

may have some knowledge of what has been going on. In the wool catalogues some clips are listed for forward sale on the auction floor. The practice is for the buyers to buy the other wool listed on the catalogues, and when the wool which is listed for forward sale is reached they refuse to bid.

However, after the auction sales some of the buyers have approached the farmers, even on the same night after the particular sale, and offered a price to them. This is a form of private buying of the wool on the property. In many cases the price offered by the buyers is lower than the price fetched at the auctions. This sort of practice should be frowned on.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Is this not private enterprise—the buyer and the seller willing to negotiate?

Mr. McPHARLIN: The prices which the buyers generally offer are lower than those that are fetched at the auctions.

Mr. T. D. Evans: That is enshrined private enterprise—the buyer and the seller willing to negotiate. You do not believe in it, when the occasion does not suit you.

Mr. McPHARLIN: There are specialist buyers operating on the wool markets, and they have the best possible information available from overseas contacts. They are constantly in touch with overseas markets by telephone. These people make approaches to farmers, many of whom do not know what is going on. The farmers are placed at a disadvantage.

Mr. T. D. Evans: So is the working man placed at a disadvantage through hire-purchase practices.

Mr. McPHARLIN: The time is overdue when a form of wool marketing should be introduced to stop this sort of practice.

Mr. T. D. Evans: That is socialism.

Mr. McPHARLIN: It is not socialism.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You know it is.

Mr. McPHARLIN: I know it is not. Under the Government's socialistic doctrine it will take full control of everything, and it will direct people to do this and that. What I am referring to is not socialism but an orderly marketing scheme.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Perhaps you have the wrong picture.

Mr. McPHARLIN: The Attorney-General knows that what I am saying is very true.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I do not know that.

Mr. McPHARLIN: Is it possible for the Attorney-General to make investigations into these practices?

Mr. T. D. Evans: Investigations are already being made—not through representations from you but from somebody else.

Mr. McPHARLIN: I do not mind who has made the representations as long as there is some investigation.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Investigations have already been made.

Mr. Hartrey: I agree there must be some restraint on capitalism.

Mr. McPHARLIN: In many cases the farmers are receiving far less than they are entitled to. These practices are keeping the better types of wool from the market. When these types of wool are not placed in the auction the best possible price is not obtained. I am glad to hear that inquiries are being made, and I hope the Attorney-General will give us the information which we would like to have.

I said earlier that I thought the dominance of the Federal Government over the State was making the State more reliant on Commonwealth finance. We see finance being allocated to the State by the Commonwealth Government, but always with strings attached.

Mr. T. D. Evans: That has always been the situation, and you know it.

Mr. McPHARLIN: Not to the same extent as at present. In recent times, on each occasion when a financial allocation is made to the State more strings are attached. This is in line with the centralist policy of the Federal Government.

Sir Charles Court: Now it is direction by the Federal Government, but previously it was co-operation.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Play with your yo-yo. It has never been thus, and the Leader of the Opposition has said that himself.

Sir Charles Court: Previously it was co-operation, but now it is direction.

Mr. McPHARLIN: By this means the Federal Government is endeavouring to take over the control of the States, and that is quite evident from the policies of the Labor Party. The Federal Government wants centralised control at Canberra, and it is achieving that by tying strings to funds provided to the States.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired.

MR. B. T. BURKE (Balcatta) [5.11 p.m.]: Mr. Speaker, firstly I would like to pay tribute to one who is no longer with us. I refer to my late father, Tom Burke, who on the 28th September, 1943, delivered his maiden speech to the House of Representatives at Canberra.

At that time he paid tribute to a great Labor movement; today I do the same. I say that any credit that is mine is due to him, and one of my great disappointments is that he is not present today. I am proud to be his son.

I am also proud and humble to accept the trust and responsibility that the people whom I represent have placed on me. To them I pledge loyalty and sincerity of effort on their behalf.

The electorate that I represent has one vivid feature, and that is the very marked presence of the State Housing Commission.

