial comment in regard to politics in local government was closely followed by a statement that he saw an advertisement in the local newspaper prior to the last local government election.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: The *Independent Gazette*.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Its name is immaterial. The point he was making was that in the advertisement was mention of a candidate for the local authority election who on a previous occasion had been an endorsed Liberal candidate. He suggested that this indicated there was a political affiliation in local government. I said that it did not indicate this at all.

The point I want to get across to him is that we have never denied that serving in local government there are people who are supporters of the Liberal Party. What we do say is that we are opposed to political parties endorsing candidates for local government elections, and the Liberal Party is certainly opposed to assisting candidates for local government elections as members of the Liberal Party. That is where we differ greatly with members of the Labor Party.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: There seems to have been a great deal of difficulty experienced in convincing your members in my electorate.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Not at all. It is the principle which differs considerably. The political party to which Mr Claughton belongs makes no secret of the fact that it endorses candidates and, indeed, that it is increasingly interesting itself in ensuring that it supports members of the Labor Party who go into local government. That is where we differ in our views on politics in local government.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You do not differ in your actions.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: There is no difference in our actions. There are no members in local government who have been endorsed by the Liberal Party.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Not publicly endorsed.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Or in any other way, either. The Liberal Party does not endorse candidates, and does not assist candidates who are members of the Liberal Party.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You have not convinced members in my electorate.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The honourable member is unable to understand plain English. What I am saying is that certainly members of the Liberal Party make themselves available for councils. Certainly members of the Liberal Party help people to get into local government but they do not do so as members of the Liberal Party; they do so as individuals.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: They do it secretly.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: They do it as individuals, and the honourable member knows it.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You do not want the public to know it.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The public knows it, and that is why the Labor Party's attempts to endorse people for local government are constantly rejected.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: The only candidate we endorsed last time was elected.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: So the Labor Party had one candidate elected. It has been trying to do so over the years; mostly unsuccessfully. Mr Claughton claims a major breakthrough because at the last election the one and only candidate the Labor Party endorsed was successful. Perhaps he is looking forward to endorsing others in the future. The point I was trying to make in my interjection is that the Liberal Party does not endorse candidates or engage itself in local government elections.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You give them a pat, as we do in Fremantle. You do not endorse them.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: We do not do anything.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I know you do not. That has been proved in the last 24 years.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I mean as far as local government is concerned. The further disgraceful remarks the honourable member made in regard to the current situation in the City of Stirling, involving the deputy town clerk, need no

comment from me because members will make their own evaluation of that state of affairs. Although I interjected and said I was not aware of any comment Mr Clarko was alleged to have made, I concede now that if Mr Clarko did make the comment he was obviously on the right track, from the comments made by Mr Claughton.

Mr Claughton also spoke about a letter written to the newspaper by a Mr Walsh in relation to the Police Force. I read the letter and the replies with great interest but it occurs to me to be passing strange that a person who was speaking from 14 years' experience in the Police Force and 14 years' personal experience of these alleged activities waited until after he had left the Police Force—under dubious circumstances, to say the least—before making comments about the activities to which he was a party during the time he was in the Police Force. So I think Mr Walsh's comments should be looked at with suspicion, to say the least. He was never a member of the Western Australian Police Force but, if I recall the letter correctly, he was speaking from some experience—

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Where did you glean that information?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I read the letters and I was familiar with the case.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I thought it might have been through an interjection.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Sometimes an interjection does assist members, but I think members of this House would be able to evaluate the merits or otherwise of Mr Walsh's comments and whether or not, on the basis of them, we should embark on a tirade of abuse against the Western Australian Police Force.

On Wednesday, the 14th August, 1974, when speaking in this House I mentioned a group of people who work under the name of the Women's Centre Action Group. I indicated at that time they had been to see me expressing a desire to provide night shelters for women who needed emergency accommodation for various reasons. I suggested the Government should give serious consideration to providing some financial assistance to the people who make this night shelter accommodation available in the community. I went on to say there were one or two places in the city for people who needed to go somewhere in an emergency—perhaps wives of drunken husbands who belted them up periodically, who were placed in a situation where they had several children, no money, and no place to go.

I am pleased to say the Government did give the group some assistance and is continuing to do so; and I am also delighted to report that recently the Town of Canning purchased a house in Bentley which is to be made available as a night shelter.

Indeed, the night shelter has been named after Mary Smith, one of the ladies who formed a voluntary group in the Town of Canning area for the purpose of running the night shelter. I attended with others at a public meeting which was called a couple of weeks ago and at which an association was formed for the purpose of establishing an incorporated body which would approach the Canning Town Council in an endeavour to lease the building which the council had purchased and run it as a night shelter. I want to commend that group of women and the Town of Canning on their initiative in taking this step to provide a greatly needed service in the community.

I want to take the opportunity to speak tonight on a couple of other points, one of which is the Strata Titles Act. It will be recalled this Act was introduced into Parliament around about 1966 or 1967 for the purpose of enabling people to obtain titles to duplexes and home units in multi-storied blocks, which previously they were unable to do under the purple title system. The Act provided a title which enabled people to take out a mortgage and borrow money for the purpose of buying their units. It was an innovation in this field as far as Western Australia was concerned and the Act has proved to be of considerable benefit. However, with the passage of time a few anomalies and problems have arisen which were not envisaged.

During the whole life of the Tonkin Government and during the term of this Government I have asked whether it was intended to take any action to upgrade or amend the Strata Titles Act. Each time I have inquired of both Governments, I have been advised something would be done about it, but nothing has yet happened. I know the Government is currently looking at the Act, and I know the New South Wales Act has been reviewed and recently re-enacted and the Government is waiting to see the result of that.

In the meantime, there are some areas which I believe need attention. One which has come to my notice is that a strata title cannot be registered in the Titles Office until after the building is completed and the local authority has issued a certificate indicating that the building has been completed and complies with all the requirements of the Strata Titles Act. At that point the developer or builder of the units can register the strata title, and it is not until then that a title actually exists for any of the units.

Some of these projects take a long time to build—as long as 12 months. The developer is selling the units from the day he puts a sign on the block of land indicating he is building them, and he accepts deposits from people for the units. That is a reasonable thing to do and the only way a developer can do business. In the event of a block of units taking 12 months to build, a person can pay a substantial deposit—perhaps 20 per cent of the total

cost in some instances—and the developer holds that money until the project is completed. But in making an application to a lending authority the purchaser finds the lending authority cannot examine the property because until the project is completed there is no title and, therefore, nothing for the lending authority to examine and hold as a security on which to lend money.

So a situation can arise where a person who has paid a deposit—whether or not it is a substantial one does not matter—cannot apply for a loan and have it approved until after the building is completed. It could well be the building is completed at a time when funds are not available from building societies or banks, in which case the prospective purchaser is unable to fulfil his part of the contract, which usually states that the purchaser must pay the balance of the money within one month of the strata title being registered. If no funds are available, the person is not in a position to fulfil his part of the contract and is confronted with the problem of getting his money back. That is the only thing that can happen.

However, in the meantime the developer has had his money for 12 months with no interest; and in these days of escalating prices the person who develops the property has something that very frequently is worth 20 per cent more than it was when the original purchaser put the deposit on the unit.

So I think here is an area that needs to be looked at. It seems to me the requirement to wait until the building is completed before strata titles can be registered should be altered to enable these titles to be registered at the commencement of the building. There may be some legal technicality against that, but at least it should be looked at.

Another area that needs to be looked at is that when the Strata Titles Act was enacted we did not have what are now known as cluster developments. These are a new trend in building. On a given area of land several housing units are built, but they are detached from one another although on the same block of land. These buildings are completely separate with no common walls as is the case with duplexes, triplexes, quadruplexes, and multi-storied units.

So a different set of circumstances applies, particularly in respect of insurance. The Strata Titles Act says that the body corporate must insure the whole of the building for the whole of its replacement value. A provision in that Act says that a person or organisation who lends money may also demand that the borrower insure the building to cover the extent of the mortgage. So we have in effect two lots of insurance on the one building.

In these cluster type developments, as they are not joined in any way, it would seem to me to be reasonable to enable

them to be insured separately and not as a body corporate as is required in the case of buildings which are joined together. Incidentally, I understand South Australia has separate titles for cluster developments. It has introduced an Act to cover these developments. However, in Western Australia the only way they can be registered is by way of strata titles.

Whilst I appreciate that the upgrading of the whole Act is pending the decision of the Law Reform Commission, I feel we should look at some early amendments in respect of those two areas.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Are you satisfied with the double insurance aspect for high rise buildings?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: No, I am not satisfied with that as it applies to multi-storied units; and I am certainly not satisfied with it as it applies to cluster type buildings. At least in the multi-storied building there is some semblance of reason for it because some units may not be mortgaged but owned outright while others are mortgaged; and therefore if we do not have the whole lot covered by the body corporate and mortgagors are not permitted to ensure they are covered, areas of trouble could arise. Nevertheless, I still think the body corporate insurance ought to be sufficient, even in those cases. I disagree with the provision, but more so in respect of cluster type buildings.

Another disturbing matter which has been brought to my attention in the last month or so is in respect of the activities of some real estate agents. I recall reading some time ago of the activities of real estate agents in, I think, the Subiaco area, and there was some suggestion that devious activities were going on. I think the circumstances there are similar to those which have been brought to my attention and which occurred recently in South Perth.

What is happening is that elderly women whose husbands have just passed away are being visited by representatives of real estate agents and being persuaded to place their houses on the market, whilst still distraught and distressed from losing their husbands. Frequently they are talked into placing their houses on the market at prices much below the current value.

The sort of thing that has been suggested to me is that some of these people bought their houses for £900 or £1000 some years ago. Over the years the value of the land and building has increased, to the extent that some properties are worth \$30 000.

Elderly ladies who are distraught and have never handled any business during the lives of their husbands, and who do not know what to do or where to turn for advice, are being prevailed upon, in the examples given to me, by young ladies

who indicate sympathy for the women and suggest that perhaps they should sell their houses and get themselves into aged persons' home units. These young ladies suggest to the elderly woman concerned that her house is worth, say, \$17 000. To a person who paid £1 000 for the house 35 years ago, \$17 000 sounds like a fortune.

In one case a house was actually sold under these circumstances. The young lady who was working for the estate agent suggested to the buyer that because the old lady was a bit eccentric he should go along with the agent's story that he—the buyer—was her boyfriend. The agent took the buyer to see the house on the pretext that she was showing the house to her boyfriend, and the chap finished up buying it. The elderly woman was asked to sign a piece of paper which turned out to be an offer and acceptance form.

The point I am making is that it is a sorry state of affairs when the real estate industry is brought into disrepute because of the activities of one or two unscrupulous organisations which are prepared to stoop to this level in order to get some business. I certainly do not suggest a large number of estate agents do this, but some do. The fact that already reports have appeared in a newspaper of this occurring in Subiaco made me all the more determined to say something about the cases in South Perth which have been brought to my attention recently. I recommend that we consider stringent action against any real estate agent who is guilty of this sort of practice. Frankly, I just cannot go along with this practice at all.

The other subject on which I want to say a few words is the Builders Registration Act. Members will recall that we spent a great deal of time on this matter last session, and we amended the Act. Unfortunately, the Act is still not doing what we as members of Parliament expressed during the course of the debate to be the things we felt it should do in terms of protecting the home builder; that is, the person who is having a home built.

