

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 3rd April, 1979

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

ESSENTIAL FOODSTUFFS AND COMMODITIES BILL

Standing Orders Suspension

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Leader of the House) [5.05 p.m.]: I move, without notice—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended so as to enable a Bill for an Act to make provision to ensure the supply of essential foodstuffs and essential commodities to be taken on receipt of a Message from the Legislative Assembly and to have precedence each day before the Address-in-Reply, and to be passed through all stages at any one sitting.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I second the motion.

The PRESIDENT: This motion requires the concurrence of an absolute majority. I put the question that the motion be agreed to.

There being a dissentient voice, it is necessary for the House to divide.

Division taken with the following result—

Ayes 20

Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. W. M. Piesse
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. R. J. L. Williams
Hon. T. McNeil	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	Hon. G. E. Masters

(Teller)

Noes 7

Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. R. F. Calughton
Hon. R. Hetherington	

(Teller)

The PRESIDENT: The result of the division being 20 for the Ayes and seven for the Noes, I declare the motion carried with the concurrence of an absolute majority.

Question thus passed.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SECOND DAY

Motion

Debate resumed from the 29th March, on the following motion by the Hon. N. F. Moore—

That the following address be presented to His Excellency—

May it please Your Excellency: We the Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express our loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to deliver to Parliament.

THE HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [5.10 p.m.]: First of all let me congratulate the Hon. N. F. Moore for his very fine presentation in moving the adoption of the Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech. I consider his choice of subject to be good, but I think he could have gone a little further in making references to his province.

Later on in my speech I shall refer to some of the comments that I think should have been canvassed at the opening of Parliament. If one looks at the Governor's Speech one finds that it is probably the most fruitless Speech that has been made by the Governor in the last seven or eight years that I have been in this Parliament.

In fact, if one looked at the Press reports the next day one could quite easily see the great difficulty which confronted the media in trying to make any by-lines out of it; that is because there is simply nothing in the Governor's Speech.

If one takes the Governor's Speech at its face value one could assume that this will be a very short session of Parliament. Of course, one realises that it is not what is contained in the Governor's Speech, but what has been left out of it, that counts. That is what we have come to expect.

We are entering the third session of the 29th Parliament with a very sterile document which, under the Westminster system, is supposed to outline the Government's legislative programme. The Speech contains some rhetoric about the economy which covers less than half a page. We are told that the finances of the State have been balanced, but I do not know what that indicates.

The Governor's Speech paints a very rosy picture of agriculture. I think this is good on paper. However, problems confront agriculture, particularly the expectation that interest rates will rise and unemployment will increase; that our

overseas reserves will fall; and that inflation will increase even further.

Whilst I welcome the news on the revival of the beef industry and a record harvest, I shall not clap my hands too much because I believe our primary producers still have a fair way to go. They certainly can deal with the production on the farm, but unfortunately they cannot deal with the wild fluctuations in the money supply and further inflation rises under the Fraser Government.

Whilst I am on the question of inflation, it is interesting to note that at present a person who is visiting Australia from the USA has predicted that the inflation rate in the United States of America will rise by some 15 per cent.

This has been brought about by a regressive wages policy which has now burst out of its chains, and the people are looking for the dollar in their pocket to pay for their daily bread. There is a lesson to be learnt by Australia in this situation.

Let me now turn to the part of the Governor's Speech under the heading of "Resources Development and Energy". This occupies a very small portion of the total document, and there is one notable exception. Recently the Premier suggested that he was looking for money to launch a feasibility study of the Ord River dam for the establishment of a hydroelectric plant.

I think he mentioned the sum of \$90 million. Anyone with a modicum of commonsense would know the difficulties that exist. I have mentioned \$90 million, but I might be misquoting the Premier. He said it would cost that amount to put the plant into operation. We know without a shadow of doubt that, if we generated that much electric power in the north of the State, there is not a sufficient number of people or sufficient industry to justify that kind of investment.

The Governor made reference to resources development and energy; however, his Speech contained nothing about a feasibility study. That being so, one can only assume that the Premier was talking off the top of his head. Furthermore there is no indication that the Federal Government, in its wisdom, will come along to the party to pour money into this development, which in the first instance was a hare-brained scheme, and continues to be so.

On the question of education, the Governor's Speech occupies a little under half a page.

In relation to transport, the Speech says nothing. It simply indicates that the Government will buy 10 new rail cars. I am led to believe—and perhaps the Hon. Fred McKenzie will say something about this—that some of the

bogies presently being used on the Midland-Fremantle and Armadale-Fremantle passenger services were operating in the late 1890s.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: He will probably have something to say.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: Yes, I certainly will.

The Hon D. K. DANC: Regarding labour and industry, when considering the impact this subject has on human relationships in our State, one would imagine that the Governor would have dealt at great length with labour and industry; but the section of the Speech dealing with this occupies less than a quarter of a page. There is a mention of the North-West Shelf. It deals with school leavers as follows—

In addition, the Government will continue to expand its current programmes to improve job prospects for school leavers including increased use of technical training facilities.

I will return to that topic later.

In the section of the Speech dealing with housing, one reads as follows—

The number of homes financed under the homes' assistance scheme has been lifted from 350 to 520.

Probably 10 000 people in the South Metropolitan Province will be looking for homes. There will be 500 additional homes built in the State. What wonderful news for the people on low incomes!

In relation to lands, the speech indicates there will be more new farm land allocations.

Regarding forests, health, and community welfare, the best parts of those sections are the headings.

Under the heading of "Tourism", in the 150th year the Governor deals with tourism in four lines as follows—

Intensified tourist promotion has been undertaken to coincide with the State's 150th anniversary celebrations.

The Government proposes to add to its chain of travel offices in the other States by opening a centre in Brisbane.

I am amazed. Recently I heard the Minister for Tourism saying that the 150th year was not really meant for tourists. Several days later he said that 10 000 people from the Eastern States had cancelled their bookings to Western Australia since the introduction of the low air fares to the

United States of America. I do not know where the Minister obtains these figures. They are probably off the top of his head. Even the most biased person must "get the creeps", if that is the term, when he reads this sterile document.

We are told, under the heading of "Police and Traffic", that there will be another 56 officers inducted. We are not told how many officers resigned last year, or how many will resign this year. Perhaps the whole of the force at Dumbleyung will resign shortly, if a new police station is not built in the area. I am sure we will hear more in relation to that when Mr Lewis speaks.

The other good news under the heading of "Police and Traffic" is as follows—

Completion of the integrated Police and Road Traffic Authority complex at Warwick by the end of the year will fill an urgent need for such facilities in the expanding northern suburbs.

In dealing with the Department of Corrections, we are advised that a project commenced under a Labor Government is to be completed. That project is the Canning Vale Gaol. However, there is no mention of that outmoded crime factory, the Fremantle Prison. That prison has no training facilities, and it has no facilities for the reform of offenders. The Fremantle Prison should have been closed long ago.

In relation to fisheries, the Governor's Speech tells us nothing. It does not indicate how the operations of Southern Ocean fisheries are progressing.

Legal affairs, cultural affairs, and electoral matters occupy only a few lines.

Under the heading of "Legislation", the Governor's Speech reads as follows—

In addition to legislation specifically referred to earlier, a further programme of legislation covering a wide range of subjects will be introduced as necessary.

What does that sentence mean? It has been traditional to outline in the Governor's Speech the majority of the Government's legislation.

To return to my initial point, I say that the Press could not find a by-line within the Governor's Speech. If members do not wish to take my word for the statement, I refer them to last Friday's Press and media coverage of the

opening of the Parliament. The best coverage given was that on the screen which the President had placed at the front of the building.

There is a need for the people of this State and the Opposition—indeed, for the whole of the Parliament—to be given an indication of the legislation to be introduced during this session. That has simply not been done in the Governor's Speech.

Let us consider some of the failings of the Government.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: That could not take you any time at all.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: If Mr Pike is to interject, I ask that he interject so that I can hear him. I like to hear interjections from Mr Pike.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: I am sorry.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The Court Government has let the people down. It has failed, by its own standards. There is no need to take the Labor Party's word for that. The Liberal Party had three basic commitments at the time of the last election. The first is as follows—

Our first commitment is to increase job security and career opportunity with a new wave of beneficial development.

They are heady words. One can imagine people who were out of work considering those words and saying, "Well, there it is. We have to give them another go. They really mean it this time." What do we find in fact? The Liberal Party promised 100 000 new jobs. In February of 1977, when that promise was made, the Bureau of Statistics found that there were 526 500 Western Australians in employment. In January, 1979, there were only 516 500 in employment. In other words, two years after the promise of 100 000 new jobs was made, there were 10 000 fewer jobs.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: The State of Excitement!

The Hon. D. K. DANS: There are now 10 000 fewer jobs than when that statement was made.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Which statistics are they?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: If the member was not listening, I will give him a copy later. They are from the Bureau of Statistics.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Which particular time?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I do not have to qualify the figures. I will supply them to Mr Oliver later.

In February, 1977, there were eight people out of work for every job vacancy. Mr Oliver can check that himself.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: I hope you have the right year.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: There are now 40 people out of work for every job vacancy.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: What about the people coming from the Eastern States and New Zealand?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I remind Mr Pike that we belong to the Australian nation. I know his party does not believe in the Federation of the Australian States.

The second commitment of the Liberal Party reads as follows—

Our second commitment is to give special attention to the rights of the individual under the law.

That is a very good statement. It could not be bettered. The public relations consultants who compiled that statement could not have done a better job.

In relation to that statement, what do we find? In fact, the rights of the individual have been ignored, most notably because of the Court Government's refusal to consider the Federal Government's proposal to establish a human rights commission to protect the rights of the individual. I have read the Premier's statement. How can one take that as gospel, when one considers the Government's treatment of the people at Wittenoom and of the farmers affected by the clearing of land? There are further examples of the breaking of this commitment. When one considers the three policy statements, one cannot accept this Government as a credible one.

The third commitment reads—

Our third commitment is to improve the ways in which Government and people work together in building and improving our many communities and are caring for the needy.

Members know how the Government is caring for the needy. One of its first actions in fulfilling that commitment was to take bus and rail concessions from the pensioners. As for having the people working together, we will see an example of this tonight. The Government has constantly promoted community division.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Government by confrontation!

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The Government has provoked industrial disputes. It has used the most violent and extreme language when referring to those who disagree with it such as conservationists, the people at Wittenoom, and Dr Chittleborough. I would not wish to repeat the words used at the head of an article I read in the Press the other day. That article suggests that someone "put the finger" on Dr Chittleborough when he went to Melbourne. An attempt was made to have the Hamer Government not proceed with Dr Chittleborough's appointment.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: What was the paper?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I forget the name. I will supply it to Mr Pratt later.

The Government has not improved any community facilities. It has failed dismally to commit itself to regional development. The Government has failed to develop the State's major regional centres. It has failed to improve community facilities and services. I do not wish to deal at length with statistics as I am sure other speakers on both sides of the House will do so. However, the comments I have made indicate where the Government stands in relation to its policy commitments. Every one of those commitments is in ruins.

On the question of unemployment, more than 40 000 Western Australians are out of work. The magnitude of the problem is indicated by the fact that in February this year there were 40 Western Australians out of work for every job vacancy. That record is worse than the record in any other State. This year there were 45 825 people, or 8.17 per cent of the work force, without work. In February 1977, there were eight people unemployed for every job vacancy. A total of 25 506 people, or 4.85 per cent. of the work force, was unemployed. Rather than the State moving, it is rolling backwards!

I do not wish to weary the House with all these dreary statistics—

The Hon. R. G. Pike: Well sit down.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I remind Mr Pike that the statistics are not dreary to the people. If he is to suggest that they are dreary, he should climb on the stump with Mr Claughton and tell the people out in their province that he finds the question of unemployment dreary.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: That is your work, not mine.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Mr Pike did not say that.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I said, "dreary statistics." Mr Pike has no compassion whatsoever for people who are out of work.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: The usual socialist trick! You make an accusation, and then provide a remedy for the accusation in your own statement.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I do not find you dreary.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Mr Masters flatters me. He knows flattery will get him everywhere he wants to go.

When I was commenting on the commitments of the Liberal Party, I noticed that members on the other side never uttered a sound.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: We have to be fair to you when you start.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I hope members opposite will be fair to me when I finish. That is why we have a President, to ensure that fairness prevails. It is not the place of members opposite to ensure that they are fair to me when I start. I hope they will be fair to me when I finish. I am sure they will be.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: The sooner the better!

The Hon. D. K. DANS: With regard to the vexed question of unions, and despite whatever stance members may adopt on the subject, I can assure the House that the trade union movement is here to stay and it will continue to remain, irrespective of the attitude of this Government or any other Government of any political colour. I want that statement to go on record. The trade union movement will not disappear, and I will come back to that aspect shortly. All the intimidation, the arrogance, and the needless confrontation will not solve a thing.

The industrial relations situation should be put in its proper context. There has been some falling off in the number of industrial disputes in recent months, but the fact is that the Court Government's policies have been provoking and

prolonging industrial disputes. The figures tell the story. During the Tonkin Government's three-year term of office there were 421 industrial disputes and this underlines the point I was making. We will still have industrial disputes, irrespective of the Government in office.

During the Court Government's first three years in office there were 742 industrial disputes. This is an area in which the Court Government has excelled. One of the reasons for the large number of industrial disputes during the present Government's regime is that it believes in confrontation.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Do you have any comparisons? Do you have the figures for New South Wales under Mr Wran?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: If Mr Lewis wants to make a speech about New South Wales, he can do so.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Surely you must have some comparison with another State.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Mr Deputy President, if you would care to adjourn the proceedings for 10 or 12 minutes I would be able to obtain the figures concerning how Mr Wran has been able to reduce the number of industrial disputes.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: Including putting strike breakers into the New South Wales Government Printing Works. That is your Labor Premier of New South Wales!

The Hon. D. K. DANS: He is still the Premier of New South Wales.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: That is what he tried to do about five months ago.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The Government in power in this State at the present time believes in confrontation, in using provocative language, and in intervening in disputes. It gets on the sidelines and barracks, because it can envisage some political advantage in promoting as much community unrest and disunity as it can.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Would you agree with the member for Morley? Would you take his way out about the unions?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The majority of industrial disputes which have occurred since the Fraser Government took office have involved areas where disputes very rarely took place previously because of Government intervention.

Let us consider the situation. Government employees such as those in the SEC, the post office, and so on, have been involved in industrial disputes.

One must ask oneself whether our policy of conciliation and arbitration is the best policy—and I think I have demonstrated that it is, because of the fewer number of disputes under the Tonkin Government—or whether the confrontation and stirring attitude of the present Government is the best policy. The figures under the Tonkin Government seem to suggest that fewer disputes occur under the process of conciliation.

Let us pose the question: Who solves most industrial disputes in Australia? The answer is pretty simple. It is Bob Hawke, because he uses the four "Cs".

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You claim that. You never give credit to the decent union official who has worked for a settlement right up until Hawke comes in grandstanding. He just gets the finish of the dispute. I have heard you on this before, and I do not really think you are right.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: About the only time Mr Hawke is called in—and he is consulted on many occasions by the Federal Government—is when a dispute is out of control.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: That is the truth.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: That is the truth. Many in the Fraser Government would say exactly the same thing. If Mr Lewis wants to qualify or verify the statement, he would find it simple to do.

I said that the disputes had been solved under the four "Cs". The first one is communication. It is necessary to get the parties talking together. They must not be driven apart. If they are driven apart, the problem is solved for a short period, but in the following couple of days it is right back again.

The second is conciliation—getting down together and putting all the cards on the table. Very few Australians who are associated with industrial relations—which involve only human relations—would not agree with conciliation, and they include judges of the Commonwealth arbitration commission and leaders of industry in general.

The third "C" is compromise—deciding what is a fair deal for everyone. The fourth is consensus—getting everyone to accept the outcome.

There is another "C" which, as I said earlier, is adopted by the Court Government. It is confrontation, which faced even the State School Teachers' Union which previously had not been involved in a dispute for 52 years.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: They had been trying hard.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: It does not matter how hard they had been trying. The facts are irrefutable. There had not been a dispute for 52 years.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I would have thought you would deal with "CCCP". Isn't that the way they write the Russian abbreviation of their country's name.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I would not know, Comrade Lewis!

I want to deal with another subject which is the devastation experienced in Carnarvon as a result of cyclone "Hazel", and I want to refer to a question of which I gave notice on the opening night of Parliament, and then refer to some other material I have here in respect of the Lake McLeod operation—commonly referred to as Cape Cuvier.

It is my understanding—and I hope the House will bear with me on this matter—that this operation may never recommence, despite the rather open-ended answer I received today. Let us have a look at one part of the answer—and I want to commence on this point. With all the problems facing Carnarvon I would have thought Mr Moore would give attention to the area in his electorate where the majority of the citizens reside.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He did.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: He did? When?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: In the very good speech he made.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: It was an excellent speech. In my opinion a domestic satellite will do a terrific amount of good! I would have thought Mr Moore would spend some time on the human problem experienced as a result of the cyclone rather than deal with the subject he covered.

A member: The satellite emanates in Carnarvon.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: That is the earth station which is too complicated for me to understand.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Sarcasm ill becomes you.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I have been to the station about three times and I found it interesting, but I do not understand how it works. I doubt whether many others in the Chamber would be able to understand what takes place.

Let me return to my subject, the answer to my question. I do not know where the honourable

member obtained his figure of \$1 800 000. I did not go around looking for these figures. When I was in Carnarvon a week or two ago, along with some other people, I met the full council of the Shire of Carnarvon and I have the figures supplied to me by two of the councillors who were sitting at the table and who had a well-documented approach. One of the councillors was Tuckey who, I believe, used to be on the Grants Commission. I do not know whether he still is, but Mr Moore may know. The other councillor was L. Pacey.

They had taken all the business in that area into account. I did not have the opportunity to meet the people, but the local bus operator told me that he was down the drain to the tune of \$250 000. What that means I do not know, but he did have a fleet of buses which operated to Lake McLeod, and with the closing down of the plant it is not necessary for anyone to be smart to understand the situation.

We are urged to support development at any cost and we are expected to support business ventures. However, I consider that business ventures should have a commitment to the people who work for them, and a commitment to the town in which they are established.

Let us have a look at some of the statements which have been made. Right from its inception this particular operation has been plagued with problems. It was only last session, or the one before, that we released the particular company from its obligation to produce potash because it could not do so. We passed a Bill enabling the company to produce a product known as angbeinitel. That production was not successful either and so the then owners sold out to BHP which company retained the operation for a short time only, and then sold out to CRA.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Why do you say CRA and not Dampier Salt?

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I could say Dampier Salt, but Dampier Salt is owned by CRA.

The Hon J. C. Tozer: CRA is a partner.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: In this deal we can see the superb business hand of Sir Rod Carnegie whom I admire.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Did he organise "Hazel"?

The Hon. D. K. DAns: He is a man for whom I have the utmost admiration.

As a result of cyclone "Hazel" the loader was blown off the end of the jetty. This was not the first time that had occurred. However, on this occasion, before one could say "Jack Robinson",

what was the position? The shop stewards were called together by the local manager and, I believe, were given \$500 each and sent to Perth where they were booked into the Red Castle Motel. They were then told to return north and spread the good news to the people at the site. The "good news" was that the job was finished and there was no chance of the plant reopening for another 18 months. They were assured by the local manager here that no announcement would be made until they returned to report to the men on the job.

We know that the Premier made a statement, and in all fairness I will not criticise him for that. Irrespective of what the company thought, he, as Premier, had a bounden duty to make the statement that the operation would cease.

However, by the Monday or Tuesday these people had returned to Carnarvon and most of the workers had been found other jobs and had shifted from the town. There was no dispute; that was the finish of it, and it would be 18 months before the operation would reopen!

That is all very well. There was no dispute and the matter was dealt with as quick as a flash. I had a telephone call on Friday night. I indicated I could not interfere with the affairs of trade unions. I was perfectly frank. I told the person to tell his members that that was it.

It was the neatest bit of footwork ever accomplished in such a short time. The employees were very lucky they were working for Dampier Salt, because had they been working for BHP they would have been sacked and sent on their way.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: You know you cannot mention BHP.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: BHP of course, baled out very quickly from the Lake McLeod venture. It comes back to this \$1.8 million. Some people were resettled in other jobs, notwithstanding their housing commitments and separation from their families in some cases. One must admire Dampier Salt for trying to find them jobs elsewhere. But nothing was done for the people in the town of Carnarvon who did not have the protection of unions or the same patronising boss. I describe these people as the second wave of casualties, and sometimes they number far in excess of the first wave. They go down like ninepins, with no-one ready and willing to assist them. Then a third and fourth wave follow, and when these are added to the devastation of some of the banana plantations we have a very bad situation on our hands. It is in this area that we get the \$1.8 million.

I will suggest to the Leader of the House through you, Mr President, that perhaps one of the Government Ministers could go along to the Carnarvon Shire Council, meet the people I met, and ask that the same figures be presented to them.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You know very well, because it has been in every paper, that Ministers have been up there. The Minister made a factual statement: he said he did not know where you got the figures.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I have just stated where I got them.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I will send him the information.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The plot thickens and becomes murky, because at a public meeting held subsequently at the Carnarvon Civic Centre, which I attended with the Assembly member for the district and the Hon. George Berry, some undertakings were given that the Town of Carnarvon would receive all the information it required so that it could plan its future. At that meeting someone made the statement that no-one knew exactly how long it would be before the plant or the loader could be put back into operation, because the engineers had not assessed the damage. That was an amazing statement. A bold statement was made in the first place to the workers on the job, "Grab your money and go, because it will take 18 months." Another statement was made, "We do not know yet." I would go for the second statement: we do not know yet, because no assessment has been made by engineers.

As we go along we begin to think there is something very smelly about this little bit of activity. I am sure Mr Moore would know that one of the problems associated with the production of salt at Lake McLeod is the different form of harvesting. I think it is scraped up out of the lake and not harvested with the use of evaporation ponds.

The Hon. G. W. Berry: It is the same method.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: It is slightly different. One of the big problems with salt in this area is its high brine content which makes it very difficult to move, to the extent that enough salt is harvested to load only one ship at a time.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: How does salt have a high brine content?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: We know what salt does to the inside of a ship. The salt is put at grass to allow some of the liquid to drain out of it. In the shipping industry it is called brine because it

eats away the plates. One would have thought it would be possible to continue production of salt in that area on a limited scale, putting it at grass and allowing the liquid brine to leach out.

As was pointed out at the public meeting, when the jetty was damaged on a previous occasion it had been put back into operation in something like 16 weeks. I did not make that statement; if my memory serves me correctly, Councillor Tuckey made it. He also mentioned how long it had taken to build the first jetty. I am hopeful that that operation will commence again, but a few months prior to cyclone "Hazel" a decision had been made to close the operation down for three or four months while certain modifications were made. I have here documentation in relation to it and some notes I took myself, together with the names of people who conferred. A different berthing method was to be employed, putting in two breast dolphins which may have done away with one of the tugs, doing something to the mooring buoys, and generally making it a more sophisticated operation.

But, cyclone "Hazel" hit, and when some of the men went out to Lake McLeod on the main haulage road they were prevented from going anywhere near the plant. Again, I do not know why that kind of action was taken. They finally went to Cape Cuvier via Quobba.

A number of peculiar things happened in connection with this jetty. First of all, despite pleas to the company to replace two of the raker piles which hold up the jetty—and which had fallen over and were left lying on the ocean floor—those piles were not replaced. Attached to the pylons on the east side of the jetty was a steel plate, half an inch thick and about two feet long and 10 feet wide, for the tugs to buffet against while taking personnel ashore. The company was informed on numerous occasions that this would weaken the jetty in heavy seas, as the water had no way to go through it and, therefore, would pull with the full force of the swell on the end of the jetty. In other words, it was a solid steel plate which had no egress to the water. One can imagine the effect on the job of that solid plate with the raker piles lying on the ocean floor.

It had been normal to tow the buoys away when a cyclone warning was given, but that did not happen on this occasion. The No. 1 mooring buoy broke away and banged up against a pylon, forcing this section to collapse. I would not like to be accused of having a suspicious mind, but it seems to me not a great deal of attention was given to the security of that jetty, and it could well have been a blessing in disguise when it was blown down.

Even while I am standing here, and despite assurances given by me and other members of Parliament to the people of Carnarvon, no clear indication has been given to them that this operation will recommence within 18 months. I would be quite happy if it recommenced in two years, as long as some indication is given. We must bear in mind that when it was damaged previously it was fixed very quickly, according to Councillor Tuckey. So one must be very suspicious about whether this particular operation will, in fact, commence again.

This brings me to the question of the extent to which this industry has any commitment to the people in the area where it is established. I have been told the tug boats have had their contracts terminated and the operators have been informed there will be no work for them at Cape Cuvier. That seems to be the end of the road. The story going around is that Dampier Salt—let us give it its right name—is intent only on producing salt at Dampier; it does not want the Lake McLeod salt.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: What is the tonnage from Dampier?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: It will get the tonnage. The Lefroy operation in the territory of the Minister for Lands and Forests has almost ceased to exist, if, in fact, it has not already ceased to exist.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: It will revive.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: One's lawn revives when one waters it. I am told that at this stage the only plan in train for Lake McLeod is to bring it back into limited operation at some time so that, as Mr Tozer suggested by interjection, when the tonnage cannot be reached with Dampier Salt the Lake McLeod operation can be used as a back-up.

All the Lake McLeod employees who had homes at Carnarvon have gone. Fortunately, the company has looked after many of them, even though it has meant breaking up the family unit and transferring employees to Dampier; but it has not done anything for the people who provide the goods and services in the town of Carnarvon and who employ large numbers of people. The owner of the bus service was almost beside himself. One fellow had a particularly good business there—I will not mention his name—and as soon as he got news that the company was moving out he sacked his two truck drivers without waiting for even one last load.

On that basis, I think the Government has a commitment to approach the company and ask it, in the name of Carnarvon, to do something to re-establish the operation that has flourished there

for some 10 years. I believe a Japanese company—Ito, I think—has been a partner in all the business enterprises which have been established at Carnarvon.

What comes out of this is the fragility of the Australian economy. Just how fragile is the Australian economy? The economy of an isolated town is even more fragile. Perhaps Carnarvon is not so badly off, because it does not depend on one particular commodity. It is a very lucky town by virtue of the fact that a number of industries operate in the area. However, our economy is fragile, as demonstrated by this situation.

I wish to make one last point on this subject. Not one of the loaders of iron ore, salt, or anything else in the north-west cannot be blown away in a cyclone or damaged beyond repair, and in view of the catastrophic effects of cyclone "Hazel" on the economy of Carnarvon it would be hard to imagine what a catastrophe it would be if a similar thing happened at Port Hedland.

I have been told those loaders have been built in such a way that they would not blow away. That is not true. The point I am making is, if we allow a company just to whizz off in times of economic hardship in Australia, it is not very hard to visualise what would happen to a town like Port Hedland.

I trust that the Government will not only use its best endeavours, but that the Premier will be just as vocal about the re-establishment of this industry as he is about promising us things to come.

I have already made reference to the claim of 100 000 jobs to be created; however, before that has even started we have lost 10 000 jobs! I would applaud the effort of the Premier if he would publicly go on record as saying that he will restore the same kind of conditions in Carnarvon as existed prior to cyclone "Hazel".

Sitting suspended from 6.01 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Before the tea suspension I had just concluded speaking about the problems besetting Carnarvon, and I would now like to say a few words about development.

I would like to make it abundantly clear to the Chamber that the Australian Labor Party is in favour of development; it is in favour of the development of the resources of the State, including the North-West Shelf. One of the things with which we disagree is the constant harping of the Premier who uses the same terminology on every occasion: "Tremendous", "New wave of development", and so on.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: He is usually pretty right though when he says those things. Usually they happen and they are tremendous.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Earlier in my address to the Governor's Speech I pointed out that despite the very great optimism of the Premier a number of things had not happened. Of course, Sir Charles, like all of us, is growing a little older.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: He doesn't show it like some of us do.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: No, not in his general manner and bearing. However, I say again he simply makes the same speech over and over again; he changes only the nouns.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I would debate that.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: One can hear the same speech from the Premier every day.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are reminding me of the earlier days when the Hon. Frank Wise used to stand up here and do that.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The Leader of the House must be pretty old if he can remember that!

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Yes, I am getting older.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will proceed with his speech.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Thank you, Mr President. I am glad you are displaying your usual fairness.

I was saying I do not think it is good to have new waves of development in the 1980s. In my opinion we should have steady development, because the economy and the employment situation are severely damaged by peaks and troughs of development. I am not saying this has occurred only since the days of the mineral boom. Indeed, in any other country in the world the economy of which has been based largely on metalliferous mining, we will find the same kind of economic growth of high peaks and low troughs.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You could say the same thing about agriculture. How can you or anyone else control that?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: It occurs more so with mining. Agricultural people are most tenacious and just do not walk away from the job; therefore the labour force in that area remains fairly stable. That is a completely different picture from the one I am discussing. In the case of mining industries thousands of workers are brought in for the construction stage, and once that stage is concluded the jobs are gone.

I would like to hear the Premier continue to talk about mineral development; but I would like also to hear him talk about the development of other sectors of our community, such as the small manufacturing industry and the small business people. No-one would deny that mining is very, very important to Western Australia. After all, it was as a result of the original mining boom that our population increased eight-fold. That was one of the factors which brought Western Australia into the Federation of the Australian States. In those days we had a great influx of people, particularly from Victoria.

Whilst I say that mining is tremendously important to this State, it is also important that we turn our attention to other areas. I was rather surprised to see that, whilst we place such emphasis on mining, it provides employment for only 3.5 per cent of the State's work force. The manufacturing industry provides employment for 13.8 per cent of the work force, whilst the wholesale and retail industry provides employment opportunities for 20.8 per cent of the work force. So even now at its high peak, mining provides employment for only 3.5 per cent of the work force.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: How much of those figures are a result of a snowballing effect from the mineral fields?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I will not give a thumb-nail sketch in economics. I gave one in respect of Carnarvon, where there was a snowballing effect in the other direction.

I believe the Government—and certainly when we are the Government we will do so—should pay attention to the other sections of the Western Australian economy. It is essential to do this, because we are now entering what I believe we may call a normal period of development, and no-one is more anxious than I to see the North-West Shelf project get off the ground; nor is anyone more anxious than I to see the discovery of heavy hydro-carbons in that area. However, the point I make is that some of the figures I quoted earlier about unemployment and loss of job opportunity are the direct result of the terrific influx of construction workers who are no longer needed when the construction phase is completed.

When the Tonkin Government came into office it faced a similar situation in the Kwinana area where a terrific construction programme had just been completed and factories were running at their normal rate. We had an overflow of tradesmen then.

The point I am making is that we believe in a normal scale of development, and it is our opinion

that the Government should be looking at other sectors of our economy. I have demonstrated previously the fragile nature of our economy, particularly in isolated communities.

I turn now to a matter in the news today: nuclear power. I am an opponent of uranium mining—I will not go into all the ramifications of why I am—until all safeguards are met. I want to make our position perfectly clear. The Opposition believes in the mining and exporting of uranium, provided all safeguards are available. We have made that position clear on a number of occasions, and I am making it even clearer today, particularly in the light of the accident in the United States, the danger from which, I am very pleased to say, appears now to have been minimised.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis interjected.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: However, other accidents have occurred; I have material in respect of accidents in Germany which have caused death. I am happy that the situation in America did not get out of hand. In reply to Mr Lewis' interjection, I agree that when the spinning looms were introduced people thought they would do all sorts of things. When electricity was first mooted there were prophets of doom; and when the motorcar was introduced to the roads a man was required to walk in front of the vehicle carrying a red flag. Accidents have occurred in coalmines; accidents have occurred on the roads, and people have been killed in submarines. Every bit of technology has brought with it some kind of hazard to man. Even if we go back to the days of the horse, although statistics were not kept, I presume many people fell from horses and broke their necks or injured themselves in other ways. However, when we are talking about atomic energy we are talking about something completely different. We are talking about man tampering with the atom.

I agree we live in an energy-starved world, but on the other hand no-one has yet come up with the means of making nuclear energy completely safe. Therefore I am horrified when people try to equate the dangers of radiation or plutonium poisoning with the things I have just mentioned.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Why?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: One cannot smell radiation, nor can one see it, nor can one feel it. I recollect going to Hiroshima as a young sailor a little while after the bomb had been dropped and when the place was still hot. We did not really know anything about radiation then. I recall thinking to myself, "This is a terrific thing; we should have had 1 000 of these bombs." Of

course, it was not until later that the horrible genetic effects started to be felt. We saw Japanese fishermen who were affected by radiation without knowing it, and we saw the horrible mutations which resulted.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Are you mixing this up with the mercury problem?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: No, but I will come to that if the Leader of the House wishes to hear it, chapter and verse.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I would like to hear it.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I will tell the honourable member at another time.

