

If Mr. Jack Thomson agrees to this course of action I see no reason why the Bill should not get a quick passage through this House. Some people who have a vested interest in this matter have contacted me, and they are not very happy with the Bill. However, I am not concerned about the vested interests being happy, but I am concerned about justice being meted out to people who consign cattle for sale by auction. I trust that as a result of this Bill they will receive the auction rate or the ruling rate for the cattle and stock they consign.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. S. T. J. Thompson.

House adjourned at 6.00 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 2nd August, 1972

The SPEAKER (Mr. Norton) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (43): ON NOTICE

1. *This question was postponed.*

2. **ABORIGINES**

Housing and Welfare: Expenditure

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Treasurer:

- (1) What was the amount spent—
 - (a) by the Hawke Government in 1958-59;
 - (b) by the Brand Government in 1968-69;
 - (c) by the Tonkin Government in 1971-72,
 on
 - (i) Aboriginal welfare; and
 - (ii) housing?
- (2) What amount was spent by his Government for Aboriginal housing from its special programmes outside normal State Housing Commission allocations?
- (3) What has the Commonwealth Government, year by year, since it had the constitutional authority to do so, spent in, or granted to, Western Australia for—
 - (a) Aboriginal welfare; and
 - (b) Aboriginal housing?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) (a) (i) \$1,178,678.
(ii) Nil.
- (b) (i) \$2,380,793.
(ii) \$756,099.
- (c) (i) \$3,044,368.
(ii) \$814,327.
- (2) \$814,327.

- (3) (a) 1968-69—\$278,361.
1969-70—\$265,000.
1970-71—\$600,000.
1971-72—\$1,255,000.
- (b) 1968-69—\$546,639.
1969-70—\$990,000.
1970-71—\$1,080,000.
1971-72—\$1,245,000.

3.

BP REFINERY

Initial Contact and Negotiations

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

- (1) Will he advise the House the name of the Minister for Works and the director of works responsible for the initial contact and negotiations and commitment with British Petroleum to have the company establish an oil refinery at Kwinana?
- (2) When and where did this event take place?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) The Minister for Works at the time was Hon. David Brand, M.L.A., the Director of Works being Mr. R. J. Dumas.

The notes from which the Minister for Labour was reading on my behalf were unfortunately an uncorrected copy and referred to the oil refinery at Kwinana as having been initiated by the Labor Government under the premiership of the Hon. A. R. G. Hawke.

This, of course, is not so and I apologise to the House for this error having been made. The responsibility is mine and can in no way be attributed to the Minister for Labour.

- (2) Initial contacts were made in Melbourne in 1951 and final negotiations were held in Perth with an Anglo Iranian Oil Company team headed by Mr. Blake and including Messrs. Hackford-Jones and Barker.

The agreement was signed on 3rd March, 1952, and subsequently ratified in a special session of Parliament.

4.

HEALTH

Cigarette Smoking: Effect on Pregnancies

Mr. A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Health:

What action is being taken to make prospective parents aware of the high positive correlation between cigarette smoking by pregnant women and the number of miscarriages and still-births?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

As from 1st January, 1973, all packages containing cigarettes for sale must bear a warning label containing the words "Warning—Smoking is a health hazard".

Any advice to a pregnant woman regarding smoking is a matter for her private medical practitioner.

5. EDUCATION

Cigarette Smoking: Effect on Pregnancies

Mr. A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Education:

What action is being taken to make primary and secondary school students of both sexes aware of the high positive correlation between cigarette smoking by pregnant women and the number of miscarriages and stillbirths?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

The hazards of cigarette smoking are treated in each of the first three years of the secondary school course. However, the aspect of the problem mentioned in the question is not treated as a specific topic.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Lead Content in Atmosphere

Mr. A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Environmental Protection:

- (1) Have the technical difficulties of determining a satisfactory scientific method of analysing lead content in the atmosphere been overcome?
- (2) If so, will he inform the House the monthly readings over the central area during the past 12 months?
- (3) If (1) is "No" when is it anticipated that such technical difficulties will be partially or wholly overcome?
- (4) Why are these difficulties of such magnitude in Perth when such analyses seem to have been commonplace overseas for some years?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) 130 samples are being processed at present and the results will be available in approximately one month.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) The delay has been caused by the desire of the department to establish a method which gives a more representative assessment of lead in air over 24 hours than those commonly used.

7. POLICE

Household Valuables: Identification Numbers

Mr. A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

Will the Minister examine the feasibility of introducing the system of engraving household valuables with inerasable numbers that has been introduced with such success overseas as a deterrent to burglary?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

There is no doubt as to the feasibility of engraving household valuables, and electronic engravers are at present available locally. Some success has been reported in community projects in the United States of America as a deterrent to burglary.

8. MT. PLEASANT SCHOOL

Demountable Classrooms: Removal

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it proposed to remove any Bristol prefabricated classrooms from the Mount Pleasant primary school?
- (2) If so, how many, and to what locations is it proposed to move the buildings?
- (3) What is the estimated cost of—
 - (a) dismantling;
 - (b) re-erecting; and
 - (c) cartage per mile, of each building?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) It is planned to remove four rooms. The decision as to whether the rooms will be moved to another location or sold by public tender will depend upon a report by the Public Works Department.
- (3) Costs cannot be assessed with accuracy as the condition of each building and the repairs necessary are major factors. Bristol prefabricated buildings are not classed as demountables and have only been moved on rare occasions.

9. SECONDARY AND PRIMARY INDUSTRIES COMMISSION

Establishment

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Premier:

- (1) Has his Government been requested by the State executive of the Labor party to set up a commission to establish secondary and primary industries and to examine, *inter alia*, expansion of

works such as the State Engineering Works, Wundowie charcoal iron industry and the Midland workshops?

- (2) Has any decision been made and, if so, what is that decision?
- (3) If no decision has been made when can one be expected?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) The matter is still under consideration.

10. PUBLIC SERVICE

Epileptics : Employment

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Premier:

- (1) Is it a fact that persons who declare that they suffer from epilepsy are denied permanency in the public service?
- (2) If so for what reasons?
- (3) Can such a person remain in the service as a "temporary" officer?
- (4) What rights and privileges are denied a "temporary" officer compared with a "permanent" officer?
- (5) Are there any other disabilities which deny permanence; if so, what are they?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) No. Epilepsy in itself does not deny permanency. If the Government Medical Officer considers an epileptic capable of living out a normal life span and to be so controlled that he can satisfactorily perform his duties without undue absence from work, and recommends permanency the person would be so appointed.
- (2) Covered by (1) above.
- (3) Yes. It is the policy of the board to employ epileptics, along with other handicapped people, if they are at all able to do a job satisfactorily without undue disruption.
- (4) Privileges denied to a temporary officer are:
 - (a) promotion beyond level or salary range appointed;
 - (b) superannuation;
 - (c) serves longer initial period before entitled to long service leave;
 - (d) not eligible for short leave or sick leave half-pay credits in his first year.
- (5) No disabilities can be specifically stated. The opinion of the Government Medical Officer is the deciding factor in each case.

11. TOWN PLANNING

Swan Location 74: Rezoning of Lots

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Premier:

- (1) Did he direct or request the Minister for Town Planning to alter the zoning of lots 105 and 108 Swan location 74 L.T.O. plan 5215 (being lots immediately to the rear of a service station and food establishment in Canning Highway and occupying an area between North Lake Road and Cowan Street) from that proposed by the City of Melville in its town planning scheme No. 2?
- (2) Were any representations made to him in this matter, and, if so, by whom?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) By Mr. A. A. Becu.

12. *This question was postponed.*

13. HOUSING

Country Towns: Vacant Premises

Mr. W. G. YOUNG, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How many State Housing Commission homes are vacant in country towns?
- (2) In which towns are the above homes situated, and how many are in each?
- (3) What would be the approximate loss in rental per annum to the commission?
- (4) What would be the total value of the above homes?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) 412 at 30th June, 1972 plus 26 in North West = 438.
- (2) Albany—10.
Ardath—1.
Balingup—1.
Beverley—1.
Boddington—1.
Bolgart—1.
Boyanup—2.
Boyup Brook—7.
Bridgetown—3.
Brookton—1.
Broome—2.
Broomehill—2.
Brunswick Junction—1.
Bruce Rock—6.
Bunbury—93.
Busselton—9.
Calingari—2.
Carnamah—1.
Carnarvon—4.
Collie—63.
Corrigin—2.
Cuballing—2.
Cunderdin—4.

Denmark—4.
 Derby—1.
 Donnybrook—1.
 Dowerin—1.
 Dumbleyung—2.
 Esperance—34.
 Geraldton—8.
 Gnowangerup—5.
 Goomalling—4.
 Harvey—1.
 Jerramungup—1.
 Kalannie—1.
 Karlgarin—1.
 Karratha—2.
 Katanning—8.
 Kellerberrin—2.
 Kondinin—15.
 Kulin—3.
 Kununurra—1.
 Kununoppin—1.
 Lake Grace—1.
 Latham—2.
 Mandurah—2.
 Leonora—1.
 Marble Bar—2.
 Meekatharra—1.
 Merredin—1.
 Moora—4.
 Morawa—3.
 Mt. Barker—5.
 Mukinbudin—1.
 Nannup—5.
 Narembreen—5.
 Narrogin—4.
 Northam—2.
 Northcliffe—1.
 Nungarin—1.
 Ongerup—1.
 Onslow—1.
 Perenjori—2.
 Picton—1.
 Manjimup—2.
 Pingrup—1.
 Port Hedland—5.
 Quairading—2.
 Ravensthorpe—1.
 Serpentine—1.
 Tambellup—1.
 Tammin—1.
 Toodyay—1.
 Trayning—2.
 Wagin—29.
 Waroona—1.
 Wickiepin—1.
 Witchcliffe—1.
 Wundowie—7.
 Wittenoom—11.
 Wyndham—1.
 Yarloop—4.
 Yealering—1.
 Yelbeni—1.
 Yerecoin—1.
 York—2.

- (3) Rental of above 438 houses — \$5,350.40 per week or \$278,220.80 per annum.
- (4) This information is not available as the Commission records cover initial capital cost and not current valuation of each property. To obtain current capital valuations

State Taxation Department's valuers who are engaged on other essential duties. On a broad replacement cost basis, the estimated capital requirement would be of the order of \$3.7 million.

14. NAVAL BASE AT COCKBURN SOUND *Housing*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) When is a final decision expected to be taken for the siting of the homes for the navy personnel who will be stationed at H.M.A.S. Stirling?
- (2) Is the Government still adamant that the navy homes should be built at Kwinana?
- (3) As the main reason for the Government's insistence appears to be the recouping of expenditure at Kwinana will he give me a summary of the receipts and expenditure, and assets and liabilities for the acquisition, servicing and development of Kwinana residential suburbs since its inception?
- (4) How many acres were purchased by the Crown and State Housing Commission for residential development?
- (5) What was the original cost of acquisition of the land mentioned in (4)?
- (6) Will the development of the proposed new suburb at Naval Base depreciate or reduce the Commission's assets at Kwinana?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) to (6) No formal approach has been made by the authorised Commonwealth Authority under the arrangements between Commonwealth and State Governments for the housing of armed services personnel.

When a formal approach is received a final decision will be made in the light of all relevant considerations.

15. TRAVEL AGENTS *Legislation*

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Is it correct that Western Australia was one of two States that did not consider it necessary, at that time, to introduce legislation for travel agencies and charter brokers suggested by the Australian Federation of Travel Agents to the conference of State and Commonwealth Ministers held at Kalgoorlie recently?

- (2) If not correct, what was the position?
- (3) (a) What is the State Government's present attitude to legislation on this matter;
- (b) Will any be introduced this session?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) With the several States indicating different preferences as between individual State legislation or special Commonwealth legislation, I advised the conference that Western Australia had an open mind on the question and was prepared to co-operate with the desires of the majority of States and territories represented at the conference as to what form of legislation was desirable and, in fact, as to whether any form of legislation was desirable.
- (3) (a) The Government is at present awaiting the results of further discussions currently taking place with other State Ministers for Tourism on the type and format of any proposed legislation. The desirability of uniformity of legislation in respect of an Australia wide industry would be obvious.
- (b) Depending on the outcome of (3) (a).

16. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Texada Potash and Salt Projects

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

- (1) What is the latest position with potash production at the Texada (Lake MacLeod) project?
- (2) What is the current extension of time given by the Government for commencement of commercial potash production?
- (3) What assurance has the Government that the construction of the necessary plant will commence and be brought to completion and into commercial production of potash within the present extension of time?
- (4) Is it the intention of the Government to give any further extensions of time to Texada Salt for their entry into the production of potash on a commercial scale if the company does not meet its potash obligations within the present extension of time?
- (5) What permission to export salt has been given to Texada in the meantime, including tonnages, period and price?

- (6) Is he aware of the concern being expressed about the delay in the company proceeding with its potash commitments and the prices at which it is tendering for salt orders in Japan to the detriment of other projects in Western Australia which are completely dependent on salt income for their survival, whereas the Texada Salt project at Lake MacLeod was entered into on the basis that the primary consideration was the production of potash?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) The company is engaged in preparation of plans and specifications for a plant.
- (2) 18th May, 1973.
- (3) The company has given an undertaking.
- (4) It does not appear this will be necessary.
- (5) Approvals were granted in November, 1968, September and December, 1969, and May, 1970, for export of varying amounts of salt for varying periods and prices. Details of these contracts are being examined to establish what information could be released without prejudice.
- (6) Yes, there have been a number of discussions with salt producers in Western Australia. The rationalising of the production and marketing of salt from Western Australia is being studied with regard to the interests of all salt producers.

17.

FERTILISERS

Rail Cartage

Mr. W. A. MANNING, to the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

What tonnages of fertiliser were railed during the year ended 30th June, 1972 from—

- (a) Geraldton;
- (b) Bassendean;
- (c) Kwinana;
- (d) Picton;
- (e) Esperance;
- (f) Albany,

and what was the tonnage to each destination in each case?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (a) 23,656.
- (b) 3,309.
- (c) 287,683.
- (d) 58,841.
- (e) 240.
- (f) 38,796.

The information respecting individual destinations is not readily available but will be provided as soon as possible.

18. **FERTILISERS***Manufacture*

Mr. W. A. MANNING, to the Minister for Agriculture:

How many tons of fertiliser were manufactured at each of the following works during the year ended 30th June, 1972—

- (a) Geraldton;
- (b) Bassendean;
- (c) Picton;
- (d) Albany;
- (e) Esperance;
- (f) Kwinana?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

C.S.B.P. and Farmers Ltd., the fertiliser company concerned, will not make detailed figures available. The total amount of fertiliser despatched for the year ended 30th June, 1972 was 1,189,000 tons.

19. **RAILWAYS***Housing for Employees*

Mr. W. A. MANNING, to the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Has the Railway Department transferred all its housing for employees to the State Housing Commission?
- (2) If so, what provision has been made to ensure housing for employees on transfer?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) No housing has been transferred to the State Housing Commission.
- (2) Answered by (1).

20. **WOOL***Rail Freight Reduction*

Mr. COOK, to the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

Since the inception of the 50% reduction in freight to farmers railing wool to Albany from points south of Narrogin, what has been the estimated saving in freight to them?

Mr. MAY replied:

The concession allowed on wool railed from the prescribed area to Albany, from inception of the scheme on 1st July, 1971, until 30th June, 1972, amounted to \$66,344.

However, assessment of the actual saving to the farmers would be dependent on a knowledge of the tonnages, origin and destination, and mode of transport, which would have been used, had the concession not applied.

This information is not known.

21. **FRIENDLY SOCIETIES
PHARMACIES***Expansion*

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has the Government any intention of amending the Pharmacy Act or the Friendly Societies Act to allow the expansion of friendly society dispensaries?
- (2) If "Yes" to what extent, in particular
 - (a) how many pharmacies; and
 - (b) at what sites?
- (3) Has the pharmacy guild been consulted in regard to any suggested amendments?
- (4) Has the guild or its members been given the opportunity to participate in any projects contemplated by the friendly societies?
- (5) Will he now give the results of his investigations and feasibility studies into the question of friendly society pharmacy expansion?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) The matter is under consideration.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) Consideration of the whole question was delayed awaiting a submission from the Pharmacy Guild of Australia, W.A. Branch. This has now arrived. I think I gave the additional five days asked for.
- (4) This is not known.
- (5) See answer to (1).

22. **PHARMACIES***Differences in Charges*

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister for Consumer Protection:

Is one of the matters for consideration by the Commissioner for Consumer Protection the question of different charges alleged to be made by private pharmacies and the friendly society pharmacies?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

It is expected that the new Commissioner for Consumer Protection will be appointed very shortly to be followed by the establishment of the 12 member Consumer Affairs Council.

The matter of alleged differential charges between private pharmacies and friendly society pharmacies may be discussed by the council and, if they desire, referred to the commissioner for further investigation.

However, as the matter in the Member's question specifies charges, that is prices, the question—if considered necessary for referral

to any source—could perhaps more logically be referred to a committee set up as provided for in the proposed excessive prices legislation.

23. SEX SHOP

Closure

Dr. DADOUR, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the sex shop been closed, as promised by him?
- (2) If not, why the delay?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The power to close orgy shops is not contained in existing legislation. All States and the Commonwealth have met and a decision was made that the Commonwealth would restrict the import of sex aids. It was considered that supplies would then dry up.

Amendments to the Obscene and Indecent Publications Act are being prepared to forbid the sale of these publications in sex shops.

24. PUBLIC SERVICE

Number Employed

Dr. DADOUR, to the Premier:

- (1) What was the total number of persons employed in the State Government public service for the following years—
 - (a) at June, 1968;
 - (b) June, 1969;
 - (c) June, 1970;
 - (d) June, 1971;
 - (e) June, 1972?
- (2) What percentage of the total work force in Western Australia for the same years was employed in the State Government public service?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) and (2)—

| | Year ended 30th June | Number employed | *Per cent of total work force |
|------|-------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1968 | | 7,269 | 2.54 |
| 1969 | | 7,819 | 2.57 |
| 1970 | | 8,598 | 2.69 |
| 1971 | | 9,336 | 2.71 |
| 1972 | | 9,837 | 2.85 |

* Total work force does not include defence forces, employees in agriculture, self-employed persons and private domestic service.

25. ROYAL PERTH HOSPITAL

Scott Report: Tabling

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is he now prepared to table the W. D. Scott report re Royal Perth Hospital?

- (2) If not, why is there a need for continued secrecy in relation to this report?
- (3) In view of the cost of the report to the electors, does he not consider it proper to make the report available to the electors through this Parliament?
- (4) Assuming that he will still permit me to read the report in his office, will he then permit me to relate to Parliament and the electorate the contents thereof?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) to (4) Since answering questions during last session in relation to the W.D. Scott report, I have had further discussion with the hospital board, which regards these documents as confidential.

I would point out the nature of the answers given on 3rd and 4th August, 1971, to the effect that the firm of W. D. Scott carried out a complete survey of the hospital's organisation as a whole and in all its parts during the period November 1961, to December 1964, inclusive. Their findings were contained in a series of approximately 200 reports of varying sizes and importance, submitted over this period. Further, most of the hundreds of recommendations submitted were adopted by the hospital.

One of these was the continued application of work study techniques within the hospital. The company trained the nucleus of the work study group which is still operating.

The Member will appreciate that many of the reports, particularly those from the continuing work study group, mention individuals and it would indeed be unfair to make the contents public.

I have the greatest trust in the integrity of the board of management.

26.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Levels under Governments

Dr. DADOUR, to the Premier:

- (1) Is it correct that under the Hawke Government Western Australia enjoyed the highest rate of unemployment in Australia and under the Brand Government Western Australia enjoyed the lowest rate of unemployment in Australia, and now under the present Government Western Australia enjoys the highest rate of unemployment in Australia?
- (2) If so, can he explain why?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).