I would bring to the attention of the House a recent case. It seems to me to be quite extraordinary how I get all these diabolical cases. In this instance the registered builder is a person who is qualified to be registered by virtue of the fact that he is an engineer, even though he has not done any building. He was employed by the Government. The Act says he is entitled to be a registered builder; and there is nothing wrong with that, except that a development company which was not a registered builder used the provisions of the Act to use this engineer as its registered builder and as the person who would be responsible for the carrying out of all the requirements which should be carried out by a registered builder.

The development company built a block of units. The units were subsequently sold and found to be defective in so many

ways that it was just pitiful. However, the company refused to carry out any rectification of any of the problems. The fellow who bought the first unit went to the Builders Registration Board and made a complaint; and he pointed out the multitude of errors which included very grave building deficiencies.

The only person to whom the Builders Registration Board could go was the registered builder; namely, the engineer, who of course took very little part in the building of the units—if, indeed, he took any part at all. He is the only person against whom the board may lawfully take action. The development company cannot be proceeded against.

So, the board proceeded to deregister the builder. The registered builder happens to be an engineer employed by the Government, so taking his registration from him was of little consequence. In addition, the board also ordered him to pay for the rectification of the faults. However, he did not have any money. He was able to borrow some and mortgage certain properties and raise a certain amount of the money required. That is the full extent of his funds, and the poor home owner cannot take any action against the development company which I suppose now is busily looking around for another registered builder in order to continue its activities.

This is only one resident from a complete block of units. The others will not get any compensation at all because the registered builder has no further funds; all his funds and more will be required to rectify the faults in the first unit. Here is an example of glaring structural faults, not in a cheap set of units but in a tremendously expensive block of prestige units; structurally, they are a mess. This is an example where the Builders Registration Board has proceeded to the limit permitted under the Act but where the individuals will be far from recompensed and the real culprit—the development company—will be allowed to go scot free.

The Hon. T. Knight: You realise, of course, that the Builders Registration Board is not responsible for structural details; that is a local council responsibility.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: It is not a detail—the building is defective from start to finish! The Builders Registration Board agrees that this matter comes within its scope. The point I make is that the board has reached the end of the road and can take no further action to give satisfaction to the poor person who has purchased the unit.

I suggest that, unfortunately, we must look further into the legislation. Members will recall that during the debate on the last amending legislation, I stated that it was my belief that there should be two classes of builders. We should return to

the situation which obtained until the early 1960s, when we had A-class and B-class builders.

The person who wished to build only cottages would be registered in a certain category, and the builder who wished to construct multi-storied office buildings would be registered in another category. Currently, of course, a registered builder is permitted to build anything from a cottage to the type of building seen in the central city area.

In addition, I believe anyone who becomes a registered builder should be required to lodge a substantial bond with the Builders Registration Board, commensurate with the type of building in which he is participating. This bond should be similar to that posted by real estate agents and various other professions.

With today's rising costs, and inflation going the way it is, such faults as the ones to which I have referred need to be rectified quickly. The specific case has been going on for six months now, due to the inability to pin responsibility on any one person, and then due to the lack of funds on the part of the registered builder. Each day delayed means the cost of effecting the repairs grows.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: How would you apply a bond on a \$70 million contract?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: There would need to be a bank arrangement for some form of guarantee.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What about when multiple contractors are involved?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am not here to work out the minor details; they can be worked out later. I am talking only in broad principles.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Let's get the house up—the furniture can come later!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Registered builders should be required to lodge a bond when they are commencing construction on any type of building. That is the only way in which we can achieve some semblance of sanity in this legislation.

Finally, I should like to make a quick reference to an article which appeared in today's issue of *The West Australian*. The article was headed, "Threat by Labor on shelf oil" and states as follows—

The federal Labor Party moved yesterday to deter petroleum exploration off the WA coast in areas opened up for applications by the WA Government.

It continued—

This is a clear threat that as minister in a Labor government he would either refuse to grant production permits to explorers who found gas or oil off WA or would revoke production permits already granted—or both.

Earlier tonight we heard speakers condemning the present State Government for its inability to drag this State out of the recession into which it had been allowed to slide during the three years of the Tonkin Government. Very critical comments were made about the state of the Western Australian economy and the comments made by the Premier during the last election campaign in which he indicated that by electing a Liberal Government, the electorate would be allowing the State to return to a position of prosperity. Because these improvements have not been effected as quickly as the Premier forecast, he has been severely criticised.

However, actions by the previous Labor Government of the type now proposed by its shadow Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr Paul Keating) made it difficult for the present State Government to bring about the prosperous times we all wished.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Doug Anthony is helping now.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Statements such as the one contained in this morning's newspaper make it very difficult for State Governments, even in times when the Labor Party is not in office, because it removes the incentive anybody has to do anything in this country. It is inconceivable that a political party can turn around and make such a statement and virtually say, "It does not matter what you do now. The minute we get back into power—if ever—we will revoke your licences and put into effect our nationalistic ideas."

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I agree with what you are saying, and so did Mr Jamieson tonight, publicly.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: How can a State Government, a Federal Government, or any Government be expected to induce people to invest funds with statements such as that emanating from one of the major political parties in our country?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Not from the political party—from Mr Keating.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Mr Paul Keating happens to be the Labor Party's shadow Minister for Minerals and Energy in the present Federal Parliament. If he is not speaking for the Labor Party, I will expect to see in tomorrow's newspapers the headlines proclaiming that Mr Keating is the ex-shadow Minister for Minerals and Energy.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: We cannot make him an ex; we do not have enough to go around.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Mr Keating is echoing the nationalistic policies promulgated by Mr Connor.

In addition, I believe it is a sorry state of affairs when we have members of Parliament criticising the present State Government because of the state of the

economy of Western Australia, when they extol policies such as the one to which I have just referred.

I would go a little further and refer to the criticism in respect of the present Federal Government's attitude in regard to the gold tax exemption. The Premier of Western Australia shares this concern, yet the comments were made as if this State Government had no sympathy for the goldmining industry. The Premier has made vigorous approaches to the Federal Government in connection with the proposal to phase out the tax exemption, and we are certainly just as concerned as those people on the other side of the political fence.

However, we show our concern with sincerity because we are genuinely concerned. Anybody who is prepared to be a party to the sort of statement put out by Mr Keating obviously is giving only lip service to these problems.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You were very genuine when you told the people in the goldfields what you were going to do for them if you were elected back into office in Canberra, were you not?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I do not know what they were told before the Federal election.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That is the reality of the situation.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The point I am making is that the attitude of the Labor Party is spelt out quite clearly in this morning's newspaper and it is that sort of action that is placing this country in its present financial straits. I support the Bill.

THE HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [11.15 p.m.]: This is the Supply Bill, and the debate on it has been very interesting. We have listened to speeches on many subjects ranging from politics to case histories and other matters. I am afraid that my contribution, based purely on the financial aspect, will be somewhat monotonous compared with the contributions we have heard up to date. The passing of the Supply Bill does denote the continuance of the availability of moneys to the State Government so that it can carry out its functions between the 30th June and such time as the Budget is passed.

The shires in my electorate face a similar dilemma in trying to determine what their finances will be for the next 12 months, and where the money will come from. They do not know whether what they are to receive is the final amount. If it is the final amount then I am afraid the shires in my area will be a little disappointed. They are concerned that either a mistake has been made, or there has been a misunderstanding of the concept of bookkeeping, main roads grants,

personal income tax grants, and the amounts that will be allocated this financial year.

In putting my case to the House, first of all I want to deal with a news release by the Premier (Sir Charles Court) of the 8th August. The leading comment in that news release was that the Western Australian Government was to invite local government to join it in an all-out bid to get access to extra Commonwealth funds for the State's overall road-building programme. Most of the news release was devoted to a road in the north of the State.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: It is a most important road.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: It is. However, I am speaking for the shires in my electorate, and not on one road in the north. I am interested in the first part of that news release. The Premier made out that he wanted extra Commonwealth funds for the State's overall road-building programme, because there seemed to be a lack in the funds the State was receiving from the Commonwealth for road building.

I now turn to a letter written to a Federal member by the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister in Federal Affairs (Mr J. L. Carrick). It states—

You will have seen press reports of decisions taken at the recent Premiers' Conference concerning the Federal Government's decision to make available to Local Government, by way of untied grants, a fixed percentage of personal income tax.

We know what the figure was; it was \$140 million, and we know the portion allocated to Western Australia was \$13.2 million, or an increase of 60 per cent over the figure for last year. So, figuratively the State should be receiving a lot more money. We are aware of the split up of that \$13.2 million, and that added to the \$13.2 million is another \$1.125 million of State Government funds for assistance to local government. This virtually represents an untied grant.

Further on the letter states—

I should like to comment also on the question of financial assistance under the several roads programmes. The Government is concerned at some of the implications of funds allocations adopted under the current legislation, particularly with regard to the needs of Local Government and the needs identified in the Rural Arterial Roads network. The Government has decided therefore to ask State Governments to allocate additional funds to these areas to the maximum extent.

Having taken into account that the overall allocation to the Urban Local Roads category for 1976-77 already represents an increase over the allocation for this year, it is the aim of

the Commonwealth that the additional 1976-77 roads grants which were announced by the Treasurer on 20th May 1976—some \$35.8 million—should be directed to the needs of Local Government to bring the 1976-77 funds for Rural Local and Rural Arterial Roads categories as close as possible to the same level as for 1975-76.

That statement by Mr Carrick seems to contradict what the Premier has said. It may be that the Premier is not satisfied with receiving only a little more than he received last year; and he feels that the demands on the Main Roads Department are such that in order to keep up with the escalation of costs he should receive more money for allocation to specific jobs. I shall not question the Minister on this matter, but that is how I read the comments as applying to the total picture.

I come back to the shires in my electorate, and this is where I become really alarmed. I have visited five shires and I told them I did not want any morass of figures or auditors' reports. I said I wanted simple bookkeeping figures. I wanted to know how much they received last year outside of rates; how much they will receive this year; where the money came from last year; where the money will come from this year; and what is the percentage increase. That would be a simple mathematical calculation.

In respect of the Corrigin Shire I found that under the Federal assistance grant it received \$28 100 in 1975-76, and in 1976-77 it received \$35 136; in other words, an increase of \$7 036. By and large that is the amount calculated on a 60 per cent increase that could be expected from an allocation of \$140 million of which \$13.2 million came to Western Australia. So, under the Federal assistance grant it received about \$7 000 more.

Turning to the main roads grants, and taking into account construction, maintenance; and the contributory bitumen scheme—which I asked the shires to include because I considered the funds would come from specific grants, although Mr Tozer disagrees with me—the Corrigin Shire received in 1975-76 an amount of \$54 600, and in 1976-77 an amount of \$55 900, or an increase of \$1 300.

Under the statutory road grants, in 1975-76 that shire received 17.5 per cent more of the additional moneys that came to local government at the end of 1975. This represented \$13 220 making a total of \$88 335. Of course, the total amount expected by this shire this year—and it has been told it will not get any increase over the additional grant—is \$82 025; in other words there is a loss of \$6 310. So, this year it has received a net gain of total moneys coming in amounting to \$2 026 compared with the figure for the previous year. To simplify the picture,

the total grants for 1975-76—other than revenue from rating—for roads and other purposes amount to \$173 061. For the previous year the figure was \$171 035. The figure for this year represents an increase of \$2 026, or 1.18 per cent.