The commission's charter is to provide accommodation, and this is being done most efficiently—provided we regard efficiency as being measured in terms of money alone. Less than 5 per cent. of the commission's total revenue is spent on administration, but I believe that measuring stick to be false.

I am of the view that successive Governments have perpetuated a terrible mistake. They have regarded people seeking housing assistance as numbers, over whom roofs are to be placed, regardless of the type. Almost 20 per cent. of the accommodation provided by the commission in the Balga-Nollamara area consists of flats, and about 21 per cent. of those flats are empty today. That is the evidence of the mistake that has been made.

Many excuses, some of which are valid, can be produced to explain why these flats are, in fact, vacant, but there is only one answer, and that is the Government's housing policies must be humanised. It is no good telling the people they want too much; it is no good trying to impose an unacceptable life style on people; and it is no good trying to tell me that any Government has done the right thing in building multi-storey flats for the people who are lucky or unlucky enough to come within the ambit of Government assistance. To ignore the fact is to create a rod for one's own back.

In the past I have been known to criticise the Stirling City Council. The Local Government Act lays down quite clearly the responsibility for the provision of community facilities on local authorities. If the Stirling City Council refuses to fulfil its responsibility it should be called on to explain. If it is unable to fulfil its responsibility then it is incumbent on the Government to provide the finance that is needed to relieve the socially disastrous situation that develops when people are denied facilities for leisure time outlets.

I believe very strongly that the present system of electing councillors to represent specific wards militates against the proper management of the affairs of the people. The primary interest must always be the welfare of an area as a whole, and I would far prefer to see councillors elected to represent the ratepayers, not just by a ward but by an area as a whole. This would remove sectional pressures which could cause desperately needed development money to be spent unwisely.

I also believe quite firmly that councillors of local authorities should be paid; but at the same time it must be acknowledged that the City of Stirling has been placed in an almost untenable position in at least one respect.

Successive Governments have presented the City of Stirling with instant suburbs, and it has been the task of the council to match those instant suburbs with instant community facilities. That has been an unenviable task.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that the State Government—through the State Housing Commission—is prepared to make available to the Stirling City Council a loan of \$60,000 to develop community facilities.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Hear, hear!

Mr. B. T. BURKE: The money is to be offered at a rate of only 6½ per cent. and I think it could be ideally used in starting a swimming complex adjacent to the community hall planned for the 42-acre reserve in Princess Road, Balga. The offer is attractive; the decision rests with the council.

In another important matter affecting my electorate the Government has promised the City of Stirling full support. I refer to the upgrading of Wanneroo Road. The project, to cost more than \$1,000,000 is to be financed partly by the State Government and I have been assured by the Premier that all steps will be taken to ensure completion of the dual carriageway as soon as possible.

As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, I was a journalist prior to entering the State Parliament. As a journalist I was aware that enlightened decisions were most often made by informed minds. To this end I would suggest that television and radio facilities be installed in both the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council Chambers for the benefit of the public. Although a continuous coverage of proceedings could not be expected, crucial debates—if broadcast or televised—would add greatly to the knowledge of the people concerning the proceedings of Parliament.

While on the subject of the Press, I would like to make my position perfectly clear on one particular matter. It has become quite fashionable to criticise the Press and accuse the Press of bias. If the accusations are true it has been my experience that individual journalists bear none of the blame.

News gathering organisations represent vested interests, but I praise those journalists with whom I have come in contact. Invariably, they have been interested only in reporting the facts as they see them.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to make quite clear the philosophical differences which place me squarely on this side of the House. While it is not my brief to criticise the Opposition on this occasion, I refer to the debate which occurred on the workers' compensation legislation. During that debate one member from the opposite side of the House made it quite plain that his opposition to the proposal was influenced to some degree by the deterrent

effect compensation premiums would have on investment. I do not deny the honourable member his right to hold that view, but I make it quite clear that it is not mine. The difference crystallises the gulf between us.