27. ABORIGINES

Kimberley: Scott Report

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) Is the Minister now prepared to table the W. D. Scott report on the needs of the Kimberley Aborigines?
- (2) If not, why is there a need for continued secrecy in relation to this report?
- (3) In view of the cost of the report to the electors, does not the Minister consider it proper to make the report available to the electors through this Parliament?
- (4) Does the report show that the Kimberley Aborigines are really very affluent and comfortable and it is necessary to maintain secrecy to avoid an influx of Aborigines from other areas?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The report contains information of a confidential nature.
I have no objection to the Member examining the report in my office.
- (3) No. For the reason stated in (2) above.
- (4) No.

28. KALAMUNDA HIGH SCHOOL

Grounds Reticulation

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has a contract been let for the mechanical equipment necessary for grounds reticulation at Kalamunda high school?
- (2) If not, what is the reason for the delay?
- (3) When is it anticipated the project will be complete?
- (4) When will grassing of the grounds be undertaken?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Work is expected to start within a few days and completion should be in four weeks.
- (4) Grassing is to be undertaken in early spring.

29.

SEX SHOP

Closure

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Premier:

- (1) Has he acted in any way to pressure from the executive of the Australian Labor Party on the question of closure of the "Orgy Shop"?
- (2) If not, when will the long awaited legislation be presented to this House?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Legislation designed on lines of action agreed upon at a conference of Ministers from each State is in course of preparation.

30.

EARTHQUAKES

Forecasting: Report

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Premier:

- (1) Has he received a report/recommendation from the Premier's committee set up after the Meckering earthquake disaster to examine possible ways of forecasting earth movement?
- (2) If so, will he table a copy of the report?
- (3) If recommendations have been made, will he say—
(a) what they were;
(b) which ones he has acted upon?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Progressive recommendations have been received.
- (2) Relevant file may be perused by arrangement at the office of the Minister for Works.
- (3) (a) (i) That the Bureau of Mineral Resources be requested to install a three component seismograph in the Port Hedland-Marble Bar area.
(ii) That the Bureau of Mineral Resources be requested to install a seismograph station in the Meckering district.
(iii) That the Calingiri-Yerico-in-Bolgart-Meckering area be declared zone "A" and people in the area should be warned that buildings should be reinforced.
The matter to be referred to the Building Advisory Committee.
(iv) That a structural engineer and seismologist visit California to inspect a disaster area.

(v) That accelerometers be installed in any new buildings of twelve storeys or more.

(vi) That special bores be established for monitoring water level rises as a warning system.

(b) Recommendations (i), (ii) and (iii) have been adopted. Recommendation (iv) was rejected.

Recommendations (v) and (vi) are currently under active consideration.

31. MIDLAND ABATTOIR

Effluent Disposal

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Has a satisfactory system for the disposal of effluent from Midland abattoirs been chosen?

(2) When will the present system be replaced?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

(1) Yes. The calling of tenders is being handled by the consultants.

(2) Approximately 14 months after the acceptance of tenders.

32. LAMB MARKETING BOARD

Agents

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Will he give consideration to allowing persons other than stock agents to act as agents for the Lamb Marketing Board?

(2) Does he not agree that organisations, such as Patton Exporters, who in the past have dealt direct with producers, would be suitable agents in addition to the stock firms?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

(1) Consideration has been given to allow other than stock agents to act as agents for the Lamb Marketing Board and it was agreed by the board to allow only stock agents to act on behalf of the board.

(2) Other organisations would be unsuitable agents as they are unable to offer the same services—country branches, personnel and finance to qualify for the requirements of the board.

33. KALAMUNDA HIGH SCHOOL

Additions

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Have contract documents for major additions to Kalamunda high school been completed?

(2) Have tenders been called, and, if so, when will work commence?

(3) Will the additions be completed before the start of the 1973 school year?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: replied:

(1) No.

(2) No.

(3) Specified completion date is to be 4th February, 1973.

34.

SEWERAGE

City Beach Subdivisions

Mr. R. L. YOUNG, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) Did the Metropolitan Water Board undertake the provision of sewerage to the Perth City Council City Beach sub-divisions commonly known as areas 28 and 29?

(2) If "Yes" did the Perth City Council pay over to the board any moneys prior to the auction of the lands?

(3) If so, how much was paid over prior to and in respect of—

(a) No. 28 auction?

(b) No. 29 auction?

(4) How much was paid over subsequent to and in respect of—

(a) No. 28 auction;

(b) No. 29 auction?

(5) How much expenditure has the board made in respect of—

(a) No. 28 auction land;

(b) No. 29 auction land?

(6) Have all works undertaken been completed in respect of sewerage supplies to No. 28 auction land?

(7) If not, why not?

(8) Have all works undertaken been completed in respect of sewerage supplies to No. 29 auction land?

(9) If not, why not?

(10) Is water available to any lots on the No. 29 auction land?

(11) If not, when will water be available?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

(1) and (2) Yes.

(3) (a) \$50,000 paid October, 1971.

(b) \$100,000 paid March, 1972.

(4) (a) \$25,000 paid June, 1972.

(b) \$75,000 paid June, 1972.

(5) (a) \$37,717.77.

(b) \$1,402.77.

No amounts have been included for outstanding accounts.

(6) No.

(7) The incomplete work consists of two pumping stations and the connecting rising mains which serve

both areas. The delay has been due to the non availability of the sites for these pumping stations. In the meantime any householder requiring a sewerage service has been served by tankering.

(8) No.

(9) The finishing touches to the reticulation will be completed by mid August. The delay to the pumping stations has been due to the non-availability of the sites as in (7).

(10) No.

(11) By mid August, 1972.

35.

CATTLE

Brucellosis

Mr. REID, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) What is the approximate number of cattle—

(a) in the whole of Western Australia;

(b) in the area south of Geraldton;

(c) that have been vaccinated against brucellosis during last year and over the last ten years;

(d) that were found to be infected with bovine brucellosis in the year ended 30th June, 1972?

(2) In what towns in Western Australia at present are samples for bovine brucellosis tested?

(3) What is the testing capacity per week for each town?

(4) Is it true there is a three to four week delay in testing in the Bunbury-Harvey area?

(5) What steps is the Government taking to substantially increase the testing and compensation levels in Western Australia?

(6) Will compensation be limited to 3% incidence again this year?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

(1) (a) 1,781,334 at 31/3/1971.

(b) 946,113.

(c) Last year: 68,824.
Last 10 years: 460,529.

(d) 5,810 reactors.

(2) Perth.

(3) 3,500 samples per week.

(4) Yes.

(5) Steps have been taken to increase the laboratory testing capacity to 7,500 samples per week. It is not planned to increase compensation levels.

(6) Yes.

36. *This question was postponed until Tuesday, 8th August.*

37.

MITCHELL FREEWAY

Extensions

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Works:

(1) How far has the planning progressed for the extension of the Mitchell Freeway to the Leach Highway, in particular,

(a) what is the route;

(b) when will the work commence;

(c) what is the estimated cost?

(2) When will the upgrading of the Albany and South Western Highway junction at Armadale commence?

(3) If an early commencement of this work is not expected, what are the reasons for this delay?

(4) How much is this junction redevelopment now expected to cost?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

(1) (a) to (c) The Main Roads Department is still carrying out investigations to evaluate all aspects of alternative alignments. Until these investigations are complete it is not possible to give information regarding a timetable and cost of construction.

(2) and (3) Some delay has been occasioned in the acquisition of the necessary land for the improvement of this intersection. However, it is expected that work will be commenced by December this year.

(4) About \$300,000, excluding cost of land acquisition.

38.

MEAT

Prices, and Imports from Victoria and South Australia

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

As there has been a serious shortage of stock numbers being sent to the Midland abattoirs—

(a) how many truckloads of beef and lamb have come to Western Australia from Victoria or South Australia;

(b) what would be the total number of imported carcasses to the present date of beef, lamb and/or mutton;

(c) how do the prices paid compare with local prices;

(d) if the shortage continues is it anticipated that prices will be affected?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

(a) During the last three months:
1,750 sheep,
500 cattle.

- (b) Between April and July 1972, 106 carcasses of beef and 16,270 carcasses of lamb were imported into Western Australia from other States.
- (c) Not available.
- (d) Yes.

39. BUSSELTON PORT

Costs, and Jetty Maintenance

Mr. BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) How many men have been employed on jetty maintenance at Busselton in each year since 1965?
- (2) What has been the cost of—
 - (a) wages;
 - (b) material,
 in each year during this period?
- (3) What costs, additional to maintenance, are incurred in the retention of the port of Busselton as a port?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) The number of men who have been employed on jetty maintenance has been virtually constant at 8.
- (2) (a) and (b) The breakup of expenditure into wages and material is not readily available. However, the total expenditures on maintenance of the Busselton Jetty, including the section known as the Promenade, are:—
 - 1965-66—Not available. Jetty maintained by the Western Australian Government Railways.
 - \$
 - 1966-67—48,943.67
 - 1967-68—38,001.36
 - 1968-69—40,359.85
 - 1969-70—51,372.23
 - 1970-71—41,725.92
 - 1971-72—55,039.73

- (3) Port operational costs in the year ended 30th June, 1972, amounted to \$3,676.

40. RURAL UNEMPLOYMENT

Commonwealth Assistance

Mr. BLAIKIE, to the Premier:

- (1) When did Commonwealth assistance to rural unemployment in Western Australia commence?
- (2) What are the conditions relating to this assistance required by the Commonwealth Government?
- (3) What amount of moneys have been received by the State in each month since assistance commenced?

- (4) How many persons have received employment in Western Australia through Commonwealth rural unemployment assistance?
- (5) When does the current arrangement with the Commonwealth expire?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) January, 1972.
- (2) (a) Funds must be used on employment creating activities and at least two-thirds must be spent on wages and no more than one-third on materials and equipment.
- (b) Persons employed must be drawn from those registered for employment with the Commonwealth Employment Service.
- (3) (a) In 1971-72 a total sum of \$2,024,400 was received as follows:—

| | \$ |
|----------------|-----------|
| January | 197,000 |
| February | 196,000 |
| March | 532,600 |
| April | nil |
| May | nil |
| June | 1,098,800 |

- (b) For 1972-73 an amount of \$2,700,000 is to be paid to the State at the rate of \$450,000 per month for the period July to December, 1972.
- (4) The Department of Labour and National Service advises that 2,758 persons received employment up to 30th June, 1972. Later figures are not yet available.
- (5) The current arrangement will operate to the end of 1972 before which date the scheme is to be again reviewed by the Commonwealth Government.

41.

TRAFFIC

Intersections: Safety Planning

Mr. HUTCHINSON, to the Minister for Traffic Safety:

- (1) As the intersection accident type is one of the most significant in the accident situation will he make every endeavour to obtain increased allocations of finance for channelisation, traffic signals, grade separation and better lighting?
- (2) Can he announce the programme of works in regard to this matter for this and the next financial year?
- (3) What steps, if any, are being undertaken to replan existing street grid systems so that dangerous intersections can be modified or by-passed?

- (4) What other steps have been planned or are being planned in an endeavour to make our roads safer?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) to (4) As Minister for Traffic Safety I arranged for a panel of senior officers of the Main Roads Department, Police Department and Public Service Board to be set up to advise me on ways and means of implementing my new portfolio. It is too early for me to make any comments regarding the investigation or funding of the several matters raised by the Member in these questions.

However, in regard to questions (1) and (2), the Main Roads Department in their 1971-72 and 1972-73 programme of works made provision for the following traffic management facilities:—

| | 1971-72 \$ |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| Traffic control signals .. | 160,000 |
| Channelisation of intersections | 315,000 |
| Pedestrian facilities | 100,000 |
| Street lighting | 75,000 |
| | 1972-73 |
| Traffic control signals .. | 227,000 |
| Channelisation of intersections | 400,000 |
| Pedestrian facilities | 100,000 |
| Street lighting | 100,000 |

The department has not yet decided on its allocations for 1973-74.

The matters raised in questions (3) and (4) are constantly under survey by the Main Roads Department, and no doubt will also be the subject of investigation by any authority which may be set up under my portfolio of Traffic Safety.

4- WOOL CARTAGE

Prosecutions by Transport Board

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

How many convictions were made by the Transport Board's inspectors against farmers for carting wool—

- (a) to Albany;
(b) to Fremantle,
for the years 1970-71, 1971-72?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

| | 1970-71 | 1971-72 |
|-----|---------|---------|
| (a) | 19 | 3 |
| (b) | 6 | 17 |

As with question 27 of 1st August, these figures include farmers and carriers transporting on behalf of farmers. The figures for farmers only are—

| | 1970-71 | 1971-72 |
|-------------|---------|---------|
| (a) | 12 | 2 |
| (b) | 5 | 6 |
| | 1970-71 | 1971-72 |
| | \$ | \$ |
| Total fines | 620.00 | 350.00 |
| Total costs | 182.90 | 83.00 |
| Total | 802.90 | 433.00 |

Mr. Nalder: I think your figures are wrong.

Mr. JAMIESON: I stand to be corrected.

43.

STOCK BRANDS

Identification Records

Mr. REID, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Would he explain the situation regarding the enforcement of the Stock (Brands and Movement) Act, 1970, (section 46) as from 1st August when amendments to this Act are still before the House?

(2) Will a butcher or dealer daily handling hundreds of various earmarks and brands be prosecuted unless the identification is individually documented?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

(1) Section 46 of the Act proclaimed on 1st July will be enforced in relation to cattle, sheep and pigs.

(2) Steps are currently being taken to deal administratively with regard to the special problems of transporting stock confronting certain categories of carriers.

QUESTIONS (3): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Texada Potash and Salt Projects

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation:

In the answer to part (5) of question 16 the Minister listed the approvals granted for the export of salt up to May, 1970. Can I assume that no additional approvals or extensions and variations of the then existing approvals have been granted since May, 1970? By way of amplification, it may be that the last formal approval was given in May, 1970, but extensions of some of those approvals may have been granted since. I seek clarification because information that has come to me indicates the answer is incorrect.

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

The particulars supplied should be accurate in detail but I undertake to make a check tomorrow morning and advise the Leader of the Opposition.

2. KWINANA-BALGA POWER LINE

Route

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Electricity:

Does he still contend that the entire route of the Kwinana-Balga 330 kV power line has been considered by the Environmental Protection Authority and that it finds "the present route for both lines was acceptable"?

Does he not agree that the report by the Environmental Protection Authority, which he tabled in the House yesterday, gives no indication that the authority has examined, in depth, the whole project?

Will he further agree that the Environmental Protection Authority has not given support to the Government's proposals for the overall line, but that it does consider the crossing of the grounds of Guildford Grammar School to be more acceptable than the other alternative considered by the S.E.C.?

Mr. MAY replied:

I request that this question be put on the notice paper.

3. NAVAL BASE AT COCKBURN SOUND

Housing

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Housing:

I refer to question 14 on today's notice paper. The Minister was kind enough to answer parts (1) and (2) of the question. Would he agree to my putting parts (3), (4), (5), and (6)—which deal with a separate issue altogether—on the notice paper for tomorrow, if he has not the answers to them?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

I consider the answer I gave the honourable member to be the right one for that particular question. If he wants to frame another question, he may put it on the notice paper.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Days and Hours: Statement by Premier

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier) [5.10 p.m.]: I seek the leave of the House to give some information regarding the

proposed sitting times of the House and the periods during which we intend to sit before we have a break.

The SPEAKER: Leave is granted.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: It is intended that the present series of sittings will continue until Thursday, the 24th August, when there will be a week's break.

It is also intended to observe from now on the times of sitting which were observed in the early part of this session; that is, the House will meet at 11.00 a.m. tomorrow.

LAND AUCTIONS

City Beach: Grievance

MR. R. L. YOUNG (Wembley) [5.11 p.m.]: I would like to give the House a little information on the background to question 34 on today's notice paper, which was addressed by me to the Minister for Water Supplies.

What is commonly known as City Beach No. 28 Estate was auctioned in November, 1971. It was advertised as being an auction of lots that were fully serviced. The advertisements gave the impression that these lots would have available to them complete services by way of underground electricity lines, sewerage, and water. When one considers the sums of money that were paid for the lots—in the vicinity of \$13,000 and \$15,000—purchasers could be reasonably expected to assume they would obtain top quality pieces of land. In connection with the No. 29 estate, similar claims were made by the advertisers on behalf of the Perth City Council.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much talking in the Chamber.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: It seems to me that the Perth City Council, like any other subdivider, was under an obligation to ensure that what it was advertising was correct and would be supplied. The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority will not give a diagram to a subdivider unless he can prove to the satisfaction of the authority that moneys have been paid over to the department which undertakes the work, which in this case was sewerage work. Obviously that undertaking was given by the Perth City Council. Obviously money was paid over to the Metropolitan Water Board, and obviously that department undertook to do the work.

I want the Minister to take note of what I am saying and perhaps answer some of the questions I will ask during the course of this very short speech.

The situation at the moment on the No. 28 estate is that the sewerage work has not yet been completed. Roads that had been made at the time of the auction are being torn up or have been torn up considerably—to the great inconvenience of people

living in the area—for the purpose of laying down the sewerage pipes that should have been there before the houses were built.

At the present time water and electricity have not been supplied to the No. 29 estate, and in his reply to my question today the Minister advised me that water would not be available on that estate until the middle of this month.

At the auction for the No. 28 estate no warning was given to the prospective purchasers that these facilities would not be available. The lots were advertised as being fully serviced. At the auction for the No. 29 estate verbal warning was given that the blocks were not fully serviced, although all advertisements up to that time had indicated that they were fully serviced. When it is considered that in the vicinity of \$13,000 to \$15,000 was eventually paid for each of those blocks, it seems unreasonable that the facilities available to them should be second-rate.

By the Minister's own admission, large sums of money were paid over to the Metropolitan Water Board by the Perth City Council both prior to and after the two auctions. In respect of the No. 28 estate, a total of \$75,000 has been paid over of which only \$37,718 has been expended at this stage. In regard to the No. 29 estate, \$129,000 has been paid over to the Perth City Council and only \$1,400 has been expended for work on that estate. No amounts have been included for outstanding accounts.

I would point out that this land was auctioned over nine months ago and \$75,000 has been paid over—\$50,000 prior to the auction. We have the situation where only \$37,718 has been expended on works in respect of that land which was auctioned nine or 10 months ago. This is just not good enough.

In respect of the No. 29 estate, \$100,000 was paid over in March of this year and only \$1,400 has been expended. I might add that the figures I am quoting are in respect of sewerage alone and do not take account of any money paid over in respect of water supplies, and the amount of money for water supplies alone would be quite considerable. And yet, there is still no water on the No. 29 estate.

It seems to me that any other subdivider would be caught in a situation which would be considered untenable, if his subcontractor, in this case the Metropolitan Water Board, let him down to this extent.

The people who have built in the No. 28 estate and those who are contemplating building in the No. 29 estate have been considerably inconvenienced. Many of them are paying considerable sums of money by way of bridging finance to hold their land as they cannot build. This is most unfair.

It seems to me to be unwarranted that the purchasers of this land have paid over to the Government a total of \$250,000 of which only \$38,000 has been expended. This leaves a sum of \$212,000 in the coffers of the Metropolitan Water Board. It is just not good enough.

People in the No. 28 estate have been greatly inconvenienced. The roads were recently torn up at a time when the sewerage should have been completed and this resulted in an accident. A man drove his car into a four-foot unmarked hole in the middle of the road. He did \$600 worth of damage to his car and his pregnant wife was severely shaken up and was very lucky not to have been badly injured. This should never have occurred but it did occur because the Metropolitan Water Board did not do the job at the right time.