The point I want to make is that the increase does not in any way keep up with inflation. It certainly does not keep up with the serious factor that is developing within all these shires; that is, they have to increase their rates continually at an almost alarming degree in order to cope with the lag in Commonwealth moneys received from taxation coming back to them through the back door.

In the case of the Corrigin Shire, in the last three years its rates increased by 50.47 per cent, while its income rose by 1.18 per cent. Turning to the Cunderdin Shire, there is a large decrease in each instance in the main roads allocation. That is where the decrease has occurred in respect of road expenditure. The decrease has not occurred under the Federal assistance grant; in fact the allocations from that source have risen. The decrease has occurred under the statutory road grant.

In the case of the Cunderdin Shire, in 1975-76 the total grants amounted to \$163 286, and in 1976-77 they amounted to \$169 726. The net gain was \$6 440, or an increase of 3.84 per cent. The increase in rates from 1974 to 1976 was 58 per cent, and this year a further 20 per cent will be added in order to keep up with inflation and the need to retain the men and upgrade the roads. I should point out that in the case of Corrigin the increase this year was 20 per cent.

In the case of the Koorda Shire there is a total gain of \$153 this year, as compared with the income for last year. This represents an increase of .115 per cent. It is noted that the increase from the Commonwealth tax grant, the statutory road grant, the Main Roads Department specific grant, the Commonwealth aid road base grant, and the special roads grant will be .115 per cent greater than the figure for last year. Therefore, the increase in payments by local residents and the increase in grants is in the ratio of 471:1. What the shire is alluding to is that the rates have gone up by 37.89 per cent, and a further increase of 16.31 per cent is expected this year.

In the case of Dowerin the summary shows that in 1975-76 the total income was \$125 024 and in 1976-77 it will be \$126 036, an increase of \$1 012 over last year, representing a percentage increase of .81 per cent. Again, the Main Roads Department figures are down considerably. The situation has collapsed. The special tax share in the formula has gone up but the main roads grants have gone down. That shire will receive \$1 012 more than it received last year, an increase of .81 per cent.

The rate increase, since 1974, has been 55.68 per cent. The shire has not struck its rate for this year.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: How do those figures compare with the direct grants they got from the Federal Government over the last few years?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I am trying to point out that there is no difference in the total income which the shires received this year as against last year. I presume the member who has just interjected was referring to the Federal grant during the term of the previous Government. We are receiving considerably more now.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Moneywise, but what about percentage-wise?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: While the grants have increased, the main roads grants have correspondingly gone down. So, in my opinion, the position is virtually the same.

No business can continue to operate these days if it is not getting any more money this year over and above what it received last year. The increase in wages and cost of fuel cannot be paid, and graders which have increased in price from \$38 000 two years ago to \$68 000 cannot be replaced. The shires cannot continue to operate and will have to close down their works programmes. Perhaps that is the whole idea in order to steady the work which is being done; I do not know. One thing is certain, the money is not coming in.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Is that Government spending policy?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: No, I have already read extracts from the two articles. The member is missing my point.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I understand it fully.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: In the first place, Sir Charles said that he wants more money. He said that the funds for 1976-77 should be as close as possible to those granted for 1975-76.

The money which has been promised to the shires for this year is considerably less than that which they received last year. If money is to come from the Federal Government to the State Government, it should be in the same proportion as was provided last year. The reduction is clearly indicated by the level of roads grants received.

I will refer to one particular shire in which the roads grants during the last seven years have increased by only 30 per cent. However, road costs have increased by 89 per cent, licence fees have increased by 126 per cent, and the rates have gone up by 109 per cent. What is virtually happening is that the entire district is being rated in order to maintain the road

services. We are paying the same scale of taxation but not receiving the same amount through the back door.

The situation is serious because the shires are not only losing the income which they previously received from licensing, but they are also losing matching money. I admit the shires now receive a recording fee, for licensing vehicles.

I am interested in the total amount of money coming to the shires; whether it is tied to one thing or another the amount of money must be increased. Certainly, the shires should not have to increase their rates, or apply special rates in order to raise enough money to exist. I am particularly concerned with this matter.

I am not too sure that the Treasury, or the Main Roads Department, fully understands the situation in the outback areas which have been affected by the drought. The only way for the shires to counteract the situation is to increase their rating, and the situation is becoming impossible. I know that in the northern part of my province, in the drought-affected area, it will be impossible to increase rating in order to compensate for the money which it is evident will not be going to the shires. I say it is evident, because the shires have approached the Government in an attempt to find out what they will receive this year. The last indicator they received was an increase of 9.02 per cent. They have been told the figure will not be increased to 17 per cent, which they received last year.

This is a complex subject but I am concerned that Sir Charles has come out in a Press statement and invited local government to join in an all-out bid to get extra finance for the State road building programme. I am suggesting it is possible the money will not be coming to the State. For that reason I agree it is absolutely necessary for an all-out effort and an approach to the Federal Government in an attempt to bring some sense into the apportionment of money to the shire councils and stop this excessive rating. Costs are increasing and inflation is stampeding.

I will now refer to a matter which I was hoping would have been raised by a previous speaker. It concerns the subject of a question asked by Mr Claughton today. He asked the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Local Government, the following question—

- (1) Is the Minister yet aware of the extent to which the ratepayers of Fremantle are required to subsidise the wheat industry of Western Australia by virtue of rate exemptions for Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. at Fremantle?

I do not intend to quote the whole of the question, but I would like to point out for the benefit of Mr Claughton a little of the history attaching to the installation

at Fremantle—and other installations throughout the country—to which he believes rating should be attached.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: It involved a matter of \$30 000. I suggest the allowance could be by way of taxation.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I am referring to the question asked in May, 1976, and the question asked today.

When one considers the matter of rating, as far as CBH is concerned, one has to go back into history a little to learn how the situation came about, and how the silos came to be built at Fremantle, Geraldton, Esperance, Bunbury, and right throughout our country areas.

In every other State except South Australia silos have been built with the taxpayers' money, and always on Government land, as in the case of CBH. It would be fair comment to say at this stage that if the CBH silos had not been built the grain would virtually be in godowns at the wharf or in goods sheds beside railway stations. That is all CBH installations are—goods sheds alongside railway stations or wharves; and these are provided, I might say, by 12 000 shareholders who lend money free of interest for 10 years. They have done this over many years and have saved the taxpayers of Western Australia many millions of dollars, whereas taxpayers in all other States except South Australia have provided these facilities.

If they were Government facilities I do not think we would hear any argument about them. The growers have united to provide what the Government would not provide. When the Bill went through in 1934 it was lauded because, I believe, it was taking the load away from the taxpayers of the State. It started an enterprise which even Mr John Tonkin opposed at the time, although subsequently he has supported it.

However, the Western Australian Government attempted to build silos at Bunbury and Fremantle, and in fact built 300 000-ton silos at Fremantle and an installation at Bunbury. But the Government then pulled out smartly because the project was not progressing quickly enough for the farmers. The farmers took it over themselves and have expanded the organisation to the stage it has now reached.

I will not elaborate any further except to say the installations at portside at Kwinana and around the countryside would, in my opinion, have a replacement value today of \$300 million, not one cent of which has been provided from taxpayers' money. Furthermore, of that \$300 million, \$100 million in round figures is owing by CBH in its enterprise.

At Fremantle, goods sheds are provided alongside the wharf for general cargo, from which Fremantle does not receive any rates. There is another general shed on the other side—put there by CBH, not by the Government—on which the Fremantle

City Council expects rates. Some of the country shires also expect rates on buildings which happen to be alongside railway stations, because, they say, they are there and they are different. That is what the argument is based on—not on the logic that the installations are placed there by somebody else, without any finance being contributed by anybody at Fremantle, and these are installations at the wharfside which the Government should have provided.

At Fremantle there is a shed in which to store cargo; it brings shipping to Fremantle, provides jobs in Fremantle, and consequently builds up the town of Fremantle, just as it does at Esperance, Bunbury, and everywhere else.

The Fremantle Hospital is also not rated. These 12 000 farmers contributed to that hospital by way of taxes, as they contributed to the gaol and other things in Fremantle. But the Fremantle people have not contributed to the siding, the installation, or the warehouse at portside in Fremantle or anywhere else. It is easy for the honourable member to say, "We are losing \$30 000 a year out of it." He is looking at a little installation like that at Fremantle. We can project the same argument to Kwinana, Esperance, and Albany where the installation will be expanded within two years—not by the State Government but by the farming community of Western Australia.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I thought they were all broke.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: The honourable member would not understand the finance behind this; it would be too much for him to understand. When he goes on his trip to the country tomorrow he should have a look at the installations as he goes through and realise that if they were all ratable the farmers themselves would not be able to run to the rating of those sidings. They could not do it.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I did not say they had to.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: The significance of all these questions is that the installations should be rated. It has even been mentioned on the hustings that they should be rated on annual value. Just imagine what the rates would be at Kwinana on \$70 million annual value. It is crazy. On top of this, at Fremantle and Kwinana the farmers pay a lot of money in water rates on these installations. Although the amount of water they use is negligible, their rates help to keep down the cost of water and other rates in the metropolitan area.

I believe it is only flying a hungry kite in an endeavour to bring in some money from a system which has saved the taxpayers money because the installations were built by a private organisation; in other words, a co-operative. It is absolutely wrong, particularly when co-operatives

have helped this State out so much. Certainly they have helped themselves but they have also helped the State. If the co-operative had not started the State would have had to put a lot of money into the installations, as has happened throughout the rest of Australia and in other countries of the world. The State has not put in one dime. We even built the jetty at Kwinana and we pay wharfage, too.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You did not at one time.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: We did not pay wharfage on coarse grains but we have always paid our proportion on wheat. I believe these questions are building up public antipathy towards this huge company. They are coming up over and over again, and it is time they stopped. CBH is a public utility company. It is recognised as such by the Government because it is not taxable in view of the fact that it does not make any profits and no rebates are made to the shareholders. The shareholders do not get any interest on their money and they cannot get their money out until they have contributed for 10 years, at which time they can get one-tenth every 10 years, with no interest. In addition, they lose on the depreciation of their money over that period. So it is costing the shareholders quite a bit to maintain the installation, and I get rankled when somebody tries to get in under the guard, not knowing anything about the finances and what the installation provides.

The Hon. J. Heitman: You can put that down to their ignorance.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Are you denying a member the right to ask a question to seek information?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: The honourable member certainly got the information.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I did not ask the question.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Thank you, Mr President, I have nothing more to say at this stage.

THE HON. D. W. COOLEY (North-East Metropolitan) [11.50 p.m.]: I feel very pleased to be able to follow Mr Gayfer and Mr Griffiths in this debate. Firstly, I believe Mr Gayfer is probably shying at shadows in respect of his bulk handling organisation, but he did give an excellent example of the advantages of socialism through this co-operative body.

I feel a little bit his way in respect of the financial problems besetting the respective councils in his province. From what he has told us, it seems to me that their problems stem either from bad management on the part of the State Government or from the fact that the Federal Government is breaching faith with the State Government in respect of grants to be made to the shires. Perhaps it is a case of chickens coming home to roost after the 13th of December election last year!