I think it is immoral for anyone to say that although this technological development caused those terrible things we will still go ahead with it. Yet the situation in America is even more awesome. In today's paper we read that plans were to be put into effect to evacuate more than 600 000 people, to protect them from something which cannot be seen, smelt, or felt.

In today's paper the Premier (Sir Charles Court) is quoted as saying that the Harrisburg accident is the type of accident that happens with the development of any great resource. Then he went one better. He said the factual information available to him yesterday on the US accident suggested that the Harrisburg situation was by no means as serious as some publicity might suggest.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I would agree with that.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I would not have liked to say that. The Mayor of Harrisburg ordered several things to happen. He said, "We are playing with the atom; get them out." Sir Charles went on further—and here his arrogance comes shining through—to say the State would also have the benefit of experiences in other countries operating nuclear plants. He said Western Australia would look closely at what happened at Harrisburg and take full advantage of any information it got about the technological defects that took place in the plant. I do not think the United States Consul would be very happy with his next statement. He said, "However, the United States is not as up-to-date in some of its nuclear technology as some countries." What other countries?

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Great Britain and West Germany.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Mr Lewis has not qualified that. I can show him documents which indicate that nuclear accidents have occurred in Germany causing death, and which explain why there have been no deaths in the United Kingdom. There have been malfunctions at Windscale.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You are rambling on.

The Hon. D. K. DANC: I think we should take note of what has happened in the United States. If people were sensible, not only in this country but in the rest of the world, and devoted some of the money and energy going into the nuclear industry to find a final solution to making atomic power plants safe and the disposal of waste safe, we would be doing mankind a good service. This could be done by diverting money away from the arms race.

I repeat: I cannot go along with the statements made by the Premier and the interjectors tonight that this is just another form of technology and that we have to expect accidents. The smallest accident that allowed radiation to enter the atmosphere could cause genetic defects and mutations to thousands of children yet to be born. We are not dealing with a coalmining accident, but with indestructible things most of which have an atomic half life of 200 000 years. People should not say that the Americans do not have the best nuclear safety technology and that nuclear accidents could not happen here. I am interpreting that statement in the manner I am entitled to. I have no doubt that unfortunately for those people who have been shovelling money into the uranium mining industry—not in the best interests of the community and in providing jobs but for quick profits—the proliferation of nuclear power plants in the world is not going to be as rapid as they thought, because there will be a rethinking on this matter.

I read that Governor Brown of California has called on the President of the United States to shut down a nuclear power plant there, because it may be subject to the same malfunctions as the plant in Harrisburg and be capable of emitting the same insidious disease from radiation and plutonium poisoning. The Press gave statistics of how many people were expected to be killed if there had been a melt down at the Harrisburg plant. I had not heard of the term "melt down" until I read the Press reports this week.

I shall repeat the Opposition's policy on uranium: we are not opposed to the mining and export of uranium provided all the safeguards have been met. The accident at Harrisburg proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that the policy adopted by the ALP is correct and in the best interests not only of the people of Australia but also of the world. It is no good the Government quoting what some scientists have said or what they are doing in America, because it is a fact that there is no known way at present of making a nuclear power plant completely safe, just as there

is no known way of safely disposing nuclear waste. That surely and certainly vindicates our position.

In recapping, the Governor's Speech is the most sterile document I have ever read. It says nothing and its greatest danger is in what it does not say. I believe the Governor has been used, because my assessment of the Westminster system is that in the Governor's Speech at the opening of Parliament it is incumbent on the Government to outline to the Parliament and to the people what the Government's legislative programme is to be. In my opinion the Governor's Speech does not do that.

I support the motion.

THE HON. T. KNIGHT (South) [7.50p.m.]: I rise to support the motion so capably moved by the Hon. Norman Moore last week at the opening of Parliament. This debate as usual gives members the opportunity to raise matters of concern in their electorates. In this case my first point is not in regard to my electorate but to the State of Western Australia.

As I see it at the moment we have a problem of sewage and garbage disposal. We have problems at the Burswood Island and Shenton Park sewage works. In the past I believe Governments, and today local governments as well, can be accused of having their heads in the sand on this issue. We have the Brockway tip which is going to cause problems in the near future. We have another tip proposed to be established at Midland. We have shires all over Perth carting their rubbish to particular plants.

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! There is quite a deal of audible conversation and I request members to restrict their conversation to the lowest undertones in order that the *Hansard* reporter may carefully take down what the honourable member on his feet has to say.

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: Thank you, Mr Deputy President. I believe that the cost to the shires for the operations through which the garbage trucks have to pass will be another problem in the years to come. No-one has looked at the easiest or most sensible way out of sewage and waste disposal.

Every year in the metropolitan area 23 hectares of land eight metres deep is required to landfill rubbish. When one looks at the cost of that land, in its loss for use in housing or industrial development, one finds that the Government or the shires, whichever may be responsible, is overlooking the fact that the initial cost of setting up a garbage or sewage treatment plant that will capably handle these wastes in the community is negligible.

When filled the land is useless for building, because of decomposition and deterioration of the rubbish. In the paper in the last few months there was a comment by Dr Tom Riggert when commenting on the Burswood Island situation in which he said that people in England excavating old garbage tips had located newspapers 50 years old which were still readable.

This shows that the problem can be with us for years and years and can affect our children and grandchildren. When looking at using this land which can only be used for recreation, parks and reserves, the cost of levelling, filling, watering, grassing, tree planting, general maintenance and staff needs must be considered. The land is useless for any other type of use, and Perth is adequately catered for in parklands. We should be doing something more about our rubbish disposal problem.

When one considers the cost of 23 hectares of land in Perth and breaks that up into building blocks one can see there would be something like 80 blocks at an average price of \$10 000. It can be seen that \$800 000 is being wasted by filling land for garbage disposal. There can be no doubt we have a big problem with the smell coming from the Shenton Park works, and Government and local authorities have been made aware of this fact through letters and the media.

The situation can be resolved. Last October or early November I was absent from the House, because I undertook a trip to Italy at the invitation of a large Italian consortium to look at the possibility of setting up an industrial, commercial and business establishment, perhaps as a joint Italian and Western Australian or a straightout private establishment to cope with this problem of waste disposal. The consortium believes it has a solution which could be used here for the benefit of the State and international relations.

Whilst in Italy I was looked after by two engineers, a Mr Gaetano D'Agostini and Mr Domenico Belisario who have set up a firm in Italy to deal with the southern hemisphere. The firm is based in the city of Rome. It has a franchise for the southern hemisphere from a big firm specialising in sewage and garbage waste disposal plants. That company is De Bartolomeis.

I visited many factories whilst I was there covering the cheese, glue, marble and granite industries and the complete construction and precast factory industries. They believe the last mentioned could be a great asset to Western Australia and could effect savings in building costs.

During the first few days I visited an establishment in Ostia, a suburb in Rome. It was a sewage treatment plant handling the raw sewage from the sewers of Rome. This raw sewage was being recycled through a ponding system. At the end of six processing stages the water was considered suitable for watering stock and industrial use. From the gas which was given off during the process they found a means whereby the gas could be used as fuel for the motors of electric generators which produced the electricity for the entire plant. The solids taken off during the process were dried and pressed into briquettes which were highly combustible and could be used for fuelling incinerators. They could also be broken down into pelletised form and used in agriculture.

The firm has established factories all over the world; in France, Brazil, Japan, Canada, Ghana, Norway, and Sweden. It has something like 68 plants which have been set up over the last 10 years. Whilst I was in Milan I was taken to Ambeverie which is 30 kilometres to the east where the company has a large factory which produces most of its machinery. At this factory was a garbage recycling pilot plant set up to show prospective buyers what a plant could look like if people were prepared to go to the limit, or at any suggested stage of recycling.

After we left there we went on to Switzerland and we called at two recycling plants at Sion and Satom which are situated in the one valley. Those plants were monstrous concrete structures architecturally designed so that they fitted in aesthetically with the surrounding countryside. The local councils pick up the rubbish from approximately 250 000 people, which is brought in by the normal garbage collection methods—such as we have in Perth. The rubbish is dumped into great wells or ducts where it is weighed. The trucks then tip the rubbish into a recycling pipeline. The whole procedure is covered by a television set-up for each recycling stage in a central control room.

It is the only dry separation plant in the world. On the first stage of the conveyor belt were plastics, metals, glass, and paper. These mixed with other organic types of rubbish were separated into different sections as the conveyor belt moved along. At the end of this first process a high humus content compost was produced for agricultural purposes.

I should like to digress at this stage. In this particular valley in the Swiss Alps I noticed as we drove through how heavily the grape vines covered the land. The engineers told me that 10 years before it was a valley with few agricultural

operations, and yet since that time by using this high humus content compost, by covering the grape vines during the severe winter, and as a result of the humus compost getting in behind the vines, it had become one of the largest producers of grapes and wines in Europe. I tasted the wine and saw the grapes. I saw thousands of grape vines in that area.

The next stage in the treatment was that the waste was incinerated. The Hon. Des Dans mentioned the subject of uranium mining. We have looked at uranium power plants. Here the waste was incinerated. This created steam which was then used to run turbines to produce electricity. The balance of the incinerated material was charcoal carbon and potash which is obviously ideal for land filling. Members would be aware that charcoal and potash are two of the best filtering agents available. Water is purified if it filters down through these agents into a catchment.

Over the next 10 years we shall cover hundreds of acres of the metropolitan area with garbage and effluent. We are polluting our underground water supplies and this is a matter which should be examined.

The rotating classifier, using the dry separation method, obviously does not use water as do so many of the other recycling plants in the world. In fact, all of the other recycling plants use fluids. As a result of the use of the dry separation method, we do not have the problem of disposing the waste water or purifying the water contaminated in the recycling process.

If more than one per cent of the rubbish processed during the course of the recycling is aluminium, it is important that this be recycled, because aluminium is obtaining a price of \$340 per tonne on the world market.

The refuse derived fuel RDF or, in other words, the garbage of the garbage can be added to by the briquettes formed during the processing and, therefore, another fuel additive is obtained which can be used to produce energy, power, and in turn electricity.

The final component, charcoal and potash, is ideal for filling and it can be compacted and built on, because it has such a refined base. There are no impurities in it and such land can be used for housing, industry, and commerce in the metropolitan area.

The estimated cost of a straightforward line plant capable of handling the rubbish of approximately 250 000 people is estimated at \$8 million. If we had four such plants in the metropolitan area they would be capable of

handling the garbage disposal requirements of one million people, which is 200 000 in excess of the present population of the metropolitan area.

If we established a full plant it would be capable of recycling metal, plastic, paper, and glass, and of detinning metal so that it can be used immediately. We could incorporate in the system the packaging, cartoning and whatever else are needed, and the products could be wrapped up in bulk and taken from the factory in usable form to paper mills, steel factories, glass works, and aluminium works. The plastics can be recycled immediately also, and reused for plastic articles.

Such a plant would cost approximately \$15 million. The ideal set-up would be to have the plants on a double line system. In this way, we would have two plants in one. We would have one plant north of Perth and one plant south of Perth and instead of costing \$15 million per plant—in normal circumstances a double plant system would cost \$30 million—in this case the price is reduced to \$22 million as a result of setting it up in the manner I have discussed.

For a total cost of \$44 million we would have plants capable of handling the rubbish generated by one million people, which is 200 000 people in excess of the present metropolitan population. In addition to this we would have the revenue from the sale of the plastic, metal, glass, paper, and aluminium. Also the compost and briquettes from the sewage works could be used as additional fuel. Then mixing of the high humus content compost with the briquettes into a granulated form has turned out to be one of the highest concentrations of superphosphate or fertiliser in the world. One of the problems facing the farmers in this State today is the high cost of superphosphate. We must add to this the saving generated by the filling and sale of hundreds of acres of land each year, and we arrive at a figure of \$800 000 per year for an \$8 million plant. That adds up to the principal repayments for a period of 10 years.

If we charged the public residing in the metropolitan area \$1 per head per year for garbage disposal, we would obtain the other \$800 000. As a result of this we would receive \$1.6 million per year on an \$8 million outlay. On my calculations the plant will be paid off in 10 years and the people will not even notice it. We would have stopped the landfill, the pollution, and we would have alleviated all the other problems I have mentioned which are facing the community today, and make a profitable return in the process.

On the 9th March, 1979, in *The West Australian*, we see a statement by Professor Michael Hugo-Brunt about a system he had seen in Hamilton, Ontario. In this issue he states as follows—

It was estimated that by salvaging waste, the fuel obtained could produce enough energy to operate all city lighting in the United States—a saving of the equivalent of 190 million barrels of oil each year, or about \$6 000 million.

These are the sorts of problems we have to look at. The system I have mentioned has the same effect as the one mentioned in the extract I have just read. The professor continues—

The capital required for a facility would be \$14 million with \$4 million spent on site development, fuel, storage and handling equipment.

I believe we can set up a similar plant at a cost of approximately \$6 million or \$7 million by using the dry separation system which I have been talking about. The article continues—

A shredder tears the garbage into pieces before pulverising it in an air classifier (in a three-storey blower), which separates it in a series of zig-zag screens into light, combustible material.

He is referring to a three-storey blower which means a building. I have seen the pilot plant at Ambeverie which is used to develop new ideas and methods. With the climate we enjoy in Western Australia, we could use an outdoor plant which would save the cost of the building. That would be another saving and would reduce the cost of the plant. The professor went on to say—

Throughout the plant, close-circuit TV monitors are used by operators checking from various vantage points. In an emergency they can switch off any part of the plant. Communication is by radio, loudspeakers or telephone.

All these components were found in the plants I saw in Switzerland and Italy when I was visiting those countries.

The Italian engineers carried out some research on Perth and its environs and brought out a booklet when they were here. That booklet is entitled, *Municipal Solid Waste Resource Recovery Project: Some Possible Solutions*. They based the report on details which are as follows—

—population in the area to be served	250 000	inhabitants
—waste generation per person per day	1.5	kg/d/person
—waste generation total per day	375	tons/day
—lower heating value	2 000	Kcal/kg
—composition of the waste:		

ferrous metals	7	%
paper and cellulosic products	33	%
plastics	6	%
vegetables and putrescibles	31	%
fabrics, wood, rubber, leather	6	%
glass	6	%
inert matters	4	%
other unclassified matters	7	%

CASE 1:

Construction of an energy recovery plant, converting total incoming waste into:

A—steam (IV)

B—electric energy (IEE)

CASE 1.A.—incineration/steam production plant

Plant working on 3 shifts per day, 24 hours per day continuously, 7 days per week, 48 weeks per year

Plant utilization factor total waste	0.94	
processed	126 000	tons/year
steam produced	250 000	tons/year
ferrous metal recovered	6 300	tons/year
incineration slags	37 500	tons/year

This would obviously be used for landfill and we would have no problems with it in future generations. To continue—

The plant would consist of 2 process lines, each line 200 t/day capacity; each line entirely independent from the other. Energy recovered would be limited to "STEAM", since such a final product would be totally sold to:

—nearby thermal power plant, as additional steam

—nearby District Heating system steam plant

—nearby private industries steam consumers, such as paper mills etc—

The report mentions that such steam as is required could be sold to the nearby Subiaco or Shenton Park sewage treatment project. The report continues—

Some steam, as much as required, would also be sold to the nearby Subiaco Sewage Treatment Works, for sludges drying process. Dried sludge would be incinerated in this plant, thus recovering its energetic value.

Ferrous metal would be recovered from incineration slags and sold to steel industries.

Incineration slags would be utilized in roads construction or landfilled.

This book is fairly complicated. It is written about Perth, Western Australia. It mentions two cases and then refers to the incineration or electricity energy production plant, which is an integrated plant turning out all of the recycled products which may be resold and reused. The report gives the quantity of material and the estimated price which can be expected for it.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Is that available in the Parliamentary Library?

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: It is not available in the library. It was given to me by the Italian engineers.

The engineers came to Perth and, at my request after speaking to the international chairman of De Bartolomeis in Milan, brought a 20-minute film about the recycling of garbage. I have shown this film to the Perth City Council, the Shire of Stirling, the Minister for Conservation and the Environment, the Department of Industrial Development, the Department of Conservation and Environment, and the Public Health Department. I have shown it also to several members of Parliament. Last Friday week I showed it to representatives of the metropolitan shires in Perth. Approximately 46 people representing different shires were present.

These people were very interested and asked for figures on what needed to be done. The cost of a complete, overall study or survey would be approximately \$100 000. Someone has to pull his head out of the sand and look at what we shall have to face up to in the next few years. We have the Burswood Island situation and the Shenton Park sewage treatment plant. If we carried out this survey and then went ahead with it, it would be two years before the plant was commenced. If we wait two more years it would take approximately five years before it was operational. Something must be done now.

The councillors at the meeting asked me the way the matter could be handled. Some years ago the State Government took over the power plants in the country towns. It took over the water supplies in country towns, and power is handled now by the SEC. Water is handled by the Public Works Department or the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Board.

Should the shires or local governments be responsible for something which, in turn, will provide the fuel or the steam to drive the turbines to create electricity which the State will then sell? These plants will recycle the sewage and produce water suitable for stock and industrial purposes. I was assured by an engineer that after one more recycling process the water would be suitable for human consumption, but they felt that the world was not ready for such a step yet.

Would the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Board be happy to buy back this water from local government? Should the Government move into this area? On the other hand should local government be responsible for it, or should a combined group of

the two bodies be set up to examine the best way of handling the matter? I am not sure which way it should be handled. However, something must be done. Someone must come up with a solution.

I have been shown films on American plants and I have seen recycling plants in Italy and Britain which use a fluid or water system. A system of smashing or pulping is used to get this through the recycling plant. This increases the maintenance cost with the replacement of hammers and machinery necessitated by the constant hammering. The system I am suggesting is a dry separation process which means maintenance is kept to a minimum, we receive money from the recycled products, and from the sale of filled land.

People have to pay for garbage disposal, as they do now. However, money will be returned from the steam and the water, and from the fertiliser which will be produced. How is it possible to place a cost on clean air, clean water, and clean ground? Costs are going up and up each year and we have to do something. I think now is the time for us to move.

At the meeting to which I have referred the engineer from the Nedlands City Council said that a couple of years ago the council looked at the situation of the Brockway tip and it was worked out that it had a life of approximately 44 years. It has now been determined, with the City of Perth and other associated shires using the site, that it has a life of only 19 years. If excavation is stopped at the depth suggested, the life of the tip will be lessened to that degree, and if other councils use the tip, shorter still.

I spoke to the Senior Health Surveyor of the Bayswater and Bassendean Shires and he told me that last year those shires were looking at their disposal area having a life of four to six years. When I rang the surveyor today he said he had presented a report to the shires showing that the life of the dump was limited to 16 to 20 weeks. Those shires have to look somewhere else. They discovered that the 2800 cubic metres of rubbish disposed each week was not all coming from the Bayswater and Bassendean Shires. The rubbish dumped at the Brockway site is not all coming from the Nedlands City Council and the City of Perth. Other shires are running out of space and moving into these places. Before very long this State and the City of Perth will have a considerable problem on their hands.

Someone has to bring this matter to the notice of everyone concerned; someone has to get off his butt and get something moving. I believe I should bring this matter to the attention of members to

make them aware of the situation which exists. It will get worse day by day and we have to do something now.

I mention that my concern is for Western Australia. I realise I am speaking on a topic outside my province along the south coast, but as members of Parliament I believe we all represent the State of Western Australia, and what concerns the City of Perth concerns me also.

It will not be long before this problem faces Albany, Esperance, Bunbury, and Kalgoorlie. The engineers have told me that recycling plants can be produced to handle the rubbish of a community of as low as 30 000 people. Perhaps we will have to look at that type of plant for smaller populations.

The Esperance Shire and the Albany Town Council have said they want to see the film. I daresay that members here would also like to see it. I am sure we have to do something about setting up an authority, a board, or a committee to work in conjunction with the shires and the Government. It would not be necessary to outlay a great deal of money, because much of the cost would be recovered.

The system I have mentioned is the best in the world, and I say that unequivocally. The Japanese are using it, and in Canada one was built just across the border from the USA. That does not say much for the Canadians' respect of the Americans, but the Americans built one just across the border from Canada. The Canadians chose the Italian system.

I believe we have an answer to the problem. I have information available which I am prepared to pass on to the City of Perth. I understand the City of Perth has appointed Maunsell & Partners as its consultants.

The engineers have offered to do the job for anyone who obviously wants to pay for it. The approximate cost is \$100 000. The report would be available by the 30th June, this year, the date which the Government has laid down as an ultimatum for the City of Perth to come up with an answer to its problem. That information has been published in the Press and I am quoting something that has already been done.

The City of Perth will not have an answer by the 30th June, because by the time the consultants travel in conjunction with their inquiries the City of Perth could have to fall back on De Bartolomeis, the company which was here last month. How it will work out financially from that point is up to the powers that be.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Earthworms are cheaper.

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: If one can get them to eat plastics and metal! I believe we have to do something, and I am drawing the problem to the attention of this Parliament. I hope my Government will see its way clear to move in an effort to do something about it.

I will now move off that problem, having had my little blast. The next matter I want to mention is the costs associated with land subdivision. It appears to me that the cost of subdividing land is going up and up. I received a complaint from a subdivider in Albany who approached me because of a recent move. I have been in touch with Mr Lewis, of the Public Works Department, with regard to this matter. The particular subdivision has reached the stage where it is costing \$1 105 per block of land for reticulation of water. The average cost of supplying water to the average subdivision in Albany has been between \$250 and \$350. For that reason I requested a break-up of the costs involved.

In a letter addressed to me it was pointed out—

The high cost can be attributed to the fact that to adequately service the proposed subdivision, it is necessary to construct a service tank and that a proportionate cost of this has to be borne by the area subdivided.

Associated with the tank it is necessary to develop mains bringing water in from the source and a pipe distributing water from the tank.

These factors also contributed to the high subdivisional cost.

A break-up of the cost per lot is as follows—

	\$
Proportionate cost of the tank	375
Proportionate cost of the mild steel main necessary to bring water to the tank	80
Proportionate cost of main from tank to subdivision	435
Reticulation and contingencies	215
	<hr/>
	\$1 105

The subdividers asked me whether, if they moved out east or west of Albany, behind Mt. Clarence or Mt. Melville—and the reservoirs were considered to be not large enough to handle the needs of the subdivision, and the walls of the tanks had to be extended—the department would require the subdividers to pay for capital works. Of course, that extra cost has to be loaded back onto the young people who wish to buy the blocks.

I believe that somewhere along the line we have to consider the young people.

A member in this House said to me tonight that he believed building costs could increase by some 25 per cent by the end of the year. At that rate, we will push young people out of their homes. The greatest asset of living in this country is being able to own one's home. We have to ensure that that ability is maintained for our young people. They have a right to own their own homes but they are slowly being pushed aside.

At the moment the high cost of subdivision and the development of land is placed on the young people. As against the conditions of 10 or 15 years ago, people now have to pay for roads, footpaths, in-fall and out-fall drainage, power, sewerage, and water. It is about time we had a close look at the problem to see how we can help our young people.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Did you say you demanded those figures from Mr Lewis?

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: I requested them.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I have found him to be very co-operative.

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: I asked for the figures.

I now refer to the search and rescue organisation. I have mentioned this matter previously. We have a very efficient and hard working search and rescue organisation in Albany which is involved in the saving of lives. At the moment, the high cost of overheads required to maintain the service is getting beyond the resources of the organisation. I would like the Government to look closely at the cost of the rescue squad. I believe it would cost a great deal more if it were operated at the Government level.

To emphasise the point, perhaps we should contribute more to this service which saves many lives along our coast. In fact, on a recent Saturday night the president of the association rang me and said it had four calls on one Saturday night, and on each occasion the organisation brought in someone in a vessel which had broken down. That involved honorary members going out to sea, and using their own boats and vehicles in order to save people. I believe they are doing a remarkable job. I sincerely ask the Government to look closely at what this organisation does to see whether something can be done by way of a greater contribution to the search and rescue squads each year.

The next point which I will deal with briefly has been brought to my notice by several fishermen during the last couple of months. I have tried to get more background material, but I

daresay the Minister concerned will look into the matter. The point I raise is the use of monofilament nets, particularly shark nets. This type of net does not deteriorate; it does not rot away the same as does other nets. When this type of net breaks away it wraps itself around a reef.

Fishermen who are associated with skin divers have told me that thousands of fish are trapped on the reefs by these nets, which will stay there for years and years. The nets have been banned in America, New South Wales, Victoria, New Zealand, and Tasmania. I daresay the Leader of the House is aware of what I am talking about, and has probably had the problem presented to him already. I think we should examine it, because we are losing thousands of immature and mature fish when the nets break away and drape themselves over the reefs. The nets will not rot away until kingdom come. We have to safeguard our fishing industry.

I now refer to the salinity of our catchment areas, and the controversial Bill we passed last year which raised considerable storm in my area. I have been very outspoken on the Bill, and the way it was introduced. However, I am pleased to say I have had numerous discussions with the Minister concerned, and a new set of guidelines has been drawn up. Officers of the department are moving around the area quickly, and the services of those officers have been made available to the farmers. I think the new guidelines will greatly assist the farmers. I consider that in the next few months the matter will be brought to a head to the benefit of the farmers and we will overcome what was thought to be obnoxious at the time. The new conditions were brought in overnight, and the ban scared the living daylights out of the farmers.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Why did you support it?

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: To be quite honest—and I am embarrassed in admitting it—I did not understand the measure. I was not aware of its implications. It was like so many other Bills which, at the second reading stage, appeared to be harmless. I voted for the Bill, because I believed it was to protect the land from salt encroachment. I believed the land would have been returned to use. The concept in principle is supported by all, but not the manner in which it was introduced.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: But you voted for it.

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: So did the honourable member. I think that members of the Opposition are probably better placed to oppose the Government than I am to oppose my Minister. Members opposite are aware of the contents of

legislation. I have stated that I voted for it, and therefore I take the consequences, although I admit I did not research it as I possibly should have.

Discussions and meetings are taking place throughout the area, and the problems are being overcome. I believe the situation is that the problem is not as bad now as it quite obviously appeared at the time. The farmers could see that a ban on clearing for a period of 12 months would mean that they were 500 acres down in development and crop, or 50 baby beef down in production. Having regard for increasing prices, that is one year's income which a farmer would not receive, due to the 12 months' delay in his proposed development programme.

The farmers are permitted to clear the land under the guidance of the Public Works Department, and the boards that have been set up consisting of farmers. I have been approached because of delays that have occurred, and whenever I have contacted the Minister or the department I have been completely satisfied with the answers I have received, and the people I represented have been satisfied with the outcome to date.

I support the motion.

THE HON. W. R. WITHERS (North) [8.30 p.m.]: I wish to advise the House of a very serious shortcoming in one area of the Federal Government's administration in the hope that public pressure from Western Australia will force a change of thinking in Canberra in regard to the existing injustice. I wish to advise members also of the lack of tropical research, and this matter was commented on by His Royal Highness, Prince Charles, during his recent visit to Australia.

Firstly, I wish to refer to secondary education for children in isolated areas, and the imposition of personal income tax on the moneys that have to be earned by the parents solely for education purposes. For the sake of brevity, I will read to members a letter I wrote to our Federal Treasurer. I am sure that even those people who have studied the problems of education for children in isolated areas and the cost of taxation on education expenses will be horrified to hear how much it costs today to educate a child at boarding school, and how much taxation must be paid on that money.

My letter to the Federal Treasurer reads as follows—

Dear Minister,

Thank you for the letter and advice dated 23 March 1979.

It is with some measure of despair that I must request support for taxation deductions which may allow for these expenditures.

I have personally educated three children at boarding school; a system which I was forced to adopt when living in an isolated area. Most of that expenditure took place under the old system when expenditure on education was allowed as a taxation deduction.

Under the socialist taxation provisions relating to education expenditure which were implemented by the Whitlam Government and continued by the Frazer Government, I would have to earn \$61,880 at today's values solely for the payment of income tax on monies earned for education expenditure and education expenses with 1979 values at a boarding school. This can be shown as under;

BOARDING SCHOOL COSTS & RELATED TAXATION AT 1979 VALUES				
TOTAL COST				
No. of Children	x	No. of Years at School	x	Annual fees per annum \$3,500
3	x	5	x	
				= \$52,500
GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE				
No. of Children	x	No. of Years at School	x	Assistance per annum
3	x	5	x	\$750
				= \$11,250
Residual cost to parents after tax				= \$41,250
Amount required to be earned solely for education before tax at a tax rate of 33-1/3%				
Say				= \$61,880

As I pointed out in my letter, a person who has to educate three children for five years at boarding school will have to earn \$61 880 solely for education and taxation purposes—and I am not including the cost of food, running a car, clothing, or anything else in that line. I pointed out in my letter that taxation paid on the personal income which is earned solely for education is \$20 630; in other words, the Government takes a rip-off of \$20 630, and yet it hands back only \$11 250 as assistance to education. My letter continues—

It can be seen that the existing system is a financial rape of independent parents in isolated areas who send their children to boarding schools.

In the sample situation they are given \$11,250 in direct assistance whilst paying \$20,630 in taxes on income earned solely for the education of their children.

I can no longer accept this situation which has continued despite my representations. I will therefore release the information to State Parliament in the hope that public opinion may inject some sanity and fairness into the existing system which was perpetrated by a socialist government.

I trust you will do everything in your power to correct this injustice.

I have forwarded a similar letter to the Prime Minister and the Minister for Education.

Sincerely,

(Signed)

Bill Withers

I hope that members will support me in my endeavours to rectify this injustice.

Secondly, I would like to refer to a statement made by His Royal Highness, Prince Charles, in his address to the Academy of Science after his recent visit to the north of Australia. Although I do not have his exact words, he expressed surprise at the lack of tropical agriculture research in the north of Australia. I was surprised 15 years ago at the lack of this type of research, and that surprise has changed through the years to shock, and now to despair.

In order for this House to understand the incredible situation which has been allowed to develop in our attitude to tropical agriculture and tropical research, I will read some excerpts from personal papers and correspondence which will enable members to gain some insight into the lack of success of the Ord River irrigation scheme.

In 1977 I visited some tropical horticultural research establishments in north Queensland. My visit was organised by the Queensland Minister for Primary Industry.

In December, 1977, I prepared a paper recommending a tropical horticultural training and research institute for the north of this State. The State Minister for Agriculture advised me that he passed this proposal on to Sir Norman Young, who was then the Chairman of the Ord Review Committee. The report is entitled, "Tropical Horticultural Research and Training Institute Proposal", and under the subheading of "The Need", I had this to say—

- (1) Western Australia has approximately 36% of its surface land mass in the tropics.
- (2) There is no full-time horticultural research done in the tropics by qualified State departmental officers who are trained in tropical horticulture.
- (3) The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation has a horticultural research station in Merbein, Victoria but the station is over 1,500 kilometres south of the Tropic of Capricorn.

- (4) The sub-tropical areas of Western Australia have water limitations for further development.
- (5) The tropics of Western Australia have massive population expansion rates during mineral development periods but "food bowl" horticulture is not being established with back up services to feed the present and future populations.
- (6) Metropolitan "food bowls" are being decreased as the land is taken up for urban housing. This situation coupled with a higher demand for "non-productive domestic water" will place the metropolitan area of Perth in a precarious position with a dearth of fresh water before the end of the century.
- (7) The Ord River District has unlimited supplies of fresh water, various soil types of arable land and a reliable climatology but the few growers who have commenced commercial horticulture projects have insufficient back up services from experimentalists, plant pathologists, plant breeders and agronomists trained in tropical horticulture. The same applies to other growers throughout the Pilbara and Kimberley.
- (8) There is a tropical nursery operated by the Department of Regional Administration and North West at Broome. This nursery does obtain limited root stock from Queensland and Merbein, Victoria via the Department of Agriculture in order to distribute plants under the North West Tree Scheme but it does not have the facilities nor staff to fill the need of commercial ventures even though the officers concerned do endeavour to assist wherever possible.

Consideration of these factors caused the writer to approach the Western Australian Minister for Agriculture (The Hon. R. Old, MLA) with a proposal to create an institute in the tropics of W.A. which could conduct experiments for developing tropical produce whilst providing professional officers and field staff with specific, post-graduate training in tropical horticulture.

When an institute of this type is operative, it will provide career opportunities in the tropics for certificated personnel.

