

made the necessary progress. However, if he falls sick he will, to some extent, be guarded by this clause.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Report

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

Message to Legislative Council

MR. WILD (Dale—Minister for Labour) [12.50 a.m.]: I move—

That the Legislative Council be acquainted accordingly.

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

Ayes—19

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Brand	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Court	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Dunn	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Wild
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Williams
Mr. Hart	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Hutchinson	

(Teller)

Noes—18

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Brady	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Davies	Mr. Moir
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Norton
Mr. Graham	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. H. May

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. Evans
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Rhatigan
Dr. Henn	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Nimmo	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Hall
Mr. Burt	Mr. Curran

Majority for—1.

Question thus passed.

The Legislative Council acquainted accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [12.53 a.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 11 a.m. today.

House adjourned at 12.54 a.m.
(Friday)

Legislative Assembly

Friday, the 29th November, 1963

CONTENTS

	Page
ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE:	
SPECIAL	3446
ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1963-64—	
Committee of Supply: General Debate—	
Speakers on Financial Policy—	
Mr. H. May	3435
Mr. O'Connor	3441
BILLS—	
Alumina Refinery Agreement Act Amend- ment Bill—2r.	3443
Electoral Act Amendment Bill—2r.	3409
Mining Act Amendment Bill (No. 3)—	
Intro.; 1r.	3409
2r.	3446
Public Service Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	3412
Com.	3414
Report; 3r.	3415
MOTION—	
Wool—Increased Levy and Improved Marketing System	3415
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Fish—Prices in Capital Cities	3406
Great West Processed Foods Pty. Ltd.— Moneys Owing to Government	3408
Harbour, Geraldton—Deepening: Calling of Tenders	3407
Lotteries Commission—Agencies in Plaza Arcade Area	3407
Patients at Royal Perth Hospital—Charges for Services of Honorary Doctors	3406
Railways Department—Petrol and Oil: Name of Brand Used	3407
Timber Shorts, and Shooks—Restrictions on Road Transport	3406
Workers' Compensation Act—Introduction of Amending Legislation	3407
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—	
Great Western Processed Foods Pty. Ltd.— Guarantees to State Instrumentalities	3408
Rust in Wheat—Assessment of Damage	3408
Workers' Compensation Act—Introduction of Amending Legislation	3408
SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE—	
Hours for Closing Days of Session	3446

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman) took the Chair at 11 a.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

1. This question was postponed.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Introduction of Amending Legislation

2. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Labour:

(1) Is he aware that on the 16th October last, in reply to my motion relative to Workers' Compensation Act amendments, he

stated that "he intended to give notice in the course of the next few days of the introduction of some amendments to the Act"? (See *Hansard*, page 1699.)

- (2) Does he recollect that in reply to a similar motion moved by me last year he gave an assurance that an amending Workers' Compensation Bill would be one of the first to be introduced this session?
- (3) In view of the foregoing, how does he reconcile such statements with his reply to my question last week in which he stated the following:—

Due to the extreme pressure under which the department and I have been during the past fortnight I have not been able to talk to them or to devote myself to the Act. I shall look at the matter next week to see what I can do?

- (4) Does he intend to repudiate the assurances given to the House on this matter?
- (5) If not, when does he intend to introduce an amending Bill?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) to (5) An amending Bill will be introduced next week.

3. *This question was postponed.*

PATIENTS AT ROYAL PERTH HOSPITAL

Charges for Services of Honorary Doctors

4. Mr. DAVIES asked the Minister for Health:

Are patients at Royal Perth Hospital charged for the services of "honorary" doctors at any time or under any circumstances?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

Members of the "Honorary" staff are not permitted to charge for their services to public ward patients. However, medical practitioners, who may or may not be members of the "Honorary" staff, are entitled under section 31 of the Hospitals Act to charge fees to persons classified as "intermediate" or "private" patients or third party or workers' compensation cases.

5. and 6. *These questions were postponed.*

FISH

Prices in Capital Cities

7. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Fisheries:

What are the comparable prices in all capital cities in Australia, on average, for fresh wet fish—

- (a) whiting, whole and fillets;
- (b) snapper, whole and fillets;
- (c) mullet, whole and fillets;
- (d) herring, whole and fillets;
- (e) skipjack, whole and fillets;
- (f) garfish;
- (g) flathead;
- (h) bream, whole?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

This information is not available to the Fisheries Department.

TIMBER SHORTS, AND SHOOKS

Restrictions on Road Transport

8. Mr. MITCHELL asked the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it a fact that certain small general purpose mills have been notified by the Commissioner for Transport that permits to cart "shorts" (under seven feet) by road would be refused in future?
- (2) What are the regulations governing the carting of "shorts" by road?
- (3) How long have these permits to cart "shorts" by road been fairly freely available?
- (4) What is future Government policy in the matter of road haulage of "shorts"?
- (5) Is there any intention on the part of the Government to place any further restrictions on the road haulage of "shooks"?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) to (3) Since 1954 it has been the policy to grant road permits for transport of short length timber (up to seven feet) produced as a by-product of sleeper mills. On occasions carriers have been found conveying "shorts" not produced from sleeper off-cuts and their attention has been drawn to the fact that the adopted policy does not relate to this transport.