Before coming to the main body of my speech to this Bill, I should like to say that I congratulate Mr Griffiths on the way that he raises the problems of the people in his province when they are faced with difficulties. He is one member of this House who does that. However, I think he was a little astray in his last observation in regard to the article that appeared in this morning's Press. I feel he has lived long enough to realise that not everything he reads in the Press is gospel, and perhaps a little more observation of the remarks attributed to Mr Keating will give him an opportunity to speak on this matter again. According to that Press report, I do not think Mr Keating is saying anything very different from what Mr Anthony is saying in respect of the development of Australia's resources. Even the great Mr Bjelke-Petersen, the Premier of Queensland, and our own Premier, have indicated that Mr Anthony's policies in respect of the development of our national resources are not very different from those of Mr Connor while he held the Federal portfolio of Minerals and Energy. So I feel that Mr Griffiths should obtain more information about that statement before referring to it again. A great many legal difficulties will be involved by one Government abrogating a decision of the other. Perhaps Mr Griffiths was emulating Mr Gayfer who likes to shy at shadows!

The Bill before us seeks our permission to grant a vast sum of money to the Government. It has been described as a formal Bill, but it is a very important one. I think it is proper for us to look at some of its aspects and to speak in detail about the Minister's second reading speech which was delivered to us this evening.

I cannot share Mr Heitman's congratulations of the Government in coming up with a \$594 000 surplus this year. Had it not been for the shilly-shallying of the Minister for Health in the earlier part of the financial year over the Medibank proposals—

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: No shilly-shallying by us at all.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: —there may have been something like a \$5 million surplus.

The Hon. J. Heitman: There would not be that much—we would have helped the Government spend it.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We understand the Minister's actions cost the State Government something like \$3.9 million.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Nothing of the sort, and you know it.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: One must take into account the doubts expressed over this \$8 million surplus which has been raised hither and thither.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: What doubts?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Here we go again—same old innuendos; no common sense and no facts.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: One would think it is very bad management on the part of the Government—

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Bad management to pay people?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I think it is bad management—

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: From a union man, too.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: —to create a surplus Budget when about 22 000 people are unemployed.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: How big was the surplus?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: According to the Minister's speech, it was \$594 000.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: A huge surplus!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I was associated with negotiations—and they must have been before Christmas for me to have been involved with them—when the Premier was talking of sacking 300 men from the Metropolitan Water Supply Board. His reason for the sackings was to save the Government having a deficit Budget.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: That is not a correct statement at all.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is correct. Finally 45 men were sacked and I believe the other 300 men sacrificed a week's pay. While we are talking of deficits, I think those 45 men who were sacked suffered a severe deficit.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The unions forced that.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Losing one week's wages to these workers would be a severe deficit.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I think that was another inept union official.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is a tough setback for a worker to lose one week's wages particularly if he is on the wages paid to these water supply workers.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is really amusing, considering the strikes we have had.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Government members now come here and tell us how proud they are of the surplus. I do not have documentary proof here, but we have heard a great deal of screaming and wailing over the last two years about a \$4 000 million deficit in the Federal sphere, and it might surprise people in this Chamber to know that America finished its last financial year with a \$70 billion deficit in order to overcome the unemployment situation.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Do you think that is good?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am not saying it is good or bad, but to have a surplus when we have 22 000 people out of work highlights the bad management of the Government.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: You would prefer to run into a deficit every year?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I would rather run into a deficit every year and see people in full employment. To talk about a surplus being good management is only acceptable in a period of almost full employment. If Government members could understand this, we might see some semblance of good government in this State.

Another aspect of the Minister's second reading speech was the prediction about actual increases that would take place in this year. The Minister told us these would be hard to estimate. If the Government played the game in respect of its wages policy, it would not be in such difficulties about estimating its wages bill in the coming year.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: What do you mean by that? Just be a little more explicit.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Premier last year made much play of the fact that there would be a deficit Budget because he anticipated a 21 per cent increase in the Government's wages bill.

According to the Minister's second reading speech, this turned into a 16.87 per cent wages increase, which had the effect of saving the day so far as the Government was concerned when it ran into this wonderful surplus with 22 000 people unemployed. I submit that if the Government would agree to wage indexation as it promised it would at one time in its history, this would be acceptable to all people. The Government would be able to estimate quite accurately what would be its wages bill for the ensuing 12 months. But instead it is throwing the situation into chaos, and it is advocating now that wages should increase by only 30 per cent of the increase in the Consumer Price Index.

Of course, that would trigger off another wave of wage increases. The workers of this country would not be satisfied with the abrogation of a promise, and we might have a situation such as that which prevailed in 1974 with the whole wage structure getting out of hand. At least at the present time there is a regulating force, and if we all go along with that we may be able to reach a situation where we can accurately assess what will be the cost for wages which, as the Government says, play such a major part in the Estimates.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Will the unions go along with it?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The union movement has indicated that it will go along with it, but there has been an abrogation of indexation principles by the Government. If the Minister has read the recent national wage case submission by the Federal Government, he will know that three propositions were put up. But they amount to nothing more than workers getting 30 per cent of movements in the Consumer Price Index.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The unions would not be satisfied with that.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Certainly they will not be satisfied with 30 per cent, but they would be satisfied with full indexation.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: They will not be satisfied with indexation.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: While there are people like the Minister shaking their heads and saying, "They will never be satisfied" we will not get anywhere. The unions will be satisfied only when we get down to negotiation and give them a reasonable deal.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: What is a reasonable deal?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: A reasonable deal is sticking to the promises made by Governments when they take office. I have here a Liberal Party advertisement dated the 30th November, 1975, and it says something about turning on the lights by voting Liberal. Now people are saying it should have read, "Turn on the lies" because of the abrogation of policy. The advertisement shows a photograph of a young worker wearing a safety helmet and carrying a shovel on his shoulder. The text is addressed to workers, and it says that Liberals will continue to support wage indexation along with the introduction of indexation of personal income tax. It states that is the full package sought by the ACTU.

That is what the Liberals promised before they were elected on the 13th December; and we know now what their interpretation of indexation is. It is certainly not the full package sought by the ACTU. Trade union leaders have indicated over the last few weeks that they are prepared to settle down to a proper, regulated form of wage indexation.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Do you mean there has not been a proper form in the past?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Up until 1974 there was absolute chaos in respect of wage increases.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: And unionists created it.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am trying to say there are people like Mr Lewis—unfortunately they predominate in the Liberal Party—who are not prepared to take a sensible attitude in respect of the trade union movement and to get down to taws and talk with others. We will not get anywhere in this country until that is done.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You accuse me of this, but have you ever talked to the people in the work force?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: There has been reasonable negotiation from the work force.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You are making these statements off the top of your head.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: No I am not.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You are making them off the seat of your backside.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You would know all about that.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am sorry Mr Lewis feels that way about it, but it is a fact that—

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I feel very hurt about the situation of which you are accusing me.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: —he has often spoken in this Chamber of the dogma on our side. However, there is also dogma on his side.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: No way.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The attitude of members opposite towards the trade union movement has worsened in the last few months, although I do not know why. When the Federal Labor Government was in power members opposite used it as a whipping boy, but now they are using the trade union movement. To the Liberals and conservatives of this country wage increases are dirty words.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: And to most workers.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Lewis never refuses the wage increases that are handed to him from time to time in his position as a parliamentarian.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Do you really think that applies?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: He agrees with that situation.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: They are applied by a tribunal and not by pressure.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Wage increases given to workers in this country since March, 1975, have been awarded by the Industrial Commission, and by no-one else.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Under severe pressure by the unions.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The commission has not been under pressure. The increases have been awarded after a correctly argued case has been taken before a court of arbitration. Until we get to the situation of proper indexation we will not get anywhere in respect of getting this country out of the terrible mess it is in.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: That Whitlam got it into.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: There is no question that it is in a mess, and the introduction of Liberal Governments has not improved the situation in accordance with the expectations of the Australian people on the 13th December last year. They thought that by electing a Federal Liberal Government the economic ills of the country would suddenly disappear, but that has not been the case.

There has to be a solution to our economic problems and the only way to achieve it is with economic planning on the part of the Government, the trade unions, and employers in order that we may plan for perhaps three years ahead. The Government should say to the unions, "This is what is expected of you in the next three years" and the unions should be able to say to the employers, "This is what we expect of you." With proper planning and discussion we might be able to get on the right road. To say there cannot be any discussions is to show a lack of appreciation of the difficulties that are confronting our nation at the moment.

We on this side support Supply Bills. We would not be so unethical as to vote against a Supply Bill introduced by a Government that has been democratically elected by the people of this State. I think this should be pointed out every time such Bills come before this Chamber, after the disgraceful events of the 11th November, 1975, when we saw supply denied to a Government that was democratically elected. We support the Bill, thankful in the knowledge that it will be the last one presented by the conservatives in this State for a long period of time.

I say it is certain this will be the last one for a long time, because the people have realised that this Government is an abject failure. It has failed because it has not been able to contain inflation which is running at a rate possibly higher than in any other State in Australia.

It has failed to reduce unemployment, despite the promises which were made in 1974 that it would cure all the ills of unemployment. When the Liberals came to office, there were 6 000 people unemployed; now, we have over 20 000 unemployed. The Government has failed in its duty because it has been unable to hold government charges at a reasonable level. My leader has outlined the respective outrageous increases which have taken place.

The Government has failed because it has been unable to attract industry to the State. At one time, the Liberals used to be able to point proudly—and rightly so—to the degree of industry it attracted to the State during the boom period of the 1960s. Of course, there is nothing to say that Labor would not have done as well in the same circumstances. However, during the past 2½ years there has hardly been an industry established in Western Australia, despite the fact the Liberals indicated that when the Tonkin Government was voted out of office, the State would get on the move again. Our State is far worse off now than it was in 1974.

The Government has failed because it has been unable to attain industrial peace with the unions—possibly due to the dogma that has been displayed in this Chamber this evening by members opposite who are not prepared to sit down and talk with the unions. It has failed because members

have failed to maintain unity within their own ranks. We read of dog fights almost weekly between members of the Liberal Party and the Country Party and recently, a group of Liberal members rebelled against the Liberal leadership.

The Government has failed to show any compassion for the underprivileged people in our society; in this regard, it has not been able to match the efforts of its predecessors. It even withdrew the right of pensioners to travel free of charge on public transport. I do not know how many members opposite are proud of that.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: What about the country pensioners?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Pensioners in the country had the right to travel free on public transport.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: That is about as much as you know about the subject. You make these statements yet you really do not know what you are talking about.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Neither do you.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I think I know about the country; you are never there to see it.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Never where?

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: In the country.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have called for order on a number of occasions this evening. If my requests are not heeded, I will take sterner action. The House will maintain order.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: One of the excuses for this action handed out by the Premier of this State, on the advice of the Chairman of the Metropolitan Transport Trust was the lamest political excuse I have ever heard. It was claimed by both the chairman of the MTT and the Premier that the concession was removed because the pensioners were too proud to travel on public transport free of charge, and that pensioners had written letters stating that they would prefer to pay something, rather than accept the charity of the Government.

The Hon. N. McNeill: That was not advanced as a reason.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It was, if I never sit on this seat again.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: That is an untruth!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: What an excuse to offer to people of the intelligence of Western Australians! If this were true, all the pensioners had to do was not to display the card which permits them free travel. Such an excuse is absolute hogwash and an insult to people's intelligence.