The current policy of sending W.A. officers to the tropics on two year postings without the benefit of tropical training is not

efficiently beneficial to the district nor is it fair to the departmental officers.

Then further on, under the subheading of "Recommendation", I had this to say on page 6—

- (1) A 15 to 20 hectare Horticultural Research Station should be established in the Dry Tropics of Western Australia. The station should have various said types available for growing and unlimited water supplies for irrigation. The station should be close to existing agricultural offices. The Ord River Irrigation Scheme would be best suited for such a station.
- (2) Research staff should be recruited from persons trained in tropical horticulture from within W.A., N.T., Queensland and overseas institutes.
- (3) Small numbers of post-graduate students and non-graduate field officers who seek careers in tropical horticulture will receive field and laboratory training at the Tropical Horticultural Research and Development Unit.
- (4) The station should be financed by State and Federal funds with some Federal assistance towards the training establishment.
- (5) When ten or more commercial growers commence the marketing of their produce, a levy could be raised to finance machinery purchases for the institute in order to attract matching Federal funds.
- (6) When levies are raised, the growers will then be invited to form a Committee of Direction similar to that which operates in Queensland.
- (7) CSIRO should be invited to establish their Dry Tropics Research Station in the Dry Tropics as an adjunct to, but with separate functions to, the proposed State institute.
- (8) Recommend to the Federal Government that the Tropical Research Station at Merbein be closed down and split into two divisions for re-establishment in the Wet Tropics (Queensland) and the Dry Tropics (Western Australia).
- (9) The State Government should recognise Carnarvon as a Sub-Tropical Horticulture Centre.
- (10) Future land releases in the State should be made with sufficient security of tenure to allow development borrowings.

During my investigation I came across some interesting goings-on in the Northern Territory,

and under the subheading of "The Northern Territory Interest", at page 8 I said—

Some interested parties in the Northern Territory are negotiating with the Darwin Community College for the establishment of 3 and 4 year courses in Tropical Horticulture. It is understood that the initial enrolment may be 48 students in the class.

The Darwin College course would provide Northern Australia with the technical and technical assistance staff trained in Tropical Horticulture.

If Western Australia could establish the post-graduate certificate course in the Dry Tropics plus a certificated course for field workers, as suggested in this proposal, then Northern Australia would be equipped for the establishment of Tropical Food bowls plus horticultural establishments for the export of Exotic Tropical Flowers. There is a very lucrative export market in this field but it is not being fully exploited.

In 1978, during a visit to the Perth Metropolitan Markets, I was shattered to find that Western Australia in that year imported over \$1.5 million worth of tropical produce from north Queensland. This year, it is expected we will import \$2 million worth of tropical produce from north Queensland. This market will allow the Ord River scheme to obtain at least a short-term return of \$2 million.

This is briefly explained in a report I wrote after my investigation, after I had negotiated some freight rates with Western Australian companies, and after I found out what was being brought into the State. The report—I gave it a name so that I could make contact with various people—is called "Operation Ord Produce" and reads as follows—

As a result of the investigation into produce requirements of the Perth Metropolitan Markets from tropical areas, it was found that the 1977-78 financial year brought \$1 569 000 of tropical produce into the Perth market from North Queensland. The produce tonnages and values are listed as under;

	\$
Bananas: 1 481 tonnes (actual figures)	Value 1 300 000
Pineapples: 260-300 tonnes (estimate)	Value 117 000
Watermelons: 400-500 tonnes (actual)	Value 152 000

Yes, the early season watermelons come from north Queensland. My report continues—

Total Value \$1 569 000

In addition to the above fruits other imports from tropical areas were as under;

Walnuts 200 tonnes (from California, USA)

Passionfruit 20-25 tonnes (from Northern NSW)

Coconuts 40 tonnes (from Malaysia)

Mangoes quantity unknown (from the Ord, Broome, Carnarvon, Queensland, India, Philippines and Mexico)

Rockmelons (from Western Australia) and

Ginger (from Queensland).

Sweet Potatoes are also a crop with an expanding potential.

The estimated requirements for the 1978/79 financial year are as under;

This is not the total requirement of the market, but simply the requirement away from Carnarvon. In fact, Carnarvon is not even mentioned here. This is the requirement in the Perth Metropolitan Markets from tropical north Queensland and other tropical areas of the world. The report continues—

Bananas	2 000 tonnes
Pineapples	300 tonnes
Watermelons	500 tonnes
Green Ginger	50 tonnes
Sweet Potatoes	20 tonnes
Onions	200 tonnes
Garlic	20 tonnes

It should be noted that some of these crops from tropical areas need to be supplied as early season produce in Perth, otherwise locally grown crops such as watermelons and rockmelons will make the crops from distant areas uneconomical.

Freight rate estimates were obtained from road haulage companies, MMA and the State Shipping Service.

MMA offered a very generous discount on a trial basis for any crops that needed to be air freighted.

The Gascoyne Trading Company offered the best haulage rate as backloading from the Ord River for delivery into the Perth Markets. The backloading freight rate for refrigerated or general cargo was quoted as \$45 per tonne.

I repeat, \$45 per tonne. The report continues—

For the first time in the history of the Ord River Scheme, growers are in a situation

where their distance from the market has actually allowed an incredible low backloading freight rate. The freight rate is comparable to that which the Carnarvon producers pay for delivery to Perth Markets.

Growers were invited to attend a meeting on the 19th September by the Ord Project Manager. At that meeting the growers were urged to consider supplying some of the requirements of the Perth Markets.

It should be noted that the North Queensland growers are paying a freight rate of 16 cents per kilo whereas the freight rate offered to the Ord Growers is 4.5 cents per kilo. This gives the Ord Growers an 11.5 cents per kilo freight rate advantage over and above their North Queensland counterparts who are supplying the Perth Metropolitan Markets.

W. R. Withers,
Member for North Province.
20th September, 1978

This information also was passed on to the Ord Review Committee. After speaking to members of that committee, I realised they were going to take evidence mainly from Government officers who would be considered experts in their field. So, I thought it might not be a bad idea if I wrote up some of my observations which had been gathered in the 15 years I had lived in the Ord River irrigation scheme area. I say "in" because I had lived all that time right in the heart of it, at Kununurra.

I wrote a causal summation of the Ord's history and had it checked for accuracy by some settlers. I might say at this point that if we do not correct some of the mistakes we have made at the Ord River we are going to have mendicant farmers for a long time. The causal summation is under two headings, "Cause" and "Effect" and reads as follows—

CAUSE	EFFECT
(i) Government invitation for farmers to participate in development of the Ord River Scheme with Conditional purchase land, Conditional to;	(i) (a) This had taken the early farming incentive from farmers, whilst the advising officers were never trained in tropical irrigated agriculture. Agricultural failures have been evident.
(a) Farming and operative directives by government departments.	(b) This had several effects which were;
(b) Living in the townsite of Kununurra within rental housing provided by government.	(i) Farmers and their families did not have the feeling of residential permanence which is experienced in privately owned homes on their own property.

(ii) Sustenance farming became non-existent. Most farmers residing on their farms can lower their cost of living by producing farm food but urban living did not encourage this with the Ord farmer.

(iii) High commuter costs in farm vehicles when added to (ii) increased the cost of living higher than costs experienced by normal farming operations elsewhere.

CAUSE

EFFECT

(2) *Insufficient, effective government research into crops, processing and marketing prior to the releasing of the commercial farms.

(2) Unsuitable crops were grown for the available knowledge. Millions of dollars were lost in processing and marketing due to inexperience. Local people and agents were still learning the basics in these fields when cotton farming was terminated. This aggravated the accumulation of growers' debts.

(3) High cost, capital intensive crop recommendations which proved to be unsuitable.

(3) Farmers were left with high cost equipment which had to be sold out of the state at a tremendous loss. This further aggravated their losses.

(4) Insufficient, effective entomology research was made prior to releasing commercial farms.

(4) Although K.R.S. was aware of *Prodenia litura* (Spodoptera), no effective control was known. Farm releases were still made. Later applications of Parathion not only killed Spodoptera but it also killed predators which allowed *Heliothis* to become predominant. This was partly responsible for the economic collapse of safflower and cotton crops.

(5) Information promised (in brochures) from the Pilot farm (NDL) and the Research Station (KRS) was of little practical value.

(5) The promised information advertised in the government brochures misled farmers into believing that directive knowledge existed. Farmers were forced into trial and error situations which they could not afford (also refer to (2).)

(6) *Government enthusiasm and financial assistance drew appreciation from farmers plus the deep belief that the scheme would succeed.

(6) This influenced many farmers to remain quiet about the malaises of the scheme. This was evidenced by the following:

(a) The Growers' Organisation and their agents only dealt with the Cabinet Ministers. They never lobbied the opposition or back bench MPs regardless of the political party in government.

(b) They were insufficiently vocal about optimistic but erroneous budgets prepared by departmental officers.

(c) No Federal lobbying was instituted, consequently the CSIRO Cotton Botanist was transferred to work on the eastern cottonfields.

(7) *Government enthusiasm and the hope of the farmers for a "miracle crop" such as sugar.

(7) This has caused farmers to remain on the land and/or in the area even though they are not in an economic position to remain. Their debts are accumulating with unpaid rates, water rates, land development repayments, land & survey fees plus interest on debts plus bank overdrafts. If they sell their farming interests they can not recover sufficient monies to repay existing debts plus enough capital to start life anew. Many would have insufficient money to repay debts without entering bankruptcy. They are living in hope that "someone" will introduce a miracle crop or that sugar cane development may increase land prices to a point which will allow them to recover. This overall situation has developed, in some farmers, the syndrome, "Waiting for Godot".

I think we are all familiar with "waiting for Godot".

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The cargo cult?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Not quite. It is more like waiting for some great person to appear and solve all the problems.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Do you mean that once land prices increased they would be able to sell out?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: The hope was that if a miracle crop appeared, someone with expertise in that crop would come in and buy land because of its potential for growing that crop.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Is there any potential for selling sugar? I understand Queensland restricts the acreage.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: But they are spending millions of dollars in developing the cane land.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: It has been stated the Queensland Government is spending a lot of money on sugar. I believe this is so. I believe it is also true Queensland has a lot of sugar it cannot sell.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That is the way I would read the world sugar market. I just do not understand it.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: This is the way I see it: The whole history of sugar, when laid out on a graph, shows a series of peaks and troughs. In my view, if a person wants to go into the sugar business, he should wait until there is a surplus of sugar and prices are down. Unfortunately, however, when one must obtain political and bureaucratic decisions in an industry which is so huge—one private enterprise company alone could not take it on—one finds the decisions are so slow in being made that everything gets out of kilter. I doubt very much whether we will start

growing sugarcane while it requires a political or bureaucratic decision.

I continue reading from my causal summation—

CAUSE	EFFECT
(8) The accumulation of debts due to the aforementioned causes.	(8) This has placed some farmers in a position whereby they can not initiate a crop even when the crop is estimated to be economic. Their existing debts prevent crop financing from institutions or frightens potential financial partners.
(9) *Non-use of land because of the aforementioned.	(9) A build up of precocious noxious weeds such as <i>Calotropis procera</i> and <i>Mesquite</i> is rendering some land unusable. Eradication is costly.
(10) Engineering errors in irrigation.	(10) This was experienced earlier in the scheme. One farmer left the area after a meeting of creditors due to unsuitable land. Another endeavoured to "fight back" but in his endeavour, his debts to government have reached a point where his economic survival seems impossible (also refer to (8)). Other farmers experienced a loss of yields due to flooding caused by inadequate drainage within the irrigation system. This added to the loss of farm income and an increase in subsequent debts.

To continue—

- (11) Union instability on the Wyndham wharf. (11) This increased overheads on cotton seed sales and reduced farmers' returns. International traders kept increasing their charges for this reason.

NOTE: The Ord irrigation farmers have generally been most appreciative of the financial assistance which they have received from the State government at various times but they are now in a position where a different approach to the "band-aid" assistance is required.

I therefore make the following recommendations

- (1) Farmers should be encouraged and assisted to build homes on their land (also refer to (7)) in order to establish a normal farming situation.
- (2) The latter stage planning to allow farmers to research crops through government assistance should be further encouraged and broadened as a National project with Federal funding. Processing and marketing expertise should be obtained from overseas if necessary to train local people.

My numbers are not in chronological order for the recommendation. They are taken from the causal summation and the chronological order there. To continue—

- (4) Entomology should be studied and applied at two levels i.e.,
 - (a) by the State Department of Agriculture for insect control on existing crops
 - and (b) by the CSIRO for control methods within the total ecology system of the area.
- (6) The continued operation of the Ord Project Manager's Committee should be a watchdog for maladies in planning. This committee should be checked periodically to ensure that farmer and local commerce representation is not overshadowed by government officers.
- (7) The State Government should establish a purchase price for irrigated land until such time as farm viability can establish a demand which would automatically establish a market price per acre. This would allow impoverished farmers to sell to the government and leave the area if they so wish.

For those farmers who wish to remain in the area and to attempt farming under new conditions, I consider they should have all government debts such as water rates, land development payments and lands and survey fees waived conditional to participating in active farming with a fixed percentage of their holding. (Equitable adjustments with cash to some farmers could be used as crop finance).

- (9) Any land purchased by government should be cleared and kept clear of noxious weeds in preparation for future farming.

It should be emphasised that this summation is not a total overview of the Ord Irrigation Scheme. It does not cover the Sociological aspects or funding problems in high cost high risk areas.

I did a separate report on those. It goes on—

Commercial enterprises and non-irrigated farm ventures in the area also have special problems but these have not been covered.

W. R. Withers,
MEMBER FOR NORTH PROVINCE.
5th May, 1978

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: In paragraph 7 you are talking about the Government repurchasing the land. Are you suggesting the Government should set up a land bank, and if such a bank is set up to take over the land which is of no use to whom is such land disposed?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: It is similar to a land bank, but I am not suggesting the land is of no use.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Why take it to the stage where they get rid of the land to the Government?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I thought I made the situation clear in the report; but I will summarise it. This has been the whole theme of my speech tonight and the situation is this: no people have been trained in tropical irrigated agriculture. We do not have anyone able to go up to the Ord River to direct the farmers, assist them, and give them back-up services.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Do we need a new breed of farmers?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: We almost need a new breed of farmers.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: That answers the question.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: We almost need a new breed, but not quite. Members must remember that the farmers in the area now are good men and, to put it crudely—the only way to describe it is in the Australian colloquial fashion—these farmers have had their guts kicked in. They have spent 16 years on the land thinking initially they would receive advice from Government experts when, in fact, we did not have one such expert. Not one person had been trained in tropical irrigated agriculture.

Consequently when the farmers went into that area under the direction of the Government, which was part of the conditions of purchase of

the land, they expected that people trained in tropical irrigated agriculture would advise them. However, we did not have anyone trained in tropical irrigated agriculture to advise them.

The people who were there were sincere men from the Department of Agriculture of Western Australia. However, they were totally untrained in tropical irrigated agriculture. As a result, they became post-graduate students to the very posts they were sent to fill. What happened? The farmers became the guinea pigs; and whose money was being used in the laboratory? It was the farmers' money. I am referring to the laboratory in the field. Those farmers have battled and struggled. Some people have criticised them for obtaining Government assistance. Members should see the state in which some of them find themselves. However, they have tried.

Had we carried out the proper research at the Kimberley Research Station we might have succeeded on the Ord River. The Kimberley Research Station has been of no use. I would say it has been almost a complete write-off. Some of the situations which have arisen might not have arisen.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: You are saying that a new breed of farmers would bring in fresh enthusiasm.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Let me explain further. The member is putting words into my mouth.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: If he puts words into your mouth, spit them out again.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: There is no sense in having a great number of new farmers if we do not have people trained in tropical irrigated agriculture.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Where do these experts come from?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: They come from the various institutes and farms throughout the world.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: The Philippines.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: They do not necessarily come from the Philippines. There are many Caucasian people who are trained in tropical irrigated agriculture. There are all sorts of nationalities trained in this type of farming. Australians have become very insular and they feel because their forefathers invented the stump-jump plough they are good farmers.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: And none of this has been undertaken by the Kimberley Research Station as yet—the type of agriculture you are talking about?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: The people in the Kimberley Research Station are not trained in tropical agriculture.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: And never have been.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: One or two people trained in tropical irrigated agriculture have visited the research station. You, sir, have heard the causal summation I gave to the Ord Review Committee. I hope members have read the Ord Review Report. It is a good report. Members may also read about the research confusion in that report between pages 166 and 184.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I also have read Dr Davidson's report.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I can understand a man such as Dr Davidson writing a report like that. He would starve if he was put out in the field. He is an academic who does not look far into the future. We would not be in Perth if our forefathers had thought like Dr Davidson.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Is he the person who wrote the book *Australia Wet or Dry*?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I do not know the answer to the question asked by the honourable member. The Ord Review Committee made the point that no mal-administration of the Ord River scheme had occurred; but it said there was a lack of understanding of the Ord agronomy.

I was very pleased also to note that the committee recommended an input of public funds to the Ord River scheme in order to assist it to remain operational. The committee recommended also that the Ord project manager should continue the work. I still do not believe that the report of the Ord Review Committee clarifies the need for tropical trained staff and that is what my speech is all about. We need tropical trained staff so that they can conduct not only a research institute, but also a training institute to train our people.

I reported to this House when I returned from overseas that, when in conversation with the Vice Chancellor of the Tropical Agriculture University in Lyalpur, he said, "Where do you people train your men in tropical agriculture?" I said, "I do not think we do." He said, "That is funny. We have people from all over the world, but we have no Australians." I said, "I will go back and ask if our universities have any objection to your university." I did that. I still do not know if they have any objection.

The immediate need for trained personnel and back-up services may be shown in a letter which I wrote to the Ord project manager, Mr Lyons.

During this debate this evening members have heard me present a proposal, as I did in 1977, for the training institute about which I am talking. Members have heard my report on the market findings of tropical produce required in the Perth markets and they have heard my causal summation of the Ord. Let us see what is happening. Where are we getting? Where am I getting? I do not think I am getting anywhere at the moment, but I should be grateful if members would bear with me.

I will read the letter I wrote to Mr Lyons, who is the Ord project manager and possibly members will understand what I am getting at. It reads as follows—

I was interested to hear the accurate remarks made by His Royal Highness, Prince Charles, in his address to the Academy of Science. He referred to the lack of agricultural research in the North of Australia.

My proposal for a Tropical Horticultural Research and Training Institute made to the West Australian and Federal Ministers for Agriculture in December 1977 was forwarded by the Ministers for consideration by Sir Norman Young's Ord Review Committee. That committee was also given the details of "Operation Ord Produce" (a resume is enclosed).

There are still some farmers who have not grasped the importance of the horticultural market in this State and they need to be reminded that they have a tremendous freight advantage over their Queensland counterparts.

It is the next paragraph which is the nitty-gritty of the whole debate. It reads—

However, they do have a tremendous disadvantage whereby they lack the expertise and advisers in tropical horticulture which, with the relevant extension services, are found in Queensland and other tropical countries of the world.

We just do not have them. The letter continues—

Although we have a great State and a progressive Government, I must admit that our attitude to tropical horticultural research is not even in the stage of infancy.

Some positive research has been done at Carnarvon, however, that station is geographically located in the sub-tropics. The CSIRO tropical research station is also located in Victoria with a very small extension unit in Darwin.

I would be most pleased if you could give your support to my Tropical Horticultural Research and Training Institute proposal. If such an institute is brought into being, it will allow growers to take advantage of the existing local markets with confidence and it will prevent the repetition of the mistakes we initially made on the Ord River Irrigation Scheme when farmers were put under direction of personnel who had not been trained in tropical irrigated agriculture.

Kind personal regards—

Sincerely,

W. R. WITHERS

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What is the reply to that.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I do not know what the reply will be. I only sent it on the 30th March.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Were there replies to the other two letters you read?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: They were not letters. One of the items I read was a report given to the Ord Review Committee by the Minister to which I did not receive an answer; another was the causal summation which went to the Ord Review Committee also and I did not receive an answer to that; and the other item, "Operation Ord Produce", went out to the farmers and I did not receive an answer to that. In fairness to the farmers I should say it was a verbal presentation at a meeting, so I would not expect to receive an answer.

I have endeavoured to explain the complexities of the Ord and the growing need for a research and training institute of the tropics. In so doing I have not advised the House of the personal assistance I have been able to obtain from officers in the tropical research station at Carnarvon, in respect of my private venture. They have been extremely helpful. I have pointed out that Carnarvon is not in the tropics. It is in a subtropical region.

I have also received assistance from employees in the Office of Regional Administration and the North West who have established a nursery at Broome. They have been helpful and I hope that they will not interpret my contribution tonight as being a criticism of them. I hope they will envisage it as it is; that is, a plea for trained personnel within the Ord River irrigation scheme for tropical horticulture and agriculture.

I repeat that a decision regarding such a scheme must be a political decision—a decision by Government. This is important, because

without such a decision and without such an institute for training the Ord cannot possibly succeed in the near future. It may succeed in the long term, but we would like it to succeed in the near future, because until it does, we will not have other irrigated agriculture in the north or the development of the Fitzroy Valley.

I would like to offer my sincere congratulations to Mr Moore for the excellent contribution he made on the opening day of Parliament. I was disappointed his comments were not passed on to the public through the Press. Possibly if he had been a little outspoken about his colleagues and rude to them the Press would have taken note of what he said. The standard of excellence is not sufficient for an editor today. The Press want something sensational, crude, or nasty.

I notice that Mr Moore is smiling. I told him something crude which I thought would be sure to get into the Press, but I will maintain the dignity of the House by not passing it on to members.

I was also interested in the remarks about waste disposal in a contribution by my colleague (Mr Knight). His speech was most enjoyable and he, too, is to be congratulated.

I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. D. W. Cooley.

*Sitting suspended from 9.18 p.m. (Tuesday) to
3.17 a.m. (Wednesday)*

ESSENTIAL FOODSTUFFS AND COMMODITIES BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Leader of the House), read a first time.

Second Reading

THE HON. G. C. MACKINNON (South-West—Leader of the House) [3.18 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is for an Act to make provision to ensure the supply of essential foodstuffs and essential commodities, and is relatively self-explanatory.

It is reluctantly introduced by the Government to ensure the public obtains the essential commodities they need and, indeed, to which they are entitled, and indicates clearly that the Government is not prepared to sit idly by and see the community held to ransom.

The Bill is made necessary by the action of the Transport Workers' Union which, by a number of 24-hour stoppages culminating in the current dispute, is attempting to prevent essential foodstuffs such as bread, milk, and eggs reaching the public.

The situation is that a handful of employees, reported to be only 550, by a majority vote of 80 put a reputed 3 000 transport workers out on strike, affecting the supply of essential commodities to approximately one million people.

The Government has not stood idly by and, had it not been for the goodwill and assistance of the producers and suppliers and the tolerance of the public, the community would now be subjected to grave food shortages.

The Government took immediate action to facilitate the sale of eggs through sources other than the normal channels. According to information provided yesterday, there was a record sale of eggs at up to 20c less than the normal price.

As far as milk is concerned, both the producers and the consumers have been severely harassed, with the dairy farmers in many cases having to pour their milk out or sell it at 14c per gallon less than the normal price, while others have had to arrange, with the co-operation of the Farmers' Union, the Dairy Industry Authority, and volunteers to cart milk and personally process it at pilot plants set up quickly and close to the metropolitan area, but nevertheless at a considerable deal of inconvenience.

The Health Department has also co-operated extremely well by assisting and facilitating the movement of milk and advising the public of the necessary action in treating raw milk.

Tribute is paid to all the organisations and individuals who have assisted to facilitate the movement of essential commodities to the community.

Bread has been regularly baked, but flour supplies are likely to run short unless immediate action is taken.

The fact remains that an attempt is being made by a small minority to hold the whole community to ransom, an action which is totally unreasonable in view of the fact that it is well known that the matter is before industrial tribunals and a decision can be expected in a few days.

In fact, the decision is being delayed because of this irresponsible action by the Transport Workers' Union.

This Bill is not concerned with the rights and wrongs of industrial disputes. Tribunals have been

set up to deal with these. However, the Government has a responsibility to see that the community is not denied essential foodstuffs and commodities and the intent of this Bill is to give the Government the power to purchase, to sell, and distribute, essential foodstuffs and commodities in situations as exist at the moment and which may occur during the term of the legislation.

Adequate provision is made for compensation in addition to the normal rights of citizens before the courts. The Bill provides for a person who, as a result of compliance with a direction given under the Act, or while engaged in carrying out such direction, suffers loss, damage or injury, to have an extra option as regards settlement of claims.

This extra option has been provided for in the interests of expediency and reduced costs, as some people may prefer to apply for compensation direct to the Minister.

The Government has no intention or desire to disadvantage any trader. The Government will not tolerate interference to any citizen who is carrying out his lawful business.

In recent years there have been many instances of threats being made against people who are acting within the law and intimidatory tactics have been used against them. The Bill proposes that a person who by coercion, intimidation or threats in relation to another person, that person's family, household, property or employment, attempts to restrain that person from carrying out any activity authorised by the Act, shall be guilty of an offence against the Act.

It is again stressed that the Bill is aimed solely at securing the right of every member of the community to access to essential foodstuffs and commodities.

It appears strange that an organisation such as the Transport Workers' Union, with the action it has taken, has the greatest detrimental effect on the low income earner and pensioner, those who have less finance available to store goods in refrigeration and those who have less cash available to purchase the more expensive substitutes.

It has shown a total disregard for the low income earner, the pensioner, children, the ill, and those who have a need for the essential commodities, and also those who can ill afford to use transport to go in search of such commodities.

This union has disrupted the community continually and it is disappointing to see its lack of concern for the public.

Today, if a person is going east he cannot be sure, with the number of airline strikes, when he will return. Just prior to Christmas a number of people who had saved for many years to go on a holiday were unable to do so because of an airline strike that precluded them from catching their boats and transport from the east.

The tactics and the inconvenience this union has caused to the public have been regular and have been, in many cases, irresponsible and unnecessary.

The union has not used courses open to it through arbitration and, in many cases, it has caused hardship to its own members.

The majority of the public and the Government are sick of the irresponsible action so often taken by irresponsible unions which leave a stamp, unfortunately, on the responsible unions.

The Government, as the elected representative of the community, can no longer allow the public to be denied essential and basic commodities by a militant minority. The public have been more than tolerant, and the Government believes it should act on their behalf. We intend to do just that.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Adjournment of Debate

THE HON. D. W. COOLEY (North-East Metropolitan) [3.25 a.m.]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 9

Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. Hetherington	Hon. R. F. Cloughton
Hon. R. T. Leeson	(Teller)

Noes 20

Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. W. M. Piesse
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. R. J. L. Williams
Hon. T. McNeil	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	Hon. G. E. Masters
	(Teller)

Motion thus negatived.

Debate Resumed

THE HON. D. W. COOLEY (North-East Metropolitan) [3.29 a.m.]: Mr President, this is indeed a disgraceful situation and I think you should object to the Leader of the House

subjecting members to the long wait while this Bill was dealt with by the Assembly. I doubt there is any precedent for the action the Government has taken tonight in respect of this Bill.

For what reason has the Government taken this action? No reason has been given by the Leader of the House regarding why we should have been subjected to this long wait. No urgency is associated with the matter. No mention was made in the Minister's second reading speech of any urgency in respect of allowing the Government to act in the manner set out in the measure. This is a Bill which, no doubt, has been introduced into this Chamber by the Executive without any consultation with members present tonight. No doubt Government back-benchers are as ignorant of the contents of the Bill as we are.

The moves we are experiencing this morning are not procedural. Even in the closing stages of a session when we co-operate with the Government, we are given the opportunity of looking at Bills to see what is contained in them. However, this Bill has been thrust on us, and we are expected to address ourselves to it at this hour of the morning.

I protest to you, Mr President, on behalf of my party that we have been subjected to this. I protest that so-called responsible men would take this action of starting a debate in this House at half-past-three in the morning, when the last item dealt with was at approximately half-past-eight last night. I do not know what the Government is coming to with respect to this.

If the Government had given us a logical reason for passing this Bill through in such indecent haste, perhaps we could go along and co-operate with it. However, it has just brought the Bill down in this manner, knowing it has the numbers to steamroll it through, regardless of the wishes of anyone else associated with the Government in this Chamber.

This is a disgraceful situation. I do not think members in this Chamber who sit on the Government benches should feel proud of the action they have taken. They are being led by the nose by a Premier who is hell-bent on having confrontation with the unions in whatever way he can.

It looks as though members opposite have been instructed not to interject in any way on what is being said.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: We are too tired.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: They walked like sheep across the floor when we called for a division under the normal practices of this Chamber for the debate on the Bill to be adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

We are not given any reason for debating this Bill at this hour of the morning. What is the reason? I would accept an explanation by way of interjection. There is no reason for steamrolling this Bill through.

The Government has put the Bill through the other House by using its numbers to gag debate on the Bill. The Government is afraid that the details will come out, even after the members of the other place have had an opportunity to examine the Bill.

Mr President, you ought to protest strongly about this, because you are in charge of this House. I know the Leader of the House controls the business of the House. However, I hope you register a protest on behalf of the members here. I do not think the Government back-benchers would have the courage to protest to the Premier or to the people in charge of this Bill about the matter; but we protest very strongly indeed.

One would have thought that the Minister handling the Bill would have given us some indication of the reason for its introduction in this manner. It is a grim situation. It hurts me deeply that the first Bill introduced in this session has to be a Bill of this nature. We have to lock horns over it, and be in conflict even in respect of the handling of the Bill.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We all share your grief at the necessity.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It gives me a great deal of displeasure to do this.

I once thought that industrial legislation introduced by conservative Governments was brought in in a rather casual way, and not in the fashion followed by this Government. The first Bill in this session is extremely controversial, and it is brought into this Chamber at half-past-three in the morning.

The Government ought to be ashamed of taking action such as this. I do not know whether members on the Government side think that by doing this the trade union movement will start trembling at the knees because a Bill has been brought down. There will be the dramatic news tomorrow that the Parliament sat all night, determining this matter. It would not be in the news that the members of the Legislative Council stood around for 7½ hours, waiting for the introduction of the Bill in the so called House of Review.

A rubber stamp will be placed on the Bill. That is all we are going to do. It does not matter how long we debate the Bill on this side of the Chamber tonight. The rubber stamp will go on the Bill, and the Bill will pass through the House

without amendment, no matter what we say or what we do. The only course at our disposal is to protest about the manner of dealing with the Bill.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I expect you will vote on party lines.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Withers should not tell me again that this is a House of Review, because it is not a House of Review. To me it is a House of horrors, when legislation is introduced at this hour of the morning.

This Bill will be rubber stamped, like the 500 other pieces of legislation that have been through this Chamber since I have been here. Over 500 Government Bills have been through this Chamber, and the rubber stamp has gone on all of them. There has not been one Government Bill in the last five years that has been defeated in this House.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You walked out on the only one that could have been defeated.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Would the honourable member take his seat? I have been very tolerant because I understand the feelings of the honourable member. However, having voiced his protest, I suggest that he now confine his remarks to the contents of this Bill.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I thought I was when I said that the rubber stamp will go on the Bill now passing through this House. To my mind there is no other way of expressing it.

This is not a House of Review when Bills are presented to us in this fashion. I know full well that, no matter what we say here in this debate, the only thought in the minds of the members opposite is to have this Bill passed in the quickest possible way, in the same manner that it was passed in another place. That is the truth of the matter.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: That is my feeling, certainly.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Withers is a sheep in respect of these matters, the same as the other members of his back-bench. They follow their Cabinet like sheep. They do not even discuss the legislation in their party room. They do not even have the chance of making a decision there.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would like the honourable member to make some reference to the contents of the Bill.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Bill in itself is simply a means of confrontation with the trade union movement. It is a Bill introduced to allow the Government to take over the control of certain commodities during industrial disputation. No, I

shall not say "certain commodities"; I say "all commodities" that the Government would like to name. That is the reason for this Bill, so that the Government may take over the control of commodities whenever it thinks fit. This will lead to direct confrontation with the trade union movement.

The Government knows that industrial matters in this State have become quiet. It can no longer pin the blame on industrial disputes and trouble with Labor Governments. It can no longer bring out the old bogey of communism, as it has done in the past. It can no longer lay the blame on the trade union movement for going ahead with wage claims, because those claims have been controlled by indexation for a number of years.

The Government has had to raise another issue. It has had to pick off one union, and bring in a Bill such as this so that it can use volunteers in order to shift certain goods in the period of a strike, knowing full well that the union it attacks will react. The Government will then make political gain out of the situation. It is about time the Government got on with governing the State. It should stop making attacks on individuals. The Government has to raise an issue in some way or other. This Bill is a means of doing so.