- (4) Policy on haulage of timber (and goods generally) is based on the provisions of the State Transport Co-ordination Act which requires that prior consideration must be given to existing services. In the case of short length timber produced as a by-product of sleeper mills it is considered that road transport is justified.

- (5) The remarks in reply to question No. (4) apply to "shooks". Each case is dealt with on its merits and road permits are granted where existing services are considered unsuitable for the traffic but otherwise existing services such as railways are expected to be used.

9. and 10. These questions were postponed.

TIMBER SHORTS

Restrictions on Road Transport

11. Mr. I. W. MANNING asked the Minister for Forests:

- (1) Is he aware that additional restrictions have been placed on the cartage by road of short lengths of timber (7-feet lengths and under)?
- (2) Does he consider that the unrestricted cartage of "short length timber" by road has assisted the economics of the saw milling industry and greater timber utilisation?
- (3) What is likely to become of the "short length timber" previously permitted to be road-hauled but now debarred from doing so?
- (4) Does he consider that any portion of this good timber will now be regarded as waste and burnt at the mill?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) to (4) In answer to the member for Wellington, this question should have been directed to the Minister for Transport. The member for Stirling has asked a similar question of the Minister for Transport, to which the Minister has replied. As this covers the question asked by the member for Wellington there is no need for me to reply to his question, but should he require any further information I will be pleased to convey it to him.

RAILWAYS DEPARTMENT

Petrol and Oil: Name of Brand Used

12. Mr. HEAL asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Is it a fact that he has issued an instruction to the Railways Department that they are to use one brand of petrol and oil only?
- (2) If so, what is the reason for such an instruction, and what particular brand of petrol and oil is being used at the present time?

Mr. COURT replied:

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

LOTTERIES COMMISSION

Agencies in Plaza Arcade Area

13. Mr. TONKIN asked the Chief Secretary:

- (1) Will he reconcile his reply given on Thursday, the 28th November, which shows that with respect to the Plaza Arcade and immediate vicinity one agent has two agencies, with his reply of Tuesday, the 26th November, that there had been no relaxation of the commission's policy of not granting more than one agency to any one person?
- (2) On what date was approval given by the Lotteries Commission for the agent who has two agencies to open his second agency?
- (3) On what date did this agent actually commence offering tickets for sale in the second agency?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) I have discussed the matter further with the Chairman and Secretary of the Lotteries Commission and have been advised that there is no specific policy regarding the granting of more than one agency to any one person. However, where an interest in two agencies is held the reason has been because of special circumstances which have arisen. In Plaza Arcade there are three selling agencies, and since 1950 one person has held an interest in two of them. Recently, because of demolitions and renovations in the arcade, the Lotteries Commission reinstated the second selling agency as from the 15th November, 1963, for a year, when the matter could be reviewed.

I have been asked to repeat that each application for a selling agency is treated on its merits.

Should the honourable member desire any further information it might be appropriate if he himself were to contact the Chairman and Secretary of the Commission.

- (3) The 18th November, 1963.

GERALDTON HARBOUR DEEPENING

Calling of Tenders

14. Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for Works:

What action has been taken by the Government in the calling of tenders for the deepening of the Geraldton Harbour and approaches in view of the recent Press statements by a representative of McDonald Construction Co. that this work did not have

insurmountable engineering difficulties and that his firm would be interested in this work if tenders were called?

Mr. WILD replied:

Prior to tenders being invited an approach has been made to leading dredging contractors throughout the western world. Dependent upon the results of this approach a decision regarding calling tenders will be made.

15. and 16. *These questions were postponed.*

GREAT WEST PROCESSED FOODS PTY. LTD.

Moneys Owing to Government

17. Mr. HAWKE asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

What other moneys, if any, are due to the Government by Great West Processed Foods Pty. Ltd. in addition to the bank guarantee of £70,000 given to the company by the State Government Insurance Office?

Mr. COURT replied:

No other moneys are due to the Government by Great West Processed Foods Pty. Ltd. apart from the £70,000 which was advanced by the State Government Insurance Office, under bank guarantee, and which is secured by a mortgage over the freehold property considered adequate to cover the liability.

There was a Government loan of £50,000 made to Foster Clark (W.A.) Pty. Ltd. under guarantee by the parent company in the United Kingdom. This sum was in turn loaned to Great West Processed Foods Pty. Ltd.—a subsidiary. Of this, £22,916 has been repaid, and the balance awaits finality with the affairs of the parent company.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE WORKERS COMPENSATION ACT

Introduction of Amending Legislation

1. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Labour:

Referring to his reply to question No. 2 on the notice paper, could the Minister tell me—

(1) Why did he deceive the House last year when he indicated, in reply to my motion on workers' compensation, that an amending Bill would be one of the first to be introduced this session?

(2) Why did he deceive the House over six weeks ago in reply to a similar motion when he indicated that he hoped to introduce a Bill within the next few days?