I believe it is time we examined the document put out by the Government titled, "Policy and Performance". It has not been discussed by my colleagues. It appears to supersede the little blue booklet which has been the subject of such ridicule and laughter in this Chamber on so

many previous occasions and the pages of which are not even numbered. The new booklet purports to be the first of its type ever produced by any Government. However, I have in my hand a 28-page document produced by Mr Clyde Cameron relating to the performance and unsurpassed record in the field of industrial reform after only two years of Labor Government. The document deals only with industrial reform, yet occupies 28 pages. The booklet produced by this State Government contains about as much information on industrial reform as can be written on the back of a postage stamp.

I believe it is right that I should discuss this booklet, in case some members opposite have not read it. It does have a sort of index at the front of the book which is headed, "Itemised Summary of Performance".

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Are the pages numbered?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes, on this occasion for quick reference. On the same page are the following headings, "Done", "Initiated", "Implemented And Ongoing", and "Special Comment". As one proceeds through the book one finds parts of the Liberal Party policy and an outline of how they have been implemented. To see quickly what has been done and initiated, one looks to the front of the book.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: That is right.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I have chosen to explain this fully because I do not know whether members opposite have read the book.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I have a copy.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I sincerely hope the booklet is not issued to the general public, because it would be a best seller.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: All the shire councils received a copy.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: If you read the document too much you will be converted.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: One Liberal objective was to restore Liberal leadership, in respect of which the document states—

The aim of restoring Liberal leadership at the State and National levels was accomplished by the defeat of the State Labor Government on March 30, 1974, and the Federal Labor Government on December 13, 1975.

The State Government was going to restore Liberal leadership at a national level!

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: And we did.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Have you counted the Federal seats in Western Australia which are held by the Liberal and Country Parties?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Labor Party was not defeated at the election after the policy was laid down. In respect of the other matter the Liberal Party was the part-architect of the so-called defeat of the Labor Government when it was

cheated out of office by the Governor-General on the 11th November. That was a disgraceful effort by a man who should not be holding his present position.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Point of order, Mr President. I believe that in this Chamber aspersions should not be cast on representatives of the Queen in this country. Mr Cooley, I believe has just cast aspersions—

The PRESIDENT: Is the honourable member requesting withdrawal of the word?

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Yes.

The PRESIDENT: Will the honourable member please state the words he wishes withdrawn?

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I am sorry, I cannot, but it was an aspersion on the Governor-General and I believe—

The PRESIDENT: There is no point of order in that case.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I should like to see anything in the Standing Orders that prohibits me from criticising the Governor-General.

The PRESIDENT: I did not hear the remarks. I am not able to judge for myself whether the words were unparliamentary or otherwise.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I said that the Labor Government was cheated out of office in 1975 by a person who is not fit to hold the office of Governor-General in this country. I sincerely hope that he is not in office when the Queen visits us next year because there will be distinct embarrassment if he is.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Are you going to start one of these demonstrations?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I have never taken part in demonstrations.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I regard the remarks made by the honourable member concerning the Governor-General to be unparliamentary. I ask him to refer to Standing Order 84 and kindly withdraw the remark.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Standing Order 84 reads—

No member shall use the name of Her Majesty or her representative in this State disrespectfully in debate nor for the purpose of influencing Council in its deliberations.

The PRESIDENT: The Governor-General, in my opinion, is Her Majesty's representative in this State.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: May I ask who Sir Wallace Kyle is?

The PRESIDENT: I beg your pardon?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: May I ask what position Sir Wallace Kyle holds in this State?

The PRESIDENT: I am not prepared to sit here and be cross-examined by the honourable member. I have asked for a withdrawal of the remark and I suggest the honourable member should withdraw.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I suggest, Mr President, you should uphold the Standing Orders.

The PRESIDENT: I have asked the honourable member for a withdrawal of the remark. In doing so, could I remind the honourable member that I have heard him request withdrawals of remarks which were far less insulting than the words which the honourable member has just used regarding the Governor-General.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: You say that, but there is no evidence to substantiate it.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have asked the honourable member to withdraw the remark.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Would you tell me what remark you wish me to—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member is arguing with the Chair and I have asked him to withdraw his disrespectful remark in relation to the Governor-General. For the last time, will the honourable member please withdraw?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I withdraw the remark. It seems to me that whenever I speak in this Chamber there is a continual attitude of hostility towards the things I say regardless of whether they are true.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I think that is a reflection on the Chair.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If Mr Lewis thinks it is a reflection on the Chair perhaps he could ask me to withdraw again.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Would the Hon. Mr Cooley please continue with his remarks?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr President, I have tried to the best of my ability tonight to address the Chamber through you. I think you must concede that, Sir.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member must realise that he has been very provocative during the course of his speech.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: In what respect?

The PRESIDENT: I think the honourable member, to say the least, has encouraged interjections. He got more than he deserves.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I feel I have been hard done by. I think on a number of occasions other people in this Chamber have been more provocative than I have been and have been free from any disciplinary action such as that which has been imposed on me this evening, and I feel very badly about it.

I was speaking of this book which has been published by the Government and I think that while I am addressing this Chamber as a representative of a province I have every right to criticise the Government in any shape or form provided that I keep within the Standing Orders. I do not think that by criticising the Government I am being provocative and I think a lot of the provocation comes from the other side in many instances.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You spend most of your time blaming other people.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Members opposite sat here for three years and blamed other people until they cheated them out of office in 1975.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: People make the decision finally.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: People did not make the decision.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: What was the decision of the 13th December?

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: What percentage did your mob get?

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You look it up.

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

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I shall refer to the industrial relations policy of the present Court Government and I hope I am able to criticise it in some way. It is significant that in this industrial relations policy there are 10 matters that the Government has indicated it would bring into operation during its term of office. This booklet demonstrates the ineptitude of the Government in respect of its industrial programme. This policy extends over 10 subjects from No. 59 to No. 68. If we turn to the index in the front of the book we will find the columns headed "Done", "Initiated", "Implemented and Ongoing", and "Special Comment". Against the numbers 59 to 68 the first two columns are blanks. That indicates that in respect of its industrial performance nothing has been done and nothing has been initiated by this Government, by its own admission in this book that it has published for the benefit of the people.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Nothing will be.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Dellar is quite right. The booklet goes on to say that in its great industrial achievements the Government has appointed two new industrial commissioners and has made premises available at Port Hedland for use by the Trades and Labor Council at a nominal rent of \$100 per year. It has made \$12 000 available in 1976 for trade union training. That was initiated by the Tonkin Government and this Government is under an obligation to carry it on.

The booklet says that the Government has encouraged worker participation in the public sector and union representation on such bodies as the Construction and

Safety Board and the Factory Welfare Board, which representation it has had for years. It says that a union representative has been appointed to the Machinery Safety Board but there has been a union representative on it for years. The Government has talked about encouraging worker participation in the public sector and has deliberately left trade unionists off some of the boards it has established by Acts of Parliament passed in this place. So it is not accurate in that form.

The booklet goes on to state proudly that the Government has legislated to refuse to register industrial agreements which do not conform to the wage indexation principles or which constitute sweetheart deals. This sort of legislation has not been enacted either Federally or in any other State of the Commonwealth. At the time that this legislation was brought in the Government said that it could be removed within a year and no action at all has been taken to remove it.

The Government talks about wage indexation principles and is continually breaking those principles itself even to the point that it is now advocating that the benefits that will be passed on to the workers from the Consumer Price Index will be only 30 per cent of that figure.

The booklet, "Policy and Performance", put out by the present Government states further—

The Government has strengthened employer and worker representation on the Minister for Labour's Industrial Relations Advisory Committee.

That is correct. It provided one additional representative. It does not indicate that Government representation has also been increased from one to two.

The booklet also states—

The Government has vigorously promoted industrial safety.

It should do that. Further on it states—

The reporting of accidents involving workers in shops has now been made compulsory.

The Government is scraping the bottom of the barrel to find something to put forward in respect of its industrial record. Its actions indicate that nothing has been done or initiated in this field, despite the fact that the nation and the State are crying out for some form of harmonious industrial relationship so that we can get the country on the move. The Government will continue to stagnate while it adopts a stand-off policy towards the workers. In fact, the Government has worsened the situation by introducing legislation which is contrary to the wishes of the trade union movement generally.

The Hon. J. Heitman: What legislation?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Fuel, Energy and Power Resources Act; the Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Act of 1975; the Workers' Compensation Act

Amendment Act of 1975 which reduced payments to workers; and the proposed legislation for Government control of trade union ballots. I should also draw attention to the inactivity of the Government in respect of the repeal of the penal provisions contained in section 132 of the Industrial Arbitration Act.

The Government has aggravated the trade union movement by its wage indexation policy in advocating a reduction in the amount that should be awarded.

The Hon. J. Heitman: That has always gone to arbitration. What are you complaining about?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am complaining about the fact that the Government has gone back on its promise in respect of wage indexation. It promised there would be a full package deal, but it is now arguing before the court that the increase should be less than the percentage increase indicated by the index.

Not only do we find the trade unions being aggravated by the attitude of the Government in respect of industrial legislation, but also by the leaders of the Government in calling on workers to ignore a strike call.

The Hon. J. Heitman: That is fair enough.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Government is paying money to people who went to work while a strike situation prevailed, and it set those people up in business. From my knowledge of industrial relations over many years, I believe that everyone in the community deplores the fact that some people worked while others were on strike. We know the word to describe the action of such people, but I suppose if I used it now it would be regarded as unparliamentary. Everybody recognises that people who do that sort of thing are industrial renegades and deserve to be treated with contempt. We find that the Government supported those people.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Your Medibank strike was a bit of a failure. How do you account for that?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It was not as successful as we would have liked it to be, because some people did listen to the call of members of the Liberal Party and paid heed to newspaper headlines such as "Grayden: Ignore the strike call" and "Make this strike a fizzog—Grayden".

I have outlined some of the promises which this Government has not fulfilled. There are many reasons why it should be put out of office. If it is then maybe we will be able to get down to fair and reasonable dealings with the unions and get the economy of the State back on an even level.

I conclude on this note: I believe there comes a time in the life of every Government when the best service it can give

to the people is for it to go out of office. When one examines the performance of this Government one realises it should have provided this service to the people many months ago.

It is patently clear that the Government has failed to live up to the promises it made to the electors at the last election. Its administration has not been able to cope with the economy in the same manner as its counterparts in the Eastern States. Inflation and unemployment are rife and appear to be out of control.

The Government has been unable to gain the confidence of the work force, because of its continual attack on the trade union movement and its leaders. The consistent anti-union legislation it introduced during its term of office has almost deprived it of any vestige of hope of reconciliation in this area.

Its attitude to underprivileged people, pensioners, and those on low incomes has proven it to be a Government without human feeling or compassion. The deep divisions within its ranks, both from its coalition partner and individual members of the Liberal Party who are disenchanted with their leader, make it extremely suspect as a reliable Government.

Its blind loyalty to a discredited Federal Government has embarrassed it to a point where it is becoming a laughing stock in the eyes of the other States and the nation. Even Queensland has come out and criticised this Government.

In short, the people of the State are crying out for stable and responsible government that has understanding and sympathy for all the people, and not for a selected few in affluent circumstances.