If the Minister replies to my grievance, I shall be very interested to know why these pumping stations have not been built. I asked the Minister for Water Supplies this question earlier today and he answered, "There was nonavailability of site." This seems to me to be absolutely absurd as proper provision must have been made for the pumping stations when the subdivider submitted the plan. The Metropolitan Water Board must have known what work was necessary and surely it would have given an undertaking that the work would be completed within a reasonable time.

The SPEAKER: The member for Wembley has one minute.

Mr. R. L. YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To say that sites are not available at this time is absolutely ludicrous. The subdivider started off with a completely open piece of land and knew that provision must be made for all necessary work. I hope the Minister will throw some more light on the matter.

MR. JAMIESON (Belmont—Minister for Water Supplies) [5.20 p.m.]: The member for Wembley is making a mountain out of a molehill. I had received no complaints until I received a telephone call from a Press representative at the weekend. The first thing that usually happens when people run into trouble is that they contact my office. However, I made some inquiries on Monday and found out a number of things which the member for Wembley obviously does not know.

The first point I shall deal with is the availability of site. It is not the responsibility of the Metropolitan Water Board if adequate sites are not made available by the Town Planning Board. I shall have to seek further information on this point because obviously these sites should be provided in a new subdivision. I agree with the honourable member on this point. However, for some reason these sites were not provided and this has caused a delay.

The money for the sewerage work was paid over and as a consequence the board felt it had a responsibility. Therefore, the board has tankered any sewage from the area. Up to date the board has borne any extra costs.

The whole situation is not as clear-cut as the honourable member would make out. On several occasions when these estates have been up for auction the Perth City Council has told the Metropolitan Water Board to fill the ditches in when they have been halfway through the job as the council does not want the sites to be untidy for the auction. The board has had to take its plant away and fill in the ditches.

Mr. R. L. Young: Nine or 10 months after the auction? Be reasonable!

Mr. JAMIESON: The board also likes to do the sewerage work prior to the laying of the roads. The honourable member and I both know it is stupidity to pull the roads up again so there is no argument on that basis. The Metropolitan Water Board does not like being put in this position by the Perth City Council but it has no alternative. This is the situation as related to me by the board and I have no reason to doubt its accuracy.

Mr. R. L. Young: Have you been out there?

Mr. JAMIESON: If there were a number of people in trouble they would have been complaining to me a long time ago. It is passing strange that it is only after the media raised this matter that the member for the district finds it necessary to raise it with the Minister. I do not know whether the honourable member has been out there?

Mr. R. L. Young: You had better go out and check with the fellow whose car fell down your ditch!

Mr. JAMIESON: I am coming to him. Stop shouting—I can shout too! Yesterday I received a copy of the letter which this man forwarded to the Metropolitan Water Board. I have now called for a report of this incident. This is the first knowledge I had of it.

Normally sewerage is installed posthaste when money is available. However, there are often problems which are not so apparent on the surface, as the member for Wembley will see now. I suggest that he first of all determines the Perth City Council's responsibility for the delays and he will discover that many delays were at its request. Also, when he investigates he will find that the auctioneer at one of the estates was a little overenthusiastic and indicated that water and sewerage were readily available. No undertaking was given at that time by the board that this was so. Unfortunately it was stated, but this was not the fault of the Metropolitan Water Board. The Perth City Council

should have checked thoroughly and clearly informed the auctioneer of the correct position.

The Metropolitan Water Board has attempted to overcome the main problem by tankering sewage and making things as pleasant as possible until the scheme is operating. Obviously the board is doing its utmost to complete the project in the shortest possible time.

POLYUNSATURATED MARGARINE

Quota System: Grievance

MR. A. R. TONKIN (Mirrabooka) [5.25 p.m.]: A situation has arisen in Western Australia whereby people are unable to obtain polyunsaturated margarine. This is clearly due to the system of quotas imposed. The annual quota of table margarine for Western Australia is 800 tons.

In my opinion the whole concept of the quota system is highly questionable. It seems to be a very blunt and clumsy system and makes our much vaunted free enterprise principle a myth, as well as being uneconomic.

I am very sympathetic to the dairy farmers, many of whom are subsisting at a substandard level. However, are we going to pass laws to prevent the community from buying what it wants because for many years Governments across Australia have refused to rationalise an industry which is badly in need of rationalising? I feel we are now paying the price for the poor planning of Governments 50 years ago. Are we to pay this price forever?

The whole problem of the dairying industry should be grasped firmly by the Government. It is an Australia-wide problem which certainly needs to be tackled. We are infringing the liberty of 14,000,000 people in order to avoid facing economic reality. Most of the members of this industry are not being helped by the continuing situation, so even the usual ground which is used as a rationale for this system is very weak.

Furthermore, we have the absurd situation of the Australian taxpayer subsidising the National Heart Foundation to give the people advice which they cannot take because of the shortage of foods containing only unsaturated fats.

The picture is further clouded because there is no stipulation as to how much of Western Australia's 800 tons of table margarine is to be polyunsaturated.

It is possible, of course, that the manufacturers of polyunsaturated margarine are keeping supplies low in order to cause a shortage and thus create an outcry. Another possibility is that this shortage has been engineered at this time because of the important meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council to be held very soon. But this really underlines my

point. With a quota applicable the situation arises whereby the manufacturer is encouraged to create shortages so as to lead to pressure for the liberalisation or abolition of the quota. So whichever way we look at it we come back to the central problem of the quota system.

I wonder whether the quota system could be more specific and carry a stipulation as to the percentage of polyunsaturated margarine rather than stating a general quota of 800 tons of table margarine.

This shortage of margarine has certainly arisen at a most fortuitous time. However, no matter where the fault lies, the plain fact is that Mr. and Mrs. Average are not able to purchase supplies of polyunsaturated margarine which they desire, which they have been advised to eat by the medical experts, and which is needed for the better health of the nation.

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [5.29 p.m.]: I would like to answer several points raised by the member for Mirrabooka. It is true that there is a quota on margarine at the present time and this quota has been fixed by the Australian Agricultural Council. In Western Australia the quota is 800 tons of table margarine out of a total of 16,000 tons for the whole Commonwealth.

The member for Mirrabooka made reference to the reason for the quota—that is, the protection of the dairying industry. Indeed, this was probably the initiating move behind margarine quotas. There are two other points which should be considered. Firstly, the consumer is afforded a measure of protection by way of quotas. Admittedly it may not be the best way to protect the consumer, but it is a measure of protection which otherwise would not be there.

I will make further reference to that in a moment if I have the time. The other aspect relating to quotas is that whilst they are in existence it prevents the large international companies from entering the Australian field with the purpose of swamping the local margarine manufacturers and putting them out of business. These two points must be considered in the total appraisal of the situation.

As the honourable member pointed out, it is rather interesting to know that table margarine, for which we have a quota, can be either polyunsaturated or comprise other raw materials which are not polyunsaturated. There is no guarantee that if quotas were increased or removed completely there would necessarily be an increase in the amount of polyunsaturated margarine available. This is the prerogative of the company, of course, which would determine the percentage of each variety made, having regard for the com-

mercial enterprise it is conducting. That is a fairly important aspect to bear in mind.

The level of protection afforded the consumer emanates from the rather interesting point that with nonpolyunsaturated table margarine there could be, in varying degrees, a blend of animal fats and oils. By law, cooking margarine is held at a level of 90 per cent. of beef and/or mutton fat. It follows then that these very same proportions of fat and oil could be used for the manufacture of table margarine provided it was retailed under a different label and removed from the total of the quota to which the company has access.

It is not likely that this would happen because the palatability and the spreadability of the table margarine has to be considered. However, with cooking margarine some is promoted by the use of an oil to give it a better consistency so that it can be spread more easily. This is termed a spread. So these mixtures and spreads that are available are, in effect, cooking margarine. The wrappers of cooking margarine have to be clearly stamped with the words, "for cooking purposes only."

However, there are no restrictions on the use of equally emblazoned letters on the wrappings of universal margarine, as we have found out. The position is kept under constant survey by the inspectors of the Department of Agriculture and the Dairy Products Marketing Board, and at the moment this shows that there is no shortage of table margarine in this State. However, there is evidence of a shortage of one particular brand of polyunsaturated margarine. The shortages appear to last for only a short while, and several months ago there was a most noticeable shortage of this one particular brand of table margarine. The point made by the inspectors who are fully conversant with, and consistently appraising, the position is that table margarine, as such, is not in short supply in Western Australia, but that one brand of polyunsaturated margarine is in short supply.

The matter comes up for review at the biennial conference of the Australian Agricultural Council, and this question will be considered. I understand the manufacturers of margarine in each State in Australia have put forward their case and the matter will be reviewed in the light of that representation, and the overall circumstances.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES AND HOUSING

Increase in Charges and Naval Base Project: Grievance

MR. RUSHTON (Dale) [5.34 p.m.]: I wish to put forward a grievance which is in two parts. I would like to bring the first part to the attention of the Minister

for Electricity, but as he is not present in the Chamber I would be pleased if the Premier could consider this question. It is being made increasingly evident to me that agriculturists in my area are suffering a disability from the excessive increases in the charges made by the State Electricity Commission, and as a result they are considering reverting to the use of diesel fuel. When I have all the facts of the case in my possession I shall submit them to the Minister for his consideration.

One strong grievance which I have at the moment is in relation to one individual who, I feel sure, is suffering as a result of some malfunction outside his electric light meter. He has had his own mains tested completely at great cost, and it would appear that the commission has no authority to afford him some redress. The amounts usually paid by this gentleman for electricity should be about \$32 to \$42 a quarter, but recently he received accounts amounting to \$167.21 and \$88.37. I have taken these accounts to the State Electricity Commission and I have been told, "That is how the meter reads and that is what the bill will be." I have raised this matter with the Minister for Electricity and I hope he will be able to afford some redress in regard to this matter. I do say that if this excessive charge has been caused by some malfunction outside of or in the meter, surely some remedy can be found by amending the Act or by some other means so that some relief can be given not only to this gentleman but also to others who are in the same position.

I think we can all agree that it is almost beyond belief that a couple with one small child, using only the normal domestic appliances in the home, could use electricity amounting to \$167.21 during one quarter. An answer has to be found.

Returning to the agriculturists whom I have already mentioned, I would again point out that at the moment, due to the increases in State Electricity Commission charges, these people have found themselves at a great disadvantage. They have found that their electricity bill for one quarter has been something like \$500 and \$600, which seems to be completely out of proportion, even taking into consideration the increases in electricity charges that have been made by the Government. As I have said, when I have all the facts in my possession I shall present them to the Minister.

However, the highlight of my grievance is the case of this individual who has received an account for \$167.21 for one quarter, and who is using the electricity for household purposes only. This definitely appears to be far above the bill for any average household, and I am waiting for the Minister for Electricity to review that case.

I now take this opportunity, on grievances day, to refer to an answer that was given by the Premier last night to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition. Evidence has now reached me that the Premier misled the House, so I am raising the matter in order that he can satisfy the Chamber whether his answer is correct.

By raising the issue this evening it will give the Premier an opportunity to check the matter, following which I hope he will apologise to the House for misleading us.

On yesterday's notice paper part (7) of question 30, asked by the Leader of the Opposition, reads as follows:—

Has he received objections to the scheme from any organisations, persons or local authorities such as the Kwinana and Rockingham shire councils?

The Premier's answer was, "No." In fact, a report in regard to it appeared in the Press this morning, and one of the shires concerned telephoned me because it was most concerned over the Premier's reply, as it had received a telegram from the Premier stating that he would give consideration to its objections. The Premier received the shires' telegram on the 16th July and he replied on the 20th July to the joint shires of Kwinana and Rockingham. In the telegrams the shires pointed out what the Government's move would do to the people living within their boundaries.

Apart from all the other factors, this highlights the situation relating to the new suburb at Naval Base. We have been told that consideration of the project has not even been given by the Environmental Protection Authority. Here we have the Premier misleading the House by giving a negative answer to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition; and, contrary to what we understood, and to the legislation introduced for this purpose, we are told that the Government has taken no steps to rectify something which could place many people at a disadvantage. People are being placed in this area which will act as a buffer zone, and this is totally unacceptable.

The Minister for Housing has been turning somersaults to find an adequate reason for this move and the Premier has backed him because some policy is necessary in regard to the houses that are to be erected for Navy personnel at Kwinana. I might say, too, that he has refused to answer a few questions to prove how wrong he is today. The State Housing Commission is questioning the siting at Rockingham of houses for Navy personnel, because it is concerned about the State Housing Commission's asset at Kwinana. I was a member of a deputation that approached the Minister and the State Housing Commission the other day and obviously the

officer of the commission was most concerned about where houses are to be erected for Navy personnel and what this Naval Base suburb would do to its housing development at Kwinana.

The position is we are providing houses for people who are forced to go to Kwinana to protect the State Housing Commission asset and yet, at the same time, the Government intends to accommodate 15,000 people at Naval Base. Even the Minister for Labour was asked by the Shire of Kwinana to take the matter to Cabinet to make it aware of what was happening. Despite this, we have the Premier giving an answer to a question which indicates that he knows nothing about the objections raised by the shire.

Mr. Taylor: What is the relationship between those two statements?

Mr. RUSHTON: The Premier misled the House yesterday by answering "No" to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition. This answer indicates that he has received no objections from the two shires in question. I am now informed that the Kwinana Shire—the area represented by the member for Cockburn who is the Minister for Prices Control—asked the Minister to take this matter to Cabinet to ensure that it was fully cognisant of the situation.

Mr. Taylor: What I did was my business.

Mr. RUSHTON: Did the Minister ever receive that letter?

Mr. Taylor: I represent Cockburn as well as Kwinana.

Mr. RUSHTON: This is most interesting.

Mr. Hutchinson: Does the Minister have to wear two hats?

Mr. Taylor: Yes, I do.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Minister is trying to evade the issue, but here we have a question of credibility right on our plate; a question that is vital to the people of this State.

This is a most legitimate grievance and I think it is time the Premier not only apologised to the House on this issue but also took steps to ensure that the Environmental Protection Authority becomes involved in the matter so that it can vet this scheme and explain to the people of Western Australia how this housing area could possibly be developed right next to the site of heavy industry.

The SPEAKER: The member has one more minute to go.

Mr. RUSHTON: I think that is the duty of the Premier. On the main issue that I have raised I would like him either to apologise to the House, or to show clearly that he did not receive any objections from the shires mentioned.

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier) [5.44 p.m.]: We have just heard the most extraordinary performance by the member for Dale.

Mr. Davies: He will get an Oscar yet!

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I listened carefully to the honourable member to try to pick up the thread of his discourse, but he dodged around the place so much that, apart from being able to pick up one or two things, I have not the slightest idea of what he was talking about.

Sir Charles Court: That is not fair; he was clear to me.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: To start with, the honourable member made some protest about electricity charges and then said he was getting the case ready to present it subsequently to the Minister for Electricity. Therefore, he has gone off half-cocked on one question.

Mr. Rushton: That is not so.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: With regard to the other question, he is making an allegation that I misled the House with some answer I gave. Again he said he was not in possession of all the facts. Surely when a member gets up in the House and makes an allegation of this kind he should be in possession of all the facts.

Sir Charles Court: He gave you the dates of the telegrams.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: What I intend to do is to get a pull of the speech made by the honourable member so that I may see precisely what he has said, and then I will have a check made in my office.

Although the honourable member would not know it, when questions are submitted to Ministers they are first looked at by officers in the department who check them and supply basic answers. It is then up to the Minister to accept the answer and present it or alter it in accordance with what he believes to be the true position.

Mr. Hutchinson: Or give his own answer completely.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: If it suits him, that is right. But generally—and I think this goes for most Ministers—when the question comes up it is sent to the department so the information can be obtained, because the Minister would not be in possession of the information.

Mr. Hutchinson: But you know that political questions are answered by the Minister or the Premier himself.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: All questions are answered by the Minister or the Premier himself in the final analysis.

Mr. Hutchinson: But the basic answer is given by the Minister or the Premier.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: That might have been the honourable member's policy and that might be why so many answers were wrong.

Mr. Hutchinson: That is why we were responsible and you are not.

Mr. Rushton: Will you apologise?

Mr. Hutchinson: I want you to mark what I said, and I want the Press to mark it.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: Why should I do that when half of what the honourable member says is not worth marking?

Sir Charles Court: Do you have to get like this? The honourable member is asking a simple question. If your answer is right, that is all there is to it and the shire councils are wrong.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The honourable member did not ask a question. He made a charge and asked me to apologise. Is that a question? That is a fine way to ask a question—to make a charge and then seek an apology.

Mr. Hutchinson: This is a grievance and it is expected that it be answered.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition said that he asked a simple question. He did not. He made a charge.

Sir Charles Court: He asked you to apologise if the information you gave was wrong.

Mr. Hutchinson: What is the grievance session for?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: To give fellows like the member for Cottesloe the opportunity to blow off steam.

Mr. Hutchinson: It is amazing you did not say "shut up" as you did on two previous occasions.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: With complete justification.

Mr. Hutchinson: Never justified from a Premier.

Sir Charles Court: Never justified from anyone.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: If a person speaks nonsense he should be told to shut up.

Mr. Hutchinson: That shows what a leader you are of this great State we have.

Mr. Davies: Watch your blood pressure.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: All right. Keep going.

Several members interjected.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: This is some of the clutterbuck we are used to.

Mr. Hutchinson: It highlights your inadequacies as a Premier and as a leader of men.

Sir Charles Court: We will be very interested in your answer when you have read the transcript.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: What I am prepared to tell the member for Dale is that I shall obtain a pull of what he said. I shall refer it to the officer who obtained the information for me to check it, and if the

answer which was given was not factual, as I have done on a number of occasions, I will take an early opportunity to explain the situation.

Mr. Hutchinson: Mirror Tonk again! "I will look at it!"

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: As I understand the position at present, the information I gave was completely factual. Mistakes occur and they will continue to occur long after the member for Dale and I have left this House. They will continue to occur because man is not infallible.

I will say this: When I am answering questions in this House I believe the information I am giving is the true position. That is what I believe to be the true position with regard to this answer and I will certainly have it checked out.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Membership

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier) [5.49 p.m.]: I move—

That consequent upon the Member for East Melville (Mr. O'Neill) being elected by his Party as Deputy Leader of the Opposition he be released from his duties as a member of the Public Accounts Committee and that the Member for Wembley (Mr. R. L. Young) be appointed in his place.

Question put and passed.

BILLS (2): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Alumina Refinery Agreement Act Amendment Bill.

2. Alumina Refinery (Pinjarra) Agreement Act Amendment Bill.

Bills introduced, on motions by Mr. Graham (Minister for Development and Decentralisation), and read a first time.

ABORIGINES: WELFARE NEEDS

Inquiry by Select Committee: Motion

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin) [5.51 p.m.]: I move—

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report on conditions and make recommendations regarding the Aboriginal people in Western Australia with particular reference to—

- (a) health and physical needs;
- (b) finance and housing;
- (c) education of children;
- (d) vocational training.

and that the inquiry and reports be dealt with in two sections—

- (1) the South West Land Division;
- (2) the remainder of the State.

I present this motion with a genuine desire that it be supported by all members in this House and that the right decisions regarding our Aboriginal people be made because we have a great responsibility in this regard.

This is a subject which could lend itself to a great deal of talk about details and a great amount of bias about what others have done. I could commence by dealing with the actions of many administrators and I could enlarge on the conditions which have existed and still exist. I could also talk of the experience of those who try to help the Aboriginal people and the difficulties the officers of the department encounter when seeking to improve the situation.