(3) Why did he mention last week, when I asked him a question without notice, that he hoped to do something this week?

(4) On what day next week, in the dying hours of Parliament, will he introduce this Bill?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) to (4) I have been waiting for the report of the Select Committee appointed in another place to inquire into silicosis. As late as last night I again inquired, and found the report was not ready for presentation. I told the honourable member last week. He well knows that I have been pretty busy with other Bills.

Mr. Hawke: Which other Bills?

Mr. WILD: I have only one pair of hands, and very limited time at my disposal, and I have not had time to get around to this matter. But, for the information of the honourable member, the Bill will be introduced on Tuesday next.

RUST IN WHEAT

Assessment of Damage

2. Mr. HART asked the Minister for Agriculture:

Further to my question on rust damage, will the Minister send an officer to the area to assess the damage, and report on the situation?

Mr. NALDER replied:

I will give consideration to the honourable member's request.

GREAT WEST PROCESSED FOODS PTY. LTD.

Guarantees to State Instrumentalities

3. Mr. CORNELL asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

Adverting to the reply given to questions asked by the Leader of the Opposition—

(1) Were these guarantees to State instrumentalities existing at the time of the takeover of the particular company?

(2) Is the parent company in Great Britain also in financial difficulty?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) I am not quite clear as to the import of this question. Securities in respect of the State Government Insurance Office existed at the time the advances were made in 1958.

Mr. Cornell: Were they existing at the time of the takeover of the company by Foster Clark interests, or have advances been made since?

Mr. COURT: As I said, the securities in respect of the State Government Insurance Office existed right from the time the advances were made. They were securities over the premises. I might be wrong, but that was the impression I gained of the advances made at that time. The subsequent advance made to Foster Clark (W.A.), and which was guaranteed by the parent company, was dealt with at the time that the advance was made.

- (2) As is well known, the parent company has got into financial difficulties, but what will be the final conclusion of that we do not know. If the initial figures we have from the United Kingdom are to be relied upon, the present indication is that it will be sufficient to cover partly, if not completely, the amount outstanding.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Wild (Minister for Labour), and read a first time.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. GRAHAM (Balcatta) [11.16 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

It is pertinent, I think, for me to assert that the lot of a private member is far from being a happy one. This small Bill was read a first time on the 25th September. The first private members' day this session was the 11th September, and within a fortnight this Bill was, I repeat, read a first time.

It has now taken nine weeks up to last Wednesday before I, as a private member, have an opportunity to bring the Bill before the House; and, as members are aware, we are a few short days only from the expected conclusion of the session.

It would appear that it is well-nigh impossible for a private member, irrespective of which side of the House he sits upon, to play any part whatever in framing legislation, or submitting amendments to existing Statutes, if he feels that is necessary or desirable.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You have had legislation passed through as a private member.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes; I have. But I am giving the history of this Bill. I think even the Minister for Health will agree that this is wrong—that there should be nine weeks and two days between the first reading and the second reading of a Bill.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: But that happens whichever Government is in office.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not endeavouring to make this a party political issue. I am merely pointing out to members, by quoting an example, how difficult it is for a private member to initiate legislation. I think therefore that our Standing Orders Committee, or somebody else, should give some attention to this matter; because surely there is a role for private members additional to being mere yes men for the Government, and no men for the Opposition. One of the principles, and ideals perhaps, is that individual members should have every opportunity and facility to submit their ideas in the matter of alteration to legislation.

This Bill is to amend the Electoral Act. It contains one short and simple principle. So far as its scope is concerned it is designed to bring Western Australia into line with the procedure in practically every part of the Commonwealth.

I refer to what was the procedure in this State until 1948, when the law was amended to put Western Australia in a different category from the majority of the States. We have had a great deal of legislation from the Government, and views by it, as to the necessity for some degree of uniformity. We have heard about that with regard to the traffic code, increased motor vehicle licenses, and even in connection with industrial matters.

This Bill seeks to bring Western Australia more into line with the other parts of the Commonwealth. I suggest that if this Bill is passed it will place the Government in a better position to give effect to section 31 of the Electoral Act, which makes provision for the Governor to arrange that there shall be a single enrolling authority; in other words, for the Commonwealth to undertake that responsibility.

For that step to be taken successfully it is highly desirable, to say the least, that the qualifications for enrolment should be the same in both cases. In this matter it is interesting to note that the Commonwealth, in fact, undertakes enrolments,

apart from those for the purpose of Commonwealth elections, for the States of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, and Tasmania. I find it very difficult, Mr. Speaker, to hear myself above the voice of the member for Subiaco.

Mr. Hawke: He has a nice tenor voice.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not give a fiver for it!

Mr. Hawke: It is almost a soprano voice.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think it would be agreed that it would be a major forward step if the electors of Western Australia were able, by filling in one enrolment card, to complete their responsibility for the Federal elections, as well as State elections. Now that a move has been made—no matter how belatedly—to adopt adult suffrage in respect of Council elections in Western Australia, by the filling in of one card, new electors could be enrolled; and present electors, transferring to another district or to another address in the same district, would only have to go through the process once instead of three times, as is the case at present.