I am happy to support the Bill, because I am confident that this is the last one a conservative Government in this State will present for a long period of time.

THE HON. I. G. PRATT (Lower West) [12.37 a.m.]: It has been a very interesting experience to watch, listen to and observe the Opposition members tonight in giving what I would regard generally as an uncertain and hesitant performance. This shows a very marked lack of confidence.

It must have given the Leader of the House very great heart to listen to their contributions this evening. It is this hesitancy and uncertainty on the part of members of the Opposition which prompted me to speak, when I did not intend to speak.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You would not have anything to talk about.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: The honourable member is quite right. The performance of the Court Government has been such that I have no grizzles to put forward. I am happy with its performance, and I am proud to say that. I am glad Mr Dellar agrees with me.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You are easily pleased.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: One of the speeches I do not need to comment on is that of Mr Dellar, because it contains nothing to comment on, brief and insignificant as it was. We know that the Leader of the Opposition is very able and avid in the use of the mechanism of interjecting to gain information.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: That is all you do.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: It is a mechanism which the Leader of the Opposition uses very frequently, and I think very intelligently. Very often he is subjected to the same mechanism by other members of Parliament, although at times this mechanism might be considered to be contrary to the Standing Orders. However, this is a mechanism which is accepted in parliamentary debates, whereby one can obtain from the speaker on his feet details and information.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: If he wants to give it.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: The member on his feet can answer the interjections. Tonight the Leader of the Opposition did not want to answer interjections. He showed very great reluctance to be questioned, and he avoided any test that was put on his utterances.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: He does not have to answer them because interjections are unruly.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would remind Mr Dellar of that statement.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I have stated that interjections are considered unruly, but within reason they are generally accepted as a method of gaining information from a member.

Tonight the Leader of the Opposition showed himself to be unwilling to give information in this way, and this I regard as part of the hesitancy and uncertainty of a number of speakers tonight. I do take issue on one point on which I wish to dwell briefly and give my interpretation of it. The Leader of the Opposition gave quotations of the Premier, and he went on to say, "Sir Charles Court said . . ." I took what followed to be a quote from the Premier's words. These are not the exact words, but a reference to *Hansard* tomorrow will reveal them. He said—

Sir Charles Court said, "We will fix it. There will be no trouble at all."

I interjected and asked, "Did he say that?" It would have been very simple for the Leader of the Opposition to answer, "Yes, he did say it", or, "No, he did not say it." Obviously the Premier would not have said that when seeking to be elected to lead the State. He was well aware, as were all of us, of the mess and disgrace the nation was in at that time. There is always trouble when a mess must be cleaned up,

and there has been trouble. Because of his inability or unwillingness to give a simple, "Yes" or "No" answer to that question, the Leader of the Opposition has in fact admitted the sound performance of the Government—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You presume too much.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: —because if he had said, "Yes, he did say that", he would have been uttering an untruth. By saying, "No, he did not say that", he would have been admitting he had to use inference to try to make us and the people of Western Australia believe that the Premier had said things he had not said.

I say very clearly that the Premier did not say there would be no trouble at all because he realised there would be trouble, the same as the Prime Minister realised he would have trouble in cleaning up the mess in the Federal field.

I believe that the debate tonight and the Bill itself indicate that the Premier has done an excellent job in cleaning up the mess and stepping over the trouble left by the Labor Government.

I thought I just heard something, but I am not quite sure.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I will repeat it—

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: We have heard a lot of rubbish.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: The present Government inherited the biggest load of rubbish any Government has tried to overcome. This has been the situation in the last few years when Liberal Governments have taken over from Federal and State Labor Governments.

I now come to another matter about which the Leader of the Opposition spoke; that is, rural unemployment. He referred to the unemployment level in several country areas and districts. Certainly the unemployment level is up. It is high.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It is up in Medina, too.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: What a callous point for the Leader of the Opposition to make in an attempt to try to highlight unemployment and hang it around the neck of this Government! For the past couple of years the south-west of the State has been suffering as a result of a severe and serious economic problem brought about by the lack of world beef markets.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You do not blame the Labor Government?

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: We will have to chalk that one up.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I find it very hard to please members opposite. Perhaps they would be happier if I were to blame the Labor Government. However, I only wish to state the truth and perhaps that is foreign to them.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Do you say that the Leader of the Opposition was not using the truth?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I will not accept what you say are facts.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: Mr Dans is not running this Chamber.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I am glad you said that.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I am glad Mr Dans is glad, if that makes him happy.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Now we are all glad.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: The Leader of the Opposition referred to rural unemployment and before several interjections were made which did not appear to be seeking information or adding anything to the debate, I was referring to the lack of markets for beef, which has caused severe problems in the south-west of the State. It has meant that people have had to leave farms and place themselves on the labour market which, in many cases, does not exist. They have been forced out of work and onto unemployment.

If people are forced off unproductive farms they will add to the unemployment in an area. Last week I visited my relatives in the area of the wheatbelt in which I was born and raised and there they are experiencing unemployment problems because, due to drought conditions, the farmers cannot afford to keep labour on the farms. The big worry is that the farm labour is leaving the area and moving to larger towns where there are more conveniences and the farmers believe that they will not get this labour back when the drought conditions are eased.

This is a big worry to them and it is having a heavy impact on the unemployment figures in country towns. To try to list this as a shortcoming of the Government is a very callous act on the part of the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Don't you think I have unemployment in my province? One of the highest unemployment figures is in Medina which has no farms.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I was referring particularly to country areas.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: There are no cows in my area, but I have unemployment.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I mentioned the whole State.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: Reference was made to the liquor industry in the province of the honourable member, who told us that that industry was responsible for employing the second largest number of people in his province.

To move away from the problems of unemployment and the liquor industry I wish to cover an area which involved not a degree of hesitancy, but perhaps speed. Mr Claughton spoke about politics in local

government, an area in which I have been very interested because of my involvement as a shire councillor. I also happen to be a Liberal.

The comments made by Mr Claughton were highly offensive to me because he gave the impression that if someone is supported by members of a certain political party he is endorsed by that party. When I first stood for election I was actively supported by quite a few people who were members and supporters of the ALP. They knew I was a Liberal, but they supported me because they knew I was seeking for the community at local government level those things they wanted. I am proud to call them my friends, regardless of their political affiliations. However, I would not agree with Mr Claughton that because of their support, I must be an ALP supporter, because I am nothing of the kind.

The honourable member then went on to say—and this is the point about which I object and about which I feel I must speak—that he had conveyed to certain members of the Stirling City Council his opinion on what should occur.

At that stage I asked him to clarify the point, whereupon he gave me a brief look and then later on I again asked him to clarify a point, but by that time he had resumed his seat. Perhaps at some future time he would care to clarify for us who were the certain members of the Stirling City Council to whom he gave advice. Why did he not give the advice to all members of the council, or did the others already have the same political affiliation as he has?

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Do you want me to interject or not?

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I gave the honourable member an opportunity to interject, but an interjection did not appear to be forthcoming.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: I gave you the opportunity to indicate whether you wanted me to interject.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I do not control interjections. They are controlled by the person who is making them or by the Chair.

My speech would have been much briefer had it not been for the less intelligent interjections which have been made.

I welcome the opportunity to indicate that I believe our Government has done a fine job and that our Premier is leading this State in such a way that Western Australians can be proud of him. I am sure that the performance of the Government will be such that Mr Cooley's dreams will never come true.

THE HON. T. KNIGHT (South) [12.50 a.m.]: I do not intend to make a long address this evening. However, I do wish to touch on an issue which has not yet

been raised; that is, the serious effect of the drought in the northern sector of Western Australia. I congratulate the Government on the speed with which it moved in the present situation to declare the area a drought area. The support by Government departments, by the Minister for Transport (the Hon. R. J. O'Connor) and the Minister for Agriculture (the Hon. R. C. Old), to those who have been affected, is highly commendable.

I have received numerous reports from people in the drought affected area regarding the sheep which are being sent to my part of the State and the hay and grain which are also being sent from the south. The Railways Department has virtually bent over backwards to assist in every way possible. The Minister has been approached on a number of occasions to allow trains to go straight through with sheep which have been in a very poor condition and which would not have survived the journey had the trains been delayed.

The Minister for Transport has also assisted, through the Transport Commission, by reducing road freight costs. He has also given permission for heavier than usual vehicles and road trains to travel on designated country roads while transporting grain to the drought-stricken areas. I think the allowance has applied to a distance of 60 kilometres, and I also believe a subsidy has been paid for the cartage of grain to feed drought-stricken animals in the 60 kilometre area.

A tribute should also be paid to a particular stock firm which operates in my area and which also operates throughout Western Australia. I refer to Western Livestock which has done a tremendous job. The firm has negotiated the transport of something like 12 000 drought-stricken sheep to the Great Southern area during the last week, and it has also arranged broadcast appeals for assistance in the supply of hay and grain. Efforts such as that should not go unrecognised. This is the type of situation where we all should do as much as we possibly can to assist. I must say that in all the approaches I have made, and the efforts I have heard about, everyone has worked shoulder to shoulder. I am sure their efforts will assist the farmers to get through the next 12 months.

I believe that with the passing of the Supply Bill we will see the introduction of a rural housing assistance scheme. This will be of tremendous benefit to farmers, particularly new land farmers, who so far have been unable to obtain finance for the construction of homes. For many years their city cousins have had the advantage of being able to obtain finance from building societies, while the farmers have had to battle on and live in shanties, caravans, and tents. Some of the buildings I have seen in country areas have not been fit for dogs, but the people living in those buildings could not afford anything better.

I believe the establishment of the Rural Housing Authority will help to overcome the obstacle which has existed for so long.

I was recently approached by one of my constituents who is an invalid pensioner. He has a motorised wheelchair and the licence last year was \$4. That licence has increased to \$18. A pensioner who earns in excess of \$46 per week either individually or in conjunction with his wife is not eligible for a concessional licence. I believe the Government should examine this situation and increase the amount which a pensioner is allowed to earn because the present figure is unrealistic.

The matter of builders' registration was touched on by the Hon. Clive Griffiths and I agree that the legislation requires more teeth. Perhaps its provisions could be widened, and extended to cover some country areas on a trial basis. I am sure it could work and be of great benefit in providing some cover to the public which does not exist at the moment. I do not agree with the Hon. Clive Griffiths that inspectors should be responsible for structural problems. They should be left to the building surveyors employed by the local shires and I do not believe the Builders Registration Board should move into that field. The local shires are responsible for the plans and specifications and it is up to their surveyors to see that the structural computations set out in the building permits are adhered to. However, I believe that some shires could cut down on administrative costs by working in conjunction with the Builders Registration Board.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths mentioned a prestige block of home units costing approximately \$1 million where the purchaser is not covered by any Act. The point is that once a building has been completed, and approved by the local shire, the purchaser is buying a ready-made product. He is buying what he can see. Such a building, which would have been approved by the local shire or its building surveyor, can still be subject to an inspection by the Builders Registration Board or a qualified builder. A prospective buyer would then know whether the building had any structural faults or bad workmanship. When a person is about to buy a motor vehicle, and he sees that it has a fault, the fault is always rectified before he completes the purchase. If a prospective purchaser, or speculator, discovered there was a fault in the building he would be sure to demand that it be rectified before making the purchase.