However, I have no intention of dealing with those matters today or of making this subject any more of a political football than it is. We are dealing with human beings and it is time we settled down to a fair adjudication of the best action to be taken without becoming worked up and heated and trying to gain an advantage at someone else's expense.

I speak on behalf of members of the Country Party when I plead with members to examine the situation and this motion very carefully before contemplating its rejection.

We contend that an inquiry on which to base action could provide a very firm foundation for the future, and surely this is what is required. I have specified in my motion certain matters for particular inquiry, but the scope of the inquiry is not in any way limited. I have referred to health and physical needs. We know that these are essential for every individual in the community and our Aboriginal people are no exception.

I have listed finance and housing, and it is important our Aboriginal people secure a basic understanding of how to develop their responsibility concerning their finance and housing.

It is fairly obvious what is meant by "education of children." This subject is important because of the great difficulty the Aboriginal children have in obtaining the education we desire them to have. The difficulty arises sometimes because of the children's own lack of interest, but very often it is the result of a lack of understanding by those with whom the children live. Possibly their parents do not understand the need for education and therefore do not encourage their children to go to school. So this is a very important item.

Vocational training is also very important to all Aborigines, not only to the young ones growing up into adolescence when they must accept the responsibility of a job, but also to the older ones so that they might employ their time profitably and usefully, thus giving them an interest.

All these items are vital in a programme of development. The necessity for the existence of native reserves has gradually been minimised, and they are becoming a thing of the past. So we must look to the day when the Aboriginal people are free from dependence on others so that they might stand on their own feet and be independent. Instead of being dependent they must be encouraged to be independent as quickly as possible so that they might accept personal responsibility for their own welfare.

Because of the size of our State, conditions vary in the different areas and this difference is reflected in the manner in which the Aborigines exist. My motion therefore provides for the committee to make two reports, one dealing with Aborigines in the South-West Land Division of the State and one with those in other portions of the State. Members will agree that this is a very wise provision not only because of the varying conditions, but also because the report for the first section can be presented reasonably quickly, while the report for the other portions of the State can be presented later.

In reply to a question by the member for Moore, the Minister for Community Welfare provided information which revealed that in the financial year ended the 30th June, 1972, an amount of \$6,388,991 was expended from State and Commonwealth funds on Aborigines in this State. The same answer revealed that the Aboriginal population was 29,000 for the same period. This represents \$220 for each Aboriginal man, woman, and child. For instance, a family of five, which is not a large family, would have had \$1,100 in that year. This figure includes special provisions for the Aboriginal people, but does not include any social service benefits derived from any welfare assistance, unemployment benefits, sickness benefits, doctors' and hospital fees, pensions, etc. They are personal benefits not taken into account, in the average amount of \$220 for each Aboriginal.

With such a huge expenditure, I suggest it is essential that those for whose benefit it is directed should receive the utmost value for the money spent. After all it is a great deal of money—taxpayers' money—which is spent. It is the responsibility of this House to ensure that such an enormous amount of money is spent wisely and to the best benefit of the Aboriginal people. To do this, an up-to-date assessment of the needs and difficulties should be made now, and any further action which is necessary should be taken.

Those members who are in close touch with Aborigines have seen many of them succeed where others have failed. Many are living satisfactorily and happily as

members of the community. Admittedly the numbers in this category are not as great as we would like them to be, but I believe that they give us certain hope that many more will follow along the same lines if we can help them to help themselves. That is the objective of this motion and, surely, it is the objective of spending those millions of dollars. It is up to us to ensure that the best methods are used, the best encouragement offered, and the best provisions made.

The work of a Select Committee would involve an examination of many factors. The evidence would come from people who have an intimate knowledge of Aboriginal people as well as from Aboriginal people themselves. For this reason I suggest no good purpose would be served by my enlarging on this matter at the present time and giving my views on the subject. I have no desire to provoke debate on the various methods now used and I cast no reflection on the Government, present or past, on officers of the department, or on anyone else concerned. That is not my task. I am simply presenting a motion to ensure that something further is done in regard to the needs of our Aboriginal people. If a committee were to apply itself to this inquiry, valuable information would be collated on which to base firm recommendations.

I suggest that we should seek to establish a firm foundation on which to build a structure which will benefit and help all Aboriginal people to acquire a spirit of independence which we so much desire to see in them.

If the House agrees to the motion, the Legislative Council would be requested to co-operate in the appointment of a Joint Select Committee. I am sure members would agree that a Joint Select Committee from both Houses would materially assist in the investigation. It would give a far wider expression of opinion on the evidence presented. Therefore, if the motion is passed, I shall suggest that three members be appointed by this House and a similar number by the Legislative Council. This would make a useful committee of six.

Mr. Graham: What is the real necessity to embody people from the other House?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: We should have wide representation of members from both Houses to achieve unity of opinion. It is not a matter just for us. I am open on this question but I think a Joint Select Committee is desirable, because its members would promote and develop ideas. Six people working on a Select Committee would present a wide range of opinion. I am sure they would make a worth-while contribution towards achieving the objects I am seeking.

Mr. Graham: Half a dozen people from this Chamber would also present a wide range of opinion.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: That is true. My opinion is that a Joint Select Committee would bring certain definite benefits and that is why I propose to move for one.

The SPEAKER: There is far too much audible conversation.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I do not intend to pursue the matter further, because I have presented the case for a Select Committee. I have deliberately avoided dealing with specific matters, because a Select Committee would hear all of these in the evidence. Evidence derived from such a committee would be far better than my expressing a great number of opinions at this point of time. However, I urge members to welcome the motion and to take the appropriate action to ensure that the matter proceeds further.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Davies (Minister for Health).

TRAFFIC ACT

Amendment of Regulations: Council's Resolution—Motion to Concur

MR. STEPHENS (Stirling) [6.07 p.m.]: I move—

That this House concurs in the following resolution agreed to by the Legislative Council:—

That the regulations made pursuant to the Traffic Act, 1919-1971, as published in the *Government Gazette* on the 16th December, 1971, and laid upon the Table of the House on the 14th March, 1972, be amended as follows—

First Schedule—Item 121A—

To delete the figure "20" in the last column of the schedule, and substitute the figure "5".

Before explaining the motion I would like to point out to the Premier that this matter is not of any great economic significance and, for that reason, I would request him to allow his followers to cast their votes and make their decisions on non-party lines. The motion does not, perhaps, rate in the same category as the Mining Bill and the Premier has seen fit to allow that matter to be decided on nonparty lines.

Mr. Graham: I think that in those circumstances members will exercise a very just discretion and vote against the motion. To carry the motion would make the law appear to be ridiculous.

Mr. STEPHENS: I hope that if the Deputy Premier listens to what I have to say he will finish up agreeing with me. The motion deals with the penalty which is

imposed, under the Traffic (Infringements) Regulations, for not wearing seat belts when they are fitted in cars. The mandatory penalty is \$20 and the motion which I have introduced seeks to reduce that figure to \$5.

I know it has been argued in another place that the minimum penalty is not \$20, but I think an examination of the facts will belie that statement. If a person elects to take the matter to court there is the possibility, of course, that he may be successful in having a lesser fine imposed. However, one must add to that fine the cost of legal representation, which can amount to quite a few dollars. The loss of time involved in contesting a case would also have to be taken into consideration. The total cost of contesting a case would be considerably more than \$20 so the average person, quite naturally, pays the fine imposed under the Traffic (Infringements) Regulations.

The motion does not oppose the law relating to the wearing of seat belts. Seat belts have proved their worth, although it is regrettable that it has been necessary to enforce their use by compulsion rather than education. This applies particularly because the use of seat belts results in protection to the individual concerned. I can see no reason that people would want blatantly to defy the law, although there could be the odd person who takes a delight in doing so. However, that person would be the exception.

I am sure members in this House would agree that the main reason for not fastening a seat belt would be forgetfulness. This is quite easy to understand, particularly in a town or a city where a man gets into and out of his vehicle frequently throughout the day. He could be preoccupied with many and varied matters and it could be quite easy for him to drive off without fastening his seat belt. I feel sure that, at some time or other, many members in this House have been guilty of moving off without attaching their seat belts correctly.

The problem is further aggravated by the fact that at the moment not more than 30 per cent. of the vehicles on our roads are fitted with seat belts. It is also true that in the course of one day many persons would travel in vehicles some of which are fitted with seat belts and some of which are not.

The minimum penalty for the small oversight of not fastening a seat belt is \$20, and I think any fair person would agree that the penalty is too severe. At the worst the infringement could result only in injury to the person concerned. By not fastening his seat belt the driver of a vehicle is not likely to cause injury to any other person.

It has been argued that the penalty of \$20 brings us into line with the Eastern States. However, there is no reason whatsoever for us to follow the course taken in the Eastern States. If we are to use this criterion I suggest we should allow the use of "smokies" in this State. I refer to the attachments which spear-fishermen use to protect themselves from sharks, which are considered legal in certain of the Eastern States. I also refer to poker machines. They are legal in some Eastern States and it could be argued that they should be legal in this State. However, I do not think many members would like to see in this State the situation which appertains to poker machines in one of the other States.

Mr. Hartrey: Hear, hear!

Mr. STEPHENS: Many serious breaches of the traffic regulations carry penalties which are lighter than that imposed on a person for failing to wear a seat belt—an offence which does not present any danger to any other person. I intend to give a few examples to prove my statement.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. STEPHENS: Before the tea suspension I was about to quote from the Traffic (Infringements) Regulations, 1969, to show how severe is the penalty for failing to fasten a seat belt compared with the penalties for far more serious offences.

For a pedestrian who does not keep to the left or who jay-walks, etc., the penalty is \$2. I think any open-minded member would agree that a person who puts himself in that situation is of far more danger to himself and other people on the road than is a person who fails to fasten his seat belt; yet the penalty is only \$2.

I will quote some of the offences which attract penalties of \$5. For a pedestrian who disobeys a signal or direction of a police officer or inspector the penalty is \$5. For driving a vehicle in reverse unnecessarily out of a parking area the penalty is \$5. For a driver attempting to enter or cross a blocked intersection the penalty is \$5. For standing a vehicle so as to cause undue obstruction the penalty is \$5. Once again, I think it will be readily agreed that these offences could cause more injury and trouble on the roads than the failure to fasten a seat belt. Riding bicycles so that more than two are abreast attracts a penalty of \$5, as do the offences of leading an animal from a motor vehicle, leading more than one animal from or tying an animal to a moving vehicle, and leaving a vehicle unattended without taking precautions for safety or security. In the latter instance I think it will be readily seen that failure to observe that precaution could lead to serious damage to both people and property because if the vehicle moves off it can finish up anywhere.

Moving on to the offences that attract a \$10 penalty, there is failure to comply with a direction of a traffic control signal displaying an amber light. In this instance, and possibly in some others, there is also a demerit penalty. There is a \$10 penalty for failure to give way to vehicles on a round-about; or altering, obliterating, or defacing engine numbers. It does not require much imagination to realise what could be behind an offence of that nature. Stealing and criminal offences could be involved, but the penalty is only \$10 for what could be a criminal charge.

Among the offences which attract a penalty of \$20 there are failure to comply with a traffic control signal displaying a red signal, failure to stop at a "Stop" sign, failure to give way at a "Give Way" sign, and failure to stop at a children's crossing or overtaking a vehicle that has stopped at a children's crossing. It will be realised that the offences attracting a \$20 penalty which I have just enumerated are far more serious than failure to fasten a seat belt, and they could cause injury and harm to other people in the community. They cannot in any way be compared with the offence of failing to fasten a seat belt.

From the examples I have given, I think members will agree that the penalty of \$20 for failing to fasten a seat belt is far too severe. I admit that the public needs to be educated to comply with the seat belt legislation; and, as I said earlier, it is in the individual's own interest to fasten his seat belt. But if the motion is agreed to I think the removal of \$5 from a person's pocket will sufficiently educate him always to comply with the legislation.

I said earlier that most people who receive infringement notices would prefer to pay the \$20 penalty than risk the heavier penalty which may be incurred when costs and time are involved in taking the matter to a court of law. However, I fear I may have been in error in saying that because, in answer to a question asked in another place on the 23rd March, the Minister for Police indicated that at the 23rd March this year 536 cautions had been given and 306 infringement notices had been issued. The recipients of 100 of the 306 infringement notices had elected to be dealt with by the courts. I think that could be taken to indicate the strength of feeling against the measure and the public resentment at the severity of the penalty.

As a Parliament in what is supposed to be a representative democracy, I think we should give the people what they want; and in this instance I think it would be just to reduce the penalty to \$5. I hope the House will support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Bickerton (Minister for Housing).

UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE ECONOMY

Government Policy: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 1st June, on the following motion by Mr. Mensaros:—

That in the opinion of this House the Government has neglected its duties and responsibilities because:

- (1) It has failed to recognise in advance the economic signs which were indicated and has failed to arrest the adverse forces which resulted in the weakening of the State's previous buoyant economy;
- (2) It has displayed complete ineptitude in halting and reversing the down turn of development and thus has allowed Western Australia to become the State with the highest unemployment rate;
- (3) Despite generous special grants from the Commonwealth, it still lacks the ability and initiative to institute and apply sound and practical measures to successfully combat and solve the grave unemployment situation, particularly in the building trade;
- (4) It does not show any signs of imaginative advance planning by incentives aimed to influence the growth of economy to eliminate or at least considerably cushion future temporary down turns in our State which under the previous Government achieved the highest rate of continuous development in Australia.

MR. O'NEIL (East Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [7.39 p.m.]: Members will appreciate that it is now some time since this motion was first moved in this Chamber. One would have expected that in the time that has elapsed since then the situation would have sorted itself out to the point where such a motion was no longer necessary. Alas, we on this side of the House regret that such is not the case.

I have heard many speeches in this House. I have heard many good speeches made by the Premier while on the Government side of the House and on this side of the House. I have heard many speeches by him and by others which have been amusing or inspiring, and I have heard many with which I did not agree. But I have never been so saddened as I was at the speech the Premier made in the early hours of this morning when replying to the debate on the Supply Bill. It was a

repetition of the speech he made when replying to the motion moved by the member for Floreat.

I was saddened because I could not see that the Premier or his Government could hold out to the people of Western Australia any hope at all for an improvement in the position in which we find ourselves. This position relates to the very severe and tragic unemployment that exists in Western Australia at the moment. The Premier simply said that because unemployment is occurring all over the world, and because there is a downturn in Australia, we cannot expect anything but what has happened here.

The facts of the matter are that under perhaps not quite such stringent circumstances Western Australia managed to hold its own during the last decade on the couple of occasions when there appeared to be a downturn in the national economy which brought about some degree of unemployment. I can recall a time—not during my period in Parliament—when it was considered by a Federal Labor Government that to all intents and purposes about 2½ per cent. of unemployment could be regarded as full employment, and that danger proportions had not been reached until something like 5 per cent. of the work force was out of work. We on this side of the House certainly agree that those days are gone. That is a concept of the past.

I would like to think all political parties believe that the aim in an expanding economy is full employment. It is true that a situation of overfull employment—I do not quite know how that situation is reached but it is a term that is used—creates very great pressures on the economy by way of the inflation that occurs. However, the motion under discussion is critical of the Government. Part of the motion reads—

That in the opinion of this House the Government has neglected its duties and responsibilities because:

And the motion states that the Government has failed first of all to appreciate the situation which was occurring; and, secondly, it has shown its ineptitude to do anything about it.

As I mentioned, last night quite sadly the Premier gave us his speech of doom and gloom, but he gave no real indication of what the Government was proposing to do either in the short or long term. In fact, he left us with a complete and utter feeling of hopelessness.

Certain statements have been made in the media as to the actions being taken by the Government to overcome the situation. Some three or four weeks before the end of the financial year there was a statement that contract and Government work would be accelerated. This was expressed as something new, but it

has been done before. However, on this particular occasion I feel the people were completely hoodwinked. I would hazard a guess that not one cent of the amount of money involved in these contracts was spent before the end of the financial year. It is not uncommon for certain instrumentalities, knowing full well that they will get some loan funds, to advance building and construction projects. These instrumentalities are aware that funds will be available by the time the first payment is due.

The Premier also made announcements in respect of smaller projects. I think a sum of \$480,000 was to be allocated for labour-intensive industries. It was stated that this would enable the employment of 500 men.

If we use round figures and make it \$500,000, this would give \$1,000 per man. Of course, we must take into account that possibly half of this money will be involved in materials necessary for the work. We are then left with \$500 per man. The men involved in this type of work would probably not be earning \$100 a week take-home money, but if we use that as a basis it will mean that the money will provide five weeks work for 500 men. Surely the public will not be hoodwinked by statements such as these.

I appreciate that this appears to be a step by the Government to do something about the employment situation but really it is just another statement about what the Government proposes to do.

Portion of this motion refers to unemployment in the building trade, and this brings me to a situation which warrants criticism. I raised the matter some little time ago of the appointment of Mr. Clohessy of the builders' union executive to the board of the State Housing Commission by the Government. Within a few weeks of this gentleman being made a commissioner of the State Housing Commission he put on his other hat, as the Press puts it, and withdrew labour—not from the general building industry but from the State Housing Commission building operations in the district of Girrawheen. Here is a gentleman appointed to represent the workers on the board of the State Housing Commission—a commission involved in an industry which uses a considerable number of workers. He showed the faith he had in the workers and in fact undermined their stability considerably by using his executive position in the union to withdraw labour from the job.

This area of unemployment was covered extensively by speakers in the debate on the Supply Bill yesterday. I think it was the member for Ascot who quoted figures giving the unemployment percentage in Western Australia in a certain year and each succeeding year. By way of interjection we tried to find out what particular month he was referring to because it

will be appreciated that unemployment is higher throughout Australia in the months of January and February because of the considerable number of school leavers who take some time to be absorbed into the business and working community.

Today we heard the Premier by way of answer to a question asked by the member for Subiaco, say it was not a fact that unemployment was at a higher level than during the Hawke regime and the period of the Brand Government and that this did not apply. Members only have to go into the streets, see the television coverage of the Kwinana area, or witness the unemployed workers marching upon Parliament House during a Labor Government's regime to realise that all of these facts and figures may have been distorted to give the Government some advantage. They certainly do not indicate the true position.

We have a very acute and serious unemployment situation in this State. On this side of the House we believe that the Government can assist the situation simply by encouraging people to look upon the bright side. The Government can—if you like—oversell the future of the State in order to start the money rolling. It is not without significance that at this time, when there is a high rate of unemployment and factories are slowing down, the rate of savings *per capita* is increasing. If we could find a way to encourage people to circulate their money instead of stacking it aside for a rainy day we will inject into the economy the sort of confidence which the State requires to get back on the move once again.

I can recall that when I was Minister for Housing I was caricatured in *The West Australian* as a Pied Piper blowing dollar bills out of the end of my flute. This was when I was endeavouring to attract money to this State.

Mr. Jamieson: In your Pied Piper suit.

Mr. O'NEIL: Yes, I was a rather plump Pied Piper. The caricature was related to my efforts to stimulate finance for the housing industry by putting out a sprat to catch a mackerel. The caption beneath the caricature said, "It has been done before, and it will work again."

I say to this Government that if it speaks less of misery and gloom and gives some hope to the people that all is not lost by creating confidence, removing the moths from the pockets, releasing money from savings banks, and encouraging people to spend, we will find ourselves back on the road to prosperity. We can do nothing without the will, the initiative, and the drive of the people. This is one area in which the Government has completely and utterly failed. Every time there is a cry for work for the unemployed the story is, "We will write to Canberra"; "We will do this"; or "We will do that."