I think all members will agree that the Commonwealth has the ready facilities, such as postmen—particularly those in the metropolitan area and country towns—who go from door to door in the course of their duties, and who are in touch and familiar with the movement of the people. In the broader sense the Commonwealth would have far more complete records in respect of interstate movement of people.

With the idea of placing the Government in a position to move in this direction, the Bill before us seeks to make the qualification in respect of residence in a district conform with the procedure in the Commonwealth. In 1948, as I have already stated, the legislation of Western Australia was altered to the present arrangement, under which it is necessary for a person to reside in a locality for three months before being eligible to be enrolled for the electoral district in the place of his new residence. Hitherto it was a period of one month.

I read with interest the remarks made by the then Attorney-General (Mr. Abbott) in connection with this matter, and he was unable to produce any valid reasons for lengthening the period. He mentioned just two points, the first of which was—

The Bill proposes to alter the qualification for enrolment from one month's residence in a district to three months' residence. It has been found that alteration of rolls, owing to persons changing their residence from district to district causes a considerable amount of work in the department.

Does the department exist to serve the electors, or do the electors exist to suit the conveniences of the Electoral Department? Of course those comments were so much poppycock. Surely people do not move from one place to another for a period of four weeks only and go through the process in any event. There is provision at the present time for a person to remain on the roll in his former address for a much longer period; and that, with suitable modification, is sought to be retained.

The then Attorney-General went on to make his second point—

It is considered that the three months' residential qualification for a district will result in greater stability in the roll. It would also enable a resident in a new district to become familiar with the interests of the district before being eligible to vote for that district.

If I were to transfer to the Murchison electorate for a period of three months, how familiar would I be with it at the end of that time? In any event, I would like to know what that has to do with the proposition.

It will be noticed that the then member for Nedlands, one time Leader of the Liberal Party in the Legislative Assembly, was most critical in his analysis of that proposed change. I notice that when the vote on the measure was taken he (Sir Norbert Keenan) was conveniently absent from the House. I think I can with profit read what he said on that occasion. I quote from page 2844 of *Hansard* of 1948—

I will deal very briefly with the amendments that are outlined in the Bill. The first I intend to refer to deals with section 17 wherein are set out the qualifications that must be possessed by any person before he becomes entitled to claim to be enrolled in respect of any electoral district. Those qualifications include one relating to residence. Under the present law, which has operated since 1907, the period necessary before one can claim to be registered is one month's continuous residence. It is proposed to strike out the provision for one month and make it three months. I listened with some degree of close attention, as far as the acoustic conditions of the House will allow, to the observations of the Attorney General, and I still remain ignorant as to any particular reason for striking out the word "one" and inserting "three" in lieu. The reason why the month's continuous residential qualification was inserted in the original Act was to prevent roll stuffing, and one month was thought to be sufficient.

As members are aware, roll stuffing takes place only close to the eve of an election and I would mention as an

appropriate fact that it is not one month but a much longer period that will be necessary in order to effect roll stuffing. In another portion of the principal Act, it is set out that no claim can be lodged for registration on any roll unless it is received 14 days before the issue of the writ and is lodged at the Registrar's office. Then from the date of the issue of the writ a minimum number of seven days must elapse before nomination day and then 14 days must elapse between nomination day and polling day. That makes 35 days in all as the actual period of time necessary to elapse, or, in all, two months and a week.

That is using the minimum period that is provided in the Electoral Act. To continue—

I do not think it could be reasonably suggested that stuffing under those conditions would be in operation and would be easy to carry out. In all my years of experience I have known of no roll stuffing except that suggested on a ridiculously moderate scale, and then only because there was some disappointment in the result of the election!

If the only object of this provision for living in an electorate for a longer time before becoming entitled to be enrolled is to prevent the abuse I have indicated by way of roll stuffing, is it possible to suggest that two months and one week is not more than sufficient for that purpose? I am opposed to this proposed alteration.

I suggest the words uttered then are equally appropriate today. But this is the position: In the Commonwealth a residential qualification of one month is provided; in New South Wales it is one month; in Victoria it is one month; in South Australia it is one month; and in Queensland, up to 1959 it was one month, but it was made three months for a reason I am unable to ascertain. There was a change of Government and a whole lot of changes were effected, I think, with an eye to party political results, rather than having regard for the welfare of the public, or the general convenience of them.

Here let me say that, apart from the overall procedure or process of endeavouring to reach the stage when the single Government authority will be responsible for all enrolments, I resolved to introduce this measure because a person who is a neighbour was prosecuted by the Commonwealth for not effecting his enrolment. He was apparently better versed in State legislation than he was in Commonwealth and considered that the requirement was a residential period of three months; whereas, as members are aware, so far as the Commonwealth is concerned it is one month.