The Government has found that the industrial scene has cooled down in some respects. There has been a quiet industrial situation in recent months; but it has to be hotted up in some way or other. This Bill is the means of doing that.

I do not point to members seated opposite, but certain people in their party have an inbred hatred of trade unionism. Some of them are in this House—

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Name them.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I will name them if Mr Lewis wishes. They do not have to be named. Their attitudes are known from the speeches they have made in this House. They are people who have an inbred hatred of trade unionism and every other sort of organised labour in this State, or indeed in this country.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Who are they?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If he wishes, Mr Pratt can look and I will point. I will start with Mr Pratt first. He is one in this House who claims, like a lot of others in this place, to have been great unionists in the past. God knows where they ever learned their unionism.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Not from you; that is for sure.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Government comes into this House and presents us with stuff

such as this. Government members follow like sheep. They follow their leaders like sheep, and they vote for legislation without any qualms, and without any understanding at all of what is going on.

I was down in another place a while ago when the member for Cottesloe was on his feet, lambasting the unions and their members, calling them thugs, and gangsters, and other sorts of names.

Point of Order

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: I rise on a point of order. The member is referring to the debate that took place in another place this evening. That is not allowed under the Standing Orders. He also named a member.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member will refrain from referring to the debate in another place. He will confine his remarks to what is contained in this Bill. I have already warned him twice to relate his comments to the contents of the Bill. I find it very difficult to relate the points the honourable member is putting forward on this Bill. I ask him to proceed.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I appreciate that the hour is late and the members opposite want to have this Bill passed as quickly as they possibly can. They will raise as many points of order as they possibly can.

I would like to know under what Standing Order I am not allowed to refer to debate in another place, Mr President. Under what Standing Order am I not allowed to refer to debate in another place, and refer to a member in another place? I will accept that it is not in accordance with the Standing Orders but I would like to know which one, because I have not seen it.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: Standing Order No. 132.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member does not have to be given the number of the Standing Order. It is sufficient for me to instruct him to confine his remarks to the contents of the Bill.

I was not aware of any reference that you make to a member in another place. I simply ask you not to do it and I would like you to proceed now.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is a well-known fact that a member can be put off his speech; but I would have thought that by referring to the Bill discussed in another place this evening I would be in order; but if you, Sir, rule I am not allowed to refer to people in another place or to discussions of the Bill in another place I shall accede to your

request, but I hope you will apply the same standard to members of the Government who may enter into the debate.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I hope the honourable member is not suggesting that that is not always done.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: With due respect, Sir, I have heard people in this place refer to members of another place in a most disparaging manner and they have been allowed to get away with it.

The PRESIDENT: I do not want to have a confrontation with the honourable member and I am doing my best not to do so. I have simply told him that I hope he is not suggesting I interpret the Standing Orders differently for any particular member. I hope the honourable member is not suggesting that, and I am sure he is not; but the Standing Orders state clearly that no member shall allude to any debate in the current session in the Assembly and I am simply asking the member not to do so.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: You are a most unbiased President, Sir, but I am simply suggesting that you put a curb on members opposite when they enter into the discussion.

The PRESIDENT: I will handle that when the time comes.

Debate Resumed

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: As I was saying, this Bill was introduced for the purpose of hotting up the industrial dispute situation which has reached a low ebb at the moment. I do not know where it will end. This is about the eighth Bill to my knowledge in this 29th Parliament which has been designed to attack the trade union movement and bring about a situation which will either embarrass or place penalties upon the trade union movement.

This Bill will result in penalties being incurred by workers who take certain action in an endeavour to protect their occupational interests. The people who are on strike at the present time and at whom the Bill is aimed—that is, the members of the Transport Workers' Union—are endeavouring to protect their occupational interests and are trying to make life a little easier and more comfortable for their wives, families, and people who depend on them. All they are asking for is parity with people employed in other sections of the industry.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: This case is currently before the tribunal.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It has been before the tribunal and in some instances, where two trucks are being driven one behind the other, one driver is receiving \$8 more than the other despite the fact that they are doing exactly the same work. That is not justice. They have a right to draw attention to the anomalies which exist.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They can do that before the court.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is all right for the Leader of the House to mutter about this matter, but he is not backward in coming forward when pay increases are offered to him on the basis that parliamentarians in the Eastern States are receiving more than he is receiving. This was evidenced by the last pay increase handed out to Government members. Members opposite say that the real wages of workers should not be increased and yet they are prepared to accept real wage increases without one murmur of dissent themselves. Not one murmur has been heard in respect of the 5 percent increase passed on to members, because somebody in the Eastern States received a slightly higher salary than that received by members here. That was the reason for members in this Chamber being granted an increase.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We abide by the decisions of the tribunal as should the TWU.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I agree with the Leader of the House; let us do so. The tribunal is meeting tomorrow morning. Maybe it will meet before this Bill is passed by the House. Why do we not wait for the tribunal's decision? The Premier said he does not believe in industrial commissions; he does not believe in the system of arbitration.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is the unions which have ruined the situation.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Premier said he does not believe in collective bargaining.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You should read the comments made by an ex-Federal Minister about it.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Premier does not believe in sweetheart agreements between the unions and employers. He does not believe in conciliation. In what does the Premier believe as far as industrial arbitration is concerned?

The Hon. R. Thompson: He believes in Joh Bjelke-Petersen.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Premier believes in his own Bills which are designed to browbeat workers into submission. I should say the Premier believes the workers will be

browbeaten into submission, but they have much more fight than that. The Government can introduce all the Bills of this nature it likes whilst we have a democracy—and I hope the time will never come when the conservatives try to destroy it—but the trade union movement will stand up against the Government. It will never be destroyed; it is indestructible.

I know some unionists do not play the game, just as some members of the Liberal Party do not play the game, and some employers do not play the game; but in the main the trade unionists are decent and honourable people endeavouring to do their best for the people they represent. They will not be smashed down by Bills such as this which will introduce people into industry who are foreign to it. An example of this is the Assistance and Security people—the Thomases and the News. These people will bring out dogs and guns against the trade unionists. Will they be employed under the Bill and will they move the goods around for the Government? Is that what it has in mind? Does the Government want a para-military force?

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: Who had the dogs out?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: They had the dogs out on the unionists at one particular time.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I have seen some big dogs in my time, but I do not think they could carry loads of milk.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will members refrain from interjecting?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is what the Government has in mind, and if suitable people cannot be found to do the work the people I have mentioned will be employed. These were the people who came to the fore in the flour dispute and the Government paid them \$1815 for eight hours' work to shift "black" flour out of the flour mills.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: What is black flour?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: For black bread!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The honourable member would not understand what it is.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is made out of rye.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is the sort of flour handled by the people whom the honourable member supports and with whom the honourable member has said in this Chamber he is proud to be associated. They are scabs who will go to a job and do the work for people who are striking legitimately.

The Hon. G. E. Masters interjected.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The member has an inbred hatred of good unionists and unions.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I did not realise we were going to hear some more of your great oratory.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: The dairyman will bring his milk to the town.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is not the dairyman to whom I am referring. An assertion was made tonight that there is a shortage of eggs, bread, and milk. Three members of my party went out and bought nearly \$20 worth of eggs, bread, and milk at the first shop they came to and they have placed them on a table somewhere in this building. One member in the other place said he had to come up from the south-west with a carload of milk and bread for children who were starving. What nonsense! Is anybody short of eggs, bread, or milk in Perth at this particular time? Members can go to any shop and buy eggs, bread, and milk quite readily.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: That is not correct at all.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Nobody in Western Australia, as far as I know, has suffered undue hardship as a consequence of a strike. I do not know what the devil it has to do with the matter, but the Minister talked about people being unable to go on holiday at Christmas time because of the actions of the TWU. We are talking about a Bill which will allow the Government to handle essential foodstuffs and commodities. What has going to the Eastern States on a jaunt at Christmas got to do with essential foodstuffs or commodities? I do not think they are related. Can any member of this Chamber tell me about a person in this State who has suffered extreme hardship as a consequence of strike action over the past 10 years? I should be very interested to know about such a case.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Let us have a look at the situation in relation to dairy farmers. You are not game to do that.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Would the honourable member refrain from interjecting?

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Certainly.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: At no time has anyone suffered extreme hardship in this State as a consequence of a strike.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: That is utter rot.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You are saying that with tongue in cheek.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The honourable member will probably be told not to speak on the Bill because of the time factor; but he will have

an opportunity to stand up and tell me of such a case. He has not been able to do so during the last 10 years. He has not been able to tell me of a case where a person has suffered extreme hardship as the consequence of a strike.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You will not listen.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I will listen to the honourable member.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Mr Thompson wants to say something to you.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Would honourable members refrain from these unruly interjections? If the honourable member directs his comments to the Chair, he will find it much easier.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If there were an extreme shortage of milk and bread in this State at the present time and we had to meet at four in the morning to rush through this Bill, we would not have had bread or milk on the dinner table last night. In fact there was an abundance of it.

Some of the members sitting at my table asked for a second bun and they got one. There was milk on the table. If anyone wanted an egg with his steak I am sure he would have been able to get it. Where is the hardship? Where are the women and children queuing up at shops to purchase milk, eggs, or bread?

If every housewife made a conscious effort yesterday to obtain these goods, I am sure she would have had an ample supply. I daresay housewives would have an ample supply today of the three commodities the Government is seeking to control under this Bill and they will have an ample supply tomorrow also. I will make another prediction that at this time tomorrow the strike will be well and truly over. What do we have at this hour of the morning? We do not have a Bill introduced to ensure the supply of eggs, milk, and bread; we have a Bill which will cover every commodity we like to name.

The Bill also refers to other commodities. It will stay in force long after the time I have passed from this place. It will be in force until some time in September or October of next year. The Bill sets out that it shall continue in operation until the 21st sitting day of the Legislative Assembly of the first session of the 30th Parliament, and no longer. During an election year Parliament does not usually sit in March or April, so I believe the date will be during October.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is the first correct statement I have heard you make tonight. Congratulations!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Bill sets out that the Governor may, from time to time, by

proclamation declare any commodity to be an essential commodity for the purposes of the Act—any commodity one likes to name, or which the Government likes to name. That bears out the statement that no member has read the Bill other than those who set out to have it introduced; namely, the members of the Cabinet.

That is the situation. I have seen the surprised look on the faces of a number of members after reading clause 3. Those members thought the Bill dealt only with eggs, bread, and milk, but it will deal with every commodity that is produced.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: The Bill refers to essential foodstuffs.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is right. The Bill states that the Governor may declare any commodity to be essential. We can all make mistakes!

Perhaps Mr Lewis is one member who has read the Bill. The Government can declare any commodity as an essential commodity. I do not know whether eggs are essential. Clause 2 of the Bill states that "essential foodstuffs" including bread, eggs, and milk, and any other foodstuffs declared to be an essential foodstuff by a proclamation that is made under section 3 of the Act. I understand that eggs are a cause of high cholesterol blood level.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Have you done any real research on the matter?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If it is possible to declare eggs as being essential, I believe it is possible to declare beer or tomato sauce as being essential. Goods which are declared essential are subject to clause 5(2) of the Bill. Subclause (2) states that for the purposes of the Act, and not otherwise, the Minister may do any one or more of the following things. He may buy, sell, supply, transport, store, market, and distribute any essential foodstuffs or essential commodities. He may also enter into any contract, and undertake and carry on business transactions. That is what the Minister will be able to do. I hope Mr Lewis is following what I am saying.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: It is the first time I have been able to follow you.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: For the purposes of the Act the Minister may, by a direction given in writing—

- (i) authorise the taking of possession or control and the disposal or use of any essential foodstuffs or essential commodities and the packaging of any essential foodstuffs or essential commodities and require any person to place any such essential foodstuffs or essential commodities and packaging in his possession or control at the disposal of the Minister;

That is not all. Under the provisions of clause 6 the powers of the Minister may be exercised on his behalf by any person—I repeat, any person—so authorised by the Minister. That applies to any person at all who has the power to do the things set out in proposed section 5(2).

We are supposed to have a free-enterprise Government. Any person—any bureaucrat—will be able to walk into a poultry farm and take away eggs. He will be able to walk into a bakery and take as much bread as he wants. He will be able to walk into any factory at all which produces a product the Government deems to be an essential commodity. There is no other definition of "essential commodities". There is reference to bread, eggs, milk, and other foodstuffs to be declared. I submit that is not in accordance with the principles which the Government professes to enunciate. Does the principle of free enterprise mean that the Government can walk in and take over the distribution of a particular product?

The Hon. R. Thompson: Hitler did it, you know.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I know he did. Someone said this was a socialist Bill. I think my colleagues believe it is more like a nationalist socialist Bill than a democratic Bill.

The Minister, or a person directed by the Minister, will by a direction given in writing—

- (ii) authorise the taking possession or control, and use, of premises, vehicles, machinery, plant or other equipment ordinarily used for the manufacture, preparation, treatment, packaging, transportation, storage, marketing or distribution of any essential foodstuffs or essential commodities and require any person to place any of such premises, vehicles, machinery, plant, or other equipment in his possession or control at the disposal of the Minister;

The situation was bad enough last year when the Flour Bill was introduced. It probably contained somewhat similar verbiage as appears in the Bill now before us. However, this Bill goes further by a long way. Until some time late in 1980 the

Government will have powers under this particular measure.

When the Bill has passed through this Chamber today, how will the Government exercise its powers? What will it do with the legislation? Immediately the powers are exercised there will be a head-on confrontation with the unions, and pickets, and all sorts of other people will resist the Government in this regard. What will the Government do then? It will bring down the provisions of the Act, and fine offenders the sum of \$2 000, or imprison them for six months. The Government will have the power to put a man away for a period of six months. However, the Government is aware that it will not apply the provisions of this Bill. It knows it will not get anywhere. The Government has had powers under the fuel and energy legislation, but those powers have never been implemented. The Flour Bill was passed and its provisions were applied only once.

I forecast that the Government will not use the provisions of this Bill very often once there is reaction from the trade union movement. The measure has been introduced here with indecent haste so that the Government will be able to meet the Transport Workers' Union head on. The transport workers are in confrontation with their employers over an increase of \$8 per week. They are only after justice. They have not been on strike for a long time. In other countries of the world—in places like Canada and the USA—strikes last between three months and six months. Those strikes do cause some shortages of essential goods and the people do suffer some hardships. I think the workers in this State have been out for less than a week, but we have had to sit here all night in order to debate a heavy-handed Bill so that the Government can crush the unions. That is the idea.

It is about time the Government got down to some sensible means of talking with regard to industrial relations. The Government does not seem to have any knowledge at all of industrial relations.

For a while I thought the trouble we had over the past four years was the responsibility of the former Minister for Labour and Industry. I thought the appointment of the new Minister was a move in the right direction. Things went along rather smoothly for a while, and I told the new Minister I believed there would be more stability in industrial relations. However, it was not the former Minister for Labour and Industry (Mr Grayden) who was to blame; it was the Government. The Government knows there has to be some sort of stir. Things have been quiet, and the Victorian election is coming up. People are a

little complacent in respect of the celebrations taking place.

The real purpose of this Bill is to hit at the trade union movement and create confrontation, because there has not been enough trouble during the past few months since the new Minister for Labour and Industry took office. However, he has been lined up by the Government in order to get the trouble going again so that the Government can reap some political advantage.

It is a disgraceful situation when industrial relations are carried on at their present level in this State. It has been said that outside of Queensland one would not find a State carrying out its industrial relations as they are carried out in Western Australia. This Government is becoming more like the Queensland Government every day where the Premier would be a virtual dictator if there were not a democracy. Lord help us if we ever reach that position, but we are heading that way. If one looks at the Acts which have passed through this Chamber, one will find that what I am saying is absolutely correct. The Government will not let the matter rest at all.

Good Lord, when I was playing a prominent part in the trade union movement we expected conservative Governments to introduce something of a damaging nature to the trade union movement. It is the policy of the Government to do that once in a while; once every session a controversial matter would be brought down. Now, that sort of thing is occurring not only once each session, but almost every month. These matters are raised in an attempt to inflame the trade union movement and divert the unionists from their proper goal.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: Has not New South Wales introduced something very similar in the last 24 hours?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I have not seen any reference to anything of that nature. I am dealing with Western Australia.

Why are we resisting the people who want an increase of \$8 per week? What they are losing represents real wages to them. It has been the policy of the conservatives, since the election of the Fraser Government, to reduce real wages of workers. Why does the Government want to reduce real wages? Is it to allow firms such as Utah to make a profit of \$150 million a year and send out of this country about \$130 million a year? Does the Government want that type of firm to make a profit out of the wages of the workers? Every wage increase that is resisted puts more money into the pockets of the international

cartels—the companies sending money out of this country at the expense of the working people.

This Bill has been introduced all because of a miserable \$8 a week. Our workers want parity with their comrades in the Eastern States.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I suggest you read the title of the Bill.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Never mind what I read in the title of the Bill, we know what the Bill is aimed at. In his second reading speech the Minister said—

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Essential foodstuffs.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Bill is introduced not only in regard to foodstuffs, but also in regard to carting people out of the country and the employees of airports. That is what it is directed at, and I will never forget it was Mr Masters who said that the sole object of the Fuel, Energy and Power Resources Act Amendment Bill was to smash the Transport Workers' Union.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: That is rubbish.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is recorded in *Hansard*.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You are taking it out of context.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Masters is a union smasher. He believes that if he smashes one union he will take others down the drain with it. He has attacked the TWU the whole time he has been here, although not very successfully.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I have stirred you up sometimes.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The honourable member may have stirred me up, but he has not stirred up the trade union movement. It is too strong and too honest to be stirred up by people such as him. The Government will have a fight on its hands if it takes on the strength of the TWU.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: We are not taking on the TWU. It is only the irresponsible elements of the unions we are concerned with.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Government is creating a dictatorship. It can only carry out such tactics by creating a dictatorship as Hitler did. However, it will have a hell of a fight on its hands if it introduces legislation such as this which is designed wholly and solely to smash a strike. That is the purpose of the measure; make no mistake.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Nothing of the sort.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is the reason we are here debating this Bill at 4.15 a.m. The Government wants it passed tonight, although no explanation has been given for it. If we were suddenly to pass this Bill now, what would the

Government do with it? Would a messenger take it down to Government House and wake up the Governor to sign it? I daresay the Government would do that so that the legislation could be proclaimed before the commissioner has a chance to make a decision at 8.00 a.m. That is the whole purpose of it.

What will Government members say when the transport workers go back to work? We will be told that they went back to work because the strong-armed Government sent them back by passing a Bill such as this. We see Mr Fraser using similar tactics. He waits until a strike is just about to be resolved and then he tries to tell us that it is through his strong Government and its actions that the strike was settled. We are led to believe that the employees go back to work because they are frightened of the Government.

The Government will find that it may get away with such action against one particular union, or even two unions, but when it invokes the anger of all the unions it will have a fight on its hands.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I would say that the majority of responsible unionists strongly support the Bill.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Government will take on the union movement at its own peril. However, it should first ask Mr Heath and Mr Callaghan about such actions, and even Mrs Thatcher, if she ever gets the job—and God forbid she ever will.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I assure you she will.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: She will be out again if she tackles the trade unions.

The Hon. Tom McNeil: Who is running the country, Mr Cooley?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The honourable member is not in his seat, and he should not be interjecting.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are learning. That is covered by one Standing Order.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If the Government applied more propriety to the Standing Orders we would not be here now.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are a fine one to say that.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Leader of the House may know the Standing Orders, but he does not apply much propriety to them if he adopts tactics such as this.

I turn now to the penalties contained in this Bill, and set out on page 6. Subclause (2) of clause 9 reads as follows—

(2) Where a person convicted of an offence

against this Act is a body corporate, every person who at the time of the commission of the offence, was a director or officer of the body corporate shall be deemed to have committed the like offence, . . .

Does that mean that every member of a committee of management involved in something which may be contrary to this legislation will be subject to the penalties contained in it? I fear that it does. The penalty set out is \$2 000 for each person or six months in gaol. I thought that penalties had been phased out of industrial relations affairs. I thought the Government had come to realise that there is an organisation like the International Labour Organisation which believes that every person or organisation should have a right to defend his or its occupational interests, and furthermore that the Government should not interfere in industrial disputes; Governments should keep out of industrial disputes altogether. A dispute should be between an employer and a union, and in this country, unlike all other countries of the world, we have tribunals to settle disputes.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: And a fat lot of notice you take of them.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We do not want Governments interfering in the settlement of disputes, and that is what the State Government is doing with this legislation. If there is a reaction to the Government's interference in a dispute, under this legislation an offender may be liable to a fine of \$2 000 or six months in gaol.

Is it the intention of the Government to gaol trade unionists? I believe the Government will huff and puff about the matter, and then finish up paying the fines itself.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You are huffing and puffing yourself.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: This Bill is designed simply to bypass the system of arbitration which conservative Governments say they believe in. They believe in this system while everything is going their way.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Come on now!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: In this State the Government has gone before the Industrial Commission for 12 years, from 1959 to 1971, and not once has it supported a wage rise. The Government has even resisted wage indexation, and now it is facing the situation where indexation of 4 per cent is to be applied to the whole community. The Premier says that the arbitration system has failed. When something does not please the Premier, it has failed. I repeat: What are we going to do if we are not to negotiate

privately, if we are not to negotiate before a conciliator?

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Where is this in the Bill? I thought you were talking about the Bill.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: What are we to do if we do not go before the Industrial Commission to have disputes settled? Where do we go, and what do we do? The Government will not be able to smash the union out of existence, but it has introduced legislation to smash a strike.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: It is to protect the public.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: What section of the public needs protection? We have not heard yet what section of the public of Western Australia has been under extreme hardship.

Members opposite all work on an assumption that when there is a strike the union is in the wrong. In many cases the union is in the right and the employer is in the wrong; I would say this is the situation in the majority of cases. In this particular case the employer is in the wrong for not passing on to the transport workers the increases that have been obtained in the Eastern States. On every other occasion that the master carriers' award has been amended, there has been a flow-on to all other transport workers eventually. That is all the men are asking for. Mr Oliver may shake his head, but he knows nothing about it.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: What about the BWU under the State award in Victoria; they received an increase well in excess of \$8 under the Federal award in all other States?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am talking about the TWU and the tradition of passing on increases granted to master carriers. The usual course has been for these increases to flow on to all other workers in the TWU.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: You have sets of rules for all sets of circumstances.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Oliver knows as much about industrial relations as does the member for Cottesloe in another place.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I do not know where the honourable member gained his knowledge, whether it was in the high command or at Hale School. However, he has never got down to the nitty-gritty of industrial relations. He has been sitting in his ivory tower telling people that they should live on a meagre wage.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: You are so misinformed.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Oliver sits here like a robot, obeying the commands of his masters in the Cabinet of a conservative Government. That is what he is doing, and when the numbers go up—

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: The revolutionaries will get you when the numbers go up!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Government will have a revolution if it goes on with things like this.

The PRESIDENT: Would members refrain from interjecting? Will the member on his feet direct his comments to the Chair and to the Bill?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is typical to find people like Mr Oliver trying to pit his industrial knowledge against mine—a person who has been in the hurley-burley of industrial relations for the past 25 years.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It has taken you six years to learn one Standing Order; that is how much you know.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: In another place tonight the member for Cottesloe tried to air his knowledge, but he was out of his depth.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the member return to the contents of the Bill?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes, Mr President. I have been saying that Mr Oliver is trying to interpret the contents of this Bill when he knows nothing about the matter at all. He has not seen the Bill until this evening; its contents have been a closely kept secret in the Cabinet, and Government members have been kept here just to make up the numbers.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Rubbish!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The legislation was not discussed in the Liberal party room, because it is not that party's policy to do so.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Ha, ha!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Even if it were discussed and members voted against going ahead with it, the legislation would still be introduced here, because the Liberal Party is not bound by the decisions of its members. I know all about the Government members. We saw what happened in regard to the Liquor Bill. Government members voted against the Government but then they were pulled back into line. They went out of this Chamber like lions and they came back like lambs. They were given a good dressing down by the Premier and the then Leader of this House and they came back like meek little boys and voted with the Government.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: You should write nursery rhymes and fairy stories, with your imagination.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Government members are more disciplined than we are. The lions became lambs.

A member: Rams!

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: More like wethers than rams.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: That is the sort of interjection we could expect from the honourable members.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I do not really know how she would know!

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: It is comic opera.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The member opposite talks about comic opera; I think he has been looking at the antics of the member sitting in front of me.

I admit that I am getting a little away from the Bill, and I apologise to you, Mr President.

Clause 8 reads as follows—

8.(1) A person who without lawful authority and with intent—

- (a) to coerce or compel any other person to abstain from carrying on any activity which pursuant to this Act that other person is authorised, permitted, or required to do;
- (b) to prevent such an activity being carried on; or
- (c) to obstruct such an activity,

manifests that intention by doing or threatening any act in relation to that other person, the family, household, property, or employment of that other person or the activity so authorised, permitted, or required, or by failing or omitting to do any act in relation thereto which he is lawfully required to do, shall be guilty of an offence against this Act.

In regard to industrial relations, where has there ever been any previous interference with the family household? Why is that particular reference included?

This is something different from the Flour Bill. Does the Government think these awful trade unionists are going to descend upon the families of these people—albeit, they are scabs—and take it out on them?

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Has that never happened?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: No, it has never happened and if it did happen I would be the first

to condemn it. The Bill talks about damage to property. Members opposite should not be the ones to be talking in this manner, when they condoned the recent action by the police in going onto people's property and confiscating electric kettles and spare tyres to satisfy \$5 fines. If a Labor Government were in office, that sort of thing would not be going on.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Would they be allowed to break the law?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Members opposite are breaking the moral laws of this country by allowing this sort of thing to go on. This is a most deplorable aspect of the legislation and I am sure that is what is intended by this section of the Bill. The Government condones the taking away of workers' possessions to satisfy \$5 fines.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Do you agree that employers should be punished or fined for breaking the law?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes, but how many people have ever gone onto an employer's property and confiscated goods, despite the fact that that employer has robbed his workers blind? Members opposite should be ashamed of themselves for including this provision in the legislation.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask members again to refrain from interjecting on the honourable member who is on his feet. For the last time, I warn the honourable member who is on his feet that if he does not confine his remarks to the Bill I will take the next step to see that he does not continue his speech.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr President, I was discussing people threatening family households and interfering with property; that is contained in the Bill, so I do not see how I was departing from the subject matter before the Chair. I will be sorry if you do not allow me to continue, because I have a reasonable amount yet to say on this legislation.

The PRESIDENT: I suggest the honourable member get on and say it.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I have been trying to do that under a lot of duress and interjections.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: All I have heard has been a diatribe of abuse.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: What does the Leader of the House expect when he introduces legislation of this nature; the legislation itself is an abuse.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: There you go again.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member should not carry on conversations with other members, but should direct his comments to the Chair.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is an abuse of the rights of this House for the Government to introduce this sort of legislation at this hour of the morning. I do not think people in glass houses should throw stones.

This Bill is designed to suppress militant people. However, there are more militant people sitting opposite than one would find in a cross-section of people at Trades Hall. Militancy is not to be found only on one side of the political fence. There are many militant politicians and employers, just as there are militant employees.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: In what section of the Bill is that?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Militancy runs throughout the entire Bill—much more militancy than one would find in the trade union movement. The legislation is designed to encourage scabs to go on the job to take the place of striking workers.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: There you go again—intimidation!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Masters is one of the strongest supporters of people who go in during a strike and take other people's employment. Clause 8(2) states as follows—

A person who does, or omits to do, or threatens any thing, at any time or in any manner, by way of retaliation, discrimination, coercion, or intimidation against any other person by reason of, or as a result of, the carrying on by that other person of any activity which pursuant to this Act that other person is or was authorised, permitted, or required to do shall be guilty of an offence against this Act.

From that, it would seem that if, for argument sake, a committee of management of a trade union omitted to stop some of its members from standing in a picket line the committee would be committing an offence under the legislation and each and every member would be subject to a fine of \$2 000, or six months in gaol. What pleasure do members get out of imposing such fines or by putting honest trade unionists in gaol? This legislation will affect not only trade union officials; it will also hit the workers. They may be receiving only \$150 a week, yet they may be subjected to a fine of \$2 000. But what offence would they have committed? Only the offence of protecting their occupational interests.

Other countries in the British Commonwealth, notably England, regard picketing as a lawful activity, yet we in Western Australia will subject any person picketing to a very heavy fine. I thought penal provisions in industrial relations were a thing of the past, but apparently they are not. The Government wants to resurrect them.

The Government talks about the trade union movement breaking laws yet it is prepared to break international law under this legislation. These laws were not entered into lightly but were agreed to by all States of Australia and the Australian Government. The ILO Convention states, firstly, that there shall be no penalties against people going on strike and, secondly, that governments shall not interfere in industrial relations. This Bill, the Flour Bill before it, and other Bills the Government has introduced in this Chamber over the short period I have been here have breached the international law which this Government has agreed to.

The Government seems to have scant regard for this sort of situation. It believes in everybody upholding the laws it wants to make, such as this legislation, which will put a person in gaol simply for trying to defend his occupational interest, yet it will not obey a law brought down by a higher authority, outside Australia. This law was not imposed upon the States of Australia but was ratified by unanimous agreement between the six States and the Australian Government. The conditions of the ILO Convention were regarded by all citizens and the Governments of Australia as international law. However, we find today that this law constantly is being breached for the sake of political expediency.

The Government is not breaking this law only in a normal manner but also in an abnormal manner by holding us up here for seven hours in order to get this Bill through the Parliament. Not once by way of interjections or during the Minister's second reading speech were we told why the Bill had to be rushed through the Parliament, and why the precedents which have been established in this House over the years have been broken.

Why did members opposite vote against my motion that this debate be adjourned to the next sitting of the House? It is an established custom of this House to follow that course, and when that custom is departed from the Leader of the House usually has the courtesy to tell us why we have to depart from it. Generally, of course, it is because we are nearing the end of a session and the Government needs to put several Bills through in one sitting. We all agree in a spirit of co-operation.

However, on this occasion we were not even consulted. The Deputy President simply left the Chair and said that we would resume at the ringing of the bells. We waited for seven interminable hours. If there had been a reason for this procedure, I would be the first to agree.

We have been told there is an emergency, but I want to know where it is. Where is the hardship to which the Minister referred in his second reading speech where he said—

The Bill is made necessary by the action of the Transport Workers' Union which, by a number of 24-hour stoppages culminating in the current dispute, is attempting to prevent essential foodstuffs such as bread, milk, and eggs reaching the public.

The word used is "attempting"; it does not say the union is succeeding. The second reading speech continues—

The situation is that a handful of employees, reported to be only 550, by a majority vote of 80 put a reputed 3 000 transport workers out on strike, affecting the supply of essential commodities to approximately one million people.

From how many members of the Liberal Party did the Government obtain authority to introduce this "urgent" piece of legislation? It was not by a majority of 80, and the Government did not consult the membership of the Liberal Party. Even Mr Crichton-Browne would not have known about this legislation. The only people who knew were the 12 people sitting in Cabinet. Yet the Government has the hide to criticise the TWU for accepting the decision—carried by a majority of 80—of 550 people attending a meeting. I think that is quite a good attendance for a union meeting, or for any meeting held where democratic decisions are made.

The Minister claimed the strike was affecting approximately one million people. That is incorrect, because people who live in the country areas are not affected by this dispute and, to the best of my knowledge, there are not one million people living in the metropolitan area. I think the Government is a long way out in its figures.

The Government has seen fit to keep members here until after five o'clock in the morning. Members opposite have not even said that there is an extreme emergency or that an emergency is pending. They have just said, "We have to bring down legislation which will introduce scabs into the industry."

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I do not think you should use that word in this place.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I will use that word every time I see people taking the jobs of other people out on strike. If Mr Masters likes to support that sort of person, he is welcome to do so.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: It is disgraceful you should use that sort of language.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If Mr Masters looks in the *Oxford Dictionary* he will find the meaning of the word "scab". The Minister's second reading speech continued—

The Government took immediate action to facilitate the sale of eggs through sources other than the normal channels.

We are supposed to have a shortage of eggs and of other essential foodstuffs. However, the Minister made the following admission in his second reading speech—

According to information provided yesterday, there was a record sale of eggs at up to 20c less than the normal price.

It seems to me that the Transport Workers' Union is doing the public a good turn.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Do you suggest we leave them out of it altogether and continue to give the public eggs at 20c a dozen less?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes, I do. I believe in a minimum price for goods.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You don't care about workers and blokes who will lose their jobs? You don't give a damn whether they lose their jobs or not.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: According to information provided yesterday, eggs went at 20c less than the normal price, yet the Government has introduced legislation to control things such as what vehicles are to be used to transport goods. Yesterday we had a record sale of eggs. Where is the shortage? Why does this Bill include eggs when there was a record sale for this item yesterday?