I recall on one occasion when we had a housing problem—and this occurs from time to time—I made a special mission to Canberra in order to obtain housing funds. A Loan Council meeting was being held at the time I was in Canberra, and I was complimented roundly by the Treasury and Housing officers of the Commonwealth for the case I put forward. But how much did we get? Not one penny. It is true that the present Government—and the Premier has admitted this on many occasions—would be in far greater difficulties than it is now had it not been for the relatively generous allowances made by the Commonwealth—certainly they are generous when compared with the assistance we received.

Mr. Hartrey: It is our money the Commonwealth is assisting us with.

Mr. O'NEIL: I agree; but at least the honourable member's Government is receiving back more than we ever received. Yet members opposite still blame the Commonwealth. I suppose it boils down to the fact that we have a Government shrouded in gloom and misery. If only we could change this attitude and do the Channel 9 thing!

Mr. Hartrey: Do you think you will cure the situation by pretending it does not exist?

Mr. O'NEIL: I have already said that we admit the situation exists; but the Government will not overcome it by preaching gloom and misery. It must give people something to look forward to.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: What are you doing now?

Mr. O'NEIL: The only hope we can offer the people at present is to throw out the present Government.

MR. O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley) [7.54 p.m.]: I rise to support the motion moved by the member for Floreat, and to support the comments made by my deputy leader. Although this motion was moved some months ago the reasons for its introduction are more urgent today than they were at that time. Unfortunately a decline has occurred in the employment position in this State. Like the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Floreat, I attribute this to the stagnancy and lack of initiative of the Government. I hope that by this motion we can inject some activity into it.

The Government never ceases to amaze me. It sits back doing nothing, expecting things to happen, and making statements about happenings which never happen and which, if they did happen, would be of tremendous assistance to the employment position in this State.

If a football team or some other sporting team runs onto the field without enthusiasm and without interest in the

game it is invariably defeated. That is what is happening with this Government. It has displayed a lack of interest and enthusiasm. When a football team lacking those qualities is defeated frequently its members say, "We could have won, but . . ." The present Government is on the field with a lack of enthusiasm and initiative and it is doing nothing to endeavour to improve the employment position. It is blaming others for what is happening and is continually crying for help.

If the Government were to get out and do something about the situation it would be much better off for it, and so would the people of this State. But, unfortunately, this Government is operating under the cloak of a protective Press which is making little attempt to point out its many inadequacies. This is apparent when one realises that last night the Leader of the Opposition, in his first speech in this House since assuming that position, spoke for a considerable time in connection with a very important matter, and presented a good story. But what recognition did he receive?

Mr. May: The same as the Premier: very little.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Premier did not deserve any recognition because he did not present a story.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Not much he didn't.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The only story he presents is about what is to happen; but it never happens. He looks into his crystal ball and tells us what is to happen and that is the last we hear of it. His Government is blaming everyone but itself for the serious unemployment in this State, and it is doing nothing to relieve the situation. Let us consider some of the headlines which have appeared in the Press. In April, 1971, a headline appeared which mentioned a new large industry promised from Japan. On the 25th April, 1971, another headline spoke of a huge Kwinana solar salt prospect; then in June there was mention of a \$20,000,000 steel plant for Western Australia; again, on the 19th June there was mention of eight firms joining in a \$327,000,000 project. A number of these headlines have been pointed out already by the member for Floreat. Other headlines were: In July, "Japanese bid for chemical plant"; on the 18th July, "Giant iron and steel venture soon"; and then later a headline appeared stating that the Premier was back with a promise of jobs for 300,000.

Mr. Williams: Three hundred thousand what?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I do not know; but it is just as well that he brought back that many jobs because where would we be now had he not done so? But what is the result of all this? Merely a lemon.

We have gained nothing from these things; if we have gained anything at all it is very little. We also saw headlines in the Press about \$14,600,000 being provided for unemployment relief; but this was money which normally would have been supplied in any case and would have been used for that purpose. Such statements tend to make people disheartened because the unemployed are told that something will happen but it does not.

Mr. Speaker, what is the position regarding employment since this Government has been in office? I am sure you would agree that in this field the Government has been a dismal failure. I admit that unemployment has increased throughout Australia, but not to the extent that it has in this State. We now have the highest unemployment figures in Australia, as was the case under the Hawke Government. We are followed by South Australia and Tasmania—the other Labor States. This is an indication that the Labor Party is not at all the best proposition for the workers, because it keeps them out of jobs.

When the Brand Government was in office the A.L.P. blamed it for all the wrongs. But what happens now? It is not the fault of the State Government; it is the fault of the Commonwealth Government. The position has changed!

The position in this State is extremely acute and I hope the Government does something about it. I have had people come to me in recent weeks looking for work. They are decent people who are prepared to work and they want to work; people who have been looking for jobs but are unable to find them; people who have been employed in jobs for something like 10 years but as a result of the decline in this State they are no longer required. A person who holds a job with a company for 10 years normally would be considered a fairly good worker, otherwise he would not be employed for that length of time.

These people are now striving to obtain employment but, in many instances, they are having great difficulty in finding it. Apart from this there are now many workers who are taking home less money in their pay packets. This is the position that has been created in the State because the Government has drawn the curtain down and reduced the amount of overtime available and has thus placed the workers in an extremely difficult financial position. Many of them have numerous commitments and as a result of not being able to work overtime they are finding it difficult to meet those commitments.

The State Housing Commission is a body which undoubtedly creates a great deal of employment, but in 1970-71 the expenditure by the commission was \$7,000,000 less than the amount expended in the previous year. There is no doubt

that because this money has not been spent on housing this is the cause, to some extent, of the unemployment problem. The expenditure of \$7,000,000 in the housing field provides a tremendous amount of work, and gives us some indication of how many people are finding difficulty in obtaining employment.

The people of this State have no doubt become confused over the statements that have been made by the Government in regard to proposed large steel undertakings and many other matters. For example, the Deputy Premier travelled all around the State saying that Albany was to be the site for this steel project. Then it was to be Geraldton, then Bunbury—

Sir Charles Court: And then "X."

Mr. O'CONNOR: Yes, and then "X." As a result no-one knew where this steel project was to be established, and the people of this State still do not know. The rural areas of Western Australia have had a bad time. The people in those parts are generally the first to be hit when there is lack of activity within the State. Therefore, new life needs to be injected into these parts; in fact, not only in the country areas but also in the metropolitan area. There is also a great need for money to be spent to create employment.

We have heard reports of the Government's intention to spend \$546,000,000 on an inner ring railway to serve the metropolitan area—admittedly to be spent over a period of time—but just imagine what the expenditure of such an amount would achieve if it were directed towards the relief of unemployment. Up until the 31st March, 1972, this Government had not provided one cent towards relieving the unemployment situation in this State. I thought someone on the opposite side of the Chamber would refute that statement but no comment is forthcoming. I asked the Premier a question in connection with this matter. Despite the fact that Pressmen were present in the gallery, no record appeared in the Press of the question that I asked. Perhaps it was not considered important that the State had not contributed one cent towards solving the problem of unemployment in this State. Perhaps it was considered that it did not matter, but in my opinion it mattered a great deal.

Last year I spoke on the unemployment position in this State and my speech is recorded in *Hansard*. I pointed to what would result if certain action were not taken at that time. I said that unless the Government got off its tail there would be more than 2 per cent. of the workers in this State unemployed by the end of February, 1972.

Mr. Taylor: Do you know that the housing programme was brought forward by three months, and yet you are saying that no action was taken by the Government at that time?

Mr. O'CONNOR: What has happened now?

Mr. Taylor: We are three months behind, but we are doing our best to catch up.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Why does not the Government encourage people to come to this State in order to create some activity?

Mr. Taylor: You stated that the Government had done nothing to relieve unemployment. I have given you one example indicating that you could be inaccurate.

Mr. O'CONNOR: It is a case of the Government's spending next week's house-keeping money this week and the next week finding it has nothing.

Mr. Jamieson: That is what was suggested that we should do. I have worked for firms that have done that and they have finished up quite well.

Mr. O'CONNOR: If I may, I will return to the comments I was making. When I made this prediction about unemployment last year, it was pushed aside by the Premier. In July I went further by asking the Premier that in view of the grievous unemployment position in this State, what was he going to do about it. That question, and the Premier's answer is recorded in *Hansard*. The Premier replied that the Government was having a look at the position in Albany. However, in my opinion, this was a State problem and not a problem confined to an isolated area. I was talking about the problem throughout Western Australia, but the Premier referred to only one area of the State. However, there were reasons for his selecting the Albany district because at that time the member for Albany was in hot water in this House.

I asked a further question of the Premier on the 21st March, 1972. This question is also recorded in *Hansard*. I asked him how much had been spent by the State on unemployment relief in Western Australia during the last 12 months. The question was replied to by the Deputy Premier who said that \$2,999,000 had been spent on unemployment relief in Western Australia in the past 12 months. I then asked how much of that sum had come from State money, as in the reply I received a cloaked answer which created a wrong impression. By means of a question without notice I inquired whether the \$2,999,000 had been provided by the Commonwealth, and the effect of the answer I received was that this was so. In other words, this meant that the State Government had not been sufficiently worried to contribute even one cent to relieve the unemployment position in this State during that time.

These are the people who criticised us so harshly when we were in office. In my opinion they can be aptly referred to as

"Canberra criers." They declare it is Canberra's fault that this unemployment situation has been created, while they themselves do nothing. This Government is acting like a tired parasite. It is living off the activities of others and continually crying for more money to be given to it. What a predicament to be in; to have a group like that running the country! What I have been saying is recorded in *Hansard* and is completely factual. I have quoted the questions I asked and the answers that were given to me by Ministers.

Mr. Hartrey: But what you have said is not true.

Mr. O'CONNOR: If the honourable member said it is not true, let him prove it.

Mr. Hartrey: The answers that were given do not indicate the true unemployment position.

Mr. O'CONNOR: They indicate that the people on the other side of the House have done nothing.

Mr. Hartrey: How can you say that?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I am saying it. What I have said is recorded and it is a fact.

Mr. Fletcher: It is not even entertaining.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Of course it is not; and it is certainly not entertaining to the people who are unemployed in this State. They are the ones who are suffering. They are the ones who are faced with the problem. We should not have to tell the Government what it should do, but the Government is standing up and claiming the credit for everything that is good. It disclaims all else. The members of the Government can be referred to as the "Canberra criers." We do not want that. We on this side of the House have tried to bring the matter to the attention of the Government, but to no avail. The State needs an injection to create some activity; to get things going and so obviate unemployment, and finally to get the economy back to a proper level. We have a doctor in the House and perhaps we should call on him to give the Government an injection to bring this about.

I commend the member for Floreat for moving the motion, because I believe it is a good one. Although it was moved some months ago I consider it is more appropriate now, and I hope the Government will take some notice of it and try to do something to lessen unemployment in this State.

MR. HARTREY (Boulder-Dundas) [8.09 p.m.]: I have been greatly impressed with the debate on this motion which was introduced by the member for Floreat on the 12th April, 1972. The fact of the matter is that those on the Opposition side of the House have ignored everything contained in the motion and devoted themselves to a repetition of the tedious nonsense they were speaking last night.

Mr. O'Connor: That is a reflection on the Speaker.

Mr. HARTREY: It is not. It is a reflection on certain other people, whether or not they regard it as such. In moving the motion the member for Floreat pointed out that the fact that a humble Indian and not one of the chief's had moved it indicated the Opposition's wish to give the Government time to study the problem. It does not indicate anything of the sort; all it indicates is the prudence of the shrewd heads behind the Indian. The chiefs themselves were not game to put forward a proposition of this kind, and they talked about matters other than the contents of the motion. Let me refer to the contents of the motion.

Mr. O'Connor: When the mover was talking about Indians on this side of the House he was thinking about the Ned Kellys opposite.

Mr. HARTREY: At the moment we are discussing the motion. The first paragraph of the motion reads—

- (1) It has failed to recognise in advance the economic signs which were indicated and has failed to arrest the adverse forces which resulted in the weakening of the State's previous buoyant economy;

That is a straightout charge, it is either true or false, and it applies either to this Government or to the previous Government. Therefore we are entitled to discuss it; but it is very obvious that the Opposition chiefs did not want to discuss it, and for a very good reason which I will point out presently they ignored it altogether.

Let me emphasise the curious wording of the motion again—

The Government has neglected its duties and responsibilities because:

- (1) It has failed to recognise in advance the economic signs which were indicated and has failed to arrest the adverse forces which resulted in the weakening of the State's previous buoyant economy.

I accept that it is the duty of a vigilant and a prudent Government to recognise, as they appear, the signs of financial stringency or economic depression, and to do what it can either to avert that contingency, or mitigate it if it cannot be averted. However, to expect anyone to see in advance the signs of something is to ask that person to have the prophetic gift of Joseph who prophesied seven years of plenty to be followed immediately by seven years of famine. That is all very fine in the Scriptures, but it does not happen in these times.

I shall draw the attention of the Leader of the Opposition to the signs that appeared to indicate the present lack of buoyancy in the economy. I will remind him of when they started to appear, and what he did when that happened. It is quite obvious that much of what the member for Floreat has made so much

play on began in February, 1970. I will tell the Leader of the Opposition something about that, and he can deny what I am saying if he likes.

In 1970 I was a member of the committee of the Boulder branch of the A.L.P. which was invited to discuss with the Chamber of Mines at Kalgoorlie a very serious problem; which was that the gold-mining industry was about to phase out. Surely that would be a sign of a recession in some parts of the State.

Sir Charles Court: That was not new.

Mr. HARTREY: That statement was supported by the then Chairman of the Chamber of Mines. We were told that three goldmining companies would close down on gold production within 12 months or at the outside within 18 months, and that two other companies would have a great struggle to carry on and it was quite possible they would close down on gold production within three years. Thank goodness that did not eventuate; but this incident was one of the portents that arose in 1970.

Sir Charles Court: That was not new in 1970.

Mr. HARTREY: What did the honourable member's Government do about that?

Sir Charles Court: Plenty.

Mr. HARTREY: The honourable member was then the Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party in the Government. I will not enter into a dialogue with the honourable member at the present moment; I will deal with that matter at another time.

Sir Charles Court: You inspire me to talk.

Mr. HARTREY: I am addressing my remarks to you, Mr. Speaker, and not to the gentleman who is interjecting. To turn back to what I was saying: That was the first portent.

The second portent on which I will not expatiate this evening was mentioned when the member for Murchison-Eyre moved an urgency motion in this House last May. I supported it, and so did all members of this House although they might not have all spoken. We recognised there was a grave crisis in the pastoral industry in the outer goldfields area. That was well known in 1970, and it was causing grave anxiety in the districts I have mentioned.

By the middle and towards the end of 1970 there were grave problems in all of our agricultural industries, but the Government of the day did nothing about the matter. It did not only fail to anticipate the signs of the depression, but also failed to see them as they arose. When it did recognise the signs subsequently it did nothing. When the State election was drawing near, when conditions were getting quite critical in the agricultural industries,

and when there was talk of providing assistance to those industries and of introducing moratoriums for debts, the Government merely talked because it could not do anything effective.

The St. George's Terrace farmers control the Opposition parties in this State, and therefore the then Government could not do anything for the farmer who was out in the bush and who was the person really producing. The Government of the day had to think of the stock and station companies and the St. George's Terrace farmers.

Let me point out what the previous Government did, and let me remind members opposite about something which was said by Sir David Brand, a gentleman for whom I have the greatest respect and personal liking, and who is a man of integrity and ability—but a man who had to bow to the limitations imposed on him as Premier by the supporters of his party. Everybody knows that.

A few days before the last election Sir David Brand used certain words in a statement he made at Merredin. I have a copy of *The West Australian* which contains a report of what Sir David said at that election meeting. I ask members to listen to his words and to decide whether the previous Government failed to realise the signs of a coming depression, and did nothing about the matter.

Mr. Graham: It only made speeches.

Mr. HARTREY: The report states—

The State Government had no solution to the crisis in the rural industry, the Premier, Sir David Brand, said last night.

That was the Thursday night of the week before the State election. To continue with the report—

He told an election meeting that rural problems now facing farmers were basic and deep-seated.

This did not happen while we were the Government of the State, but while members opposite were in Government. The report continues—

W.A. had been the first State to agree to the Commonwealth proposals for a rural reconstruction scheme.

May I ask the member for Mt. Lawley who was the Canberra crier on that occasion?

Mr. O'Connor: You are one of the Canberra criers when anything goes wrong.

Mr. Court: The Commonwealth proposals for a rural reconstruction scheme were put forward largely as a result of the action taken by the Brand Government, of which the member for Katanning was the Minister for Agriculture.

Mr. HARTREY: What Sir David pointed out at that meeting was that the then State Government had no solution to the deep-seated problems of the farmers. To continue with the newspaper report—

"I am very anxious to get a committee operating soon so that we can at least obtain some information about rural industries—

Can we imagine the circumstances when the then Premier of the State in the course of an election campaign had to tell the unfortunate farmers at Merredin that he could not do anything for them, that Western Australia would be the first to co-operate with the Commonwealth, and that he was very anxious to get a committee operating soon so that the Government could at least obtain some information about the rural industries?

The Government of this State was to get "information about rural industries and perhaps a little later to establish a rural reconstruction board."

Mr. Hutchinson: Your Government has done that sort of thing right throughout the whole gamut of economic activity.

Mr. HARTREY: The honourable member must not interrupt the sacred words of his ex-leader. He could not say at that stage what sections of the industry would be represented on the board. Was there ever so hopeless and self-condemnatory a statement uttered by a leader of Western Australia at any time? By that time his party and the Country Party were, as the phrase states, "going to the country." They were going to the country in an election, but they did not even know the way. They had to appoint a board to find out where the country was. It is no wonder they got lost.

Have I not demonstrated clearly that instead of our Government being blame-worthy for not seeing the coming signs in the goldmining industry, the mining industry generally, the pastoral industry, and the agricultural industries of the south-west and central belt, the previous Government was to blame? The signs were there for anyone who could read to see. The previous Government saw them, but, at the very last, the leader of the Government had to tell everyone he wanted a committee to give him some information. The next portion of the censure motion reads—

(3) Despite generous special grants from the Commonwealth, it still lacks the ability and initiative to institute and apply sound and practical measures to successfully combat and solve the grave unemployment situation, particularly in the building trade;

Mr. Hutchinson: That is true.

Mr. HARTREY: All right. That is fine. What did the previous Government do about it? It was to appoint a rural reconstruction board to find whether it could give any information.

Mr. Hutchinson: Rubbish.

Mr. HARTREY: In moving the motion the honourable member used these words—it is his motion I am talking about and not the diatribe of the gentlemen who spoke this evening—

Before going into the details, I wish to say the motion is inspired by one governing thought which follows right through. In case the people of Western Australia have forgotten—and the present Government has done everything it could to make them forget—Western Australia, as a Sovereign State, should have an independent and responsible Government.

That is almost sedition. The honourable member does not understand the Commonwealth Constitution, so he can be forgiven. However, Western Australia is not a Sovereign State. To be a Sovereign State a State must have full control over all legislative matters arising in the territory over which it governs, and the Commonwealth and the States do not have that control. However, the Commonwealth has the sovereign power of taxation and we have not. We have no right to duties of customs or excise for example, and we have no right at present to impose tax on income. Consequently we are left to scratch and beg for what I forced the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to admit is our own money. Yet we are told that it is generous of the people in Canberra to let us have the money which is wrung out of our pockets. Have members ever heard anything more stupid than that?

We are supposed to vote for this motion because it has been so ably submitted and splendidly supported. The speech of the mover of the motion includes the following:—

Subtle political observers may even suggest that the Government does it to demonstrate the traditional Labor Party policy of centralism.