As it was confusing to that person, who is a new Australian—although he has been here quite a number of years—it must be confusing to a great many other people as well. For a start, they cannot understand why it is necessary to fill in a number of cards. But having moved to a new area, to become eligible after a period of one month in the Commonwealth and a period of three months for the State, is doubly confusing to them. I do not think it is desirable that we should allow this state of affairs to continue. The more we can simplify and the more we can standardise the process, then the more easily it will be understood by our people, and the more desirable will be the ultimate result.

As you have no doubt adduced, Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to bring the residential qualification back to one month as it was prior to 1948 and as it is in every other State, except one, and the Commonwealth as well. There is another feature in addition. For the Commonwealth, there is a requirement that a person shall have resided in the Commonwealth of Australia for a period of six months. That applies in New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, and South Australia, but it does not apply in Tasmania and Western Australia. Here the qualification is that a person must have resided in Western Australia for six months.

Members will readily appreciate that somebody who comes from Britain and lives in Western Australia for six months becomes eligible to be enrolled in exactly the same way as a person who comes from South Australia, because our Act says that a person must have resided in this State for a period of six months. In the other States I mentioned, the qualification is that a person shall have resided in the Commonwealth of Australia for six months, and in the particular State for three months.

So here I propose an amendment to make Western Australia conform with every other State with the exception of Tasmania. Why that State is different I do not know. So if this Bill becomes law it will have the effect of making the requirement of an elector in the matter of enrolments more easily understood.

I might mention to the Minister who will be handling this Bill on behalf of the Government that, apart from what I seek to do, there is also a correction made in the existing law. I refer to section 119, which provides that the presiding officer shall put to any person claiming to vote at an Assembly election certain questions; and this one is amongst them:—

Have you within the last preceding six months *bona fide* lived within that district?

The requirement under the Act is a residential period of three months, so it appears that some time in the past, when the periods were altered, on account of an oversight no correction was made here.

All I want to say in conclusion is that this is not a party Bill. There are no party political reasons whatsoever for its introduction. It is to overcome the confusion on the part of an already confused electorate. Lots of people, particularly those who come here from other parts of the world, as they have been coming in the post-war years in considerable numbers, cannot understand the two Parliament system—that is, the Commonwealth and the State—and where there are different qualifications they become completely confounded. After all, following certain requirements and lapse of time, a person is either a citizen entitled to all the rights in this country or he is not. But when there are two laws, and one says something and another says something different in respect of the same matter—namely, being enrolled for the purpose of voting—then I think the situation is farcical in the extreme and it is unnecessarily confusing to our people.

If the Government is prepared to give consideration to this procedure—I think there is no argument against it at all—and subsequently the Commonwealth becomes the sole enrolling authority—the State, of course, to still conduct its own elections—then some attention might be given to the fortnight incubation period. If I have all the qualifications necessary and I lodge a claim card with the electoral registrar, why should it have to remain in his possession for a period of 14 days before he can place me on the roll? I think that in theory the idea is that the electoral registrar can investigate the claim in order to see that it conforms with the requirements set out in the Act; but we know that such a process is not carried out.

We remember the case mentioned by the member for Beeloo when somebody in West Perth decided to nominate against him. I think this gentleman moved into the district, but before he did that he enrolled for the Beeloo electorate. As there was evidence available to the Electoral Department that that person was still residing in West Perth—because that is the address he gave when he nominated for the election—something could and should have been done about it if there was this check. But if somebody has been placed on the roll and subsequently it is found by the department he is not entitled to be enrolled, there is a process under which his name can be removed.

In any event, this process does not apply in other parts; and I submit that to the responsible Minister in the hope that we in Western Australia may play our part in

making the electoral qualifications identical throughout the whole of the Commonwealth. In the case only of the most compelling reasons should we entertain any thought of having our processes different from those existing under Commonwealth law.

I commend the Bill, and hope and trust it will have an easy passage through both Houses.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development).

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 28th November, on the following motion by Mr. Brand (Premier):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle) [11.42 p.m.]: The Opposition is pleased to see that at long last legislation is being enacted to give public servants three weeks' recreation per year.

Mr. Brand: Not "at long last"—just "being enacted."

MR. FLETCHER: With the passage of this legislation, public servants will become among the last workers in Australia to reap the benefits of this necessary industrial reform; and although we feel that the Government should have taken a lead in this matter with its own officers, instead of following, it is good to see that the additional leave is operative from the 1st January, 1963.

Public servants are playing a very important role in this State's development; and if our present democratic system of parliamentary government is to function efficiently and effectively, it is necessary to maintain a highly competent and stable public service. One of the best ways to achieve this is to ensure that salaries and conditions of employment are of the highest order.

The Opposition supports the other amendments to the Act, which are obviously designed to eliminate much of the unnecessary red tape and make for easier administration of the Public Service. It is understood that once the Bill becomes law, the Public Service Commissioner will be in a position to table revised Public Service regulations in the House, and that shortly thereafter public servants will be able to obtain a copy of the regulations, with which they are expected to be familiar.

The existing regulations have been out of print for many years, and members will probably be aware that although section 77 of the Act prescribes that every officer shall be entitled to a copy of the regulations, free of charge, very few public servants possess such a copy. It is noticed

that the free issue of the Act and regulations has been dropped from the present proposal, and that is significant. I assume the Government intends to continue this practice by administrative action.