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You do not want people to have their jobs back. That is what you said.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: You will not see that in *Hansard*. I did not say anything about people losing their jobs. I said I believed people should get their eggs at 20c less than the normal price.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: When we check *Hansard* we will see what I said. The second reading speech of the Minister indicated that as far as milk was concerned both the producers and

consumers have been severely harassed with the dairy farmer in many cases having to pour his milk out or sell it at 14c a gallon less than the normal price. So we have a Bill before us now to destroy all this.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You don't think that matters.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We have a Bill that will allow scabs to fill jobs left by people on strike.

Members opposite do not like to see working people, people on low incomes, and pensioners getting a fair go.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Are you accusing me?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Government intends to sit here all night and pass this Bill so that tomorrow it can be proclaimed so forcing the price of eggs to rise. The Minister's second reading speech indicated that a small minority of people were holding the public to ransom, yet it is expected that the industrial tribunal will shortly make its decision. That being the case, why should we have this Bill before us?

The fact is that an attempt is being made—or so the Government claims—by a small minority of unionists to hold the community to ransom. So this Bill has been introduced. The Bill is not concerned with the rights or wrongs of industrial disputes. This was stated in the speech by the Minister, and therefore I wonder why it has been introduced.

I believe it has been brought in for one specific reason: to allow the Government to claim it had circumvented the arbitration tribunals so that the men would go back to work tomorrow morning. The Government will say it made a dramatic attempt to improve the position, that Parliament sat all night, and that it was heroic in its efforts. The Government will say it got the men back to work and this should not be forgotten at the next election.

The Government will say to the people that they should not worry and that it is in control of all industrial ills. The only way the Government can act is by bringing in this sort of legislation; by bringing down the heavy hand of its power and using its cruel numbers in this Chamber. That seems to be the only way the Government can carry out its industrial relations. It said it would solve industrial disputation five years ago, but it has failed dismally. If it had not failed it would not have to bring down this type of legislation now and endeavour to browbeat a single union into submission. The Government might succeed on this occasion, but it will not always succeed.

If the Government attempts to use this legislation on a number of occasions between now and later next year, it will find that the trade union movement as a whole will move in opposition to it.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Shame!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The measure gives the Government too much power in a democratic society. It should not be able to walk into a factory and take over. It is indeed a shame. The trouble is, most Government members have not been on the lower rung of incomes. They have never known what it is like to be on the lower rung and supporting a wife and children on the minimum wage, like many of these people on strike have to do. Some are earning less than \$150 a week, yet the Government brings down legislation that could result in their being fined \$2,000 and thrown into gaol. The Government will find that people will defend their occupations by standing in picket lines and resisting attempts to move them. We have blue-nosed members opposite who have never known one day of adversity.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Are you including me?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: No. The member for Cottesloe who called these people gangsters and thugs has never been in the situation where he has had to want or to face adversity. Yet he talked about these people in this manner. He does not understand the problems of the working people. The Government has no idea of the problems confronted by the working people or of the way industrial relations should be carried out. If it did it would not have to introduce Bills such as this, because it has had plenty of time to bring about a better situation in the industrial relations field.

As my leader said tonight in an earlier debate, the number of disputes that were current under the Labor Government has escalated greatly under this Government. It is because the Government does not understand people or industrial relations. The only thing it understands is the heavy hand of the law, which it brings down on people who can ill-afford to have this happen.

The Government brings down the law on people for doing things which the people believe are quite legitimate and in accord with international law. If those who have spoken so harshly about the unionists understood people we would not be here debating this matter now at this hour of the morning.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: That is the fifth time you have said that.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I will keep on repeating it.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: What is your claim to industrial relations, anyway?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Has not the member read the papers over the past 20 years? I have better relations with people in the employer class in this country than Mr Oliver would ever have in his life as an employer. I have been denigrated in this Chamber in respect of my involvement in industrial relations, yet I never made a bad friend when I was arguing industrial matters. I have solved dozens more disputes than I have created.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Can you give the figure?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes. The disputes I created would amount to nil.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: So you have solved dozens?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: He did not need legislation like this either.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Disputes are solved by understanding people, not by forcing the law onto them and introducing Bills that will create confrontation.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You have been going on for 1½ hours.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I will go on longer than that, because the member's Government has brought this legislation in and I wish to show Government members that we oppose the legislation. The Government has said the matter is before industrial tribunals. If that is the case, why is it bringing in such legislation? To the best of our knowledge the workers will go back to work in a couple of hours.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Can you guarantee that?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Of course I cannot.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the honourable member refrain from interjecting?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Government could have waited and used the ordinary processes of arbitration rather than introducing this matter into the Parliament. This is not the only dispute the Government is wanting to handle. It is wanting to handle every dispute and all other unions under this piece of legislation; it is not to be kept for the Transport Workers' Union only. Every time the Government thinks the unions are wrong the Government, after this Bill is passed, will have the right to invoke the industrial provisions contained in it. That is all this Bill is

about; strike breaking is the policy of the Government.

If it is not strike breaking, why were we not told the reason for its introduction? There is no reason given in the second reading speech of the Minister. There is no extreme shortage of eggs as referred to in the second reading speech.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You have said that 23 times.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I will keep saying it. The Minister can raise a point of order if he wants to. The Minister should have told us what the shortages were and why it was necessary to bring the Bill to this Chamber in the small hours of the morning. The Government says it has a responsibility to see that the community is not being denied essential foodstuffs and commodities. By its own admission in the Minister's second reading speech, no-one is being denied any essential foodstuffs. That has been proven in this Chamber last night and this morning. If any member walked out of the Chamber to buy a loaf of bread, a dozen eggs, or a pint of milk he would not have to go far.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Thanks to the volunteers.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Minister's Speech states—

However, the Government has a responsibility to see that the community is not denied essential foodstuffs and commodities and the intent of this Bill is to give the Government the power to purchase, to sell and distribute, essential foodstuffs and commodities in situations as exist at the moment and which may occur during the term of the legislation.

This legislation will last for 18 months or more. Is this how the Government will carry out industrial relations in that time? Every time a strike looms or when there may be some shortage of goods, is the Government to bring down the provisions in this Bill to settle the dispute? If that is the case the Government is on the wrong track, and it will create more confrontation with unions not only in this State but all over the country.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: A while ago you indicated your attitude to employers who broke the law and were fined; should those fines be recovered?

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the honourable member proceed with his speech?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Part of the Minister's second reading speech reads as follows—

It appears strange that an organisation such as the Transport Workers' Union, with the action it has taken, has the greatest detrimental effect on the low-income earner and pensioner, those who have less finance available to store goods in refrigeration and those who have less cash available to purchase the more expensive substitutes.

I wonder how many people in Western Australia do not have some access to some form of refrigeration.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: No mention is made of the unemployed.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: No. The Government is ashamed to do so. The second reading speech continues—

They have shown a total disregard for the low income earner, the pensioner—

When did anyone in the Liberal Party or the NCP ever have any regard for low-income earners? They have consistently appeared before the Industrial Commission since 1975 and indicated that the real wage of the low-income earners should not be increased. Yet they talk here about the union's total disregard for the low-income earners and the pensioners. They took away a lousy 5c from the pensioner concession.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: And instituted fixed charges.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes, and reintroduced the means test. They did all sorts of things to the pensioners. To continue—

—children, the ill and those who have a need for the essential commodities and also those who can ill afford to use transport to go in search of such commodities.

When I read that my mind naturally turned to the Tresillian Hostel and the regard Government members had for those children. Yet they talk about the union not having regard for children. The Labor movement has more regard for these people than do all the Government members put together.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: That is rubbish, and you know it.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: What has the Liberal Party done in the interests of pensioners and low income earners?

The Hon. W. R. Withers: For a start we got equalisation on transport in the north of the State

which your Government refused to get. You cannot deny that.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Is that not a big deal! Members opposite also took away the children's allowance to balance it up. I repeat that every time the present Government goes before the Industrial Commission it advocates a decrease in the real wage or at least that the status quo be maintained. Therefore how can members opposite say that they have done anything for low-income earners? Members opposite have no compassion at all for these people, but they have the gall to indicate in the Minister's second reading speech that the TWU has no regard for them.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: You ask the public at large. Do not ask us.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The second reading speech states—

The majority of the public and the Government are sick of the irresponsible action so often taken by irresponsible unions which leave a stamp, unfortunately, on the responsible unions.

Members opposite are always saying things like that. They will never name the unions which are irresponsible. I submit that 98 per cent of the unions demonstrated responsibility not only to their own members but also to everyone with whom they are associated. Yet we have before us legislation designed to deny them their just rights.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Don't you like this legislation?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If the honourable member can indicate that 98 per cent of the unions do not display responsibility to their members and the country at large, I will be prepared to retract my statement. There are only a few who have a complete disregard, and as it is presently constituted the TWU is not one of them, but the members of the TWU are being hit as a result of the legislation.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: Why the qualification about the TWU?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Because it is mentioned in the second reading speech and the inference is that the TWU is not a responsible union. I am saying that it is a responsible union and the reason its members are on strike at this time is that the employers are being irresponsible in not passing on the increase which the comrades of the TWU workers, covered by the Federal award, already receive. That is where the irresponsibility is.

The Government should not be introducing this legislation. The Government should be talking to

the employers and telling them that they ought to do the right thing and pass on the \$8 increase. They should be doing that instead of being proud of the fact that by using scab labour they are trying to control the industry as a result of ministerial action. With all its influence that is what the Government should be doing. It has plenty of influence with the employers and it ought to be telling them to settle the claim quickly so that things can return to normal, just as we have been telling the unions on many occasions in a similar manner. Members opposite do not hear about such occasions. If we consider that a union is wrong, we tell it to settle the dispute involved.

I repeat that merely because a union goes on strike does not in every instance indicate that it is acting irresponsibly. In many cases it is demonstrating a sense of responsibility in those circumstances, and if unions had not resorted to strike action in the past, unionists would not now be enjoying their present conditions. Many people in the community enjoy a flow-on of conditions which have been obtained as a result of militant unionists, and consequently are in good financial position and work under congenial conditions. That is a fact. The people who become submissive in the work force are taken advantage of by unscrupulous employers. It is only right that those employees should show their feelings and take strike action if they feel they are not getting a fair go. These truck drivers are not getting a fair go. They are \$8 behind and are only trying to pick up the \$8 taken away from them by the Court and Fraser Governments which advocated that there should not be full wage indexation. These people would not be out on strike today if it were not for the previous action of the Court and Fraser Governments. The workers are merely trying to catch up a little on what they have lost as a consequence of past actions.

These are the facts I am trying to impress upon the Government. I know very well that when we take a vote on the Bill the vote will be against us. However, surely Government members should listen to a person who knows something about the situation and they ought to endeavour to use their influence on employers in order to establish a policy which will give some form of wage justice at least to people on low incomes.

I repeat that this sort of legislation would not have been necessary if the Government had taken the appropriate action. The legislation before us will destroy the souls of workers and sometimes the reputation of people who have to engage in certain activities.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would ask the honourable member to study Standing Order No. 89 which indicates that if he continues with irrelevant and tedious repetition I have the authority to ask him to cease his speech. I am now coming to the conclusion that the honourable member is repeating comments he made an hour ago, and I suggest that if he wishes to continue to speak he should confine his remarks to the Bill and not repeat comments he made previously.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: With respect, I know that if we were talking to the Bill at a reasonable hour you would not be so intolerant of repetition and would not have raised the matter.

The PRESIDENT: I am raising it now.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is not my fault—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am suggesting that I have been extremely tolerant and I am giving the honourable member an opportunity to comply with the Standing Orders.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes, Mr President. I always believe that if people make a statement they should be prepared to stand by it, but the Government is not doing that at this time.

The PRESIDENT: Order! It is not the Government which is asking you to comply; it is the Chair, and I suggest you do so or I will implement the Standing Order.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: In his speech the Minister said—

The Government, as the elected representative of the community, can no longer allow the public to be denied essential and basic commodities by a militant minority.

Again the militant minority is not named. Who are they? Is it necessary to introduce a Bill like this to hit at the militant minority? Is the Government referring to the TWU, because that is the only union mentioned in the Minister's second reading speech? If the Government has a reason for introducing a Bill like this, it should have the courage to name the unions it regards as the militant minority.

However, in accordance with the usual practice of members opposite, they have indicated that they have received letters from many people complaining about the actions of the unions, but we never see them on the Table of the House. Members opposite are supposed to have received phone calls concerning the actions of militant unions and we are told that it is about time something was done about these militant unions,

but nothing concrete is produced by the people who make these statements.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: That is not correct.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I have not seen a single letter brought here containing any complaint about militant unionists, or any unionists at all.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I have produced letters and you know it.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Did the honourable member table them? No.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I quoted them.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: No-one else has seen them.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I am talking about truck drivers, for a start.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is one in the five years the honourable member has been here.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I have had more than one.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Masters is like everyone else in the Chamber. He makes assertions, but has nothing with which to back them up. That is what the Minister is doing in his second reading speech. He is referring to militant unions, but he does not back up his statement by naming them. That is wrong. As I said before, I do not know what people, going on holidays at Christmas—

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You said that an hour ago.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: —have to do with essential foodstuffs. It is a mystery. I think the Minister must have been carried away in his endeavours to crack down on the unions.

I do not consider the House should support the legislation although I know it will, because members opposite are sitting here waiting for a division to be called, and like the well disciplined people they are they will remain on their side of the House and vote for the legislation. If the legislation is passed and implemented on too many occasions, there will be far more industrial turbulence and strife in the trade union movement than is being experienced at the present time.

THE HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [5.14 a.m.]: I oppose the second reading of the Bill which is the second piece of legislation in a matter of months which it is claimed will do the same thing. Let me remind the House that despite all the huffing and puffing, and despite all the abuse of trade unions, trade union leaders, and trade unionists who, after all, are members of the

community, nothing has changed, and nothing will change as a result of the introduction of the Bill, which is a shabby political stunt by a Government which has not got a feather with which to fly, as was amply demonstrated by the Governor's Speech.

This Bill is the action of a Premier who is losing his touch and who, in my opinion, is becoming unsettled and unstable, thus taking on all the attributes of a megalomaniac.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is a statement and a half! Have a look in a mirror!

The Hon. D. K. DAns: The Government cannot substantiate the reason for the introduction of the Bill.

What is the headline in today's paper? It is "Government get-tough line to curb unions". It emerges as a shabby Liberal-National Country Party trick, because already Mr Street has given notice that he will introduce legislation similar to this Bill.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I understand Mr Wran is doing the same thing in New South Wales.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I am not talking about Mr Wran. If it is not proper to comment on debates that take place in another Chamber of this Parliament, as far as I understand the big book it is not proper to comment on actions in other Parliaments of Australia. The Leader of the House does not know what Mr Wran is introducing. He is merely speculating; he has no idea.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We will see.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I will see, just as the Leader of the House will see, but at the present time he has no idea whether Mr Wran is in fact introducing legislation. Moreover, he has no idea what kind of legislation Mr Wran is introducing.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I can make a pretty fair guess.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I do not imagine that we are in this Chamber to guess. We take an oath when we come into this Chamber and we do not guess or speculate; we work on facts.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: When you stood up you said you were speculating.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: The article in today's issue of *The West Australian* says—

They were immediately branded an "exercise in bastardry" by the Opposition's spokesman on industrial relations, Mr Young—

Mr Young accuses Mr Street of going to see Mr Hamer last Sunday in order to stir up industrial unrest to assist the Liberal Party in the forthcoming Victorian State election. We know all the problems the Victorian Liberal Government has because of having the custard mixed with the jam in its land deals.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: You were talking about irrelevancies a moment ago.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I never mentioned the word "irrelevancies" at all. A Government of any political complexion has the task of governing for all of the people. It has the task of supporting the processes of conciliation and arbitration. When those systems appear to fail, it has the task of stepping in to assist. It has the task of doing the kinds of things I mentioned earlier tonight that Mr Hawke does.

I have already read in the Press that as far as the employees and the Egg Marketing Board are concerned the dispute has been settled. I am not sure whether this will make any difference to the delivery of eggs but I understand the Transport Workers' Union refused to deliver eggs while the dispute was in progress. It may well be the settlement does not make a great deal of difference, but that was part of the overall scene. It is stated in today's newspaper that the dispute has been resolved.

It is amazing that on the eve of what we consider to be the settlement of the dispute this kind of legislation is rushed into the Parliament—rushed through the Assembly and brought here to what is supposed to be a House of Review. I do not mind admitting it is not a House of Review, but I nearly throw up when I hear people on the other side continue to claim it is a House of Review. I agree with Mr Cooley that we are going through a charade or a comic opera to get a rubber stamp on something which is not aimed at settling a dispute or bringing about harmonious relations in the community but is merely aimed at trying to make a shabby political trick work.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: If you think it is a trick you must think we will get public support.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: Yes. It is always easy to divide the people on almost any issue, but what this Government and the Fraser Government do not seem to realise is that no matter how they twist and turn the economic crisis will deepen. The people in this country today are too well educated and too well informed to accept the yoke that has been placed on their backs. Industrial disputation about wage losses is today a matter of life and death for people at a certain wage level.

Why do transport workers on a low wage go on strike and lose one, two, or three weeks' pay or a couple of days' pay? They go out in sheer desperation. And what is involved? Eight dollars, and Mr Cooley has outlined the reason for that \$8. This kind of disputation will increase because there is no escaping or running away from the facts, and all the twisting and turning in the world will not turn the clock in the other direction. If one looks very carefully one will see the transfer of wealth from the needy to the greedy since the Fraser Government took office. But that debate will wait until a later stage in this session. It can be proved beyond a shadow of doubt that that is what is happening.

People are losing wages week after week because of the application of indexation and the failure of the courts to provide the full indexation flow-on in most cases. With the cost of living increases, in order to maintain even a fraction of their living standards people are driven to take desperate action such as the transport workers have recently taken.

Let us have a look at the Minister's second reading speech and the contradictions of the Government in relation to this Bill. Indeed, on my reading of the second reading speech the Government cannot even put a second reading speech together honestly. For some unknown reason it is stated—

The situation is that a handful of employees, reported to be only 550, by a majority vote of 80 put a reputed 3 000 transport workers out on strike, affecting the supply of essential commodities to approximately one million people.

We know the majority that operates in this place and the reason that it operates, and it affects the life of everyone in Western Australia. At least the votes of all the people at that meeting were of equal value. Mr Cooley has already pointed to the fact that we are not affecting the supply of essential commodities to approximately one million people.

On page 6 of the Minister's speech notes we have a real pearl of wisdom, where it is said—

This Bill is not concerned with the rights and wrongs of industrial disputes.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Ha, ha!

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I wash my hands among the innocent. I am now free to go forward and lop off the head of anyone I stumble across. Further on in the speech we see how it does not have anything to do with industrial disputation. On page 10 of the Minister's notes the speech

goes into a completely different area. Presumably referring to the Transport Workers' Union he says—

This union has disrupted the community continually and it is disappointing to see its lack of concern for the public.

We are not concerned with industrial disputation; this Bill has nothing to do with it. The speech continues—

Today, if a person is going east he cannot be sure, with the number of airline strikes, when he will return.

Does that refer to the Transport Workers' Union or does it refer to the airline pilots or the air traffic controllers? It is not specified but in my opinion it is clearly aimed at the Transport Workers' Union. However, in my opinion the other unions I have just mentioned, and indeed also the hostesses, the maintenance workers, and the technical staff who work at airports, have all had disputes in the airlines industry. Yet this Government says it does not want to have anything to do with industrial disputes, and that is the tribunals' job. Then it goes on with this long diatribe against the Transport Workers' Union, I presume. Or does it in fact take to task the airline pilots and the other unions I mentioned? If it does, let the Government stand up and say so. It does not say so. It does not name the other unions because it is afraid to do so in view of the fact that those unions are powerful organisations with a Federal basis and professional status.

It is very significant to note the areas this Government ventures into when it engages in its self-appointed task of union baiting. Mr Cooley and I went through the period when it was red baiting. Then it turned to left-wing unions. Now the popular term is "militant unions". I have asked on a number of occasions what people mean by "militant unions" and I have not received an answer.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Anyone the Government does not like.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: That is right. The Minister's second reading speech continues—

Just prior to Christmas a number of people who had saved for many years to go on a holiday were unable to do so because of an airline strike that precluded them from catching their boats and transport from the east.

How do we know a number of people had saved for years? Has not the Government a right to qualify that remark? After all, we know this is

not a House of Review. It is a rubber stamp House. But surely the Government has some responsibility to the Parliament and to the people who put us here to qualify such remarks. However, it does not. That remark is almost as brazen as the statement on page 6.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: It would be a bit like the Labor Party and the Mining Bill.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I told Mr Lewis when I was on my feet on that occasion that I had no intention of making him the folk hero of the south-west, and I was not in the pay of the National Country Party, either. The speech continues—

The tactics and the inconvenience this union has caused to the public has been regular and has been, in many cases, irresponsible and unnecessary.

Here again we see the arrogance, mainly that of the Premier, coming through. He brands it irresponsible; therefore it is irresponsible. The second reading speech goes on to say—

It has not used courses open to it through arbitration and, in many cases, has caused hardship to its own members.

The union's own members are the best people to determine whether the union has caused them hardship. To continue—

The majority of the public and the Government are sick of the irresponsible action so often taken by irresponsible unions—

It now becomes "unions" in the plural. I must assume that the people who could not go on their holidays and those who were stranded overseas and in Western Australia were stranded by the actions of other unions in addition to the Transport Workers' Union. But why not come out and mention the unions? The Government is not game.

The Minister's speech notes went on to say that the Government as the elected representative of the community can no longer allow the public to be denied essential and basic commodities by a militant minority. Quite apart from anything else, if I were the Minister and someone prepared that speech for me, I would sack him; because in any other forum a person who quoted such a document in support of this Bill would be made a laughing stock. The Minister's second reading speech should be framed.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: The Bill is all right.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I will get to that in a minute. I am saying the second reading speech of the Minister in support of the Bill is a disgrace.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: One section of it is not very good at all, but the Bill is okay.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I do not know about that; I am not supporting the Bill. Why should the Minister present that kind of nonsense? It is a mere fabrication which makes the person who reads it look a fool, because it contradicts itself.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You just read it.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Yes, I read it, but I did not introduce it to this place. Without taking a vote on the matter, anybody who is at all fair-minded would agree with what I am saying.

Trade unions have existed in this country practically since the first fleet arrived. There is some evidence that people being transported to the colony organised themselves into unions whilst still on the ships; and unions have remained since then, in excess of 200 years.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Was that the TWU?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: In another form, yes; they used to be known as teamsters in those days. A great number of changes have occurred in the meantime, because wheelwrights have become something else in motorcar factories, and so on. However, the point I am making is that unions have been around for a long time and will continue to be with us.

This Bill is a hollow, shallow attempt to boost the Government's ego so that it can say to the public, "Look what we did to solve the problem", rather than provide the community with a sense of confidence, well-being, and security. Instead of doing that, the Government is driving sections of the community further apart.

Earlier tonight someone asked me if this Bill will do anything. Of course, it is an old, tried, and tested tactic of divide and conquer or divide and govern. The people are so confused today that the unions on strike today might find the union members who were on strike yesterday criticising the union members who will be on strike tomorrow. It all boils down to one thing: a deepening economic crisis and persistent efforts to make the ordinary men and women of Australia carry the burden. I can assure this House of Review, this rubber stamp, or this house of dolls—whatever one likes to call it—such tactics will not work. If and when the Government faces up to its responsibility of trying to do something to bring the people together and to achieve some unity in respect of resolving industrial disputes, that is the time it will have my support. At that time the Government will be doing a service not only to the people of Western Australia but also to the people of Australia.

It is amazing that this is the only State in Australia in which Bills of this nature are persistently presented to the Parliament and the public as some kind of banner or poster in an effort to say to the people, "Look what we are doing." Yet when one reads the Bill one finds it will do absolutely nothing. When one compares the Bill with the Governor's Speech—and I will do that on any public forum—one sees how hollow, shallow, and deceitful is this action of bringing forward the Bill and trying to create an aura of crisis.

The Government is trying to create an air of urgency by forcing us to debate a Bill after most of us have been here since 9 o'clock yesterday morning. How can we act as responsible legislators at this time of the morning? It is a ramp. It is a ramp perpetuated by people who have run out of ideas and who have no idea of how to manage the affairs of this country in times of normal development, or in times of abnormal economic decline not only in this country but in all western countries also.

When one reads the Bill one finds it is almost laughable. In the first instance it talks about three commodities: eggs, bread, and milk. If one reads the comments of medical scribes who write regularly in women's magazines, local newspapers, and the media, one finds that bread is said to be bad for one. Therefore, if bread is in short supply perhaps we are doing the health of the nation a great deal of good. In addition, there is a large body of opinion which brands milk as one of the greatest poisons in our community.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: And that is wrong.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I agree with Mr McNeill. However, there is a body of opinion which says milk is a poison which should never be fed to humans after they are weaned. That body of opinion points out that apart from humans no other animal which suckles partakes of milk after weaning.

When we turn to butter we find the consumption in Australia has decreased so dramatically that it is a wonder margarine is not mentioned in the Bill. Some people say butter is the root of all evil, and that people who eat a lot of butter are lining themselves up for a stroke or a heart attack. I do not believe that, either.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: That is wrong, too.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: However, that view is believed by the majority of people in the community. I agree that the dairy industry has been subjected to the greatest fear campaign ever mounted in Australia. Of course, the campaign

was initiated by the best public relations experts in the world.

Then we come to the last commodity: eggs. How many times have Mr MacKinnon and I, who are of a rather advanced age, read that if we eat more than three eggs a week it will be the stone end of us because we will certainly suffer a heart attack? I do not want to mention a few other pleasant pastimes, but after one has disposed of all those commodities there is not much left.

I am not trying to be facetious; I am simply trying to point out that if we denied those so-called essential commodities to the community we could be doing the people a favour.

The Hon. W. M. Piesse: But you are forgetting we have children.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: No, but one should never feed those commodities to children over the age of seven years. Just around the corner from here, is the Heart Foundation, from which one can obtain cookery books. If one wishes to follow what is set out in those books, one would have to live on a pretty spartan diet.

I have seen no evidence to suggest there is a shortage of cartoned milk. Certainly, there is not a shortage in my home. I have not seen any shortage of butter. I have not seen any shortage of bread although in my home we do not eat much of it; we eat a special rye bread. We do eat eggs, and we have not suffered any shortage of those. I have not received complaints from people in the South Metropolitan Province; nor have I received any calls for the imposition of this Bill.

Moreover, only yesterday I saw a provedore's truck going to the wharf, and the truck was laden with cartons of eggs and what appeared to me to be tins of homogenised milk. Evidently that provedore had no problem in carrying on his business. I do not know about bread and other commodities, but I am sure if he had the commodities I have mentioned he would not be short of the others.

Therefore, why this Bill? The only things not contained in the Bill are comic illustrations. The measure was not drawn up by a Parliamentary Draftsman, but rather by a public relations officer in the Premier's Department who has been instructed to stir up a bit of strife in order to get some support for the Government. Evidently one person drew up the Bill, and then someone else further down the chain of command was told to write a second reading speech—and never the twain shall meet until tonight, because when one compares the two one can only laugh at the comments made in the speech.

This Bill will be no better than the Flour Act. It will certainly not expedite any settlement of the dispute. I may be wrong, but I do not think there is any necessity for this Bill yet. I use the word "yet", because as I understand the situation Commissioner Halliwell has called the parties together at 8.00 a.m. today to see if the issue can be resolved. Certainly there is no need to surround this Bill with this great fanfare of trumpets, and the aura of crisis. That situation simply does not exist.

I will not go through the clauses in the Bill, because that has been done adequately by Mr Cooley and it is early in the morning. The clauses are similar to those contained in the Flour Act. We should not have to go through this pantomime which has lasted for hours and hours. A medical practitioner would doubt our sanity and our ability to think straight at this hour of the morning. However, we will vote on the measure, irrespective of how dull and deadened we are from the long hours of being in this place, because the Government believes it is essential that the measure be passed in order to boost its stocks. The Government wants to be able to say, "We brought out the big stick, and this is what happened."

It would be far better if the Government were to make this measure a standard procedure and attach it to our Standing Orders so that we would not have to go through this charade every time the issue arises. We would not have to put up with that other gimmick—the Minister's second reading speech.

The Flour Bill is the same as the Bill to ensure the supply of essential foodstuffs and essential commodities. We would not have to have all this debate; it would be there, ready all the time. Every time the Bill was trotted out, we could have another laugh at the second reading speech. All that would have to be changed in the Bill, which is becoming the *pro forma* for this Government, would be the name of the essential foodstuff—filleted fish, or whatever it was. Let me conclude by saying that this Bill is a joke. It is a charade. If I was leading the union that the Bill was aimed at, I would die laughing.

THE HON. F. E. MCKENZIE (East Metropolitan) [5.46 a.m.]: I join in the debate in opposition to the Bill. Although much of what I intend to say has been said earlier by the two previous speakers on this side of the House, nevertheless I feel it necessary to repeat those remarks.

I believe also that the introduction of this Bill is a cheap political stunt. It is generated by a

Government which, judging by the Governor's Speech delivered here the other night, is bereft of ideas to put to the Parliament. As a result of that, the Government intends to bring forward this type of legislation, which is really not necessary.

If one looks at the provisions in the Bill and has regard to the comments made by the Minister in his second reading speech, one notes that continually throughout that speech the Minister says that the Government has not sat idly by. He said that had it not been for the goodwill and assistance of the producers and suppliers, and the tolerance of the public, the community would now be subjected to grave food shortages. The fact is that the community is not subjected to grave food shortages. I cannot understand why the Government has introduced this Bill, and is trying to rush it through both Houses of Parliament in the one session. We received the Bill in this House at some time after 3.00 a.m. We are expected to study the provisions of the Bill and then agree or disagree with its contents. That is not giving a fair go to the members of the Parliament. It is very difficult, particularly after one has been up since some time early the previous day, to be given a Bill at three in the morning and to be expected to go through it, find the faults in it, and comment on them.

In the Minister's second reading speech, he says in Parliament that, according to the information provided yesterday, there was a record sale of eggs at up to 20c less than the normal price. Where is the grave food shortage and the necessity to introduce a Bill covering essential commodities, when that type of situation has prevailed? There has been a record sale of eggs at prices up to 20c less than the normal price.

To defend the action of the Government, the Minister went on to say that bread has been baked regularly, but that flour supplies are likely to run short unless immediate action is taken. There is nothing definite about flour supplies running short. I have no doubt that the same position would apply in respect of flour as in respect of the availability of milk, eggs, and bread.

The Minister said later in his speech that the action of a small minority is totally unreasonable in view of the fact that it is well known the matter is before industrial tribunals and a decision may be expected in a few days. As I understand it, there is likely to be a decision in respect of this matter later today. I cannot see any need for the indecent haste embarked upon by the Government on this occasion in introducing this Bill. We are expected to give the Bill serious consideration.

Further in his second reading speech the Minister said that the Bill is not concerned with the rights and wrongs of industrial disputes. However, the Minister said a little later that the union has disrupted the community continually, and it is disappointing to see its lack of concern for the public.

He went on to speak about the number of airline strikes. What has that to do with the grave food shortage that we are likely to be facing as a result of action by members of the Transport Workers' Union? Further on the Minister mentioned people who had difficulty returning from the Eastern States as a result of an airline strike. The Minister said in part of his speech that the Bill was not concerned with the rights and wrongs of industrial disputes. Why in the world, then, did he go on later in his speech to talk about airline strikes which have nothing to do with the shortage of bread, milk, and eggs?

The Minister said that tactics employed by the union have caused inconvenience to the public. I do not believe that is a fact. There is no problem in respect of the shortage of essential commodities now.

The Bill contains certain penalty provisions. Clause 11 refers to proceedings for offences against the Bill and indicates they shall be heard before a Court of Petty Sessions constituting a stipendiary magistrate sitting alone. I wonder why there is no provision for a matter to be dealt with by a judge and jury. A person liable to six months' imprisonment should be able to be tried by a jury. Is the Government afraid such a person might well be able to obtain sympathy from a jury, whereas if his case went before a stipendiary magistrate the result might be different? I have known people, who have been accused of offences, electing to go before a jury and their move has been successful.

The Government has been successful by ensuring in this legislation that a person considered to be guilty of an offence would not be afforded the opportunity to be tried by a jury.