Of course that is nonsense. Those who have inflicted centralism on Australia are the members of the Liberal Party and their supporters because the Labor Party has not been in power long enough to do so, if it desired. Every time the Liberals have been in power they have increased centralism. Bruce inflicted a great measure of centralism on the people of Australia by the constitutional amendment ratifying the Financial Agreement. That is the policy he stood for. Those responsible forced this policy on the people of Australia because they wanted to get their money tied up where they could control it.

Sir Charles Court: The Commonwealth cannot alter the Constitution. Only the people can.

Mr. HARTREY: I could say a lot more but I do not want to bore the Assembly and it is not necessary to delay the motion. It is not necessary to use a steam-hammer to crack a nut. I do not refer to any particular member when I say that.

I say in conclusion that much has been said in the last few days about a completely true statement of fact which has been deliberately misrepresented and misinterpreted. It is quite true that Western Australia has the highest volume or percentage of unemployment in the six States and that Tasmania and South Australia are the next in honour. Of course they are, and they always will be if there is a national depression, because we live in a community where, as I have pointed out already and as members already know, Canberra has the sole right to impose duties and customs and excise and it imposes these high protective duties to keep down the industries which keep us going; that is, the primary industries, whether they be minerals, cereals, or animals. Whatever it is, our produce is primary produce which is not protected to anything like the extent manufactured goods are protected.

However, our primary industries require manufactured goods. Members are as well aware of the comparative figures as I am. I have here the 1971 *Year Book* which gives information concerning 1968-69. If members study this information they will find that we are keeping any number of people in jobs in the Eastern States instead of having them in jobs here in Western Australia. We cannot help it because we have no control over the Federal Government. We are a small State as far as representation in the Federal Parliament is concerned so we must put up with it.

Here are the figures and facts. In 1968-69 this State imported from New South Wales goods, mostly manufactured, to the value of \$237,753,000, or near enough to \$238,000,000. We paid an inflated price for these goods because they were protected by Federal tariffs. In the same year Western Australia exported to New South Wales goods—mostly primary products not protected by tariffs—to the value of \$54,692,000, or near enough to \$55,000,000. We bought from New South Wales \$238,000,000 while we sold \$55,000,000 to the same State. They received an exorbitant profit on what they sold us, but we obtained no unusual profit on what we sold them.

The same situation applied in respect of the trade between Western Australia and Victoria and our adverse trade balance with the two States was almost \$370,000,000.

Assuming labour costs amounted to only 50 per cent. of the price we paid for New South Wales and Victorian imports—frequently labour costs represent more than half, but assuming in this instance that they represent half—we lost \$185,000,000 by reason of that extortion. At \$3,000 a year—and that is not a bad wage for a workman—we could have kept an additional 61,000 in this State with those products.

Sir Charles Court: That is if we had them.

Mr. HARTREY: We could keep the unemployed we now have. The Opposition is discussing why we have the biggest number of unemployed. That is why we have the greatest unemployment, and that is why Tasmania has the second greatest and South Australia the third greatest. We are all victims of the same general tariff policy which the Liberal Government has inflicted on us for years and years. The Labor Party has done nothing because it has had no power. The Liberal Government has inflicted its policy on us for years and caused unemployment.

Sir Charles Court: But the Labor Party supports the tariff policy.

Mr. HARTREY: I belong to the Labor Party and I know its policy; the Leader of the Opposition does not.

Sir Charles Court: The Labor Party is a very strong supporter of the tariff policy.

Mr. HARTREY: I do not want the Leader of the Opposition to tell me what I believe in.

Sir Charles Court: The member for Boulder-Dundas will have the Labor Party onto him if he is advocating a change of policy on tariffs.

Mr. HARTREY: I do not want to waste any more time, but in conclusion I point out that what the Premier had to say last night cannot be denied. He quoted good authority to show that the present Federal Parliament has deliberately designed the period of unemployment in the last 12 months for the purposes of bringing down prices and putting people out of work. Prices did fall and deflation—or counter-inflation—has occurred.

The Federal Government has caused unemployment. By reason of the high tariffs imposed over many years the Federal Government has also made it impossible for us to employ people in this State. We have been paying to employ people in the bigger States. We are then taunted because we have unemployment in this State, or a larger proportion of unemployed than the other States.

If the honourable Indian or his chief considers that this is reasonable or justifiable criticism which will appeal to the unemployed in this State I will be greatly surprised. It is about time someone tore away this hypocrisy and fetishism which

has developed the arguments of the Opposition. It is about time the true facts were exposed, which are that we are the victims of the negligence of the State Liberal Government over the last 12 months of its office, and we are the victims of the oppression of the present Federal Liberal Government.

MR. RUSHTON (Dale) [8.33 p.m.]: The eloquence of the previous speaker would have been more convincing if the facts did not tell us something different. I will put forward some facts for the consideration of this House. The need for the motion is becoming more and more evident as it is debated in this Chamber.

Paragraph (1) of the motion states that the Government failed to recognise in advance the economic signs which were indicated and, of course, this has been the experience of the Government in everything that it has done.

Paragraph (2) sets out that the Government has displayed complete ineptitude in halting and reversing the downturn of development. Of course, we see this in the Government programming which has been so slow, and in the stop-go application of overtime which has caused greater hardship and contributed to the decline in employment.

Paragraph (3) states that despite generous special grants from the Commonwealth the Government still lacks the ability and initiative to institute and apply sound and practical measures to successfully combat and solve the grave unemployment situation. Of course, the wild promises and predictions which the Tonkin Government has made from time to time have contributed to the lack of confidence in the Government.

Paragraph (4) of the motion sets out that the Government does not show any signs of imaginative advance planning by incentives. The Government activity with regard to town planning is an example of a lack of imagination. We also know the record of the Government in relation to investment in our north. One can hardly expect confidence to come from such actions.

The Hawke Government had problems of stagnation and the Brand Government had problems of growth. However, the Tonkin Government is quickly moving towards stagnation again. I have obtained figures and graphs of employment trends between 1959 and 1972 which will counter what was said by the member for Ascot when he spoke on another matter yesterday. A graph which appeared in *The West Australian* on the 18th April, 1972, will illustrate my point.

Mr. May: What about something new?

Mr. RUSHTON: Surely unemployment is important.

Mr. May: We were told about that last night.

Mr. Hartrey: Was there any real need for rural reconstruction during the term of the Brand Government?

Mr. RUSHTON: The member for Boulder-Dundas is getting away from my subject. My graph illustrates that under the Hawke Government we were at the top of the unemployment scale but then we went to the bottom. However, we have gone up again under the Tonkin Government. I imagine that the figures quoted by the member for Ascot were supplied by the Minister for Labour. However, the quarterly figures for the years between 1958 and 1972 show a clear pattern.

I have figures obtained from the Commonwealth Treasury and those for July, 1958, show that the percentage of unemployment for the whole of Australia went up to 1.6, and in Western Australia it went up to 2.4. The Brand Government was responsible for creating a situation where we moved away from that figure, and in 1962 we were close to the Commonwealth figure. The figures illustrate that the employment situation improved considerably in this State, and that cannot be repudiated.

Mr. Taylor: Are you disputing the statement that for seven of the 12 years when your Government was in office it had the highest percentage in Australia?

Mr. RUSHTON: In July, 1958, the Commonwealth figure was 1.6 and the Western Australian figure was 2.4. That was when the Hawke Government was handing over to the Brand Government. In October, 1959, the Commonwealth figure was 1.2 and the Western Australian figure was 1.7. In October, 1960, the Australian average was .8 and in Western Australia the average was 1.2. Things were fairly buoyant at that stage.

Mr. Taylor: For seven out of the 12 years your Government was above the Australian average.

Mr. RUSHTON: In April, 1961, we were ahead of the Australian average.

Mr. Taylor: The average in Western Australia was still higher with a figure of 2.1.

Mr. RUSHTON: In January the figure was 2.1. Then in April, the figure was 2.12 for Australia and in Western Australia the figure was 2. For the month of May the Australian figure was 2.7 and our figure was 2.32.

Mr. Taylor: What about the 12 months' average?

Sir Charles Court: Don't come at that.

Mr. Taylor: Surely the year's average is better than a month by month basis?

Sir Charles Court: It is the most deceptive figure one could have.

Mr. Taylor: On that basis, for two months in 1970 you had the highest.

Mr. RUSHTON: I ask the Minister to be patient. I am glad he has raised this matter, because it shows he is using incorrect figures. Members on this side of the House certainly want the Government to take more interest in unemployment and give close attention to it.

Mr. Hutchinson: Close attention to the statistics of it.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Government only uses the table that does not show the true picture. Unfortunately, the Tonkin Government has a real interest in unemployment. It set out to embarrass the Federal Government, but now it has received the backlash because the people of Western Australia have woken up to the actions of the Government. The Minister does not appear to be interested, but if he cares to examine the figures afterwards he will see that they plainly show what I am saying.

Mr. Taylor: I am flabbergasted.

Mr. RUSHTON: It has been said on a number of occasions that, since the very outset of this Government's administration, the confidence of people in the State was broken because of unfortunate predictions about this State's economy. These predictions did tremendous harm to that confidence which is so very necessary if the State is to carry on.

I give Sir David Brand full credit for the courage he showed in introducing unpopular measures from time to time for the purpose of keeping the State on a sound basis. He was not concerned about constantly chasing votes as this Government is. He had experience and knowledge of hardship. This is far different from placing people in the unfortunate situation of a stop-go Administration whose rash actions have brought about this downturn in employment.

We were most fortunate to have Sir David's personal experience. His life experience gave him the extra strength necessary to make decisions which were not always popular. On reflection, those decisions worked so well for the people of Western Australia. Let us look at some of the actions he took. Road maintenance tax was an unpopular tax, but he had the courage to introduce it. He introduced receipts tax for the purpose of giving this State a financial stability.

Mr. Hutchinson: And also a growth tax.

Mr. RUSHTON: Yes, a growth tax. We have seen what these meant for the State, but they have been frittered away by the present incompetent Government. I propose to ask a question tomorrow and I wonder what the answer will reveal. It appears that the \$14,000,000 programme which the Government says will relieve

unemployment is, in fact, many months late. The money should have been spent in the last financial year.

Let us look back over only a short period to see what happened during the administration of the Brand Government. That Government injected money into a works programme in February of one year. In other words, it brought forward the works programme for that year. This was part of the expertise which, coupled with knowledge and experience, brought such stability to Western Australia.

Now the people are sceptical. The Premier, too, is sceptical every time a member on this side of the House says that the position would be different if we were in Government. The difference is that people on this side of the House had the knowledge and experience, and understood how the private sector worked.

Mr. Hartrey: Are you excluding yourself?

Mr. RUSHTON: I am only a minor cog in the scheme of things.

Mr. Hartrey: I am glad you appreciate that.

Mr. RUSHTON: I do not entertain thoughts about my own skills, but I do have experience of matters concerning financial stability. I am looking forward to the day when we are returned to the Government benches, because I know we will quickly retrieve our former position and thrust aside the disabilities which we are now experiencing.

The action taken in connection with overtime was but one matter. When the State Electricity Commission stopped overtime it cost \$250 000 through the resulting turmoil to save \$110,000 in overtime. These are the types of actions that have brought the results to which I have referred. Further, there is the question of increased electricity charges. Nothing could be worse for bringing about a lack of confidence. One industry I know, which is not big, has to face increased charges of \$25,000 over a 12-month period. Of course other industries face much higher charges, but the particular industry to which I refer is not a big one. The people, too, find these charges a burden to carry. These extreme costs tend to retard activity.

One of the greatest examples of mismanagement has been the action of the shop stewards and the support they received from the Government in refunding costs and fines. At the present time steel workers are facing unemployment. The main reason is contractors are switching from steel to concrete because they have lost confidence in the continuity of supply. This being so, we can well understand the switch from steel to concrete. How unfortunate this is for the steel industry and its workers. It is one of the sections of our economy which is suffering most.

People could well lose confidence when they see the Government step in and pay the cost of a penalty levied against disrupters. Perhaps some form of blackmail was applied; but, whatever it was, the Government came to the party and refunded the fines. As I have said, people in the steel industry have lost confidence and the industry itself has suffered because contractors are moving into concrete. This is the direct result of Government action.

I will not name a small industry which the Minister for Development and Decentralisation and the Premier have refused to help. However I am quite aware that if this action is repeated many times we will lose tremendous employment opportunities in this State. This would be purely because the Government does not have the judgment to select which industries should receive help and which should not.

We see the Government taking on grand projects but none of them has yet returned any results. At least, the Government talks of grand projects. It does not seem to understand that little industries generate far greater employment relative to capital investment than bigger ones. As I have said previously, 80 per cent. of our people are employed by industries which have less than 50 on their work force. I have direct evidence that this Government has failed in that regard.

Mr. Graham: Produce a little of that evidence.

Mr. RUSHTON: I would not at this stage, because it would only damage the industry involved which is, in fact, battling on.

Mr. Graham: I thought you were suggesting that there is a falling off in the number of small industries that are being supported.

Sir Charles Court: No, a specific case.

Mr. RUSHTON: I am suggesting the help should be advanced. I also know that industries which should be based in this State are moving to the Eastern States because of a lack of confidence.

Mr. Graham: I would like evidence of that, because I have evidence to the contrary.

Mr. RUSHTON: I have a record of it and I am sure that when members on this side take over the Government benches in 1974 the position will be different.

Mr. Graham: Start dealing with the present and stop stargazing and day-dreaming.

Mr. RUSHTON: I think this debate lends itself very much to showing just what the unholy alliance of the Labor Party and the militant left-wing unions has contributed to this State and to Australia.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much talking in the Chamber. I am sure the *Hansard* reporters are finding it very difficult to hear what the honourable member is saying.

Mr. Graham: I think there is far too much talking by the member for Dale.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. RUSHTON: I now refer to the remarks of the present Minister for Labour when he was on the Opposition benches. As reported on page 462 of *Hansard* No. 1 of 1970, he expressed to us what he hoped for in the future regarding employee-employer participation in industry. He gave us a discourse on what was taking place in Germany. I agree with him that what has taken place in Germany is something towards which we should move, and I regret that nothing positive has been done in that direction in the time he has been in office.

Mr. Taylor: I have a file, and we hope to hold a seminar later this year. I will send you an invitation.

Sir Charles Court: I hope you invite some German industrialists to tell you their story.

Mr. RUSHTON: I will be glad to have that invitation because if we could repeat the German experience I think it would do something for this State.

Mr. Taylor: I have done some work on it.

Mr. RUSHTON: First of all, we should remove the party-political context.

Mr. Taylor: In a few weeks time there will be a seminar which I think you should attend. It will deal with worker-management participation.

Mr. RUSHTON: I will be happy to be involved because I believe in having sound incentives and I understand Germany is on sound grounds, although it is possibly moving away from them now because there is a little disquiet in that country.

Sir Charles Court: At the present time they are just about wrecking their industry.

Mr. Taylor: I will send you the literature we have on it.

Mr. RUSHTON: We want the removal of the cancer of the Labor Party's connection with the industrial wing. We want something we can trust and in which we can have confidence.

Mr. Taylor: The Social Democratic Government in Germany is associated with the trade union movement.

Mr. RUSHTON: When the employee goes into management he should become part of the management. He should not kick the management to death or undermine it. Unfortunately, I think it can be

fairly said we have already had that experience in the State Housing Commission in this State. The Secretary of the Builders' Labourers Union, or some such union, has joined the commission. We now see him urging employees to knock the State Housing Commission.

Mr. Bickerton: Why do you not get your facts straight?

Mr. RUSHTON: If the Minister for Housing would like to interject and put them straight, I will be very happy.

Mr. Bickerton: Everyone on the commission has more than one job. The members of the commission go about their other jobs and still do a job for the commission.

Mr. RUSHTON: That is always the case with a board, but we should not have someone from the employee sector coming in and undermining and ruining the industry.

Mr. Bickerton: Absolute nonsense! I had a better opinion of you.

Mr. RUSHTON: That illustrates the danger of not having true participation and a sensible approach. There is no point in having on the commission a person who cannot contribute. He should not be there just because he is a unionist. He should be there because he can make a contribution, improve relationships, and become part of the commission.

I have heard in recent times that the unions in Germany are becoming a little unhappy because of the tendency for people coming up from the unions to do their jobs so well that they lose their union connections. That is how it should be and must be. Such people must have loyalty to the body they are serving. They should be working for the best interests of the country, the employee, and the employer.

Mr. Taylor: I will be happy to discuss this matter with you.

Mr. RUSHTON: I mention that matter because it brings me to the next stage of my presentation. I mentioned it because I thought it desirable to do so. We in this country are far from achieving that goal and we cannot achieve it unless the President of the A.C.T.U. acts differently. He only wrecks the place.

Mr. Taylor: You need only the right Government, and you have that now.

Mr. RUSHTON: Not with that gentleman running loose. He dominates the scene. The left-wing unionists will be telling the Government what to do. I am delighted the Federal Government has had a win in the last two strikes. This might be the one good turn we have been done by the politicking. The fact is that there is to be an election and people are being urged to go back to work. If it were not an election year we would be torn apart.

The arbitration system has been given extra teeth to be able to tell them what to do.

Mr. Jones: You will believe it yourself in a minute.

Mr. Bickerton: I wish Mr. Speaker would allow me to tell you what to do.

Mr. RUSHTON: The figures show the picture. Since 1967—our friend Mr. Hawke's first year in office—the figures for days of work lost and loss of income have multiplied by so many hundred per cent.

The SPEAKER: There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. RUSHTON: This is something which is so significant, so well understood by the people of this country—

Mr. Bertram: In that case how is he doing so well on the Gallup poll for popularity?

Mr. RUSHTON: It is interesting to see who prepared the Gallup poll. Let us put in an impartial person to select the cross-section of the population and then we will see the result.

If we look at some of the things which are happening we see the unholy alliance between the Labor Party and the militant left-wing of the unions. Since Mr. Monk's successor came to power we have seen a total change in the order of things.

Mr. Bertram: What about your alliance with the stick-in-the-mud right-wingers?

Mr. RUSHTON: It is certainly better than this trend towards a Hitler dictatorship.

Mr. Graham: He seems to be settling most of the strikes.

Mr. RUSHTON: Did he settle them? The words one could use are certainly not acceptable in Parliament. Look at the situation which has arisen. He is in a blackmailing position.

Mr. Graham: From whom did he learn that?

Mr. RUSHTON: This is easy to see. He has the always in the grip of his hand. One of the chiefs of an always rings him up and the next moment he is being quoted as saying he was being used by the Commonwealth. This same gentleman then had to get on the air and say, "That is not the fact. Mr. Hawke misinterpreted my comments."

Mr. Graham: You read last night's *Daily News* where Mr. Ansett would not deny what Mr. Hawke said.

Mr. RUSHTON: We must have the person's actual comments in this day and age. At least the media was there to allow Mr. Reg Ansett to say what had happened.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think this is within the motion.

Mr. RUSHTON: Mr. Speaker, I can only say respectfully that this is the type of thing which adds to unemployment in this State. Unions are blackmailing the country and this is being shown so clearly. What a wonderful win it is to have the unions coming down to earth and urging men back to work even if it is for political advantage. Now we see some results. Mr. Hawke is running the show and I would like to quote a few of his remarks on various occasions.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think this is within the terms of the motion.

Mr. RUSHTON: I would like to give the figures in regard to unemployment and this gentleman has been the direct result of bringing this about.

Mr. Jamieson: I wish there had been a few more votes for you at the last election in your party.

Mr. RUSHTON: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that circumstances did not affect our unemployment situation. We have had so many political strikes; and even in Western Australia we have felt their effects. We had the moratorium strike in 1970—a political strike. There was the Budget strike over pensions in August, 1970, and the social services strike in 1970-71—both political strikes. If this present strike is not political I do not know what it is. The union ban on the South African rugby tour was generated by the same gentleman. The strike for a \$5 a week increase in pensions in July, 1970, was a political strike.