Another matter which has caused me concern for some time is unemployment. I believe that unemployment is a noose around the neck of both Federal and State Governments, whether they be Labor or Liberal. I want to refer particularly to those we call, "dole bludgers". I have been pulled up previously for using that terminology in this House. I was told that

the term was unparliamentary. I have looked through several dictionaries since then and I have not been able to find any reference to the term "bludger". I believe it must be a slang term or a fabricated word, but it is used readily by the Press and others.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: When you say "we" who are you referring to?

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: Everyone.

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

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: I do not know what the honourable member opposite calls them. My concern is that while we have these people in our community, picking up unemployment benefits, there are other people in the community with two jobs, and some people with even four jobs.

There are also service communities the members of which spend their weekends and spare time doing things in the interest of the community in which they live. I believe the people receiving unemployment benefits should be actively engaged in doing something to earn the money which we, the taxpayers, are paying.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Cheap labour?

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: No. If the honourable member looks at it in that way, what does he call the service clubs? They are dedicated to the community in which they live and someone must be prepared to back up the community.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Are you suggesting they be paid award rates?

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: I do not believe anyone should be able to get something for nothing. As residents of the community, I believe they should do something for the community which serves them. In every local authority land subdivision 10 per cent of the area must be set aside for public open space. Most of the public open spaces are left untended and have become overgrown. They are intended to be used for children's playgrounds and parks for recreation. Service clubs usually move in to build the facilities for playgrounds and develop the parks. If the people who accept unemployment benefits every week have any belief in the community in which they live, they should be prepared to do something for the people who are forking out money to assist them to get by—the ordinary taxpayers.

I know that some people, through circumstances beyond their control, are unable to find a job. I fully agree with unemployment benefits but I do not believe anyone should take handouts, which lower the dignity and lessen the ambition of people when they do nothing in return.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Are pensioners included?

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: Pensioners are not on unemployment benefits. I have stood up for pensioners and will always do so. I have mentioned one way in which

I believe the Government can help pensioners. If the honourable member condones people picking up money for nothing, he is not the person I thought he was. No-one should expect to be able to put his hand out and get something for nothing. We are not going anywhere in this world against the competition that prevails unless we have the backing of the people in the community.

I think it is quite clear what I mean. If people who have the initiative, ability, and need to work in order to live, which they demonstrate by lining up for unemployment benefits, they should assist the community by doing some small thing in return. I support the Bill.

THE HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [1.03 a.m.]: I am mindful of the late hour and my comments will therefore be brief. I wish to refer to an act of industrial terrorism which occurred in the Bunbury harbour recently. It is something which I believe we, as Western Australians, can be ashamed of, and it does not please me to mention the incident in this House. However, a number of matters arise from the incident, one of which is that in my view members of the Police Force did an admirable job, and I must pay special tribute to Sergeant Billing who had the very hazardous task of defusing an unexploded bomb.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Is this matter not *sub judice*? It is still before the courts.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I am not talking about any accused persons. I am referring to an incident which is public knowledge. I am grateful that members of the Police Force were in a position to handle the situation so efficiently on behalf of the community. We frequently hear denigration of the Police Force in one way or another. Although in some instances there may be some justification for that attitude, the community is very grateful to those officers for the excellent job they do in all kinds of circumstances.

Having expressed my pleasure at the efficiency of the Police Force and other service organisations which helped in this instance when explosives were used in the harbour at Bunbury in an attempt to disable loading mechanism for the wood chip industry, I wish to express my displeasure at a number of individuals and organisations which are conducting a very emotive campaign against wood chipping and the timber industry as a whole. I believe it was as a result of this emotive atmosphere that the act of industrial terrorism was perpetrated. I do not think the people who are conducting this campaign can be absolved from blame. They cannot say their haloes are shining in this regard. No doubt the people associated with such campaigns are very genuine in their desire to express a point of view, and nobody denies them that right, but I certainly

hope they will adopt a more responsible attitude in presenting their cases and will not stir up people's emotions.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Are you saying they have not taken a responsible attitude?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I believe some of them have taken an emotive stance.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Which ones in particular? Are you going to condemn them all?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I did not condemn them all. As the hour is late I think I shall ignore the honourable member's comments and remind him of what I said.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You are using smear tactics against them.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I am trying to explain that in my view it is not in the best interests of industry for individuals and organisations to use emotive tactics in trying to get their point of view across to the public. I will not name particular organisations, although they are well known. I hope they will not continue along this line. If Mr Claughton wishes to join them, good luck to him.

I am pleased that a number of people engaged in the timber industry in the south-west are taking a particular interest in the protection of their industry. Two or three weeks ago at a very well attended meeting, some 500 persons came together to defend their industry and livelihood. It is a great thing to have local people sticking together in this way. If more people in local situations and industries did the same thing we would have less interference by others who may be well meaning but are certainly destructive.

The drought situation which prevails over a large area of the State this year demonstrates the value of the south-west corner of the State as regards agricultural and forestry activities. The south-west is the most reliable area for rainfall in the State and it is admirably suited to forestry activities, the timber industry, and the regeneration of trees. That is exactly what wood chipping is all about—to maximise the industry and take advantage of raw material which can be regenerated and farmed in perpetuity as forest country. Some people do not seem to be able to grasp or want to understand this fact. The south-west of the State is based on a continuing industry with a renewable resource, and I think the people in the area will be doing more to defend their industries from time to time.

With those remarks, I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [1.10 a.m.]: A considerable number of speeches have been made in this debate and I must express my

pleasure that all the speakers in one way or another have indicated their intention to support the Supply Bill. Because there have been so many speakers, and more particularly because of the considerable variety of subjects covered, it is not my intention, nor would it be possible for me, to make any attempt to reply to matters raised or to provide information which has been sought. However, I give the assurance to members that the views they have expressed will be noted, and this comment applies particularly to those members who raised genuine queries or sought particular information.

I will, therefore, confine my remarks to certain of the speakers, and more particularly to those who took the opportunity, as is their right should they so wish, to make some attacks upon the Government. In the first instance I agree with the sentiment expressed by Mr Pratt when he said that the attacks on the Government by Opposition speakers lacked substance. It has been most noticeable that there has been a singular lack of attack in respect of some items.

Two or three Opposition members reiterated the views they have expressed many times before that the Government has accomplished nothing. Mr Cooley was co-operative enough to bring to the House his copy of the booklet produced by the Government, "Policy and Performance". This is still a unique document despite Mr Cooley's reference to a document produced by Mr Clyde Cameron, a Federal Minister at that time. However much Mr Cooley or any other speaker may wish to deprecate that document, of the 310 promises enumerated in the Liberal and Country Parties policy statement, 90 per cent have been fulfilled. The document indicates promises in which some action has already been initiated and others in which there is ongoing policy. In fact, it is quite a remarkable record of achievement after barely 2½ years in Government, and particularly in a period which everyone, including Opposition speakers, has recognised as one of particular seriousness in economic terms both on an Australia-wide basis and in Western Australia.

Our Government has given an incredible performance, and despite what Opposition speakers may claim, the people of Western Australia are very content indeed with their State Government. I think Mr Cooley may have expressed the hope—the vain hope—that this will be the last Supply Bill of this Government. I feel confident in assuring him that there will be another one next year—

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Better make the most of it.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: —introduced by the coalition Government. I have no doubt on that occasion Mr Cooley will make similar references to the fleeting reference he made tonight to the \$8 million suspense

account. Irrespective of which Government is in power next year, Mr Cooley will find a similar provision in next year's Supply Bill to the one which has been referred to, for want of a better word, very intemperately by certain members of Parliament. I do not know whether Mr Cooley does not really understand the very detailed explanation which was contained in the second reading speech in relation to that \$8 million suspense account—

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I only said there was some doubt about it.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I find it extremely difficult to believe that Mr Cooley does not understand the circumstances that made this account necessary. Next year this suspense account will be a little different because the school teachers' pay period will not end at the same time as it did this year. The pay period for other public servants will not end at quite the same time as it has this year. Nevertheless, as the system has been adopted, it will be repeated again next year and in successive years while the policy of fortnightly pay periods continues to operate in Western Australia. I am sure it is quite unnecessary for me to go on at any great length about this matter. However, does Mr Cooley need reminding that we have an Auditor-General? Does he need reminding we have such a thing as a Public Accounts Committee in the Parliament? As I am sure Mr Cooley knows, the Auditor-General reports to you, Mr President. He is an officer of the Parliament and not of the Government.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You are rather sensitive about the whole thing.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: True, I am making an issue of it.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You are coming in.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Mr Cooley says that I am coming in. I know perfectly well that Mr Cooley would use any opportunity on the hustings or anywhere else to say, "Yes, I did refer to this matter in the debate in Parliament." However, Mr Cooley was not prepared to go into this matter in any great length because he knows just how tender is the ground on which he would embark on any such argument. I will go a step further and refer to some other very tender ground and that is when Mr Cooley illustrated his rather appalling appreciation of what we will call "deficit budgeting". He has said it before, as have other members from his side of the House, and he said it again tonight, that he sees nothing wrong with a State Government having a deficit Budget if it can reduce unemployment. I could express some sympathy with his view if it would reduce unemployment.

Surely Mr Cooley has now been told often enough and has read sufficient times in the more learned publications that a

State Government does not have a bank; it does not have the means to produce money as the Federal Government does and as a central bank does. So how do we fund our deficit? Mr President, you know perfectly well how we fund it, and I would have thought Mr Cooley would know. A deficit is funded from our loan programme and from our capital works programme. Mr Cooley should know also that loan funds or capital works programme funds are put into employment-giving projects such as the construction of schools, hospitals, etc. I am sorry to again inflict this matter on other members. However, I feel I must again repeat that if we take money from our capital works programme to fund our deficit, where is the money to come from for the projects which the Opposition says we have not been able to initiate?

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: The Premier must have been misleading the 300 workers he was going to sack.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: So one contributes more; and the net result is that greater unemployment is created for the future. In fact I recall the Tonkin Government in its first year had to do something like that. As soon as it got to office it said, "We will take some of this money from public works" and I know from my contact with working people in my electorate what was the net result of that. It was unemployment.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: They don't understand that you can only spend money once.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: That is so.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Perhaps you could explain to me the Premier's reasoning for saying he would go to a deficit if he kept those 300 men in employment.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Mr Cooley also said that the Premier indicated during the last Budget that he was prepared to have a deficit. The Premier made no such statement.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: He did; he forecast a deficit of \$40 million.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I am sorry, but I will have to weary the House by quoting again my second reading speech. If Mr Cooley has a copy perhaps he could read page 2 again. In that speech I said that when the Budget was introduced last year it was pointed out that the State was in no position to set aside capital funds to cover a deficit on Consolidated Revenue as we had been forced to do in the previous year. I went on to say that the Government therefore aimed for a balanced Budget with revenue and expenditure equalling \$980.673 million.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: A very creditable job.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: It was not only creditable but also incredible. If Mr Cooley and others study the second reading

speech perhaps they will gain a little appreciation of the enormous variations that occurred in all the various items in that Budget. Despite all those variations—and reference was made only to one aspect by the Opposition, and that was the wages variation; and there were others of \$10 million to \$20 million—the Treasurer was able to produce a surplus of \$594 000, a truly incredible performance. If that is an illustration of bad financial management, then I shake my head sadly when I think of some of the financial statements and Budgets produced by other Governments.