I would not mind if the Government had me sitting here all night to deal with legislation presented to Parliament with solutions to the problem of unemployment, but this Bill will not solve unemployment. The Government is seeking to provoke a situation of confrontation. That is all it has left because its record in this Parliament during its term of office is one of creating unemployment which is now running at a record level. Western Australia has faced a continually deteriorating position in this regard.

That is what is worrying the Government; and to take some pressure off it and to stop the people from thinking about this sort of problem the Government has introduced this type of legislation. Time and time again we will find this type of legislation brought before us, because there is nothing else the Government can introduce in its legislative programme to take the minds of the people away from the real problems facing Western Australians.

It is late and there are other speakers who have much to say. I do not intend continually to repeat myself for the purpose of filibustering.

I am disappointed that apart from the Minister who introduced the Bill no Government member has seen fit to give the Bill support; they have remained seated and have done absolutely nothing. This is supposed to be legislation which they regard to be so important that it must be rushed through this House and through the other place in one sitting. However, not one of them has had the courage to get up and speak to the Bill.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: We have plenty of time.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: There have been three speakers in succession from this side of the House opposing the legislation. We have not heard a single word to justify the Government's action from members opposite. It would appear to me as though the introduction of the Bill has come only from the Cabinet; it has been a Cabinet decision to bring the matter forward. The rest of the Government members do not have a clue about the legislation and do not really support it. The Cabinet has tried to ensure that when the next election comes along the minds of the people will have been turned away from the problems the Government has created. All it wants the people to know is that it can resolve industrial disputes when, in fact, those disputes have already been resolved.

I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I move—

That the House do now divide.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Shame!

The PRESIDENT: In order to comply with Standing Order No. 99 it is essential that 10 members stand to indicate they support the motion.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Watch the puppets get up.

More than 10 members having risen.

The PRESIDENT: Ring the bells.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Don't you want debate?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Not your sort of debate.

The PRESIDENT: Before I appoint the tellers, I notice there are no "Noes" and, therefore, the decision is in the affirmative that the House do now divide.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Could you tell me, under the circumstances, seeing nobody is voting with the "Noes", whether there is any necessity for a division?

The PRESIDENT: The question is that the House do now divide.

Motion thus passed.

The PRESIDENT: The question is that the Bill be now read a second time.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Could members resume their original places as they cannot vote from strange seats?

The PRESIDENT: Will honourable members please resume their own seats?

Point of Order

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: On a point of order, I cannot find it in the Standing Orders, but I thought that, once a dissentient voice had been raised with respect to the division, members were not allowed to leave the Chamber. I seem to recall something to that effect in the Standing Orders.

The PRESIDENT: That is only after the tellers have been appointed—Standing Order No. 226.

Debate Resumed

The Hon. R. G. Pike: May I ask a question for clarification? I understood we had just carried a motion that the House do now divide, and my question is: Does the House now need to divide on the substantive question?

The PRESIDENT: The House has already done that and the question before the Chair at the moment is that the Bill be read a second time, and I am about to put it.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 19

Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. W. M. Piesse
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. T. McNeil	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. G. E. Masters
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	

(Teller)

Noes 8

Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. R. Hetherington	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. T. Leeson	Hon. R. F. Cloughton

(Teller)

Pair

Aye

No

Hon. R. J. L. Williams	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
------------------------	----------------------

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

Point of Order

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I did raise this point of order a while ago and my interpretation of Standing Order No. 217 was that the person who called the division did need to remain in his seat, regardless from which side of the House the division was called. It was my understanding that it came from this side of the House.

The PRESIDENT: I understood it came from the other side of the House.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (the Hon. V. J. Ferry) in the Chair; the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Leader of the House) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short Title—

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I object to the short title, because I believe it ought to be called "The Blatant Opportunism Act" and not the "Essential Foodstuffs and Commodities Act". The Bill does not refer to that subject at all. It refers to the Government which is in blatantly trying to pre-empt a decision by the appropriate tribunal which was set up to arbitrate on industrial matters and bring down decisions on them.

It seems to me this particular title, is in fact, making a farce of the whole business of parliamentary procedures. The Government brought Parliament together yesterday in a manner which is not conducive to good government or the proper conduct of the Legislature. The Government has thumbed its nose not only at the Opposition, but also at the people of this State and the whole parliamentary system.

I cannot understand people sitting on the Government benches, in whom at least I had some faith, being amused by the whole procedure. They are saying, "You have not got the numbers. Aren't you a lot of dills?" I believe members opposite are not laughing at us; they are laughing at the whole parliamentary procedure, the Westminster system, and the whole electorate of

Western Australia. I object strongly to the short title.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I too think the short title is a misnomer. I am not sure whether I agree with the Hon. Grace Vaughan. It might be called the "Sir Charles Court Benefit Bill". Why are we racing this Bill through? Why are we using the gag to get the Bill through the Chamber tonight? It seems to me the Government has taken the first opportunity available in Parliament to push through the Bill, because it is afraid the dispute might be settled before the Bill is passed.

As far as I understand it, the purpose of the Bill is not to ensure the supply of certain essential commodities. It sets out to promulgate legislation which will be on the Statute book until after the next election—21 sitting days into the next Parliament.

The Bill gives wide and sweeping powers to the Government. It gives the Government powers which some people have described as a socialist measure. I would not describe it as a socialist measure. It is more like a nationalist socialist measure. It allows the Government to declare anything to be an essential foodstuff or commodity at any time to suit itself, and gives the Government very wide powers to deal with the situation. In other words, it sets up the Government for the next artificial crisis it wants to create and it allows the Government to keep crises going in order to serve its own purposes in relation to elections.

At one stage it was suggested by some people that we might have an election in November, because after the successful euphoria of the 150th Anniversary celebrations it was thought the Government might consider that was a good time for an election; but that plan does not seem to be working very well. Perhaps union bashing will be the key issue as far as this Government is concerned. Consequently, the Government is taking advantage of the present dispute involving the TWU, not because the Government wants to resolve the dispute, as that is likely to happen anyway. I would be very surprised if the dispute is still on by the end of the week. If it is, it will probably be because of the Bill under which the Government has provoked and exacerbated the situation, which is its intention. There is no doubt about that whatever. It is government by huff, puff, and confrontation.

I recall that in one of my speeches when I first came into the Chamber I suggested it would be a good idea to try some conciliation instead of confrontation, but ever since I have been here the

Government has followed a policy of confrontation, and whenever members opposite get up they tend to condemn unions and seem to consider that all the economic evils which confront the country at the moment are as a result of trade union action. So we have the union bashing and dole bludger bashing which have become the features of speeches by members opposite.

Now we have the Bill before us which is not really concerned with eggs, milk, and bread. It concerns our giving the Government widespread powers under which, if the Government cared to use them, it could take over anything it desired. I am not suggesting it will do that. It will be selective and will intervene in other disputes in order to exacerbate the situation and try to build up an atmosphere of fear and hatred in the community because such a situation serves its purposes.

The timing of the Bill is wrong and the action of the Government in forcing it through Parliament, giving members—particularly in another place—no opportunity to study it, is disgraceful. If the Government were genuine and were trying to do something about a specific situation it could well have permitted Mr Cooley to adjourn the debate, and subsequently we could have further debated the measure later today. That would have given us little enough time, but it would have been better than the present situation under which the Bill is being forced through overnight.

I find little in the Bill or in the Government's attitude to give me any joy. After all, the Minister's second reading speech does not deal with the issues which the Bill is designed to cover. It moves from foodstuffs to airlines and is concerned with whipping up anti-union feeling. The Government is using unfortunate tactics.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: They are not our tactics at all. You read the Bill.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I have read the Bill and the second reading speech, and I have listened to the comments made by a number of members over the last two years, but I have not been terribly impressed by it all.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Because it does not suit you, of course.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: It does not suit me, it does not suit the public, and it is not in the interests of the State or anyone else who does not believe in the confrontation, division, and hatred which is being built up. Of course, it does not suit me or the trade unions which are trying to preserve their members' standard of living and

the standard of living of many other people. I am quite prepared to say it does not suit me.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: It does not suit the people who dictate to you and give you orders.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: The honourable member would be wise if he did not use that nonsensical sort of argument.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: It is true.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I would point out to him briefly that I am in the Labor Party, which I know about, and it is a party to which trade unions belong. I am in the party freely, because I believe in its policies and because I generally believe in what the unions are doing. I do not believe in what every union is doing, but I believe in unionism. I have just joined a union, because I believe in unionism. I believe in unionism and I believe in the Labor Party. I believe that in unity of labour is the hope of the world, and that in the unity of the people of this country is the hope of the country. In this time of economic and energy crises when we are facing problems because the great post-war boom and euphoria is over, we need a great deal of patience and unity to overcome them. This Government is not likely to overcome the problems, and this Bill will serve no good purpose in our society.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Your diatribes do less.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: That is a matter of opinion.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: My opinion is as good as yours.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I have not been impressed by some of the diatribes of the Minister.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Just listen to you. You are displaying too much emotion.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I have heard the Minister carrying on at various times, but at least my speeches have been consistent and are based on some kind of principle, which is something the Minister would hardly understand.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is a disgraceful thing to say and you know it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There are far too many interjections.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I will not even bother to ask him to withdraw the remark.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: The Minister has said that my remarks are disgraceful.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They are and you know it.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I am quite unmoved by the nonsense he talks.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Nonsense my eye!

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I do not wish to swap personalities with the Minister.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Why do you do it then? You say you do not want to do it and then you proceed to do so in your usual stupid way.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I will continue to deal with the Bill.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: When you do that it will be a change.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I am certain that the Bill is unlikely to serve its ostensible purpose and that it has been introduced for some different reason. Even if we were to allow that the Government's motives were as given, I maintain that the Bill is still bad. It is not the time to introduce a Bill like this. If there were any real need for it or if the Government were interested in solving this particular problem, it would have waited for up to four days before completing the debate on the Bill. The legislation could have been introduced, and the debate could have been adjourned to see what would have occurred.

However, the Government is determined to complete the Bill's passage through Parliament at this sitting, because it believes in confrontation and fear and it wants to frighten the TWU. Whether or not it succeeds remains to be seen. I do not know how the union will react to this Bill. I hope it does not behave reactively, but ignores what is going on in this Chamber and indulges in some form of negotiation. I hope that the dispute will end because this would be a good thing, and I hope that Commissioner Halliwell will bring it to an end.

Certainly, I do not get much joy out of strikes; I do not get much joy out of the need for unions to strike; nor do I get much joy out of the results of some of the strikes. However, I still claim—as I have ever since I have been here—that we would be better to try to conciliate and mediate. Mediation and conciliation are what we need in difficult situations. We have to be patient. It would be a good idea if this Government tried to do without confrontation. I do not want confrontation.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You are supporting these people.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I am trying to understand their problems, and it would be a good idea if the Government did likewise.

I would have been happy to hear the gentlemen opposite, who are now defending the Bill by

interjection, get up and make a reasoned defence of it. If members opposite do not like what I am saying, I would be glad to hear them defend the Bill to see whether they have any real reasons or arguments that hold together.

I have found that second reading speeches are usually short and unsatisfactory. Usually they lack any great depth of explanation. That is certainly true of what happened tonight.

I have made my point; I do not want to labour it unduly. It seems to me this Bill is ill-conceived and has been introduced at the wrong time. The title is a misnomer. It is not really a Bill to make sure that supplies are made available. If one reads the rest of the Bill one will see it is a Bill to make sure in the future the Government can seize on any issue at any time and intervene.

From my experience of the Government, and after watching it operate, it is becoming more and more frenetic. If this Bill becomes an Act—and it seems it will be bulldozed through this House tonight—we will have a great deal to worry about. The Government will react too often in the wrong place at the wrong time, and disputes will not be brought to an end. Therefore, I oppose the clause.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: I also oppose the title of the Bill because it would be more aptly named, "a provision to ensure that confrontation with the trade union movement should continue". Nothing has been said today to indicate that there is any shortage of essential foodstuffs and commodities. I do not think the Government is honest in giving the present title to the Bill.

The purpose of the Bill is to create confrontation with the trade union movement at a time when it is not necessary. I would say that the history of the trade union movement indicates there is less likelihood at this particular time of a shortage of essential foodstuffs and commodities. For that reason I cannot understand why the Government wants to introduce this measure with indecent haste, and expect us to go through the Bill clause by clause and make rational judgments. The Government has shown it is unable to solve the problem of unemployment, and it has brought forward a Bill of this nature to direct the attention of people away from the real problems which are facing the community in Western Australia. The Government wants to ensure that it has an even-money chance at the election next year.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Its chances are not very good at the moment.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: Its chances do not look very good and that is the reason it is trying to direct the people's attention away from the problems which are facing the community.

The Government is hoping the people will fall for this type of gimmick. Members of this Chamber have been kept up all night, but the Government will get the kudos when it claims it has solved the dispute. Actually, it has done nothing of the kind. After all, that is what the industrial arbitration system is for.

It is a misnomer to claim that the Bill is for an Act to make provision to ensure the supply of essential foodstuffs and commodities. The Bill is not aptly named because there is no real problem in respect of that particular matter. The Government is attempting gimmickery to ensure it has some chance at the next State election.

If this type of legislation is to be the trend which will continue right throughout this session, I am afraid it will not be acceptable to the people of Western Australia. During the early hours of the morning we ought to be debating the problems which face our young people when they try to find employment. They are really desperate. There are also the problems of the pensioners, such as the lack of sufficient money to purchase essentials. Those are the areas which ought to be attracting our attention. The Bill should be named, "A Bill to ensure that the confrontation with the trade union movement continues". For that reason I cannot support the title of the Bill.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I move—

That the Committee do now divide.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Committee do now divide. This motion requires an affirmative vote by 10 members of that opinion.

Motion put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 18

Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. W. M. Piesse
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. T. McNeil	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	Hon. G. E. Masters

(Teller)

Noes 8

Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. Hetherington	Hon. R. F. Cloughton

(Teller)

Pair

No

Aye	No
Hon. R. J. L. Williams	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs

Motion thus passed.

Clause put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 18

Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. W. M. Piesse
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. T. McNeil	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	Hon. G. E. Masters

(Teller)

Noes 8

Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. Hetherington	Hon. R. F. Calughton

(Teller)

Pair

Aye	No
Hon. R. J. L. Williams	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs

Clause thus passed.

Clause 2: Interpretation—

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: An area in which this legislation most seriously fails is in the use of the word "essential". The Minister's second reading speech gave indications that the commodities mentioned in this clause are not in short supply. As has already been said several times, a record quantity of eggs has been supplied and sold. So from that point of view we cannot say a serious shortage has existed in the community. We all know from our own household experience that there are no shortages of milk and bread.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: You support the strike and the strikers, yet you are prepared to accept milk which is provided by the producers.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Members on the other side have continually spoken from their seats tonight. Not one of them has had the intestinal fortitude to get to his feet and make a speech. Their speeches have been made by way of interjection. They cannot expect members on this side to take notice of what they say unless they are prepared to get to their feet and make a contribution which will enable us to test one another's point of view. I will not take any notice of Mr McNeill and his interjection for that reason.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: Of course you will not, because you are despicable.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver interjected.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Mr Oliver and Mr McNeill give us no opportunity to deal with their statements made in the proper way. Judging by their interjections they are agitated. The Minister's second reading speech refers to the so-called breaking of laws, but we have had very little regard for the laws normally applied in the conduct of this Chamber.

Let us have no more nonsensical interjections; let us deal with the contents of the Bill. We are discussing clause 2 which sets out interpretations of essential commodities.

I commenced my remarks by saying that in his second reading speech the Minister indicated there are no serious shortages. From our own experience we know this is so. I visited a household during the tea suspension tonight, and one of the members of that household brought in a bottle of milk he had purchased locally. I know that shops in my local centre had sold out of flour last Saturday because people were making provision to bake their own bread. Although we have had ample supplies of manufactured bread in our house, my wife has taken the opportunity to try her hand at making bread. She did this quite successfully.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: That must help the unemployment situation no doubt.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I do not know what it has to do with the unemployment situation. The ingredients were all bought at the shops, and I have never yet heard any argument against people undertaking activities like this in their own homes. Is Mr Oliver putting forward the view that people should not bake their own cakes, biscuits, or bread, or that they should not make their own furniture, because such activities will create some unemployment in the community? How ridiculous. My wife does not intend to take up baking bread regularly; I was simply pointing out that she had taken the opportunity to try her hand at this skill. Being a very competent woman, she was highly successful. She used an easy recipe that I am quite prepared to pass on.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Can you give it to us now?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Not off hand.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Does she baste it with milk?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: This recipe was passed on to her several years ago by Mrs Jean Ritter, a person known to us all.

This clause deals with essential commodities, and I have demonstrated there are no serious shortages of these. We must question the very necessity for this legislation. The situation would be different if there were a widespread serious shortage of a range of essential foodstuffs. That is not the present situation, and the Government did not try to pretend that it was.

The first interpretation deals with the term "essential commodities". In his speech the

Minister did not indicate any problem with the supply of commodities, other than the foodstuffs specifically referred to later. It is difficult to see why this particular reference was included. No suggestion has been made that any industrial problem will call for this part of the Bill to be brought into effect. All we can say is that the Government is casting its net extremely wide for purposes that were not made clear in the second reading speech.

Not only is the Government casting its net very wide, but also it is taking unto itself extreme powers, as set out in clause 5. Why are such extreme powers there required? Surely the Government should attempt to provide some sort of justification for such powers. If we examine the second reading speech of the Leader of the House carefully, we find that there are contra-indications for such powers. He had this to say—

... it is well known that the matters, is before industrial tribunals and a decision can be expected in a few days.

As I said, that is a contra-indication for this particular piece of legislation. Not only is it being brought in with its wide scope and extreme powers, but also it is to last for an extended period—up to October, 1980.

The existing situation does not warrant the granting of these powers to the Government, or, more particularly, it does not warrant the inclusion of the interpretation of the term "essential commodities". A very limited range of foodstuffs is all that is affected at the present time.

No doubt when we come to vote on this clause, Government members will jump up like puppets, as we have already seen them do several times this evening, in support of the clause, with no questions asked by them, and certainly with no justification given by the Government for it.

The Minister has made no attempt to reply to the questions raised in the second reading debate. Instead the guillotine was applied. No attempt was made to reply to the matters raised on clause 1; again the guillotine was applied. We must assume the same process will be carried out during the rest of the debate. It is not a pretty picture we have seen in this Chamber. I cannot recall a similar situation occurring in my 11 years in this place.

Other industrial situations of more concern than the present one have arisen, and yet action such as this has not previously been taken or even been thought necessary on those occasions.

The second definition in the clause relates to essential foodstuffs and includes bread, eggs, and

milk, and other foodstuffs declared to be essential from time to time. Again we have received no elucidation of the definition. There is no indication of what the Government might feel are essential commodities, although in this case some items are mentioned.

A fair number of alternatives to bread as a foodstuff are available. Certainly a good number of people are overweight and in need of abstinence from bread for a period. A shortage of that foodstuff would not do them any harm at all. Therefore, far from being an essential foodstuff, it could be argued it is more essential for the general health of some people not to have bread at all.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Mr Pike, for example.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I will not name anyone. Generally speaking, politicians are a well-nourished section of the community.

Therefore it can be seen bread is far from being an essential foodstuff. It can be done without quite easily and, in fact, many people avoid it for health reasons. So why is it necessary to include bread in the Bill? No attempt has been made to justify its inclusion.

As far as eggs are concerned, we know that part of the dispute has been finalised. Again, eggs are a foodstuff we can very well do without because there are many other replacements as far as protein is concerned. I do not wish to give a long dissertation on diet, but eggs are a good food in many respects, containing a well-balanced combination of minerals, vitamins, carbohydrates, and protein.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Eggs, sausages, and chops will be on for breakfast in a couple of minutes.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Is Mr Gayfer trying to tempt me to shorten my speech?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You will have to get them before the Government confiscates them to feed the multitude.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: We accept that eggs provide a well-balanced diet, but they are in no way essential because all the items I have mentioned can be obtained from other sources. I am sure orchardists would welcome people purchasing more fruit in order to obtain minerals and vitamins.

The Hon. W. M. Piesse: They still have to get those things transported to Perth, don't they?

Point of Order

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: We have

listened to extremely long speeches tonight, and I think it is obvious that delaying tactics are being employed. On a previous occasion the President drew the attention of the Chamber to Standing Order No. 89. After careful examination of the speech of Mr Cloughton, I would draw your attention, Sir, to the same Standing Order. I think there is a limit beyond which this sort of thing should not be allowed to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order at the moment. I would request members to heed Standing Order No. 89 in all debates. I request the Hon. R. F. Cloughton to continue.

Committee Resumed

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Thank you, Mr Chairman. The tactic adopted by the Leader of the House is an interesting one.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Your tactic of speaking about diets, etc., is very suspect.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Had Mr MacKinnon been listening to me he would have to agree that the Standing Order to which he referred is quite inappropriate in respect of the remarks I have been making.

Mrs Piesse indicated that fruit is a commodity that is affected by the current industrial dispute. However, we are dealing with the definition in clause 2, and I was referring to eggs and how they may be replaced in one's diet.

The clause empowers the Government to declare certain foodstuffs as essential foodstuffs. In no way can eggs be described as essential, because a wide range of alternatives is available. Another source of minerals and vitamins is found in vegetables.

The third foodstuff mentioned is milk, again an attractive addition to most people's diets and one which is widely used by young children for their breakfast, combined with a cereal. We know that sort of breakfast is not recommended by dietitians and health professionals generally as being good for the general well-being of young children. They recommend a better balanced breakfast than that eaten by so many children today.

So, again, although milk is a common component of many meals, particularly breakfast, in no way can it be seen as an essential component or, indeed, as a particularly desirable one.

Of the three items the Government has seen fit to include in this definition, we must agree that none can seriously be regarded as essential to the diet of a community. Indeed, there are many more suitable replacements for these food items, and many other food combinations which are to

be preferred for the general health and well-being of the community.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Are there any foodstuffs other than bread, eggs, and milk into which you would like to digress? I am very interested in this dietary debate.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Not really; I would have the Leader of the House taking a point of order again and I do not intend to encourage him to do so. On each of these things the decision is made by some person in the Government on some unknown basis, and that decision is imposed by the Government on the people by proclamation.

The clause must be opposed because of its looseness and lack of sense and certainly for the lack of necessity in the current situation to write such a provision into legislation.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I also oppose clause 2, because it seems to me that, even if one allows for the declaration of foodstuffs as essential, the opinion of any one person or department that a foodstuff is essential is open to doubt and query. However, the point I particularly wish to discuss relates to the word "commodity" because, at least with foodstuffs, we can define that which can be eaten whereas we are not certain how widely the Minister's powers will range in regard to what may be deemed as essential commodities.

In fact, the Minister mentioned airlines in his second reading speech. Does this mean the Government is likely to confiscate aeroplanes and distribute tickets? Does it mean the Government sees this as an essential commodity, to transport members of Parliament over to Canberra or to get people up to the north where some very important works are going on? Can we perhaps envisage a conflict between the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Industrial Development in regard to trains? Perhaps that could open up a whole new field as well. So, what is to be an essential commodity? This clause is very loosely worded.

We as legislators have had to deal with this Bill at an inopportune time of the night and early morning; we have not had adequate time to consider it, and to go away and confer with people who may know something about the matter and who may help us to make a decision as to which way we will vote. We do not take the cynical view that the numbers are against us, and that there is really no point in debating the legislation. It is extremely important to point out that parts of this legislation contain very sloppy wording which should be remedied. Obviously, the Legislative Assembly, displaying a cynical attitude to the fact

that this so-called House of Review cannot review or amend legislation because members of the Assembly have gone home—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No, they have suspended the sitting until the ringing of the bells.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I think some of them will need to be able to hear the bells in Bullamakanka, because many members of the Assembly have gone home.

I cannot stress too strongly how disappointed I am that members opposite should agree to the bulldozing of this legislation and have turned their backs on proper legislative procedure in order that they can push this Bill through Parliament in one night with a beleaguered and tired complement of people sitting in this Chamber.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I too am a little concerned with the wording of this clause as it relates to commodities. I have a copy of the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* which defines "commodity" as "a useful thing, an article of trade".

Clause 2 defines "essential commodities", and must be read in conjunction with clause 3, which relates to the power of the Governor to proclaim any commodity to be an essential commodity for the purposes of the legislation. A commodity is any useful thing. Many of us have a very useful thing; some are far more useful than others. Clause 5 talks about taking possession or control. It does not seem to be a very well worded clause and I believe it needs a great deal of tidying up.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will leave the Chair until the ringing of the bells.

Sitting suspended from 7.10 to 8.00 a.m.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I thought by this time we would have heard from the Minister or some of the members opposite, giving answers to the questions raised in the second reading debate regarding the necessity for this legislation. Questions have been raised about the existence of shortages, and whether there has ever been a strike in Western Australia which has brought about shortages and undue hardships for the people of Western Australia. I submit that the Government members cannot quote any instance where a strike has brought about hardship to the people of Western Australia.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: What clause are we on?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: All this talk about holding the State to ransom, as mentioned in the Minister's second reading speech and other extravaganzas, is not in accordance with the facts.

For those reasons I do not think it necessary that the clause be passed.

I will sit now, and perhaps members opposite or the Minister may be able to explain to the Committee the reasons that they feel this legislation is so necessary, and why it has to be rushed through the Parliament in one sitting.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I move—

That the Committee do now divide.

Motion put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 18	
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. W. M. Piesse
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. T. McNeil	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	Hon. G. E. Masters
(Teller)	
Noes 8	
Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. Hetherington	Hon. R. F. Cloughton
(Teller)	

Aye	Pair	No
Hon. R. J. L. Williams		Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs

Motion thus passed.

The CHAIRMAN: The question that clause 2 stand as printed will now be put.

Point of Order

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: On a point of order, this is a different procedure from that adopted on the last occasion. I think it is incumbent upon you, Mr Chairman, to call for a division now. The motion voted on at this time was that the Committee do now divide. We should now divide on the question of clause 2.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am just about to put the question on the clause.

Committee Resumed

Clause put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 18	
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. W. M. Piesse
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. T. McNeil	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	Hon. G. E. Masters
(Teller)	

Noes 8	
Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. Hetherington	Hon. R. F. Cloughton

(Teller)

Pair

Aye	No
Hon. R. J. L. Williams	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs

Clause thus passed.

Clause 3: Proclamations of essential foodstuffs and commodities—

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I oppose clause 3. I wish to register a protest about the way the Government is handling this Bill. In this Chamber we have seen further evidence of the fact that this is not a House of Review; it is merely a rubber stamp to ensure that the will of the Liberal Party prevails.

Obviously we will see the guillotine applied from now on so as to force the Bill through. What is the great rush that has forced us to sit all night to deal with the legislation? The legislation is provocative, unnecessary, and has wide-sweeping powers that are intended to provoke the trade unions. The clause is to ensure supplies of essential goods such as bread, eggs, and milk are available to the public. I did not see any great shortage of these items at the breakfast we just had. I have not heard of shortages in the community.

I am informed that Commissioner Halliwell's decision is to be conveyed to the men quite early this morning and it appears that the decision could very well be accepted by them. I ask again, "Why the big rush to push this through?" It is obvious the Government has been looking for an excuse to place another anti-union piece of legislation on the Statute book. No-one from the other side has got up and justified the legislation. This is further evidence that the Liberal Party in this State has no respect for the institution of Parliament or democracy. It is prepared to force through legislation like this, forcing members to sit all night when it is quite unnecessary. This was done purely because the Government wanted an excuse to put the legislation on the Statute book; another piece of anti-union legislation which can be used at any time.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: No it is not; read the title.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Recently I was involved in collecting a lot of historical pictures relating to the Labor movement and tonight's debate reminds me that we have not moved very far in this State since responsible government was granted in 1890.

The CHAIRMAN: The member should confine her remarks to clause 3.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I am trying to show that the clause is indicative of the archaic attitude held by the Government with respect to working people. The sort of pictures I have been collecting—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I cannot see where the clause mentions pictures.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is not relating her remarks to clause 3. If she cannot do that, I suggest she resume her seat.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The clause is part of the Bill designed for use against the trade unions.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Not true.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: It is dealing with essential foodstuffs.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: It gives power to the Government to take certain action to ensure these goods are available. I am trying to show that this is the same sort of tactic which was adopted 70 or 80 years ago when the working people were persecuted and harassed because they tried to get a decent return for their labour.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Talk about that when we get to clause 14!

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I register a protest and indicate that the Government is not very different in its attitude towards the working people from Governments of the 19th century.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: This clause is at the heart of the Bill and it worries me. It gives the Government arbitrary power to declare by proclamation any foodstuffs or commodity to be essential. Once this is done the Government can exercise the rest of the powers contained in the Bill should it be enacted. The clause gives the Government arbitrary powers; it means that the Government at whim can decide what foodstuffs or commodities can be declared essential. Such items can be bought, sold, or seized; the Government can do what it likes with them.

This power is drawn too widely. It is the kind of power which enables the Government to take completely arbitrary action even after the next election. The Government can make an issue out of anything which may blow up. The Bill does more than it claims to do. It allows the Government to interfere and decide that anything at all which is in short supply can be considered an essential item.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: There is no way the Government can provoke an incident.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: There are a number of ways the Government can move in on a minor dispute which normally would be left alone and exacerbate it to suit the Government's wishes. I would hope the Government would not do this.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Rest assured it will not.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I will not rest assured because it seems to me our legislation should not draw Government power so widely. My commentary on this clause follows on from what I have said consistently in this Chamber in that too much legislation is giving the Executive too much power.

Normally in a representative system of government such wide powers are not given. I will not call Western Australia a democracy, because it is not. In a representative system of government people can trust governments not to go too far, but we cannot necessarily do this in this State, because we do not trust the Government. I cannot accept assurances from the Leader of the House, because he does not have the final say.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You have to be careful of the bloke who does.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: There is growing up in this State a tendency to regard critics unduly harshly, to brush them away, to suppress them and to bring them down. The Premier specifically is speaking as though he is becoming more and more impatient with the Opposition. If he can he wants to ride in on his white charger at the next election as the saviour of Western Australia from the evil unionists with their foreign supporters and all the other things his rhetoric has produced in the past. Perhaps he would be riding a red charger.

I take this clause very seriously. Even if there was no fear of its being used, the powers are drawn too widely. As this Bill lapses 21 sitting days after the next session of Parliament, I presume there is a thought that should the Labor Party win the next election the present Government would distrust it with such powers for an extended period. I do not believe the present Government can be trusted either with such powers for as long as it will have them.

This clause is the centre of the Bill. It gives the Government wide powers. From time to time the Governor may make certain declarations by proclamation. Henry VIII had great powers to do things by proclamation. The king's proclamation has the power of Statute. However, this Bill gives the Government power by proclamation to decide any commodity or foodstuff is essential and if it is in short supply or the supplies are held up,

broken, or get into trouble—if there is a dispute involving foodstuffs or commodities—the Government can use the very wide powers contained in the Bill.

I think these powers are too great, therefore, I oppose this clause as I oppose the Bill as a whole. The measure has been introduced too suddenly without sufficient forethought. Either it has been planned over a long period—in other words, it is something like a conspiracy before the fact—or it has been brought in quite suddenly, in which case it has not been thought out fully. Whichever way it may be, this clause is a bad one. It is too wide, it gives the Government arbitrary powers, and it enables the Government to change its mind. The clause empowers the Government to seize on any particular issue and blow it up or suppress it. It enables it to use a great range of powers which makes me think the real purpose of the Bill is not to deal with the present dispute which can be and will be resolved; it is to lie in wait as a sleeper to be used in future disputes which the Government can exploit to its own ends.

For the reasons I have given, I believe the clause is a bad one and it should be opposed. I oppose the clause.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I oppose this clause because the ability of the Government to claim any foodstuffs to be essential for the purposes of this Bill is only disguising the intent of the Bill and, for that reason, we oppose it very strongly. It seems legislation is introduced *ad nauseam* by the Government to control the labour factor of production, whereas very little legislation is introduced to control the other three factors which are land, capital, and enterprise. This is where the Government's attitude on free enterprise breaks down. It says we must not interfere in business. That is contained in the second reading speech; there must be no interference in business. However, the Government has no compunction about interfering with the labour market and no compunction about interfering in industrial relations. This clause is the essence of the Bill, because it sets out the manner in which the Government would go about achieving its ends. The Governor proclaims certain foodstuffs and commodities on the recommendation of the Government to be essential. This simply disguises the fact that the Government is getting at the unions.