The same gentleman has made all sorts of strange comments. As a matter of fact, I cannot use all the material. He says things such as this—

I would like to see a federal election fought now on whether the Government or the trade union movement was running the country.

This was reported in *The Courier-Mail* and I will not read the complete quote. In *The Advertiser* of the 19th April he urges people to disobey the laws. What does this do for our country? In *The Herald* of the 14th May, 1971, he says—

Any country that excluded players from sporting teams on a racial basis risked facing an A.C.T.U. black ban on their teams.

If that is not intimidation and blackmail I do not know what is.

We now have the various unions objecting to this political participation. I shall not weary the House by quoting these reports.

Mr. Graham: You have.

Mr. RUSHTON: Obviously if this situation is not rectified we are going to be held in the grip of a Government which is directed by left-wing unionists. We have already experienced the Deputy Premier

appearing on the same platform as the executive of the Amalgamated Engineering Union. The people must be told very clearly about this. Here we have a Deputy Premier on the same platform—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. RUSHTON: —as a gentleman who says, "We will wreck the economy of this State if certain things do not happen." This was not reported. To me this means that we can only end up with anarchy. Our State will fall down because the people have not had the opportunity to apply the correct remedies.

I am urging that it is most necessary for the people to understand clearly what a person like this has been doing to us. With every disturbance the same gentleman speaks up. And here, on the steps of Parliament House, we have the Deputy Premier associating himself with the same sort of statement.

Mr. Graham: What you are saying is completely untrue. You said I made the same sort of statement.

Mr. RUSHTON: I said the Deputy Premier was associating with them.

Mr. Graham: You said I made the same sort of statement.

Sir Charles Court: He said you associated with him.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Deputy Premier did.

Mr. Graham: I addressed the people in front of Parliament House. This was a group of people who came up here to speak to the representatives of the Government. Is there anything wrong with that? Isn't that democratic?

Mr. RUSHTON: We did not have any reaction when the same Mr. Marks told us what he would do to our economy.

Mr. Graham: I was speaking to several hundred people who were disturbed because they were unemployed or about to be unemployed.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Deputy Premier was speaking to the same group of people.

Mr. Graham: What is wrong with that?

Mr. RUSHTON: The Deputy Premier will have to be a little more choosy if his Government is to be responsible for the State's economy.

Mr. Jamieson: You have the needle stuck in the same groove of the record. Get it out.

Mr. RUSHTON: On one hand the Government is saying it requires the private sector to come good and restore the State to good health, and in the next breath it is saying the private sector cannot stand up to anything.

Mr. Graham: It is a fine state of affairs if the representatives of the Government cannot speak to the people of the State. Who do you think you are—Adolf?

Sir Charles Court: Do you have to speak under the chairmanship of a communist?

Mr. Jamieson: He was not the chairman.

Sir Charles Court: He was running the meeting.

Mr. RUSHTON: It has been shown very clearly why the people of Western Australia are apprehensive about where they are going.

Mr. Graham: The Leader of the Opposition should pay attention to his new D.L.P. comrades.

Mr. RUSHTON: We hope that the Government will read the signs and show more courage in its decisions. We hope it will give encouragement to the private sector by some consistent action to get us progressing again at least. Let us hope that those who are unemployed can be assisted back to work and to a reasonable pay packet relative to the work they do.

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle) [9.06 p.m.]: I do not know why I bother, but I will say at the outset that I oppose the motion.

Mr. O'Connor: I thought you were going to support it.

Mr. FLETCHER: Like the member for Boulder-Dundas I will read the contents of the motion to ensure that the House is familiar with it. Many people appear to have overlooked what it does say. It is alleged that the Government—

... has failed to recognise in advance the economic signs which were indicated and has failed to arrest the adverse forces which resulted in the weakening of the State's previous buoyant economy;

Mr. O'Connor: That is the best part of your speech.

Mr. FLETCHER: I have no doubt that the honourable member who introduced this motion, being on the other side of the House and an ambitious man, was pressed to do so. He occupied 9½ pages of *Hansard* in support of his motion. I have read his speech and I have read that portion of his motion.

The fact that the American dollar was devalued and the fact that it is likely to be devalued again and that there were repercussions throughout the world as a consequence of this devaluation, has inspired in the Opposition the temerity to allege that our Premier, on coming into office, created that situation and all the repercussions which flowed from it.

I know that the present Leader of the Opposition is too economics-wise to be caught by that sort of claptrap. That is

why I am sure that this motion never emanated from him or from anyone of comparable status on that side of the House.

Mr. I. W. Manning: You are off the motion now.

Mr. FLETCHER: As I say, the repercussions were felt throughout the world and I very much regret that they were felt in this State. The hypocritical element opposite tried to take advantage of this situation and said we were responsible for it. Let me refer to paragraph (2) of the motion, which states—

It has displayed complete ineptitude in halting and reversing the down turn of development and thus has allowed Western Australia to become the State with the highest unemployment rate;

Before there is any interjection I would like to say that the Opposition flatters us. Does the Opposition think that this Government is capable of reversing a world trend to achieve what it is alleged we should be achieving?

Mr. O'Connor: You have certainly got an excess of the trend though.

Mr. FLETCHER: I know we have many more talented people on this side than on the other side but they are not so talented as to be able to reverse a world situation.

I will not be rude and say "shut up" to those members who are attempting to interject. I will address my remarks to you, Mr. Speaker, where they are more intelligently received. Paragraph (3) of the motion is as follows:—

(3) Despite generous special grants from the Commonwealth, it still lacks the ability and initiative to institute and apply sound and practical measures to successfully combat and solve the grave unemployment situation, particularly in the building trade;

I will deal with that at greater length later. I consider that the State Government is doing remarkably well in view of the world situation and despite the parsimonious handouts of the Federal Government—a Federal Government which nobody in Australia appears to want.

Mr. Blaikie: Do you disagree with the Commonwealth's aid for rural unemployment?

Mr. FLETCHER: If the Federal Government were more benevolent we would not have the consulate—as it is called—on our front lawn; instead \$15,000,000 would be made available for the purpose of housing Aborigines and the State Government would have the advantage of spending that money in accordance with the desire of the member for Moore to see better housing for Aborigines.

Mr. W. G. Young: We already have 1,500 empty houses in Western Australia.

Mr. FLETCHER: The last paragraph of the motion states—

- (4) It does not show any signs of imaginative advance planning by incentives aimed to influence the growth of economy to eliminate or at least considerably cushion future temporary downturns in our State which under the previous Government achieved the highest rate of continuous development in Australia.

We cannot create an increased demand in the diminishing market I have mentioned—a diminishing market for which we are not responsible. The origin of the downturn was overseas, just as it was in 1929 and the 1930s when the repercussions were felt throughout the world. We are still feeling them here now, but not on the same scale, thank goodness. I sincerely hope for the sake of the pastoralists and everybody else in Australia we never experience such repercussions again.

Anybody who is sincere will agree with me and with the public comments we hear that the Labor Government took office at an unfortunate time. I ask members to be honest with themselves and admit that.

Mr. I. W. Manning: You have the story wrong.

Mr. FLETCHER: I ask the *Hansard* reporters to listen to me as distinct from the interjectors. I am merely saying that Labor took office at an unfortunate time. For some strange reason we are looked upon as a crisis party and are expected to get the country off the hook. The feeling seems to be that if there is a war on put Labor in; if there is a depression put in Labor until we have ridden out the storm and then let our political opponents empty the bin we have filled. As the member for Boulder-Dundas said, this is the taxpayers' money—it is yours and mine—which is being spent. We must take this into account.

I am gratified to see the upturn in the pastoral industry. I am pleased to see that better prices are being received for wool and meat. However, we cannot be blamed for the situation which occurred in the past as a consequence of the foreign policy of the Federal Government which resulted in China ceasing to buy our wheat and wheat quotas coming into existence. Can we on this side of the House be blamed for a reduction in the demand for our wheat? I submit that members on the other side are being unjust when they attribute to this Government things for which we are not responsible. The motion of the member for Floreat is critical of the Government and blames it for a situation which it did not create but which was created by the Federal Government.

However, let me present additional evidence: In *The West Australian* of the 27th March, 1972, under the heading, "Report says Japan will boom again" the following appeared:—

A leading Japanese economic research institute has predicted that Japan's boom will resume—but not until 1974.

The Nomura Research Institute of Technology and Economics says that the current 16-month economic recession has hit the bottom.

I am merely providing evidence to show that the repercussions are being felt throughout the world, and not only in this State. This article refers to the economic recession in Tokyo. Do members opposite say that the Labor Government created that situation in Tokyo? Further on the article states—

Its report said that the long-awaited business recovery was apparently beginning, but it would be slow for the next year.

An average growth rate of 6.5 per cent. in real terms was all that could be expected at present compared with an average 12.2 per cent. between 1966 and 1970.

The 12.2 per cent. average was during the term of office of the previous Government, and now it has been reduced to 6.5 per cent., according to that Press comment. Do members opposite say that we created this situation? I am not accusing the member for Floreat of being hypocritical; I am accusing members opposite for encouraging him and for supporting him. Further on the article continues—

If the predicted recovery is correct it will carry major indirect benefits to Australian industry, which has been hit by the recession because of delayed Japanese purchases and investment.

We must be fair when we read that comment emanating from the other side of the world in relation to the comments which emanate from the other side of this Chamber. Another paragraph of the Press report states—

Many other experts say that Japan's gross national product growth will never return to the double figures phenomenon of the Sixties.

Mr. O'Connor: If you were concerned about the workers you would support this motion.

Mr. FLETCHER: That interjection does not concern me.

Sir Charles Court: I hope you realise that the 6.5 per cent. growth rate in Japan now is about double that of other countries.

Mr. FLETCHER: I will be pleased to listen to the Leader of the Opposition, but outside this Chamber, please, because I

have limited time at my disposal. In the last few paragraphs of the speech of the member for Floreat there appear some statistics. I will not weary the House with them because we have heard enough already. However, the Minister for Works may be interested in the following paragraph:—

One could go further. One could suggest—as indeed it was suggested to me when I was in London, Tokyo, and New York—that the Australia-wide boom during the last decade was caused and initiated by Western Australia. Those petty personal enemies of our deputy leader who switch from the D.L.P. payroll to the Hanwright payroll do not even realise how deeply complimentary they are when they write—copying the style of light American magazines—about “Charles (The State on the Move) Court.”

Mr. Speaker, you may wonder what relevance this has to the motion; but it is part of the speech made by the member for Floreat when he introduced it. I do not know how Mr. Martyr and Mr. Pownall got into the act—or, more importantly, how they got into the Liberal Party.

Mr. Graham: Anybody can get into that.

Mr. FLETCHER: Quite frankly, the Liberal Party is welcome to them.

Sir Charles Court: We draw the line at commos.

Mr. FLETCHER: However, I do not mind as long as they do not infiltrate into our party.

I will return to the motion, and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to ignore the unruly interjections. Another headline which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 29th March, 1972, was—

Qantas to put 146 staff off.

Do Opposition members say that we caused this reduction in the personnel of the Qantas airline company? To make such a suggestion would be ridiculous. I want to quote a few more brief statistics. This article, which I have before me, taken from *The West Australian* of the 19th April, 1972, reads as follows:—

Despite a drop of 17,272 to 97,877 at the end of last month, the number of registered unemployed remains at an unacceptably high level—in human, social, economic and political terms.

I quite agree with that. These are Australia-wide figures and cannot be attributed to this Government. Further down in this article we see—

Unemployment is higher in Western Australia. The Premier, Mr. Tonkin, is right in blaming external factors. This State, more than any other, looks to

a strengthening in the overseas demand for metals and wool, and to new investment opportunities, for economic recovery.

I notice the Leader of the Opposition does not want to listen but I do not blame him. That was a leading article that appeared in *The West Australian* dated the 19th April, 1972.

Those quotations are not only the opinions of the member for Fremantle. Those on the other side of the House have asserted that the strikes alluded to caused the economic downturn and all this sort of claptrap. What I think has currently caused the strikes in Western Australia is a reduction of \$12.60 in a tradesman's pay. That is equal to one-sixth of a tradesman's wage. I ask members opposite who do not have independent means how they would like a reduction of one-sixth in their salaries. In fact I ask the members on this side of the House if they would like a reduction of one-sixth in their salaries. I ask the Deputy Leader of the Country Party if he would like to live on what is left after \$12.60 has been taken out of a tradesman's pay.

Mr. I. W. Manning: Tell us how much the farmers lost when the Midland slaughtermen went on strike!

Mr. FLETCHER: Now that all the sighing and groaning has died down on the other side of the House I ask members: Do they ever listen to the radio session AM that is heard at 8 a.m. over station 6WF every morning? Mr. Rory Sutton is the person who is in charge of that session. He asks economists of high standing various questions about the economic situation. I have heard these learned gentlemen supporting, in effect, what I am saying at the moment. I am flattered by the fact that there are people of such renown who express the same opinions as I do. In effect, they say that the economic situation in Australia is the consequence of a deliberate attempt to create unemployment for the purposes they mention. That is what the Premier said last night.

If an unemployment situation is created those in authority are in a position to dictate to workers outside the gate and say to them, “If you will not agree to a decrease of \$12.60 in your wages, there are others who will.” As soon as such a situation is created we have a downturn in the economy.

Sir Charles Court: You are 50 years behind the times! Did you listen to AM this morning?

Mr. FLETCHER: If the Leader of the Opposition was honest—

Sir Charles Court: He is, I hope.

Mr. FLETCHER: All right, but the Premier seemed to have a different opinion last night.

Sir Charles Court: He has always been the same.

Mr. FLETCHER: If the Leader of the Opposition is honest, he will admit that a reduction in the spending capacity of the community reduces demand proportionately, and a reduction in demand means a reduction in production, and as a consequence the economy of the country suffers. I agree with the economists I have heard expressing their views on TV and radio sessions. They say exactly what the Premier said last night, and what the member for Fremantle has said tonight.

Sir Charles Court: He says it almost as a dead wish.

Mr. FLETCHER: Members are wasting my valuable time, but I will continue to direct my remarks to you, Mr. Speaker, as I have been doing all evening. The previous Government went flat out to build office blocks and other types of accommodation throughout the city. It invited private enterprise to go for its life in building all these structures. If a person were to look down St. George's Terrace today he would find multi-storied buildings with office accommodation to burn. There is a superfluity of office accommodation at the present time.

Sir Charles Court: You want to be careful!

Mr. FLETCHER: There is, additionally, ample vacant living accommodation for which private landlords want to charge such a ridiculous amount. As a result we find that it is not just one flat that is unoccupied in a block, but all the flats in the entire building. I am referring to buildings that are now being used for alternative purposes simply because people cannot afford to pay the rent that is demanded by the landlords. That is the position on the one hand, and, on the other hand, those people then have to go to the State Housing Commission to obtain accommodation. That is the reason the previous Government encouraged private enterprise to indulge in such a great deal of building activity.

I have spoken to businessmen down town and they have pointed out to me that there is a great deal of office accommodation completely unoccupied not only on their floor, but also on the floors beneath and above them. What is more it has been unoccupied for some time and will continue to remain unoccupied for some time into the future. The previous Government, having encouraged all this building activity, then threw the building employees onto the scrap heap and it now says it is the responsibility of the present Government to find employment for them.

Sir Charles Court: Did you not hear your Premier criticising J. G. Gorton for wanting to discontinue part of that building?

Mr. FLETCHER: The only thing I heard last night was that the Leader of the Opposition wanted to hand everything back to private enterprise and then everything would be splendid. I have just said that the downturn in the economy started during the period Opposition members were in office. Their Government was responsible for the building of all this accommodation which is now vacant, and it then threw the building tradesmen onto the scrap heap. Yet the Opposition still insists that if we hand everything back to private enterprise the position will be rectified.

When members of the Country Party were complaining about the high prices charged for services at the abattoirs, I said to them, "All right; hand the abattoirs back to private enterprise and we will see then what the farmers will pay for the services rendered by them."

When the Midland Railway Company was in operation, the then Premier (The Hon. A. R. G. Hawke) had to keep the representatives of that company off his doorstep because they were lobbying for the Government to take over the company's operations. The reason they were doing this was that the company was showing a loss at that time. The previous Minister for Transport knows full well that those in control of the private bus routes were quite happy while they were running at a profit, but as soon as they started to make a loss they wanted to hand them over to the Government, and the taxpayers mentioned by the member for Boulder-Dundas.

That was fundamental to the ridiculous policy adopted by members opposite. When an undertaking is showing a loss they hand it over to the taxpayers; but when it is making a profit they allow the sharks to take control of it, and to impose whatever charges they like on the community. Yet, members opposite dare to come up with this sort of motion.

Sir Charles Court: What did your Government do to the electricity charges? It increased them by 21 per cent.

Mr. FLETCHER: That does not contradict the three instances I have given.

Sir Charles Court: That was done when the S.E.C. was still making a profit.

Mr. FLETCHER: The Leader of the Opposition is such a rabid supporter of private enterprise it would not surprise me if he advocated that private enterprise should take over the public toilets around the city.

Sir Charles Court: They would probably be better run!

Mr. FLETCHER: I would not be surprised if after that was done, the private enterprise operators imposed charges that were in direct proportion to the urgency of the person's need. To get back to the motion, I would point out how ridiculous it is.

This Government is not alone in facing an adverse employment situation. Whilst I am aware this State has the highest proportion of unemployment, my research reveals there are 110,000 unemployed in the United Kingdom, and between 5,500,000 and 6,000,000 in the United States of America. However, we on this side of the House did not bring about that situation; and the Tonkin Government did not cause the situation, as outlined in the motion, to arise.

Mr. W. A. Manning: You should get back to the motion.

Mr. FLETCHER: The very clever member for Narrogin has asked me to get back to the motion! I am saying the Tonkin Government cannot be blamed for the unemployment situation. The Brand Government felt the cold winds of the economic downturn, and we inherited it.

Mr. O'Connor: The figure you gave of the number of unemployed in the United Kingdom is incorrect.

Mr. FLETCHER: Members opposite seem to enjoy seeing us in the position in which we find ourselves. They have a vested interest in attempting to exploit the situation.

Sir Charles Court: That is one thing we do not want.

Mr. FLETCHER: The economic downturn and the reduction in iron ore orders did not arise as a consequence of the change of Government. The reduction cannot be attributed to that cause. So, enough of the crocodile tears from members opposite; a little more sincerity would be appreciated. Their sympathy does not ring true. They know it, we know it, and the public know it. The hypocrisy of members opposite is transparent and futile.

Sir Charles Court: That little piece which you have written has been very nicely timed by you.

Mr. FLETCHER: I wanted to get it across to members opposite.

Sir Charles Court: You want to be careful, as the Speaker might catch up with you for having a written speech.

Mr. FLETCHER: Speaker after speaker on the opposite side of the House has exploited the situation in the manner I have outlined. We can expect the member for Dale to yap at our heels, and he has been doing that for a considerable time; but we do not expect that from the more intelligent members opposite.

We are doing all we can with the finance available, and we will continue to do all we can to relieve the unemployment situation. The people appreciate what we are doing, and members opposite will find that out if they move among people other than the classes represented by them.

I therefore oppose the motion that has been moved by the member for Floreat.

Mr. Hutchinson: Why?

MR. MENSAROS (Floreat) [9.35 p.m.]: In reply to the debate on the motion which I have had the privilege to move, firstly I wish to thank members who have participated in the debate. I must say I was rather surprised and almost flattered that the Government broke the custom which it has followed during the session by calling on more than one member, in fact two of its most illustrious speakers to participate in the debate; and even my friend, the wise man from Fremantle, flattered me by taking notice of what I have had to say.