I do not want to labour the subject of the Whitlam Government at any length.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Here we go again.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Mr Cooley has gone.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You would have a hard job balancing your Budget had it not been for the deficit of the Whitlam Government.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Mr Claughton used the personal pronoun and referred to my budget. I will recount from memory what happened in the Justice portfolio after we became the Government in 1974. With regard to capital works, there was just one courthouse in the course of construction. That was the Busselton courthouse which was completed and opened that year. We took office in April and the Government brought down a Budget for the 1974-75 year. What did that Budget include for capital works in my portfolio? Not one cent was there for court buildings in that year. Last year we were able by good financial management to set aside something to enable a start to be made on at least four major projects—part of the great achievement of this Government despite the economic circumstances. I am sure the Opposition will find as the year progresses that there is a continuing and even expanding capital works expenditure of this nature.

So let us not hear any more of this rubbish about bad management, and financial management at that. If members opposite want to labour the point and say that we have not been able to get projects off the ground and if they want to say the Fraser Government did not achieve something overnight and the people expected it to, or to say that the Fraser Government expected to do something overnight after the 13th December, then those statements are completely untrue.

The people did not expect that, and the Fraser Government certainly did not give that impression. In fact, quite the contrary was the case. It said it would take years to correct the problems with which we have been landed. Nevertheless, let us look at projects. We have got a couple of projects going and completed. No mention

was made of the Eneabba railway which we financed. That was not a bad sort of project.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: It was set up before you got to Government.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: What nonsense! Mr Claughton would not even know.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Come on, speak the truth.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Let us talk about the Agnew project; it was not the great project we hoped it would be, but at least we got it off the ground. Would the Opposition like me to talk about the Telfer project?

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Tell us about Telfer.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Mr Claughton knows the story of Telfer. Perhaps Mr Cooley would like to talk about industrial strife in the Pilbara. One of the disabilities the Government has had to put up with in some of the most difficult times in our history has been industrial unrest and lawlessness, and the lack of incentive and investment that is necessary to get projects off the ground.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You have Sir Charles Court. That solves everything. He can put everything right; what has happened to his magic?

The Hon. J. Heftman: We came into office and found a bankrupt Treasury.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: If Mr Claughton is prepared to be a little patient I will illustrate to him a little of that magic in just a moment. At no stage has the Premier or the Government claimed it could achieve the impossible.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Oh, yes.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: However, the Premier both in his pre-election statement and in the policy of our party could not state when we went into Government at the beginning of 1974 what would really happen in Australia in the next couple of years. Who could have anticipated that situation?

Of course, some of this may have been due to overseas influences. But let me say again: We were dealing with a Federal Government where the only person out of the top eight who remained for any time—until the people disposed of him—was the Prime Minister; everyone else was demoted, dismissed, or retired.

Then we come to the subject of Mr Connor. I was extremely heartened tonight when Mr Clive Griffiths was reading to the House an extract of Mr Paul Keating's threats to potential oil exploration companies on the north-west shelf to hear Mr Dans interject and say, "I agree with you, and so does Mr Jamieson, publicly". Therefore, I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will have seen the front page of *The West Australian* of today's date, the 11th August.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Yes, just a few minutes ago.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Perhaps he would be good enough to pass it over to Mr Cooley, because Mr Cooley attempted to interject on Mr Griffiths to the effect that one should not believe all that one reads in the newspaper. Mr Cooley suggested that what Mr Keating, the Labor Party's shadow Minister for Minerals and Energy, was reported as saying required a little checking before it could be taken as Gospel.

However, if Mr Clive Griffiths is wrong, so apparently is the State Parliamentary Labor Party, according to today's issue of *The West Australian*. Perhaps Mr Cooley did not attend that Caucus meeting. Or perhaps the report of that meeting was not correct. I am pleased that the State Parliamentary Labor Party disagrees with Mr Keating's statement.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Have you read the report?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Yes, I have. I am glad it holds the view—attributed to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Jamieson)—that there are in fact State rights and privileges relating to the north-west shelf situation. I suggest Mr Cooley might care to reflect on his words.

When Mr Claughton was speaking, I interjected to say that it was quite a disgraceful exhibition. I was referring to his comments in relation to the police and to a certain person who was employed by the City of Stirling. I do not propose to comment on the latter. However, I intend to devote a few moments to Mr Claughton's remarks relating to the Police Force of this State inasmuch as he took some time to refer to the House some correspondence and letters to the Editor of *The West Australian* written by Mr A. J. Walsh.

Of course, Mr Claughton prefaced his remarks by saying, "It really is necessary in order to maintain law and order that we have a good, strong Police Force". I could not agree more with Mr Claughton, but he used those words as an excuse for what he subsequently had to say.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You obviously did not listen.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I listened intently. I agree it is vital to have a strong and honest Police Force the integrity of which is beyond reproach.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: And one which is sensitive to its place in the community.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Mr Claughton quoted correspondence from Mr A. J. Walsh. It so happens that in today's issue of *The West Australian*, in the

"Letters to the Editor" section the following letter appears—

CLAIMS AGAINST THE POLICE

J. J. DALTON, president, Police Union (Eastern Districts branch): In reply to Mr A. J. Walsh (July 29), I would like to point out that my letter (July 17) was intended to clear up any inference that your readers could have and possibly would have drawn from Mr Walsh's previous letter (July 1) that he was a former member of the WA police force and speaking as such.

He has now cleared up that point by telling your readers that he is an ex-Victorian police officer who was fired from that force for submitting "false" claims in relation to travelling claims.

He says these were of a "minor" and technical nature." I suppose this depends what interpretation one puts on the making of "false" claims.

Mr Walsh now makes claims that he has for some time been in possession of information indicating that police in this State collect graft from brothels, etc., and he says that he has in the past "relentlessly tried to inject decency and fair play in the place of cowardly perjury and corruption."

A recent royal commission was set up in this State to inquire into claims of corruption relating to police and brothels and the royal commissioner, a judge of eminence was brought from another State as commissioner, I believe to ensure that there was complete impartiality.

That judge, who I am sure was also "well motivated," found that there was no basis for the claims of police corruption.

The finding of this "well motivated" judge was not applauded by Mr Walsh.

Members of the public, through the news media, were invited to put information before the commission and I can only wonder why Mr Walsh did not then "relentlessly try to inject decency and fair play in the place of corruption" by giving evidence to the commission of his present "claim" and thus making himself available for testing by way of cross-examination by counsel representing the police.

It appears to me that he chooses to make claims against our members by means of your column where our members have no means of testing the truth of his "claims" by cross-examination as we would have had before the royal commission.

If Mr Walsh has any real information against our members he should give it to the proper authorities. In other words, he should put up or shut up.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: He was one that I quoted.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: We could get heartily sick and tired of that sort of comment from Mr Claughton. Mr Claughton made the allegations and was criticising the police, and I now say to him what was contained in the letter; namely, "Put up or shut up". Mr President, I am sure that you and all members of the House will recall the discomfiture Mr Claughton experienced when he was referring to a particular case brought to his attention by a constituent, and I asked him what he did about it.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: I told you.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: We recognised his discomfiture by the way Mr Claughton stumbled and stammered, and by the time he took to answer the question.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Your powers of recognition are very poorly developed.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Unfortunately, *Hansard* cannot record the precise situation, but at least members would be well aware of his discomfiture.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: *Hansard* cannot record that Mr Claughton went a sickly shade of green.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: *Hansard* will not lie.

There is a need in this place in particular for people to protect, if necessary, but certainly to provide incentive and encouragement for our Police Force. There is also the need for acceptance by the community, as my colleague the Minister for Education has said. The police cannot act alone. The police need the co-operation and assistance of the community.

There may be human frailties amongst members of the Police Force just as there may well be amongst members of Parliament or any other section of the community. Nobody denies that those human frailties exist. As a group of people they and their administration are first class. We ought to hear more from people who are prepared to stand up with the police. Although Mr Claughton acknowledges the very difficult situations in which they are placed from time to time in dealing with demonstrations and protests, we know the patience that those officers exercise despite the actions and activities which are directed against them.

I should like to think that we in this House would be the first to stand up as allies of the police in general.

I feel there is little necessity for me to engage in debate on any other subject that has been raised tonight. Quite a number of those matters which have been referred to in the course of debate have subsequently been answered by other members or have been commented upon. I repeat that where necessary the Government will certainly have regard for the views that have been put forward.

I feel that I must cover again one matter, and that is the attitude towards trade unions. Mr Cooley without question uses every opportunity, as we know, to accuse the Government and Government members—Liberal Party people in particular—of union bashing. Those are his words, not mine. Of course it is simply untrue. The Labor Party does not have a monopoly of the thinking with regard to employment. Nobody regrets more than I or members of the Government our present rate of unemployment in Western Australia or in Australia for that matter. Nobody wants to see that situation, but when it comes to this being a consequence of some attacks upon the trade union movement as a whole, how wrong that is.

I have no hesitation whatever in being just as critical as any other Minister of the activities of the leaders of certain trade unions in this State. Mr Cooley might secretly even share some of those views about some of the trade unions. Some of us were able to see what I thought was a rather long exposure of one, Hawke, Australian Council of Trade Unions and Australian Labor Party President, last evening. I think he has interested himself in some of those trade union leaders and trade unions.

All the Government has asked is for the people to recognise that there are these people in the community and in the trade union movement. Let me remind Mr Cooley that my own background was amongst the great trade union people of the south-west. So there is no lack of sympathy and no lack of understanding.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Your trouble is that you judge everybody by the actions of a few.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I tried to explain rather patiently that I was doing quite the reverse of what Mr Cooley has just said. Our attentions are directed to those who would create trouble and we are simply trying to point out to the great mass of workers, the people who try to earn an honest living to support their families and buy their homes, that their prospects are not improved by the activities and actions of certain of those trade union people. I am sure that Mr Cooley knows that.

If we were to embark upon a general process of union bashing against all unionists in Western Australia Mr Cooley knows full well that we would never be in Government. One reason amongst many others why we are in Government is that a tremendous number of trade unionists are prepared to and do vote Liberal or Country Party. Mr Cooley knows that.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: They might agree with the Liberal Party but not too many vote for the Country Party judging by their depleted ranks.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I would not know for certain how the numbers are split but we would not be in Government unless they did.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I will give you \$50 if you can find the words "union bashing" in my speech in *Hansard*.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I am not aware that I said that Mr Cooley used those words tonight. If I gave that impression, I am sorry because it was not my intention to give that impression. But he has certainly used them on many occasions in the past.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You indicated that I said it tonight.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I will not make an argument of it. I shall simply deny that I said he used the words tonight, and I did not intend to do so.

I express my appreciation of the useful contributions that have been made in this debate on the Supply Bill. I thank members for their support.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

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

House adjourned at 1.50 a.m. (Wednesday)

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 10th August, 1976

The SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

LIQUOR

Hours of Trading; Petition

MR T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [4.31 p.m.]: I have a petition for presentation to the House. It reads—

To the Honourable the Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We the undersigned citizens of Kalgoorlie, Boulder, Coolgardie and Kambalda strongly protest against the provision of clause seven of the Liquor Act Amendment Bill of 1976 (seeking to amend section 24 of the Liquor Act 1974 as amended), as far as the said amendment will reduce the hours of