One could interpret this clause in conjunction with later clauses in the Bill to say that if the Government considered that commodities and foodstuffs were not readily available to the community, we must step in and buy and retail

them in a way and at places selected by the Government, because the prices are too high for the people who need to obtain these goods for their health.

We might even have the Government stepping in and saying wages are too low; but, of course, it would be laughable to expect this Government to do that. It would never take such action to improve the lot of people on low wages and to reduce the high prices of the commodities about which we are talking.

It is hypocritical to say the proclamation will be made in order to ensure that people get these essential foodstuffs. The Bill is obviously aimed directly at the work force.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Rubbish!

The Hon. R. Hetherington: It is not rubbish at all.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: This is to protect the public and ensure they get the essential commodities. You are protecting that small minority and holding the public to ransom.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The honourable member gives us that assurance, but perhaps he should buy up some of these commodities and sell them at a reasonable cost in the way that eggs have been sold at a lower price than usual. People are buying eggs like hot cakes, because they are 20c cheaper than usual.

This clause stands out as a demonstration of the Government's antipathy to the unions and to the workers. In fact the Bill will not be used to the effect of ensuring that the supplies of essential commodities reach the people, because the people are unable to pay the high prices as a result of the low wages they are earning and, therefore, they cannot buy the goods which are conducive to their health and good diet.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I oppose clause 3. I join with Miss Lyla Elliott in registering a protest at the attitude of Government members and, in particular, the attitude of the Minister in respect of the discourtesy he is displaying to the Opposition by not replying to some of the points made. When the Government cannot reply, it demonstrates a weakness in its argument. It is the first time since I have been a member that this has happened. The Hon. Mick Gayfer may recall a similar situation in 1963 when the Industrial Arbitration Act was amended and the Government behaved in exactly the same manner. Government members, of course, were instructed, as they are now, to remain silent; but the Minister of the day did at least have the courtesy to reply to the Committee debate. We are not finding this

today, despite the provisions contained in subclause (3).

If the situation is so serious and the public needs to be able to obtain the foodstuffs which have been declared essential, surely it would be up to this Parliament to determine these matters after one proclamation has been made. This goes on *ad infinitum* at least until later next year, without any reference to this place. It is not only discourteous to us here, but it is discourteous also to the whole Parliament.

At least the Minister should have the courtesy to reply to some of the points made by the Opposition instead of sitting there expecting his hatchet men to move the gag every 15 minutes.

Clause put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 18

Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. W. M. Piesse
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. T. McNeil	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	Hon. G. E. Masters

(Teller)

Noes 8

Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. Hetherington	Hon. R. F. Claughton

(Teller)

Pair

Aye	No
Hon. R. J. L. Williams	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs

Clause thus passed.

Clause 4: Administration—

The Hon. D. K. DANS: This is probably one of the worst clauses in the Bill. When one reads it one's flesh creeps and it leads me to believe that the Bill continues to be nothing more than a propaganda document.

I have read a number of Government Bills, but this one seems to have very wide-ranging powers and, in addition, it is open-ended.

In the second reading speech there was no adequate explanation of the Bill and certainly there was no adequate explanation of this clause which states that the administration of the Act shall be vested in a Minister of the Crown, but it does not say which Minister. One can only assume that it will be the Minister for Labour and Industry. Perhaps on this occasion the Leader of the House will tell us who the Minister is likely to be. Surely the draftsman of a Bill of this magnitude should have no trouble in informing the people who will be the Minister.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Practically no Bills do that nowadays. They are all like this.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I am saying that this one should.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They can be allotted by a Premier.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: This is an example of the bad habits which are creeping in under which Parliament and the people are disfranchised. Is it too much to ask who the Minister will be?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The Minister for Labour and Industry.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Would it not be easy to include that in the Bill?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No, because the next Government may change the title of the portfolio. That was found to be the case by Mr Tonkin when he became the Premier and it was exacerbated when we changed a number of portfolio titles also.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: That is interesting. If the present Government is returned to office it might change the portfolio to "persecutions and executions"! This kind of thing is getting too monotonous.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are merely using words.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I am not. The Minister should clear the wax out of his ears and listen. The clause goes on to say that the administration of the Act shall be carried out by "such authorities" but it does not say which authorities. The clause then refers to instrumentalities, persons, and bodies, but it does not say which instrumentalities, persons, or bodies. What a wide-ranging word is "persons". Any democrat in this Chamber would want to know what that means but democracy is dead in this Chamber, if it ever lived here.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Any democrat would know what it means.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The Minister can get on his feet and tell us.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You know. The word "persons" is defined in the Interpretation Act.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Perhaps the Minister will get up and tell us what it states.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Read it yourself.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The Bill refers to "bodies".

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is in the Interpretation Act.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: What bodies are they?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Have a look.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I cannot follow the Minister because the little sting in the tail of the clause states "as the Minister in writing directs". So it does not really matter what is in the Interpretation Act—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Yes it does.

The Hon. D. K. DANS:—because the clause states "as the Minister in writing directs".

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is being really careful.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: At least we have gained one little piece of information. We know it will be the Minister for Labour and Industry. I do not know why the Government wanted to hide that fact.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: We thought you might be reasonably rational.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I would expect it to be the Minister for Labour and Industry. The Premier allocates the portfolios.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Can the Minister tell me what the authorities will be?

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Even on your side the Premier allocates the portfolios.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They are as defined in the Interpretation Act which you have read.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The Minister should get on his feet and tell us it will be the Police Department.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No I should not. I have seen enough fellows on their feet in the last few hours.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: What will be the Government instrumentalities?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Any Government instrumentality. Again it is a definite entity as well you know.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The State Shipping Service?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is an instrumentality. You are smarter than you think you are.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: I would not say that about the Minister.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The Minister has no answers to these questions. This is the great danger in rushing Bills of this nature through Parliament. I will not again refer to the second reading speech which is supposed to give some information. In addition when we pose questions

in Committee we are entitled to an explanation, but we are not getting it. We are merely stumbling in a cavalier manner. The Bill is being rushed through for propaganda purposes to give the Government an open cheque.

Despite what the Leader of the House said about the Interpretation Act, everyone sitting in the Chamber knows that the Minister simply cannot answer the questions, because he does not know the answers. That is bad.

This clause is most onerous and fraught with a great deal of danger to the ordinary men and women of Australia. It is all right to talk about the Transport Workers' Union today. I have reminded members in this Chamber previously of the terrible war which was caused by Adolf Hitler. Not once did he move away from the existing Constitution to do what he wanted to do. When this type of legislation is placed on the Statute book, with the provisions of clause 4, the Government does not know where it is going. I oppose the clause.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: One can appreciate the dilemma of the Minister and his colleagues in the Government parties in relation to this legislation. We can appreciate their reluctance to get to their feet. The most cursory examination of the Bill indicates what an unwise and hasty piece of legislation it is and how difficult it would be to overcome any difficulties. The Minister claimed that there are definitions of the words in the Interpretation Act. But, in point of fact, there is no definition of "instrumentalities" in the Act. The definition of "persons", which does appear, simply states that the word includes corporations. So, we are left no wiser, because in any case the clause in the Bill refers to "bodies" which I suppose we could take to mean corporations as well. There again, there is no interpretation of "bodies" in the Act. It is not at all helpful in elucidating the intentions of the Government in respect of these words.

I suppose that indicates the great haste with which the legislation has been prepared; the word "bodies" was included when, in fact, the word "persons" would have included "bodies" under the provisions of the Interpretation Act.

There is a need to question just what individuals, bodies, organisations, or corporations the Government has in mind on whom to bestow these duties of administration. The Bill includes the power of delegation. The delegation of power and the delegation of administration will be given to persons unknown to this Parliament. No indication has been given to us of the wide scope of the extreme powers contained in the Bill.

The Government should see that it has a duty to the public to give further information. It should not, in its arrogance, ignore the questioning of the Opposition party in this Chamber. We get used to being treated in this way, but I do not think the Government should go on indefinitely treating the public at large in this sort of way.

Some further explanation should be given by the Government so that the public are able to believe that they are regarded with some responsibility, and that they have the right to know more about the Government's performance. Without that further explanation we have no choice but to oppose, in the strongest manner possible, the inclusion of this clause or any other clause.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: From what the previous two speakers have said about this clause it is quite evident that the Government, in forcing this legislation through the Parliament, indicates that we are nothing better than school children. The standing of members of Parliament in the community is very poor, and that standing is not improved when clauses such as the one now before us are not given sufficient thought. I am very disturbed that the Government has succeeded in bringing the whole of the Parliament into disrepute.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Where is this in clause 4? You are making a second reading speech to the clause and yet you talk about disrepute. You do not understand one skerrick of the Standing Orders.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: We have not had sufficient time to consider the powers that will be given to the administration. They are far-reaching, and very wide. By treating the whole thing in this manner we are being treated like school children. The whole parliamentary system is being brought into disrepute. The Government should be helping us to understand the reason for the measure. I again protest at the manner in which we are expected to give consideration to very important matters, such as those contained in clause 4 of the Bill.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I want to register my protest in relation to this clause. I particularly do not like the way in which the Minister will be able to have the administration of this Act carried out by authorities, departments, and instrumentalities as set up by the Minister. We have not had time to consider this during our waking hours, let alone during our half sleeping hours.

With regard to the word "bodies", in the light of recent experience I wonder whether Assistance

and Security Pty. Ltd. might be a body to be employed by the Government in order to carry out the persecution of unions when they are in disputation I think that is a very dangerous inclusion in the Bill, and as much publicity as possible will be given to it in my electorate with regard to what the Government is attempting to do by bringing in people from outside. The Minister has not explained anything at all to us. In fact, it is farcical that the Minister said one thing about the purpose of the Bill in his second reading speech, and another thing at a later stage by interjection.

The Leader of the Opposition asked the Leader of the House why the Minister who was to be in charge of the administration of the legislation had not been named in clause 4. The Leader of the House immediately said it would be the Minister for Labour and Industry but he might change his title to Minister for industrial relations in the next Government.

Obviously the Minister administering the legislation will not do any of the things set down here to ensure a supply of foodstuffs. The Bill purports to facilitate supply during times of disruption. Does this provision mean the Minister for Labour and Industry would also deal with the kinds of matters I spoke about previously, such as high prices and low wages when supplies are cut off from people who do not have the money to buy commodities and foodstuffs, or factory conditions which the Minister's department discovered were not in accordance with awards? Heaven knows how he could ever do that. Without organised labour, how could he find out that people were not receiving the wages and conditions which awards and the law said they should have?

This Government is very quick to persecute the unions in relation to actions which it regards as being disruptive but the Department of Labour and Industry does not have enough staff to step in and ensure people are being paid decent wages and conditions. Perhaps because they are not being paid decent wages and conditions the commodity or foodstuff is not being produced in the quantities required by the community.

While the Minister remained anonymous we were able to say that perhaps the Minister for Industrial Development or the Minister for Health would step in to ensure people in the community got the foodstuffs needed for their health. The Leader of the House has already said in one of the few explanations of the Bill he has given—and he did that by way of interjection rather than by standing up to answer our queries—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It could just as easily be the Minister for Health.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The Leader of the House said it would be the Minister for Labour and Industry, and obviously that is what is in his mind. He knows this Bill is designed to persecute the unions and interfere with industrial relations. It will not do what he says it will do.

Clause put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 18	
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. W. M. Piesse
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. T. McNeil	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	Hon. G. E. Masters
(Teller)	
Noes 8	
Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. Hetherington	Hon. R. F. Claughton
(Teller)	

Pair	
Aye	No
Hon. R. J. L. Williams	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs

Clause thus passed.

Clause 5: Powers—

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: In our view this would be the most controversial clause of the Bill because it confers very wide powers on the Minister—powers which Ministers do not normally have. We have just passed clause 4 which gives the Minister authority to delegate powers to authorities, departments, instrumentalities, persons, or bodies as the Minister in writing directs. He can delegate powers to almost anybody. This clause will make clause 6 watertight. Clause 6 states—

The powers of the Minister under this Act may be exercised on his behalf by any person for the time being so authorised by the Minister.

The Minister will be able to direct any person, organisation, or body to carry out his wishes in respect of clause 5.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: On reading the debate on the Flour Bill, I find the Opposition is using the same arguments now, word for word.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: This Bill is more far-reaching than the Flour Bill was. That Bill dealt with one particular commodity. Under the Bill now before us the Minister will have power over all commodities and foodstuffs. The honourable member does not realise that yet.

Clause 5 gives very far-reaching and dictatorial powers to one person; namely, the Minister or any person he may delegate.

I would like Mr Oliver to look at this clause to see what powers the Minister does have. Subclause (1) reads as follows—

During the operation of this Act, where it appears to the Minister that the supply or provision of any essential foodstuffs or essential commodities is or is likely to be interrupted or dislocated or become less than is sufficient for the reasonable requirements of the community the Minister may from time to time exercise all or any of the powers conferred on him by or under this Act and do and perform all such acts, matters, and things as are necessary or expedient for carrying into effect the purposes of this Act.

Can members imagine any situation where the Minister would want to invoke the provisions of that subclause other than a strike? Can any Government member get to his feet to tell us of any such circumstances other than an industrial dispute? Of course the intentions of the Government are hidden in the terms of the Parliamentary Draftsman, but the whole basis of the provision is to bring foodstuffs and commodities under the control of the Government in a strike situation. I do not think that fact was hidden in the second reading speech of the Leader of the House.

Many years ago a lot of us here were in a similar position to that experienced by Mr Oliver when he went away to fight for what he believed was democracy. I do not know whether the war he fought was a democratic war; it turned out to be a flop in the finish. Many of us, including the Leader of the House, played a very conspicuous part during that earlier war to preserve democracy, and now we find young men coming here and prepared to follow the whims of the Cabinet even when those whims include breaking down the principles of democracy; the very things we fought for, and the things which some of our comrades died for.

So this clause should be given a great deal of consideration by members of this Chamber. I was very surprised that no explanation was given for it.

Without limiting the generalities of subclause (1), subclause (2) goes on to provide that the Minister may do any one or more of the following things—

- (a) buy, sell, supply, transport, store, market and distribute any essential foodstuffs or essential commodities;

- (b) enter into any contract, and undertake and carry on business transactions;
- (c) establish, maintain, or use premises, vehicles, machinery, plant, or other equipment for the purposes of this Act;

If a Government member can say there is a similarity between this Bill and the Flour Act, it would not be beyond him, I should imagine, to enlist the services of the newly-formed Security and Assistance Pty. Ltd. which was set up by people who are confessed union haters, people who believe that unions should be abolished. One principal of this organisation is Mr Ric New of Midland Brick, and he would not, under any circumstances, have a unionist on his premises. Another principal is Mr Don Thomas who has followed the secessionist movement in this State. During the flour strike this Government paid \$1 850 to this organisation to carry out certain duties for it. Under the provisions of this legislation, the Minister would have the authority to delegate his powers to such an organisation.

This is the result we have achieved with the passage of clause 4, and if we pass clause 6 we will allow the Minister to delegate his powers to any para-military operation. The organisation to which I have referred was refused a gun permit by a magistrate. However, the officers of other organisations have been granted permission to carry guns and to use dogs on leashes for the purpose of breaking strikes. We know that these activities will occur only in a strike situation.

Paragraph (d) goes on to state—

by a direction given in writing—

- (i) authorise the taking of possession or control and the disposal or use of any essential foodstuffs or essential commodities and the packaging of any essential foodstuffs or essential commodities and require any person to place any such essential foodstuffs or essential commodities and packaging in his possession or control at the disposal of the Minister;

As I said in my second reading speech, this will mean the introduction of scab labour. People will be able to enter factories and other establishments, take over vehicles from TWU members when they are on strike, and drive them at the discretion of the Minister or of a person he appoints.

I submit that one of the reasons this Bill is being pushed through the Parliament in one sitting is so that this particular clause will not become known to the public. If it were known

generally, the public outcry would be so great that the Government would be forced to alter its course. People in the legal sphere who believe in justice, honesty, and the rights of others, would come out in force to oppose such a provision. So much discussion would be created within the community that the Government would be persuaded to amend the legislation. Am I correct that this is the reason we were held up here for seven hours tonight while the Bill was dealt with in another place? Is this the reason that Legislative Assembly members are being held up for seven hours while we deal with the Bill? Nobody has had an opportunity to examine the Bill and to give an opinion on it.

As a result of public opinion, drastic amendments were introduced by the Government to the Electoral Act Amendment Bill and the Fuel, Energy and Power Resources Act Amendment Bill. If Government members had any principles at all, they would be on their feet refuting the allegations I am now making. I challenge the Leader of the House to tell us why the legislation is being pushed through.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Why should he waste his time?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Leader of the House is frightened that if knowledge of this Bill gets out to the public, even for a couple of days, there will be a strong movement against it. I feel sure that a reading of the provisions will cause a public outcry. I have doubts that even the Confederation of Western Australian Industry would go along with this proposition that someone could walk into a factory, take over its vehicles, and undertake other activities that really amount to the employment of scab labour. This legislation will bring down heavy industrial action against the confederation, and I make no apology for saying that.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Disgraceful remarks! You should be ashamed of yourself.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The honourable member cannot get to his feet to tell me that this provision is for any purpose other than that of strike breaking.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Read the heading.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If these provisions are implemented, scab labour will be employed. The people who take the place of the striking workers are scabs.

That is the only interpretation of "scab", "blackleg" or whatever one likes to term such a person. There can be no doubt this provision is included for such people. If members opposite were prepared to rise to their feet and say

something different, I would be prepared to accept what they say; however, they will not. This is indeed a very bad principle for a Government to introduce without justification; and yet members opposite talk about this place being a House of Review whilst refusing to justify their own actions. We were kept waiting for seven hours whilst this matter was debated in another place, and now members opposite including the Minister are prepared to let the debate in this place run its course and remain silent. I feel ashamed to be here.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You should be ashamed, after speaking the way you have tonight.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am ashamed to be here in the position of having to goad and challenge the Minister to stand on his feet and say these provisions will be used for any purpose other than a strike. Subclauses (1) to (3) are included for no other purpose than to cover strike situations.

The Hon. G. E. Masters interjected.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Let Mr Masters stand up and say that is not so. Let him tell me what situation could arise which would require such provisions.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: There is nothing we could tell you that you would listen to. You are just being strongarmed and intimidatory.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: You don't like the word "scabs".

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No, I think it is a terrible term for one member to use about another.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There are far too many interjections and it is most difficult for the *Hansard* reporter to report what is being said.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Does it not hurt them, Mr Chairman? The only reaction we can get from them is an accusation that we are using improper language. Yet I am using language that is contained in the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*.

Several members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The question is that clause 5 stand as printed, and the honourable member is obliged to connect his remarks with that question.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am doing that, Mr Chairman. I am saying the provisions of this clause would be applied in no other situation than a strike situation; and if they are applied the Government will use blacklegs, industrial

renegades, or scabs—whatever one calls them, they are abhorrent to members on this side of the Chamber.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are abhorrent to us, you and your type of unionist.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: In days gone by members opposite would have rejected scabs, but now they pay them \$1 850 to cart flour. Not only did the Government do that, but it permitted a truckload of farmers to go onto the wharf and scab in respect of the meat workers' union.

The Hon. G. E. Masters interjected.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Why does not Mr Masters get up on his feet instead of merely moving the gag? Why does he not justify the actions of the Government?

The Hon. G. E. Masters: The public will make their own decision.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: The public will not have any say in the matter.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Members opposite cannot support this provision, otherwise they would be on their feet doing so. They are not finished yet; other legislation will be pushed through for the purpose of smashing the workers. Members opposite do not have trouble walking into the Chamber to vote for the infamous provisions of the measure.

Several members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member would be well advised to address the Chair.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I apologise, sir. I should be addressing you. However, it is very galling for people who have fought so strongly over many years for the principles of unionism to find legislation like this being introduced to destroy those principles which have been hard won—and hard won with a great deal of money involved in fighting for them, and sometimes with personal injury and degradation. Yet in one fell swoop the measure will allow the Minister to obstruct unionists. That is the purpose of the Bill—to obstruct unionists and to help the supporters of the Liberal Party to provide the funds. This Bill is designed to help the supporters of the Liberal Party in respect of strikes.

I believe sincerely that the Confederation of Western Australian Industry would not want these provisions in the Bill. However, it has not had the chance to consider them because the matter has been debated in secrecy in this place tonight. The Bill was slipped through the other Chamber, and the first we heard of the matter

was in our party room when we were told the Parliament would sit all night. Why have we sat all night to put through this measure? Nobody has told us yet.

Mr Lewis laughs. He may well laugh on the other side of his face if this matter gets out of hand and if the Bill is placed under the control of the wrong person. There are a number of people in this Chamber at this very moment who would be the wrong sort of people to administer this legislation.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Who are they?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I have already named a couple, and Mr Pratt is one of them. I would hate to see a Liberal Government returned at the next election and to find Mr Pratt, Mr Masters, or Mr Pike implementing the provisions of this Bill.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Are you pointing at me now?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: No, Mr Lewis is all right. I have never heard him support the proposition that people should be used to break a line of strikers. However, I have heard it said many times by other members. Fancy the possibility of one of those members becoming the Minister for Labour and Industry in the next Government and having the power to implement the provisions of this legislation if the TWU were on strike. What a terrible thing it would be. We know the industrial record of Mr Masters when industrial disputation occurred at oil depots. He was encouraging people to take on the work of bona fide employers. He has confessed in this Chamber that he would like to see the Transport Workers' Union smashed. Such a man could be the Minister for Labour and Industry if by some quirk of ill fate a Liberal Government was returned at the next election.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Goodness me, next you will be claiming Mrs Claughton is a scab for baking bread!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Minister is from the deep south. How could he know anything about industrial relations?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I reckon you have a guilt complex.

Several members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There are far too many interjections and the debate is becoming unruly. I have been very tolerant. We will get on much better if we stick to the business of the Chamber. If the honourable member will continue to address the Chair I believe more progress will be made.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Leader of the House was a member of a union for long enough to have a little understanding of unions. I do not know how long ago it was, but he has suffered adversity, and knows what it is. I know that in his heart he does not support the employment of scabs in industry. He does not like the word, but they are still scabs.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I do not like your attitude. I think you are showing a guilt complex.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Leader of the House comes from a breed of people and from an age where—

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Bully boy tactics.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have requested that the debate be conducted in accordance with the Standing Orders and I reiterate that request. I ask members to comply, and not to interject on the honourable member standing on his feet.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: These clauses have been written into the Bill for the simple purpose of a strike, and members opposite do not like to be reminded that that is the case. If they had any justification at all for inserting these provisions into the legislation, surely they would have told us by now, particularly since we have been here for so long.

It is not that members opposite do not want to debate the matter; I know they are under instructions and have an ironclad discipline over them. If for one small moment they were to stand and defend these two clauses, they would have the wrath of the Premier on their heads. Is not that a terrible situation? Members opposite talk about discipline in our party, but there has never been a time when members on this side have been silenced by their leader. We have always had the right to speak and express our views.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: What are you doing right now to the member for Morley?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Pike once took an oath during his debating days that he would never remain silent when he ought to speak.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The debate is not related to clause 5. If the honourable member is unable to make his remarks relevant, I must request that he be seated.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Chairman, I am relating my remarks to clause 5. I am saying that Mr Pike—if he believes in democracy—should stand and justify this clause on behalf of his colleagues. After all, he goes out in his electorate and states that this is a House of Review which reviews all legislation coming before it. Mr Pike tonight has betrayed his trust

to his own party. The myth that this place is a House of Review has been dispelled forever in the last few hours. We knew this place had not been a House of Review for many years, but last night and this morning put the real seal on the destruction of that myth.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: What about the collar you are putting around the neck of the member for Morley?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If Mr Pike does not stand and attempt either to justify or to oppose this clause, he will have betrayed a solemn pledge he made during his debating days. I took that pledge myself. Members of the Labor Party have never been under such iron discipline that they have not been allowed to speak. Even the Leader of the House has not stood to justify his Government's Bill. It is the first time I have seen a Minister in this Chamber fail to support his Government's legislation during debate. I think it is an act of rank cowardice and it is exemplified in the manner in which the Government rushed this Bill through the other place yesterday and is attempting to do the same in this place today. The Bill has been introduced and pushed through one Chamber before anybody—even the Government's own members—has had the opportunity to examine its contents. The only people to know about this legislation were the members of Cabinet who met behind closed oak doors in the Superannuation Building.

I often say I am very disappointed but this morning I am disgusted with those members of the Government who will not stand and attempt to justify their own legislation. In particular, I am disgusted with the Leader of the House who, for the first time since I have been here, has not responded to debates during the Committee stage. I know the Bill will pass through this place, but I do not think its passage will be to the credit of members opposite.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I have listened *ad nauseam* to Mr Cooley going on about what members on this side of the Chamber have allegedly been told to do and not to do.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: You are going to be admonished by your leader for breaking ranks and entering this debate.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I seem to remember a vote in this Chamber where the Labor Party did not take any notice of what a Bill was all about but said that somebody might have been made a folk hero if he debated the Bill, so members opposite walked out of this place when the votes were taken.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the honourable member can relate his remarks to clause 5.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I can very easily, Mr Chairman, the same as Mr Cooley did. Mr Cooley is great on democracy, but I really do not think he knows what I understand about the word. However, I congratulate him. For a man of his age, I believe he put on a magnificent fight last night and this morning. I also congratulate all members on the Opposition benches. Their job is to be an Opposition. However, they have not put forward anything which could be regarded as constructive criticism of this legislation.

Mr Cooley claimed that Government back-benchers had nothing to say about this legislation, but rather were told about the Bill after it had been decided upon by Cabinet. Let me say to Mr Cooley that the back-benchers voted unanimously for this Bill. One person from this Chamber was absent from the meeting, and did not vote for the Bill, but the remainder were unanimous in their support of it. That will ruin Mr Cooley's speech on the next clause, because he generally uses about one-quarter of his speaking time chastising Government members for knowing nothing about the Bill.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: He will make the same speech, just the same.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I do not think so.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: It rather disappoints us. We thought some of you had some sense.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I realise Mr Hetherington is disappointed. However, he has not been here long enough to realise the depths of disappointment one can reach. This is only a minor disappointment compared with what will happen after the next election to members opposite.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: You will be sitting over here after the next election.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I do not think so; I am allowed to choose my seat, and it will not be on the other side of the Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The question before the Chair is that clause 5 stand as printed. I do not think the next election has any bearing on the Bill before the Chamber.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr Cooley asked us why this clause was put into the Bill. I believe the clause has a dual purpose, firstly to allow producers of goods to sell those goods without being interrupted by any action of any person in

between and, secondly, to enable the general public of this State to buy the goods they require.

I am happy as a sand boy to hear that eggs are 20c cheaper. That only proves what I have said for years about boards and statutory marketing authorities. I wish that a Government of my persuasion would move into that area.

I will return to the clause you are so certainly bringing me back to, Mr Chairman. I believe that the citizens of Western Australia should be allowed to obtain the commodities such as milk and bread to which they are entitled, without a few people being in their way.

Mr Cooley asks me why the urgency. I suppose for the Labor movement this must be a dastardly sort of affair, when people are obtaining supplies. It is interesting to hear the members of the Opposition saying, "But the supplies are getting through." This is despite the bans placed by various people. Mr Cooley admitted earlier in the day that it did not matter about the jobs of the men.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: No, I did not.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Yes, Mr Cooley did. Unless he has altered it, he can read what he said in *Hansard*.

I believe that the citizens of this State should be allowed to obtain milk, bread, and eggs. Vegetables could be affected in the future. I believe people should be allowed to obtain them when they wish, in the containers they desire. They should not have to accept the two litre plastic containers when the housewife has to do her own pasteurisation of the milk.

We will go one step further, to the person producing the milk, and the cost to him. I know Mr Cooley will not like this, but we have to consider the cost to somebody who has invested a lot of capital in a dairy or in a fowl shed. A dairy farmer on a very moderate quota is losing, not \$150 a week but \$150 a day. He has to pay interest on his capital; he has to pay his employees; and he still has to honour his contracts. That is why these people are upsetting the union movement.

These people are upsetting the unions by volunteering to ensure that the milk reaches the market. They are volunteering to package the milk.

It is interesting to consider the accuracy of Mr Cooley's speech. It fascinates me, because we have heard a lot about the seven-hour gap. I was in this Chamber listening to the Hon. W. R. Withers at 10 past nine last evening. I went out, and I do not suppose Mr Withers would have sat

down immediately I left because he was frightened I would not hear all of his speech. I returned to this Chamber when the bells rang at a quarter past three. On my calculations, that is six hours, not seven hours. I think that the Hon. Don Cooley sometimes draws the long bow.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Who adjourned the debate?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: If he draws it in relation to the time, what does he do about the Bill?

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Are you drawing a cross bow?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Like other members on the other side of the Chamber, Mr Hetherington was screaming for somebody from this side of the Chamber to deal with this Bill, and deal in particular with this clause. It is fascinating that once one rises to one's feet to give the answers, there is a hush because—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I am listening with bated breath for you to say something.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Why should a Minister rise to his feet when a mere back-bencher, who does not know anything about the Bill and has not read the Bill can do the job? We are accused of knowing nothing about the Bill. I think perhaps I put words into Mr Cooley's mouth when he started reading the Bill. He realised that we had seen it—

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Who adjourned the debate at 9.15?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I would not have a clue.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: The Hon. Don Cooley.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am not going to make a fuss about that. I believe that this Bill is a necessity. If my information is correct, in less than 2½ hours a lot of bakeries will be out of flour.

We have been asked: What is the urgency? Well that is one of the urgent matters.

I thank Mr Cooley for his complimentary remarks. However, the other urgent matter in my opinion is that those men whose job it is to distribute bread, and milk, and eggs, should be back at their jobs, not only for their own sakes, but for the sakes of their wives and children also.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I think I made that point.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I believe that every wife and child and every worker in the city should have the right to have these services as required. I

can understand the argument that has been advanced. I can understand Mr Dans' argument when he says that the unions are upset. I could not agree with him more.

I could debate with Mr Dans the form of existence of the unions.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: This is a subject to change the rest of society.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is right. Like Mr Dans, I do not use the term about volunteer labour that Mr Cooley uses. I do not believe that term is a true and accurate assessment of the facts. This Bill is a necessity now.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Is "volunteer labour" a euphemism for "scab labour"?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: People like Mrs Vaughan use those sorts of words, but I do not. I know that these people are trying—

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: You defend your conscience.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: They are trying to do the best they can to enable their products and the products of their friends to reach the market so that they do not suffer horrifying losses. I do not know whether they use the term "volunteer labour". They might call the people who are out on strike something more than "strikers".

This Bill is a necessity. With those few words, we now know that the Opposition has very little against this Bill. All their qualms so far have been dealt with. I support the clause.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Clause 5, dealing with powers, is a highly explosive clause of this Bill. It seems to me that in the way it is worded and the way it fits into the context of the whole Bill, the Government is attempting to establish a system to compete with or to oust the existing employer-union system. In fact, the Government is thumbing its nose at organised labour and saying, "We do not want to deal with you. We will set up specific legislation every time there is any sort of disruption. We will deal with the matter ourselves."

In two ways this clause violates the ILO Convention about which Mr Cooley was speaking before. In the first place, it interferes in the way I have described it; and in the second case, in subclause (3) it violates the ILO Convention in that it introduces a penalty for people who are, in fact, taking part in a strike in order that they may gain better conditions or pay.

Not only is this clause an affront to the workers, the unions, and the people of Western Australia, but also it is an affront to our credibility in international matters. We have

agreed to the provisions of the ILO Convention, yet we are violating them literally in print. Furthermore, this interference which is set out here in black and white is not needed. There are ways not just for the goods to be delivered to the people, but also ways by which the industrial scene can be dampened down. People can be brought to the discussion table rather than inflaming and confronting them for whatever reason. If the Government continues to interfere in an area in which it claims it is not interfering, but by the very existence of this Bill it is interfering, then it might seem reasonable to the unions to seek a way of solving their problems outside the arbitration system. This could lead to absolute chaos.

With whom would the Government then negotiate if there were a shortage, disruption, and interruption to the supply of goods? If unions adopted the collective bargaining system now referred to as sweetheart arrangements, where would we be in trying to settle disputes if, in fact, there were no conventional, formal channels through which we could effect a solution to our problems? The Opposition is saying—as did Clyde Cameron in the Federal Parliament when talking to a similar Bill—that the unions have found themselves locked into the arbitration system. The only way they can get out is to be deregistered and this is what the Federal Government is doing with the TWU. The unions will be so fed up that some other form of solving industrial relations problems will suggest itself to them, perhaps in the form of collective bargaining.