I moved this motion in good faith, contrary to what the member for Fremantle has said, to shake up the Government so that it will do something; because until the motion was moved there was no evidence that it had done anything. I had hoped that this motion would result in some action by the Government.

The first reply to the motion came nearly two months after I had moved it, and the conclusion of the debate is taking place a further two months subsequent to that. One could, of course, speculate on reasons behind this delay, and it is not unreasonable to assume that the Government waited for some miraculous change to take place under the influence of outside forces which the Government blamed for the sad situation that existed and still exists. However, the situation had not improved at the time of the Premier's reply and in fact it has worsened to a marked degree now when the debate on the motion is to be concluded. The Premier's reply was not unexpected, but it was somewhat disappointing.

If one analyses his reply to the motion one finds he argued mainly along two lines. In the first line he used his well known and undoubted skill in public speaking, combined with his usual tactics to evade the issues, to put up a perfectly correct argument of itself. If someone were to read his speech, without knowing anything about what had been said previously, one could assume that what he said was quite correct; however, he evaded the issues raised in this debate, as he based his statements and arguments on entirely different premises from those on which I moved the motion. This is a rather unfortunate habit which seems to spring up in the ranks of Government members.

Even the member for Boulder-Dundas used this tactic in the House, yet I doubt whether he has used it before the courts in the course of practising his profession. Nevertheless, this was the first line of the Premier's reply, and it was mixed with some personal attack about my ability which I took in a sportsmanlike manner as

it is part of the political game. He simply denies that Western Australia is the only State with unemployment. His argument is perfectly valid, but I would point out that nobody has said that this is the only State with unemployment.

This statement of the Premier, which is not even an argument of itself, does not require a great deal of speculative or research thinking. The trouble is that his reply is not an answer to the issues raised in the debate. It is quite an independent statement, because neither I nor any other member taking part in the debate has said that Western Australia is the only State where there is unemployment. In fact, if I can convince the Premier that nobody has said this in an argument on the issues, I might even regain his regard for me as not being a naive sort of person.

The second line of the Premier's argument is again something which the present Government uses most of the time. This can be summarised as the Government saying, "You did not do any better either. You were a nasty boy also." It is like a mother going into the nursery and castigating the children who are quarrelling, and Tommy says, "John started it."

This is the second line of answer on a serious debate. Basically of course this is rather flattering because it means that the Government takes as a yardstick for its achievement the performance of the previous Liberal Government. About this we cannot complain, but that is no reply to the argument either. It is not even an argument in itself.

We have never said that our Government was without any fault or that it made no mistakes. We simply said—and this is what this motion is about—that things are bad and this Government is responsible. It is responsible for the general state of affairs, and we asked what the Government was going to do about it. There could be only one situation in which one could accept the argument which, as I have said, is recurring; that is, that we did no better. This would be if the Premier's policy speech had contained something to the effect that the Labor Party promised to do the same as the Liberals had done, or 75 per cent. of what the Liberals had achieved. As I have said, from the speeches I have heard I understand that the yardstick of achievement is what the Liberal Government achieved. It is almost like a statistical yardstick when we take the figures, disregarding—

Mr. Graham: Did the Country Party not help you at all?

Sir Charles Court: Of course it did.

Mr. Graham: You say that the yardstick is the achievement of the Liberal Party.

Mr. MENSAROS: I am referring of course to the Liberal-Country Party Government. I am sorry I did not include the Country Party. Perhaps I might be excused because the Country Party has not taken part in this debate.

There was no sign in the policy speech of comparisons. It contained a simple promise that things would be better. It was not a comparison between what the Liberal-Country Party Government had achieved and what a Labor Party Government would do. I maintain that even if we had failed continuously for the 12 years we were in Government we would still be entitled to expect a responsible Government to do the right thing and achieve the required results. A Government should try to be independent because it is the Government and its actions must be judged independently and not in comparison with what has occurred previously. Simply I stated what the situation is concerning the present conditions and I criticised the Government because it was not doing anything about it.

To come back to the essence of my motion—I will not read it because the member for Fremantle has done that for me—I wish to say briefly that none of my contentions has been contradicted or negated. I said that the Government failed to recognise advanced signs. The member for Boulder-Dundas made some verbal play about this and questioned whether they are in fact "advanced" signs. He suggested reference should have been made only to signs. I might even agree with him, but the fact remains that not only has there been no negation of my allegation, but his was a remarkable statement which, in fact, proved I was right.

The Premier said that this situation some time ago was deliberately created by the Commonwealth Government trying to hold inflation. If we accept this, and I do not quite accept it—

Mr. Davies: Lynch admitted it on AM a few mornings ago.

Mr. MENSAROS: I said I did not quite accept it and I choose my words. However, if this is so it proves that what I said is absolutely true. The signs were there. The Premier now admits that the Federal Government created a situation like this. The signs were there, but he failed to recognise them at that time. He says he does recognise them now. I allege in my motion that he should have recognised not only this sign, but also many other signs in advance as they were plentiful.

Mr. Hartrey: The signs were there before the last election.

Mr. MENSAROS: I also said that the Government did not hold the downturn and that Western Australia is in a worse

position comparatively than the other States. Again there was no refutation of this statement. The member for Boulder-Dundas presented perhaps the only argument which dealt with this motion. He accused the leaders of the Opposition for not dealing with the motion. Their job was not to deal with it, but to complement what I have said. The Premier's task was to deal with the motion as it was, which he did not do.

The only argument from the Opposition came from the member for Boulder-Dundas who mentioned—I do not quite go along with what he said, but I can see the logic of it—certain policies regarding customs and excise and trade protection. He referred to the size of the various States and also to the type of economy which exists in those States. This was a factual answer which attempted to shed the responsibility. It is possibly the only way that responsibility can be shed.

I enjoyed very much his complete disagreement with what we know is the policy of the A.L.P. on centralism, because I am exactly on the same side as he is. I also enjoyed his disagreement with the Federal Labor spokesman about the tariff policy, and I compliment him on those remarks. I might be in the same boat.

I went on to say that despite the Commonwealth aid which I termed generous, the State Government did not apply proper measures to solve the unemployment. The statements by the Government, the facts, and the results have not disproved this allegation.

Finally, I said that the Government has no advance planning to prevent or cushion further downturns. Again this subject was not dealt with by any of the Government speakers. There are no signs of anything having been done about it.

I went further when elaborating on the motion to say that there should be a responsible State Government which acts instead of only crying out for help. In the debate which followed this statement we had an aggravation and the proof of my accusations, because nothing else came from the debate from the other side, other than the statement that the Government cannot do anything by itself and that it is not responsible for the situation. Nowhere in my motion did I say that the Government solely and alone can do everything, but I do say that there is a tremendous scope for a State Government to remedy the grave situation. If a State Government is responsible it can do a lot, but, according to my allegation, this Government has omitted to do what it could.

There is no evidence to contradict any of my contentions. There is no evidence that any action is being taken along the

lines I requested and there are no signs that any improvement resulted from actions or inactions of this Government.

The words which have been expressed have proved me, and my motion, to be entirely right. Many facts and a large number of figures could be produced to reinforce my arguments. I have personally noticed that the Commonwealth Department of Works has deliberately done more work in Western Australia than anticipated. Perhaps this could be termed additional "invisible Commonwealth aid."

The points set out in my motion have not been disproved, and they have not been contradicted either by words, even promises, facts, results, or experiences. I do not believe that any member, in conscience, who did not attempt to contradict the points set out in my motion can vote against it.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes—21

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| Mr. Blaikie | Mr. O'Neill |
| Sir Charles Court | Mr. Reid |
| Mr. Coyne | Mr. Ridge |
| Dr. Dadour | Mr. Runciman |
| Mr. Grayden | Mr. Rushton |
| Mr. Hutchinson | Mr. Stephens |
| Mr. Lewis | Mr. Thompson |
| Mr. W. A. Manning | Mr. Williams |
| Mr. McPharlin | Mr. W. G. Young |
| Mr. Mensaros | Mr. I. W. Manning |
| Mr. O'Connor | (Teller) |

Noes—21

| | |
|-----------------|------------------|
| Mr. Bateman | Mr. Jamieson |
| Mr. Bertram | Mr. Jones |
| Mr. Bickerton | Mr. Lapham |
| Mr. Brady | Mr. May |
| Mr. Burke | Mr. McIver |
| Mr. Cook | Mr. Sewell |
| Mr. Davies | Mr. Taylor |
| Mr. H. D. Evans | Mr. A. R. Tonkin |
| Mr. Fletcher | Mr. J. T. Tonkin |
| Mr. Graham | Mr. Moller |
| Mr. Hartrey | (Teller) |

Pairs

| Ayes | Noes |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Mr. Gayfer | Mr. T. D. Evans |
| Mr. R. L. Young | Mr. Bryce |
| Sir David Brand | Mr. Harman |
| Mr. Nalder | Mr. Brown |

The SPEAKER: The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Noes.

Question thus negated.

Motion defeated.

CONTRACEPTIVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 1st June.

MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara—Minister for Housing) [9.53 p.m.]: I took the adjournment of the debate on this Bill in my capacity of acting for the Minister for Police. As members are aware, the Bill was introduced by the member for Karrinyup.

I do not intend to speak at any length because I think the measure is quite clear. The Bill will amend the Contraceptives Act of 1939 in two respects. I understand that the parent Act in its present form is a hindrance to the newly-formed Family Planning Association in Western Australia. The proposed amendment will overcome some of the anomalies which confront this—I would think—worthy body.

I personally support the provisions contained in the Bill. The first amendment will overcome the anomaly whereby it is an offence to sell contraceptives in a public place. Apparently this section of the Act has been the cause of some argument over the years. It has been argued that a shop may, in effect, be called a public place and, of course, that would include a chemist shop. There appears to be no clear legal opinion on the correct definition.

The first amendment in the Bill seeks to enlarge the definition of a public place so that it does not include a pharmacy registered under the provisions of the Pharmacy Act of 1964. The amendment will clarify the position so that contraceptives can be sold in a shop which does not come under the definition of a public place.

Sir Charles Court: Is the Minister talking about the sale of contraceptives, or the publicising or displaying of them?

Mr. BICKERTON: The Bill contains two amendments and I am coming to that aspect now. The second amendment will repeal section 4 of the Contraceptives Act which prevents the advertising of these goods, or the advertising of places where they may be obtained. If this provision were to remain in the Act it would hinder the operations of the family planning clinics. Surely it is necessary for the authorities to let the public know where the clinics are situated. To some extent, it is necessary to let them know just what services, advice, and guidance may be obtained within these clinics. If the clinics were not able to do this—doubtless within certain restrictions—it would be very difficult for them to inform the public of the services that were available.

I believe family planning is necessary. When we discuss this type of question it always becomes a controversial issue and, for that reason, I do not intend to deal with it at any length. I realise some people, for religious and other reasons, have their beliefs in connection with these matters and I respect those beliefs. My own view is that family planning is necessary in the community provided it is carried out by the right people, under the right conditions, and under certain restrictive legislation which would be the case under the Contraceptives Act, even with these amendments therein. Indeed, the amendments, as I see them, are necessary to

make that Act work if the Family Planning Association is to carry out what I, anyway, consider a worth-while duty. I am not alone in my beliefs on these matters. I have received, as I suppose other members have too, correspondence on this question. This has come, not from cranks, but from many leading medical people within our community and those associated with them who feel that a town planning service in this State would be worth while.

Mr. O'Neil: A family planning service you mean?

Mr. BICKERTON: Yes, but I suppose to an extent it is a town planning service because if there is family planning to a certain extent there is town planning. Operated along the right lines, I believe the clinics would help many people who, under other circumstances, could find themselves in quite a deal of trouble. They may have unwanted children and families larger than they can afford to support. In their endeavour to carry out planning in their own way they may get into much worse trouble both with the law and from the point of view of their health than they would do with some form of education such as these clinics would afford.

I said I would be brief and I will stick to that. I intend to support the measure because I think it is worth while.

Sir Charles Court: Before you sit down: The Bill does not do what you say.

Mr. BICKERTON: I suggest the Leader of the Opposition should read the Bill in conjunction with the Act.

Sir Charles Court: I have read it in conjunction with the Act.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. I. W. Manning.

MINING ACT

Disallowance of Regulations: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 26th April, on the following motion by Mr. Grayden:—

That regulations made under the Mining Act, published in the *Government Gazette* on the 3rd December, 1971, and laid on the Table of the House on the 8th December, 1971, be and are hereby disallowed.

MR. GRAHAM (Balcatta—Minister for Development and Decentralisation) [10.04 p.m.]: My colleague, the Minister for Mines, has already addressed himself to this motion and, therefore, is unable to speak again. There is certain information which he desires to have placed before the House and, in this connection, I understand he has had discussions with the member for South Perth, the author of the motion, and also with the Leader of the Opposition. With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I desire to convey a message.

It will be recalled that the member for South Perth advanced as his reason for moving this motion that the introduction of the new rentals had dealt a crippling blow to the mining industry in Western Australia. He further asserted that mineral leases and mineral claims were being shed by Australian companies and being taken up by overseas companies. I might mention that he produced no evidence on this score.

In his reply of the 26th April, the Minister for Mines pointed out that in his opinion the motion by the honourable member was premature because at that date he had been unable to obtain any real assessment of the true position; that is, the new rentals had been in operation for an insufficient time to judge whether or not they had resulted in the surrender and withdrawal of claims and applications for mineral claims. The Minister also pointed out that some two months ago he had met a deputation of several people representing about 30 companies who asked that consideration be given to some easing of rental charges for both mineral claims and mineral leases.

The Minister assured the members of the deputation that provided they could supply him with sufficient evidence that hardship was being caused to those engaged in the industry, the question of rentals would certainly be reviewed. He also referred to the fact that he had had an examination made concerning the relinquishing of 1,100 mineral claims by a certain company and that no specific reason for relinquishing these claims had been found. In fact, the investigation showed that it was a combination of the following factors:—

- (1) The increased rentals—the company's bill is something like \$250,000 per annum.
- (2) Shire rates approximate up to \$16 to \$18 per claim (7½ cents in the acre).
- (3) The company considers the ground is barren.
- (4) Company policy has changed and a cut down in exploration activity is warranted in view of the present economic climate and the fact that competition has eased or is not so intense.

Since the date of the Minister's reply there has been various correspondence between him and the representatives of the 30 companies to which I have referred previously, but at this date no further submission has been received from these people substantiating that the increase in rentals has been the cause of surrenders and withdrawals of mineral claims and applications for mineral claims.

The officers of the department have also carried out some work in an endeavour to ascertain whether the increased rentals were the cause of the increasing numbers of surrenders and withdrawals. It is interesting to note the result of this examination.

For the information of members, it is well for them to know that the sudden increase in numbers of applications first occurred in 1967 when 4,273 applications were received, as compared with 1,882 in 1966. The trend continued in the following years when applications received were as follows:—

| | | | | | |
|------|------|------|------|------|--------|
| 1968 | | | | | 8,789 |
| 1969 | | | | | 22,622 |
| 1970 | | | | | 43,693 |

whilst in 1971 the number dropped to 14,933. An estimate of the number of applications for 1972 is 9,750.

It is reasonable to assume that with the large number of applications dating from 1967 onwards and the difficulty in speedy processing of such large numbers, withdrawals and surrenders for each particular year from and including 1969 onwards refer in the main to applications received for the three previous years.

To illustrate the point, the surrenders and withdrawals—858—for 1969 as related to the total number of applications for 1966, 1967, and 1968—14,944—expressed as a percentage equals 5.75.

The surrenders and withdrawals—4,093—for 1970 related to the total number of applications for 1967, 1968, and 1969—35,684—equals 11.47 per cent.

Again, the surrenders and withdrawals—17,979—for 1971 compared with the total number of applications for 1968, 1969, and 1970—75,104—expressed as a percentage equal 23.93.

From what I have outlined it will be seen that the numbers of surrenders and withdrawals increased almost exactly at the rate of 100 per cent. from 1969 to 1970 and to 1971.

Mr. Grayden: May I interrupt you and say this? Six million-odd acres have been surrendered in the first six months of this year, which represents a loss of \$3,000,000-odd to the Treasury in that period. That is twice as much as was surrendered last year and was directly because you foreshadowed in your pre-election speech that you would increase rentals. Five million acres were surrendered last year and 6,000,000 acres this year, with a combined loss to the Treasury of \$6,000,000.

Mr. May: That is not because of increased rental.

Mr. GRAHAM: In reply to the member for South Perth: Yes, he may say what he has already said.

The point to be made, however, is that this percentage increase occurred prior to the increase in rentals which applied from the 1st January, 1972, except in respect of new applications lodged between the 3rd and the 31st December, 1971. I think that would be at least a reasonable reply to the second speech made by the member for South Perth.

It is quite obvious from these figures that what has, in the main, affected the number of surrenders and withdrawals is not the increase in rentals but a cut-down in exploration activity in view of the economic climate which has caused speculative interests to depart from a hitherto lucrative field.

Only an estimate can be made of the situation for 1972, and this is that of the total number of applications for 1969, 1970, and 1971—81,248—the surrenders and withdrawals could approach 40,000, although this figure is considered to be an excessive estimate, even allowing for the fact that 21,408 surrenders and withdrawals took place from the 1st January to the 30th June, 1972.

However, even if we take a figure of 40,000 for surrenders and withdrawals, relate it to the number of applications—81,248—that I have mentioned, and express this relationship as a percentage, it will be found to be 49.23 per cent.—again very close to a 100 per cent. increase during the period that increased rentals have applied.

Members may query my statement that the estimate of 40,000 surrenders and withdrawals is high when there have already been 21,408 such items for the first six months of the year, but they should bear in mind that these relinquishments are considered to be substantially in respect of ground applied for in the flush of the boom period of 1967-1970. It is therefore quite likely that the estimate of 40,000 is far too high.

The Minister also referred to the comparison of rentals charged in Western Australia with those applying in other States, but made the point that it is difficult to make an accurate comparison because of the different types of tenants. However, from what he had to say it is clear that our rentals are substantially in accord with those charged elsewhere in Australia.

In view of what I have had to say on the investigations and inquiries made by the Minister for Mines following the assurance he gave in this House on the 26th April, 1972, the motion by the member for South Perth should not be supported.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Sir Charles Court (Leader of the Opposition).

House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 3rd August, 1972

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Postponement

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [2.38 p.m.]: As the replies to the questions are not to hand as yet, I seek permission to supply them later in the day.

The PRESIDENT: Permission granted.

ALCOHOL AND DRUG DEPENDANTS SELECT COMMITTEE

Disclosure of Information

THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [2.39 p.m.]: I seek leave to move a motion without notice relating to the Select Committee.

Leave granted.

THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [2.40 p.m.]: I move—

That leave of the Council be granted under Standing Order 354 for the President to authorise the disclosure, to appropriate authorities, of documents or evidence received by the Select Committee inquiring into the Treatment of Alcohol and Drug Dependants.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I agree with this request.

Question put and passed.

PRISONS

Garry Meadows Show—Drug Allegations: Ministerial Statement

THE HON. R. H. C. STUBBS (South-East—Chief Secretary) [2.41 p.m.]: I seek your permission, Mr. President, to make a ministerial statement.

The PRESIDENT: Permission is granted.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: On the 9th May, The Hon. R. J. L. Williams asked a question without notice, concerning an allegation made on the Garry Meadows' Show on 6PR on the 8th May, that massive doses of tranquillising drugs were being administered to prisoners in Fremantle Prison. In reply, I undertook to obtain the relative information requested by Mr. Williams and relate it to the House.

The radio station 6PR was kind enough to allow me to hear the tapes concerned and a transcript of the allegations have been made—copies are available should members desire to examine them.