Having studied the Appropriation Bill (Consolidated Revenue Fund), and the financial statement, I congratulate the Government on its handling of the finances of the State.

[Applause.]

MR. BROWN (Merredin-Yilgarn) [5.20 p.m.]: I also rise to support the Appropriation Bill (Consolidated Revenue Fund). Before commenting on the Budget I would like to congratulate the member for Balcatta on his maiden speech in this Parliament. I wish him well in his career, both in the Government and in the Parliament of Western Australia. I consider he will serve the present electorate of Balcatta, and the future electorate of Balga, in a manner which will reflect credit on him and on the Parliament of Western Australia.

I am gravely concerned, not with the Budget as presented to this Parliament, but with the comments which have ensued following the presentation of the Federal Budget on the 21st August, 1973. My concern is with the reports of the effect of the Federal Budget on primary producers. At the outset I must say that the reports which are circulating throughout the rural areas of Western Australia are not only incorrect, but misleading. They do nothing but undermine an industry which is of tremendous importance, not only to the people who live in the country areas of Western Australia, but to the people of Australia as a whole.

Mr. McPharlin: Can you prove that statement?

Mr. BROWN: I certainly can prove it, and I will be glad to enlighten the Leader of the Country Party.

Mr. McPharlin: You do that.

Mr. BROWN: I will do that by illustrating how misleading statements are issued by way of publications and utterances, and even by way of questions asked in this Parliament.

Let us reflect on the Budget presented by Mr. Crean, and its effect on the primary producers. When the Budget was presented *The West Australian* published an article under the headline, "Budget shock". Towards the end of the article it was stated that there would be a rural levy of 1c per pound on all meat exports. That was the only comment to appear on the front page of *The West Australian*.

Mr. Rushton: The increase in the P.M.G. charges were against country people.

Mr. BROWN: I will deal with P.M.G. charges as I come to them.

Sir Charles Court: But did not that 1c prove to be, in actual fact, 1.65c?

Mr. BROWN: But the 1c levy has been withdrawn. In the same issue of *The West Australian* the rural community of Western Australia rated a comment at page 8 under the headline, "Big increase in country phone rents." There was no mention of the deductions available to primary producers, but a statement that telephone rentals would be increased from between \$27 and \$35 to \$60.

Mr. O'Neil: That is true is it not?

Mr. BROWN: Actually, it was false because the increase is to \$55.

Sir Charles Court: What about the line charges?

Mr. BROWN: The increase is to \$55, the same as the metropolitan rentals which are to remain unchanged.

Sir Charles Court: That is a great thing for decentralisation!

Mr. BROWN: The newspaper article did not state that charges to country subscribers within 50 kilometres were to be reduced from 19c to 15c.

Mr. O'Neil: A good farmer could yell that distance and would not need a phone.

Mr. BROWN: It also did not state that calls outside of business hours were to be reduced from 15c to 10c.

Mr. Stephens: What about the construction of lines over eight kilometres?

Mr. BROWN: With the exception of the removal of the investment allowances those were the only comments made in *The West Australian* concerning the effect on rural producers.

Sir Charles Court: What about the tax concessions which were taken away?

Mr. BROWN: The Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Country Party are misinformed.

Sir Charles Court: I would pit my knowledge of taxation against that of the member opposite.

Mr. BROWN: I would have thought so, but the Leader of the Opposition demonstrates his ignorance.

Sir Charles Court: You tell us we are wrong; give us some proof.

Mr. BROWN: The Leader of the Opposition has demonstrated his ignorance of rural matters and the manner in which the economy of the primary producer is affected. I will refer to the firm of C.C.H. Australia Ltd. I had never previously heard of the firm, and probably the firm has never heard of a chopper. It would probably consider a chopper to be a helicopter. I have made some inquiries through our library and I am pleased to announce that the firm of C.C.H. Australia Ltd. is well skilled in taxation matters. It has issued a publication *Australian Income Tax*