Mr. Brand: That is so.

Mr. FLETCHER: Perhaps the Premier could enlighten me on this point subsequently. Of course, the Government could have gone much further with this measure and introduced legislation for the establishment of a public service board.

Mr. Brand: Would that achieve a great deal more?

Mr. FLETCHER: I will let the Premier make some further points during Committee. Being polite at this time, I will not make the personal comments I have in mind, but will do so later, and perhaps the Premier might like to reply.

Mr. H. May: You are always polite!

Mr. FLETCHER: With a larger population and many more Acts to administer, the Public Service is becoming increasingly more complex, and it is asking a lot of one man to expect him to be responsible for its efficient performance. However, I am aware that the Civil Service Association is keen to have this Bill become law so that its members may enjoy the same annual leave as other workers; and, with this primarily in mind, the Opposition supports the Bill.

Apart from advising members of the attitude of the Civil Service Association, I have a few personal comments to make on this Bill. I want to make the point that this is a deferred benefit; and it is significant that it has been introduced on the eve of the Federal election.

Mr. Brand: That is absolute nonsense!

Mr. FLETCHER: This could buy some goodwill for the Government's Federal counterparts. I suggest it is fortunate there are periodical elections so that some of this type of goodwill can be purchased.

Mr. Brand: It has not been done in this case—but it has been done before!

Mr. FLETCHER: At this late stage, I am not anxious to look a gift horse in the mouth. Other States are already enjoying these conditions, and I would like the Government to understand that the rank and file of the Civil Service Association were justified in their impatience. Congratulations are due to the executive of that association, and I acknowledge the commissioner's onerous responsibility in adjudicating between the Government and the association. I congratulate the executive, because it was under considerable pressure from the rank and file.

The rank and file felt they were entitled to the long overdue benefit. It was common knowledge that had Labor been elected, the Civil Service Association members would have been granted the three weeks' annual leave very shortly after that

election. If there had been any frustration encountered by procrastination from any source, the objective, if necessary, would have been achieved by administrative action.

As I stated, whilst not altering any general principles in the Act, except for the three weeks' annual leave, this Bill does simplify certain administrative procedures, clarifies certain ambiguities, and gives authority for certain regulations to be made for the smoother working of the civil service.

This Bill has been used, evidently, as a vehicle to achieve the purpose already mentioned. I would submit that if the Bill's arrival was delayed only to achieve that purpose, it could have been introduced earlier and made many people happier. I have asked many questions in the House on this issue, as has also the member for Beeloo, and Mr. Dolan in another place. However, at long last the Government has granted the three weeks' annual leave. It would be a brave man, indeed, who opposed such a measure; and, while regretting only that an earlier opportunity was not taken to introduce the Bill, I support it.

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [11.50 a.m.]: I would like to thank the honourable member for his co-operation in honouring a promise that he would not speak for too long, and, of course, for speaking on behalf of the Opposition on this occasion. I would like to assure him concerning a question he raised on the free issue of regulations. I think he mentioned the Act. However, we are prepared administratively to continue the practice of the years. I see no reason why it should be changed.

The section in question has been left out of the Act purely to bring it into line with other Acts and perhaps, I think, to avoid some waste. I could think of a lot of people in the Public Service, and elsewhere—in fact, even in this House—who receive a lot of circulars and regulations which they immediately forget. These circulars and regulations fill cupboards and files of all kinds.

I think we can come to a satisfactory arrangement whereby those people who are seeking information can get copies of these new regulations and, indeed, any other information if they are genuinely interested.

There was great emphasis placed on the "at last" effort of the Government in bringing this legislation before the House. I want to point out to the House that this was an issue at the last general elections. It became quite a wordy battle, printed and otherwise. It was all taken in reasonably goodwill. The decision was made by the electors. We said we would do certain things, and we have honoured that promise, as a result of the developments

that have taken place; and we have, indeed, made the application of this Bill retrospective to the 1st January.

As for the other changes that have been brought about, as I said, it is hoped that they will streamline the Act; help the Public Service Commissioner in some of his administrative duties; and save time, money, and so on, in many ways.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. I. W. Manning) in the Chair; Mr. Brand (Premier) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 16 put and passed.

Clause 17: Section 52 repealed and re-enacted—

Mr. HAWKE: This is the clause in the Bill which proposes to substitute three weeks' annual leave on full pay in place of the existing provision which grants two weeks' annual leave on full pay. This is a very desirable and long overdue reform. I think, in this situation, it is desirable that a few words might be spoken about the very great efforts which are required over a long period of time by the various organisations of employees before finally they are granted an improvement in their conditions; in this instance, an extension of the period of annual leave to be made available.

The move in Australia for three weeks' annual leave for wages employees and for salaried employees has been going on for a long time. The industrial organisations concerned have had to spend a very considerable amount of money; have had to argue very solid cases before appropriate tribunals, as well as tribunals which covered salaried employees. I think this situation emphasises once again the great value of organisation on the part of employees, irrespective of whether they are paid what are called wages, or whether they are paid what are called salaries.