In supporting this Bill Government members will find, probably, that their efforts will backfire on them and they will be sorry that the delinquent interference with the system which, while it does not work perfectly—if it did it would be consistent with the concept of perfect employers and employees which we do not have—in respect of workers struggling for better conditions, is better than what might eventuate. While the number of strikes may have increased over the years, it is quite evident that the length of strikes has lessened and fewer man-hours are lost now than was the case some years ago. Perhaps this is because of the cost of living today and because this Government has effectively reduced real wages, thus preventing workers from striking for long periods.

In handing over to the Government powers as are contained in this measure we are, as it were, treading on the work of thousands of people who in the last 150 years in this State have gone hungry and become destitute in order to establish

unions, informally at first and later formally through blood, sweat, and tears, to look after the workers. It is disappointing to hear members on the other side denigrating the concept of unionism and claiming, mealy-mouthed, that they support unions. I find it extremely disappointing that people for whom I have respect should be so conditioned and twisted in their thoughts that they are able in one breath to say they support unionism and at the same time do everything they can to denigrate, hound, persecute, and upset a system that is working fairly effectively. Certainly it is better than the system that will result if the unions go outside the arbitration system, or if they remain within it and are faced with the problem of having not only to contend with employers in their search for better conditions and wages but of having also to fight the Government. This is in the context of an increasingly hostile community; not because of facts, but because of the lily livered Press in this country which cannot take up a matter of social justice. It is a Press which has earned a reputation throughout the world of being the worst in the world.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Utter rubbish!

The CHAIRMAN: I would like the member to relate her comments to the clause. The clause contains nothing dealing with the Press.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The clause seeks to set up a different system of arbitration. If unionism is to survive in the form we understand and can formally deal with, we need the unions, the work force, and the Australian Labor Party to fight to retain the present position. We are not getting any help from members opposite. The unions are having to fight the Government as well as the employers in an effort to get decent conditions for the workers. No country can call itself civilised or advanced if it finds within itself a deprived minority; people who are asking for a miserable \$8 rise.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: There is nothing in the clause dealing with \$8. They will get that tomorrow.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: How could the Leader of the House be so hypocritical when he has already read out a speech that indicated this was what the Bill was all about.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What rubbish!

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The Minister should read the speech again. If the Government carries on with a campaign of denigration and persecution of the unions, then heaven help this State. We are asking that these people receive an extra \$8 which will bring them almost to one-

third of the basic salary of parliamentarians. Imagine members opposite living on that amount.

The Hon. D. K. DANKS: I oppose clause 5 as it is one of the more reprehensible clauses in the Bill. I shall not dwell very long on the contents of the clause, because I have just been advised that the strike is over and the workers are returning to work at midnight. No doubt their claim for \$8 has been met.

Taking into account the futile exercise engaged in by the Government in introducing this Bill to gain some petty political mileage, it is my opinion that the whole thing is pitiful and the people who perpetuated this move are pathetic. It is no good the Government claiming that, as a result of this proposed legislation, the workers went back to work.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You have just said that; we have not.

The Hon. D. K. DANKS: But the facts are there is no legislation at this time.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: But you have just said it; we did not say it.

The Hon. D. K. DANKS: I am fully aware who is saying it. The Government cannot go out and claim that, because it trotted out another Goliath.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are claiming it for us. We have not claimed it.

The Hon. D. K. DANKS: This debate will make interesting reading in *Hansard* for people who study contemporary politics in Australia and particularly as it affects Western Australia. Firstly, we have the Bill itself; secondly we see the second reading speech which did not tie together—and I have canvassed that already—and thirdly we have the lack of Government speakers. One would think that when a Government puts forward a Bill such as this, its members would have the gumption to get to their feet and defend their stand; but that did not happen.

More importantly, one of the matters which will flow through to students of political history will be the silence of the Minister and his inability to answer even the most elementary question, because the Liberal Party when in Government uses this Chamber as a rubber stamp only. Members do not research the Bills they introduce here; they rely solely on their majority.

The great value of the upper House in this State is seen when the Labor Party is in government and the conservative powers use it to block social legislation and legislation which endeavours to provide a better standard of living for the people. There it is in a nutshell.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He lives in a dream world.

The Hon. D. K. DANKS: I can understand that the members of the union will receive their \$8, because that is one matter on which the Minister was very definite. He said they were going to receive it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I never doubted it. Did you ever doubt it?

The Hon. D. K. DANKS: I did not even contemplate it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You never doubted it. Be honest.

The Hon. D. K. DANKS: Mr Chairman, let me answer the Minister through you.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It was never in doubt.

The Hon. D. K. DANKS: A long while ago, because of my involvement with the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission and the maritime unions, I discovered it was wise never to speculate on the decisions of Commonwealth and State Arbitration Courts. A number of people walked into the Criminal Courts thinking they would not be hanged. They speculated that the decision would go their way. I thought the workers were entitled to the \$8.00 and I thought the tribunal handling the case, having more sense than the Government, would see to it that the workers received their entitlement; but one can never be sure and I did not intend to be so foolish as to say that I knew they would receive it, because I simply did not know.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Had you bet money on it, I know which way you would have bet.

The Hon. D. K. DANKS: I am not a gambling man. People have been up from 6 o'clock yesterday morning until 10 o'clock this morning. Government members have been speaking in support of a cheap political trick which has not worked on this occasion.

Let me challenge the Minister to go back to the Premier and withdraw this legislation.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: There is no point in it.

The Hon. D. K. DANKS: I should like to ask the Minister why there is no point in doing that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You make your speech.

The Hon. D. K. DANKS: I am making my speech. I challenge the Minister that, in support of good human relations—and that can be translated to mean industrial relations also—and

as a mark of good faith for future industrial peace in this State—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is precisely why we want the Bill; for good human relations.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: —the Minister recommend to the Premier that this legislation be withdrawn.

In conclusion I should like to point out for the attention of members that at no time during the strike did the Transport Workers' Union make any real effort to interfere with the legitimate business of primary producers. That is borne out by the fact that when entering our own dining room this morning we found there was no shortage of bread, eggs, or bacon. We saw also the great pile of produce on the Table in the other place. It is borne out also, as I mentioned in this Chamber, by the fact that as far as my own home was concerned we had no shortages. The whole matter was a trumped up political trick and the Government should now be honest and admit it. The Minister should go to the Premier and ask him to withdraw the legislation.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I should like to refute some of the statements made by Mr Lewis. My leader touched on this matter.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are a bit of an anti-climax after Mr Dans; do you know that?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am replying to one of the members who had the courage to stand up and speak from the other side of the Chamber. He made a contribution to the debate which is more than the Minister or any of his other colleagues have done. The Minister and his colleagues have sat there and interjected in a manner which does them no credit. It exemplifies the ignorance of members opposite in respect of the legislation that Mr Lewis was the spokesman, because he indicated that the provisions in the Bill would allow the primary producers to bring their goods to Perth when at no time during the dispute were they debarred and at no time did the union bear any animosity towards them.

I shall finish where I started in respect of this matter. The only spokesman for the Government has been unable to refute my charge that there has never been a serious shortage in Western Australia as a consequence of a strike. He has not been able to tell us also where the shortage is at this particular time in respect of the present strike.

Clause put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 16	
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. T. McNeil	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	Hon. G. E. Masters

(Teller)

Noes 8	
Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. Hetherington	Hon. R. F. Cloughton

(Teller)

Pair	
Aye	No
Hon. R. J. L. Williams	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs

Clause thus passed.

Clause 6: Delegation—

Clause put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 17	
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. T. McNeil	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. G. E. Masters
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	

(Teller)

Noes 8	
Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. Hetherington	Hon. R. F. Cloughton

(Teller)

Pair	
Aye	No
Hon. R. J. L. Williams	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs

Clause thus passed.

Clause 7: Compensation—

Clause put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 17	
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. T. McNeil	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. G. E. Masters
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	

(Teller)

Noes 8	
Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. Hetherington	Hon. R. F. Cloughton

(Teller)

Pair	
Aye	No
Hon. R. J. L. Williams	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs

Clause thus passed.

Clause 8: Special offence re coercion, obstruction, intimidation, etc.—

Clause put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 17	
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. T. McNeil	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. G. E. Masters
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	
(Teller)	
Noes 8	
Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. Hetherington	Hon. R. F. Cloughton
(Teller)	
Pair	
Aye	No
Hon. R. J. L. Williams	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs

Clause thus passed.

Clause 9: Penalties for offences—

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I do not wish to weary the Committee, but it is obvious that the Bill will go through clause by clause without any discussion and no member will speak until the third reading debate. Would it not be better in the interests of the Committee to put the clauses *en bloc* and stop the charade?

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the wish of the Committee that I put clauses 9 to 13 *en bloc*?

In view of the dissentient voices, leave is not granted.

Several members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Clause put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 16	
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. I. G. Medcalf
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. T. McNeil	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. G. E. Masters
(Teller)	
Noes 8	
Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. Hetherington	Hon. R. F. Cloughton
(Teller)	
Pair	
Aye	No
Hon. R. J. L. Williams	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs

Clause thus passed.

Clause 10: Consent to prosecution—

Clause put and division taken with the following result—

Ayes 17	
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. T. McNeil	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. G. E. Masters
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	
(Teller)	
Noes 8	
Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. Hetherington	Hon. R. F. Cloughton
(Teller)	

Pair	
Aye	No
Hon. R. J. L. Williams	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs

Clause thus passed.

Clause 11: Proceedings to be taken summarily—

Clause put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 17	
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. T. McNeil	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. G. E. Masters
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	
(Teller)	
Noes 8	
Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. Hetherington	Hon. R. F. Cloughton
(Teller)	

Pair	
Aye	No
Hon. R. J. L. Williams	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs

Clause thus passed.

Clause 12: Regulations—

Clause put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 17	
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. T. McNeil	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. G. E. Masters
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	
(Teller)	
Noes 8	
Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. Hetherington	Hon. R. F. Cloughton
(Teller)	

Pair

Aye	No
Hon. R. J. L. Williams	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs

Clause thus passed.

Clause 13: Duration of Act—

Clause put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 17

Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. T. McNeil	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. G. E. Masters
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	

(Teller)

Noes 8

Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. Hetherington	Hon. R. F. Cloughton

(Teller)

Pair

Aye	No
Hon. R. J. L. Williams	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs

Clause thus passed.

Title—

Title put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 17

Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. T. McNeil	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. G. E. Masters
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	

(Teller)

Noes 8

Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. Hetherington	Hon. R. F. Cloughton

(Teller)

Pair

Aye	No
Hon. R. J. L. Williams	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs

Title thus passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Leader of the House) [10.31 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

Amendment to Motion

THE HON. D. W. COOLEY (North-East Metropolitan) [10.32 a.m.]: I move—

That the word "now" be deleted and the words "this day six months" be inserted after the word "time".

I move this amendment to give the Government an opportunity to show the courage of its conviction. It has rushed this Bill through the two Houses of Parliament, yesterday and today, without exposing the Bill to public scrutiny. We believe that the public should know the contents of this Bill so that they can express their reaction.

Most Opposition members were quite surprised when I was able to tell them during my second reading speech that the effects of this legislation would extend into October of next year. In view of the longevity of this legislation, and most importantly, as the current dispute has been settled and the transport workers are back at work, the proper course to take is to delay the third reading of this measure for six months.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Are you sure they are back at work?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: From midnight tonight, I understand.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I do not think my leader would incorrectly advise us about this.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: They are not back at work at present.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It would be only fair and proper for the Government to delay the passage of this legislation in order to obtain a reaction from the general public, and particularly in respect of clause 5 of the Bill. If the public reaction is favourable, the measure could be proceeded with. However, I am certain that when this legislation is exposed to public view the reaction will be most unfavourable. I hope the Government will see the wisdom of deferring the third reading of this Bill for six months.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 8

Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. Hetherington	Hon. R. F. Cloughton

(Teller)

Noes 18	
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. I. G. Medcalf
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. T. McNeill	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. G. E. Masters

(Teller)

Pair

Aye	No
Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs	Hon. R. J. L. Williams

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate Resumed

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [10.38 a.m.]: I would like to say just a few words so that there will be no misunderstanding about what took place in the latter part of the debate. Once members on this side of the House were aware that the strike was over, we felt that there was no further point in contesting the later provisions of this Bill.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: One strike was over.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I would not like that action to be misunderstood. We took it in the interests of the good conduct of this Chamber.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That was appreciated.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: We would not want our action interpreted in any other way. Through Mr Cooley we have provided the Government with an opportunity to retire gracefully from the debate by agreeing to his amendment. I regret that the opportunity was not taken, but I hope that, as in our case, good sense will prevail on the part of the Government and that we will see no more of this Bill after the final vote is taken.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Leader of the House) [10.39 a.m.]: I feel constrained to say a few words about this measure in finally winding it up. This has been a particularly long debate, but a very important Government Bill had to be passed through in the one session of both Houses. That was quite clear.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Why?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Irrespective of any talk about democracy, there are occasions when any Government requires this to be done, and indeed, at the same time we have been doing this, Mr Wran has introduced and passed legislation through both Houses of the New South Wales Parliament to control the Transport Workers' Union truck drivers' strike and intimidatory tactics in that State.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: Are they TWU truck drivers?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: All truck drivers are members of the TWU.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: Are they?

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Yes.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It is a principle of Governments that they should govern and remain in charge of a situation. I am sure all members who know the history of politics will recall Chifley using the Army in a coal strike.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley interjected.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Let us stick to Mr Chifley, to Mr Wran, and to our own situation. There has been a great deal of talk last night and this morning about there being plenty of milk, bread, and eggs available. Of course, we also had many wasted words about the food value of those commodities, which had nothing at all to do with the matter. The point is that virtually all of the supplies of those commodities were made possible by the fact that the strike by the Transport Workers' Union did not have the wholehearted support of union members. One speaker opposite illustrated that quite clearly. The supplies were also made possible by the fact that a considerable number of volunteers turned out and worked. The interesting part of the situation is that members are quite correct when they say that nobody in the State went without, because I am quite sure even TWU members and their wives would have gone into the shops and obtained their milk, bread, and eggs.

A great deal has been said about the matter that this Bill somehow or other hinges on a dispute which has to do with the flow-on of a wage increase. I simply cannot recall when increases granted by the Federal jurisdiction have not flowed on to the States.

I was interested to hear the Hon. Grace Vaughan mention Mr Cameron's warning to the unions of the dire results which would follow if the arbitration system collapsed. It is my belief that the union movement has been superseded by a very excellent arbitral system, and that the union movement in this country is in dire danger of falling between the stools of wanting direct negotiation on one hand and an arbitral system on the other hand. It was Mr Cameron who pointed that out to the union movement.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: There is ample opportunity for direct negotiation under the Commonwealth arbitration legislation and, I believe, under the State Act.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Mr Dans is 100 per cent right. This has been brought home to me very much since I have been the Minister for Works, because frequently strikes are held against a decision of the very people who have done more to safeguard the welfare of the workers than the unions have done for years and years and years; and I am referring to the system of industrial courts in this land.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: More disputes are solved through the system than strikes caused.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Members opposite rarely give me credit for having been a member of a union. Of course, I know that is the case. Let me point out there are more tradesmen unionists on our side of the House than there are on the other side.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: What does that mean?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: We have more practical experience of the situation.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The fact that you were a member of a union does not necessarily make you a good trade unionist.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That is a good point. The fact that someone is a leader of a union does not necessarily make him well aware of the situation. A report, the name of which slips my memory after these long hours, points out very clearly how very far removed from the body of unions are the leaders of unions. Strangely enough there is more disparity between workers and the leaders of unions than there is between workers and management.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: In some areas I would agree, but in a whole host of areas I would not agree.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Nobody bothered to quote that this Bill was made necessary by the action of the Transport Workers' Union which, by a number of 24-hour stoppages culminating in the current dispute, is attempting to prevent essential foodstuffs, such as milk, bread, and eggs, reaching the public. No mention was made from this side of the House of the resolution of that particular dispute; mention was made of the fact that those people used their very responsible positions as drivers of transport to block off the supply of essential foodstuffs.

There is no way that dairy farmers can store more than two or three milkings; and if they cannot store any more milk they must pour it away. At the very best they would still receive much less for their milk than they would normally receive, and that is disastrous.

The fact that eggs were available does not necessarily mean every poultry farmer was getting rid of his eggs. The fact that bread was available does not mean that every baker was able to bake and deliver bread.

In addition, it was not mentioned that the Government took immediate action to facilitate the sale of eggs through other than normal channels. The Government stepped in to make this possible.

It is all right for the people who have money and motor cars; but it is an indisputable fact that pensioners, the elderly, and the sick must have suffered considerable inconvenience. In respect of milk, both producers and consumers have been severely inconvenienced. A number of producers have had to pour out milk.

Again, nobody bothered to point out that although bread was being baked the supply of flour was likely to run short.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I pointed that out.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am talking about the Opposition. Nobody on that side bothered to point out that flour was in short supply, and that could have been ascertained by a 5-minute phone call.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: What about the black flour from the flour mills?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The sort of old-fashioned verbiage that Mr Cooley uses such as "black flour" and "scab" should be deleted from the lexicon of this country, because it represents a sort of hatred complex suffered by some members.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: You should talk.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Why should the member say that? I have a brother, two sons, and a nephew who are tradesmen.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Why prosecute unions?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Members opposite are the ones who talk in terms of hatred.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: But you are the ones who are taking this action and causing the trouble.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: We are not attacking unions; we are merely helping those people who are being obstructed in respect of receiving their normal daily requirements.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I have been involved in a strike, and I know what it is like. I know the way the union fellow can control the situation these days when he has a microphone.

Members opposite know as well as I do who controls the meeting. Let us make no mistake about that. We know how the vote is taken: "Those in favour on this side, and scabs on the other side."

This Bill was introduced to ensure the normal life of the citizens of this State will not be impeded and disrupted willy-nilly. The fact that the strike is over, according to members opposite—and I understand the men will return to work at midnight—has nothing to do with the matter. This measure has become essential and it is a sad thing that it has. In my opening remarks I said the measure was introduced reluctantly, because it had become essential here and in the Labor State of New South Wales to have such a measure on the Statute book.

Regrettably, that is the way it has gone. I do not know what the end result will be.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The end result will be that you will end up with a general strike on your hands which you cannot handle.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I hope the end result will be that people will continue to talk, that common sense will prevail, and that we will get a few less of the Mr Cooleys of this world and a few more of the conciliatory Mr Dans in the Opposition's side of politics. In that way, we might get somewhere. Mr President, I ask members to support the third reading of the Bill.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 18	
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. I. G. Medcalf
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. T. McNeil	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. G. E. Masters

(Teller)

Noes 8	
Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. Hetherington	Hon. R. F. Cloughton

(Teller)

Pair	
Aye	No
Hon. R. J. L. Williams	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION

Assembly Personnel

Message from the Assembly received and read

notifying the personnel of sessional committees appointed by that House.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Leader of the House) [10.54 a.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Thursday, the 5th April.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.55 a.m. (Wednesday)

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

WATER SUPPLIES

Catchment Area: Land Clearing

The Hon. W. M. PIESSE, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is it a fact that within the newly defined catchment area a request was made to clear an area of land and then plant it with nut and other trees?
- (2) That permission was given to do this and was subsequently withdrawn?
- (3) If this statement is true would the Minister explain why the permission was withdrawn?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

I thank the honourable member for giving me some notice of this question. The answer is as follows—

- (1) to (3) There is a company known as Nut Farms of Australia Pty. Ltd., which is the owner of a property of approximately 1 500 acres situated in the catchment area of the Warren River. As members are aware this area is subject to the recent amendments to the Country Areas Water Supply Act.

This company made an application to clear the remainder of its property; from memory I think that was about 600 acres. This application was refused.

By appointment, the owner of the property saw me and appealed to me personally. He pointed out that he had 162 000 young tree seedlings of various types, ranging from food nuts to black walnut which is used for decorative timber. These were to be planted at 180 trees per acre. He said that it was absolutely essential the land be cleared forthwith in order that these trees might be planted, and that if the licence was not granted then these 162 000 seedlings would go to waste. He said the cost was estimated at \$5 a tree.

In the light of all these factors and the tremendous claims that would

be made, and the fact that the land was to be fully planted to trees anyway, the appeal was upheld and the licence was granted.

Virtually as soon as the licence was granted, the company offered the land for sale on the basis that the licence to clear had been granted, and therefore there was 1 500 acres of fully cleared land, subject to the bulldozers carrying out the job.

This was proof positive to me that the information provided by the company in this appeal was thus misleading, and the licence was immediately revoked.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

LAND: NATIONAL PARKS

Cape Range and Ningaloo Reef Marine

1. The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Attorney General, representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Has the National Parks Board imposed, or is it about to impose, a ban on people camping on the western coast of Norwest Cape in that area known as the Cape Range National Park, and is the only camping to be allowed in the caravan park known as Yardie Creek Dude Ranch?
- (2) Are there any restrictions on people beach fishing in the area?
- (3) Is it a fact that people are being stopped from camping in the area?
- (4) (a) Has the Ningaloo Reef Marine National Park been gazetted;
(b) if so, when; and
(c) what restrictions are there on people fishing in the area?
- (5) What other restrictions are there on camping within the Shire of Exmouth?
- (6) What instructions has the Ranger been given regarding the above?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) Yes. The National Parks Authority has withdrawn permission for camping in Cape Range National Park at the insistence of the Shire of Exmouth and the Lower North Regional Development Committee and in order to comply with Health Act Regulations. There are believed to be other approved camping areas in Exmouth Shire in addition to that at the Old Yardie Creek Homestead.
- (2) No.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) (a) No;
(b) not applicable;
(c) there are no restrictions on people beach fishing specifically related to the Cape Range National Park.
- (5) Not known.
- (6) The national parks ranger has been informed that permission for camping in Cape Range National Park has been withdrawn.

EDUCATION

High School: Belmont

2. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister for Lands, representing the Minister for Education:

As doubts have arisen in some people's minds on the question, will the Minister confirm that it is the intention of the Minister for Education that the timber framed buildings at Belmont Senior High School will progressively be replaced by new buildings?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:
Yes.

EDUCATION

Kimberley Electorate

3. The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Education:

Would the Minister advise the list of works promised by the Minister during the visit he made to the Kimberleys between the 7th-20th March, 1979, giving also estimates of costs and projected completion date for—

- (a) each of the schools listed—

Wyndham District High;
Derby Junior High;
Kununurra District High;
Christmas Creek;
Fitzroy Crossing;
Halls Creek;
La Grange;
Broome; and

- (b) other Kimberley schools not listed, or educational facilities attached to other institutions?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

The Minister discussed with local people works which are already on the works programme for 1979-80, or which are actually under way at present. These are—

Wyndham—Library/Resource Centre and replacement classrooms;
Derby—Replacement of old buildings and the School of the Air;
Fitzroy Crossing—Additional accommodation and replacement of the existing air-conditioning system;
La Grange—Replacement classrooms;
Broome—Basketball courts and preparatory development of a camp school.

These projects are ones upon which there has been considerable local interest and correspondence.

Other works are in the planning stage.

TRANSPORT: MTT

Profit and Loss Account

4. The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE, to the Minister for Lands, representing the Minister for Transport:

Referring to the Metropolitan Transport Trust Annual Report for the year ended the 30th June, 1977, where the Profit and Loss Account for rail shows Traffic and Motor Power expenditure was reduced from \$5 029 271 (1976) to \$3 767 826 (1977), a net reduction of \$1 261 445, whereas Mechanical and Ways and Works increased from \$2 944 000 (1976) to \$3 947 000 (1977), a net increase of \$1.003 million and General Administration expenditure increased from \$1 289 074 (1976) to \$2 096 000 (1977), a net increase of \$807 000—

- (a) will the Minister explain why there was a substantial reduction in the expenditure incurred in the Traffic and Motive Power Section, and why there was a substantial increase in the Mechanical and Ways and Works and the General Administration sections; and
- (b) will he give specific details on where the reduction and increases occurred?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (a) and (b) Due to an alteration in 1976-77 in the allocation of accounts between the various headings which appear in the MTT's annual reports, the expenditure headings of 1975-76 and 1976-77 were not comparable, except in total.

However, it was considered that as the figures for 1975-76 had already been quoted in the annual report for that year, it would be confusing to re-quote them in the 1976-77 report in an adjusted form.

There was in fact, very little variation in Traffic and Motive Power Mechanical and Ways and Works and General Administration expenditure between the two years, as shown by the following table which compares the expenditures with the adjustments resulting from re-allocation of accounts, made—

30th June, 1976		30th June 1977
\$		\$
3 440 343	Traffic and Motive Power	3 767 826
3 642 000	Mechanical and Ways and Works	3 947 000
2 189 000	General Administration	2 096 000
417 000	Depreciation	358 000
336 000	Interest	483 000
<u>10 215 343</u>		<u>10 652 826</u>

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Administrators

5. The Hon. T. McNEIL, to the Leader of the House, representing the Premier:

- (1) How many Regional Administrators have been appointed?
- (2) For what regions?
- (3) With respect to each Regional Office—
- (a) what is the composition of staff;
- (b) how many vehicles are at their disposal; and
- (c) what are the running costs including wages and salaries?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) to (3) (a) The information is the same as that supplied in answer to question 81 asked by the member on 12th April, 1978.
- (3) (b) Kimberley 2,
Pilbara 3,
Gascoyne 1,
Goldfields 3,
Greenough 2,
South West 2,
Great Southern 2;
- (3) (c) 1978-79 financial year to February 28—

Kimberley \$110 930.86,
Pilbara \$89 629.81,
Gascoyne \$48 612.91,
Greenough \$50 942.21,
Goldfields \$62 226.91,
South West \$59 125.23,
Great Southern \$52 143.29.

TRAFFIC: MOTOR VEHICLES

Natural Gas

6. The Hon. W. M. Piesse, for the Hon. H. W. GAYFER, to the Attorney General, representing the Minister for Industrial Development:

What research has been done or is being done on the possibilities of natural gas being used for automotive power?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

The Energy Commission is testing an 18 vehicle fleet using LPG as fuel. It is likely that significant quantities of LPG would become available from the North-West Shelf gas stream in the mid-1980s. The commission is also looking at using bottles of compressed natural gas to be located in the boot of normal cars. This option has the difficulty of limited range and there could be some hazard in the event of collisions.

The Government is also keeping abreast of natural gas processing technology such as the Mobil Oil Company's petrol from gas or petrol from coal process. However under present conditions they do not appear to be economically viable and all involve a substantial energy loss in the conversion process. Further research is under way which the Government will monitor.

HEALTH

Brockway Rubbish Tip

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

With reference to my question No. 446 of the 21st November, 1978, drawing the Minister's attention to the fact that the close proximity of the Brockway rubbish tip to Swanbourne Hospital, particularly Manning Ward, was creating appalling unhygienic conditions for the 50 elderly patients in that ward, and with further reference to my question without notice on the 28th November, 1978, requesting the Minister to visit the hospital to investigate ways and means of overcoming the problem, will the Minister now advise—

- (1) Why these patients have been allowed to continue to be subjected to the conditions listed in my question No. 446, namely, noise, smell, dust, flies, and the danger of salmonella from seagulls feeding on the tip?
- (2) Why did the Minister or his department not take action to either—
 - (a) move the patients;
 - (b) move the tip operations; or
 - (c) take immediate interim steps pending (a) or (b) following my approaches to him in November?
- (3) To what does the Minister's department attribute the 32 cases of diarrhoea in Manning Ward patients during the months of January and February?
- (4) Is it a fact that the Brockway tip is on Mental Health Department land?
- (5) What action does the Minister propose to now take to re-locate the Manning House patients who are in a situation unacceptable to any other group of people in a civilised and affluent community?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

The honourable member is using a question to express in rather wild terms an opinion with which the Minister for Health disagrees.

The Minister has visited Manning House and finds it hard to reconcile the honourable member's intemperate description with the facts.

The patients have been subject to some noise, dust, and an unpleasant smell at times and remedial action has been taken. It is questionable whether flies, which the honourable member will admit are not uncommon in Perth, are entirely attributable to the operation of the tip.

Thirty patients experienced diarrhoea over a 10-week period ending the 11th March, 1979. There is no evidence that salmonella organisms were involved, or that the diarrhoea was in any way attributable to the operation of the tip.

The Minister confirms that the Brockway rubbish disposal site is on Mental Health Department land vested in the Minister for Health.

No action will be taken to relocate the Manning House patients. The wards are of good standard and certain improvements have been discussed with the Director of Mental Health Services. Action has been taken in regard to the rubbish disposal site to relieve any remaining nuisance.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Salt: Lake McLeod

8. The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Leader of the House:
- (1) Is the Minister aware that as C.R.A. have halted the production of salt at Lake McLeod and dismissed the workforce because of cyclone damage to their loading facility at Cape Cuvier, and as a result of the closure and dismissal of the workforce, the economic impact on the Town of Carnarvon has been disastrous; an estimated \$1 800 000 has been lost to the Carnarvon area through the loss of the salt harvesting operation?
 - (2) Will the Premier re-assure the people of Carnarvon by making a public announcement that C.R.A. will recommence operations as soon as possible at the previous level of production.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) The Texada loading facility is inoperable because of cyclone damage. As a result salt production has been suspended. Portion of the workforce has been paid off, but some remain to undertake care and

maintenance and some have been transferred to the Dampier salt facility.

I do not know where the member has obtained his figure of \$1 800 000.

- (2) It will be about a week before the company will have sufficient knowledge to put a firm programme to the Government for repair of the loading facility and resumption of salt production.

The member can be assured that both the company and the Government are pressing on with the work needed to finalise such a programme with all despatch. The people of Carnarvon understand this.

In the meantime, no good purpose is served in premature statements which might cause misunderstandings and unnecessary anxiety.

HEALTH

Fluoridation of Water Supplies

9. The Hon. **LYLA ELLIOTT**, to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is the Minister aware—

(a) that a decision was handed down by Judge John P. Flaherty of the Court of Pennsylvania, USA, on the 16th November, 1978, ordering the cessation of the fluoridation of certain public water supplies in that State because there was evidence to show fluoride caused cancer;

(b) that the decision was taken after five months of hearing of extensive expert testimony; and

(c) that the evidence included a study of 10 cities which fluoridated their water, and 10 cities which did not, over a period of 18 years, the results of which revealed a significant increase in cancer mortality in the fluoridated cities?

- (2) In view of the foregoing information and the serious health implications, will the Minister obtain a copy of the decision handed down by Judge Flaherty for investigation and report by the Public Health Department?

- (3) If not, why not?

The Hon. **D. J. WORDSWORTH** replied:

- (1) (a) Yes, the order related to one authority in the western suburbs of Pittsburgh, and I also understand that the order has been set aside pending an appeal to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court;

(b) yes;

(c) the conclusions of the study referred to have been authoritatively rebutted by Sir Richard Doll, one of the world's foremost epidemiologists.

His analysis of the data indicated that the expected cancer mortality fell slightly in the cities with fluoridated water and was unchanged in the unfluoridated cities.

- (2) The Minister has already obtained a copy which is being studied by officers of the Public Health Department.

- (3) Not applicable.

HOUSING: RENTAL

Maniana

10. The Hon. **R. HETHERINGTON**, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Housing:

(1) With regard to the old Maniana State Housing Commission estate at Queen's Park, is it a fact that tenants whose houses have been upgraded have their rents increased from \$25.50 to \$35.00?

(2) If rents are substantially increased, what arrangements are made for tenants on low incomes who suffer hardship because of the increased rents?

The Hon. **I. G. MEDCALF** replied:

- (1) Yes.

(2) Following long standing practice these tenants may, on application, have their rents reduced in accordance with the current rebate scale.

ABORIGINES

Swan Shire

11. The Hon. **LYLA ELLIOTT**, to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Health:

In view of the fact that—

(a) the housing of the Aboriginal urban fringe dwellers is becoming urgent with the approach of winter, particularly in view of the large number of children involved—19 at the Lockridge camp alone, seven of whom are under school age;

(b) that the Government has apparently failed to provide an alternative site acceptable to the Aboriginal people, the local authority or the surrounding neighbours; and

(c) that the Marshall Road site was apparently acceptable to the Aboriginal people, the Swan Shire Council and the majority of rate-payers at a special meeting of the council at which the matter was discussed;

will the Government now either agree to the Marshall Road site or develop the Lockridge site where the people are presently camped?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

The Marshall Road site is not available and a more attractive site at Madonna Downs near Beechboro Road is being considered. This proposed site is acceptable to the majority of Aboriginal people who are living in camps in the Swan Valley.

The temporary camp site at Lockridge is entirely unsuitable for development as a permanent camping park. The area is too small to accommodate all the the people living in the area and could not be developed in accordance with the wishes of the people who are asking for some physical separation between the various groups in the new camping park.