We know that in these latter days there is a tendency for many workers, including wages employees as well as salaried employees, to be a bit casual and even apathetic about the value of organisation. That is a very bad modern tendency, because its further development could not only be the means of making additional advantages in the future much more difficult to obtain, but could even endanger the continued operation of some of the advantages which have already been won.

Therefore my great hope in this matter would be that those who gain the benefit of this additional leave would not rejoice in it merely from the fact that it would give them one week longer off work, but would see in it the great value of unity, the great value of organised approach to such authorities as are required to be

approached in order that an improvement or advantage of this kind might sooner or later be obtained.

I would certainly like to add my congratulations to the member for Fremantle and to all who have been responsible in any way for bringing into operation in Australia, on a very wide basis now, the three weeks' annual leave as against the two weeks' annual leave which formerly operated. I think, in this regard, it is fair and truthful to say the Australian Council of Trade Unions has been the major organisation in bringing this long overdue reform into practical operation.

Mr. FLETCHER: I would like a little clarity on this clause. It has reference to those who have had their leave this year on the two weeks' basis. Since this measure is retrospective to the 1st January, I assume that those who receive their leave next year will, as from this point in time, receive that extra week which they missed out on; that, in effect, as from this point in time those who will enjoy this provision of three weeks' leave will have the week's leave which they missed out on on this occasion and, therefore, will receive four weeks' leave on the next occasion.

Mr. BRAND: In order that I do not get confused I will say that I will confer with the appropriate authority; and those who are entitled to have three weeks' leave, as from the 1st January, under whatever arrangement is decided upon, in cash or in kind, presumably, will receive it. I do not propose to get myself confused with the three weeks' or four weeks' proposition at this stage. It is the intention of the Government that the three weeks' holiday period should apply from the 1st January, 1963, and that proposition will be honoured.

The Leader of the Opposition made a comment with which I agree in regard to the organisation necessary over a number of years to bring about some of these changes. A battle—if I can term it that—always goes on to bring about industrial changes and awards from time to time; but, on the other hand, from the point of view of the Government, one of the easiest decisions one could make would be simply to accede to the requests made, human nature being what it is.

Mr. H. May: Then why don't you?

Mr. BRAND: I think it is acknowledged, on the other hand, that consideration must be given to these requests; and there are always two sides to a case. The Government which I represent has considered these requests from time to time; and, as I have said, we have thrashed out these matters and made certain public statements. The Bill is here today to honour the undertaking given.

Through the Civil Service Association and the commissioner, where the Government is directly concerned, we will be

pleased to confer on any matters; but, at the same time, I think we also have to adopt the attitude that we have a responsibility. In the ultimate I hope we can adopt decisions which bring about a happy and contented Public Service, which is so essential to whatever Government may be in office. At this stage it may be appropriate to pay a compliment to the Public Service of this State for their co-operation and help during the years that we have been in office. They have been under some strain and have travelled extra miles for the money they get, but they have done it in the interests of the progress and development of this State.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 18 to 32 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [12.6 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

In moving the third reading, may I express the hope that the three weeks' annual leave will be thoroughly enjoyed by members of the Public Service, and that they will have a happy Christmas and a prosperous New Year.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

WOOL

Increased Levy and Improved Marketing System: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 25th September, on the following motion by Mr. Kelly:—

That in the opinion of this House, the Government has failed lamentably in its duty to Western Australian woolgrowers, by sidestepping its obligations to clearly define its attitude to the proposal to increase the wool promotion levy by 34s. per bale, as announced by Sir William Gunn, as Chairman of the International Wool Secretariat; and further, we consider there should be an early and thorough move made to establish a new and greatly improved wool marketing system in Australia.

MR. NALDER (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [12.7 p.m.]: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Hawke: Aye!

Mr. NALDER: I appreciate the enthusiasm of the Leader of the Opposition in trying—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: To gag the debate.

Mr. NALDER: —to get through the notice paper quickly, but I can assure the House that I shall not take up a lot of time on this motion because I really believe it is quite unnecessary.

Mr. Kelly: You would.

Mr. NALDER: I will give some very good reasons—

Mr. W. Hegney: That will be unusual.

Mr. NALDER: —why the House should not waste its time in discussing the motion.

Mr. Hawke: You would want to know a lot more about wool than you knew about apples to put up any sort of a story.

Mr. NALDER: I would like to commence by reading the last sentence of the honourable member's speech when moving the motion. He said—

So it is with confidence I feel the Government will agree to this motion because it is on all fours with the line of thought of many Government members . . .

Now let us turn to the wording of the motion. It reads—

That in the opinion of this House, the Government has failed lamentably in its duty to Western Australian woolgrowers, by sidestepping its obligations to clearly define its attitude to the proposal to increase the wool promotion levy by 34s. per bale, as announced by Sir William Gunn, as Chairman of the International Wool Secretariat; . . .

That is the appropriate part. Can we expect the House to agree to a resolution that condemns the Government for not taking any action—

Mr. Kelly: Of course we can.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Of course not.

Mr. NALDER: —on the subject which has been mentioned? The only aspect on which I could commend the honourable member, with reference to the motion, is that he must have spent a lot of time in getting cuttings from newspapers, reading articles, and so on in building up a case which he felt was one upon which he could condemn the Government for its inactivity in regard to a subject which was well and truly being discussed by the industry itself.

Mr. Kelly: Don't you think I would have some ideas as a wool producer?

Mr. NALDER: Woolly ideas.

Mr. Kelly: Not woolly ideas; you are trying to pull the wool over our eyes.

Mr. NALDER: I would like to read to the House a statement made by the President of the woolgrowers' section of the Farmers' Union.

Mr. H. May: We are not criticising them.

Mr. Kelly: How about quoting your impressions?

Mr. NALDER: Be patient. If the honourable member looks at his speech, in introducing the motion, he will find that I did not interject.

Mr. Kelly: What a pity you didn't!

Mr. NALDER: If the honourable member goes to the trouble of looking at his speech he will see that I did not interject.

Mr. Kelly: Yes you did; I have just been looking at it.

Mr. NALDER: This is the statement—

The wool section of the Farmers' Union of W.A. met in special conference on October 14th to decide policy on the proposed increase in grower levy for research and promotion.

The conference was aware of the Government's decision to assist by matching any grower increase in levy for a three-year period, and delegates were in possession of all information publicised during the Board Chairman's campaign in W.A. during August.

I might interpolate here that the member for Merredin-Yilgarn did spend some time criticising the board's chairman for his action in Western Australia, but mention will be made of that later. Continuing—

A very large majority of the 220 delegates present carried a resolution opposing any increase in grower levy for promotion until a "more satisfactory marketing system" is approved.

This resolution is consistent with the views expressed repeatedly by W.A. woolgrowers and does not mean repudiation of the Wool Board's request for extra finance or of the Government's offer of assistance.

I would mention here that I hope members will think clearly on what is being quoted because it indicates that the Western Australian growers are not against promotion, but they consider it is necessary for a marketing scheme to be brought into operation before any increase in levy is made. I want to emphasise that. Continuing—

W.A. growers recognise and appreciate the enhanced value of the I.W.S.—

that is, the International Wool Secretariat. Continuing—

since its reconstitution under the able management of Mr. W. J. Vines. They also recognised that I.W.S. activities may have contributed to some degree in lifting wool prices to recent levels.

However, they insist that the scale of promotion necessary to hold or increase the present price level depends upon the method adopted to market the clip. Until the method of marketing is known they will not attempt to assess the amount required for promotional support.

Since Conference reaffirmed this policy the Wool Executive of the Farmers Union of W.A. has given an undertaking to support increased long-term promotional planning with Government assistance, but not to commence until immediately after a grower ballot has approved market reform.

I will mention here that the planning with Government assistance mentioned, refers to Commonwealth Government assistance. Continuing—

W.A. growers have faith in the Wool Board and its Marketing Committee and expect to vote on a marketing proposal before the end of 1964. An affirmative vote will permit increased levies to operate from July 1st, 1965 and until then they consider the promotion levy should remain at 10s. per bale, or its equivalent percentage of returns.

This is consistent with past policy. W.A. growers agreed to increase from 6d. to 2s. in 1946—

That is the levy per bale. Continuing— from 2s. to 4s. in 1955, from 4s. to 5s. in 1960, and accepted a majority Federal decision to increase to 10s. in 1961 for one year. They agreed to continue this rate in 1962 and are now supporting a continuation of 10s. for another year. Right through this period they have taken the view that the promotional body should be kept alive and ready for vigorous action in support of a reformed marketing policy when such comes to fruition.

This decision would not curtail the Wool Board's present activities, but it would embarrass the Board to the extent of requesting authority for short-term borrowing. Because the I.W.S. funds are provided in quarterly instalments paid in advance, and the bulk of levies do not flow in until later in the season, short-term borrowing would be necessary in the early months of both 1964-65 and 1965-66 seasons.

W.A. growers request the Wool Board to accept this temporary embarrassment in the interests of long-term security and solidarity for the industry. It is recognised that a twelve month delay will make the I.W.S. job more difficult, but this will be countered by strong and more reliable grower support.

In our opinion it would seem unwise for the A.W.I.C.—

that is, the Australian Wool Industry Conference—

to commit growers to a compulsory tax which is unacceptable to a large number of growers, notably in W.A. and Victoria, as this would severely test the infant A.W.I.C. as spokesman for the Industry.

Mention has been made above of the confidence of W.A. growers in the ability and sincere intention of the Wool Board and its Marketing Committee to produce an acceptable marketing plan. This will be put before growers for a ballot, but this ballot could be lost as a result of the propaganda that will be directed against the proposal at that time. A lost ballot would make it extremely difficult to avoid disintegration of the A.W.I.C., thus losing all the progress so painstakingly achieved in the last two years. The chances of losing this ballot will be greater if a prior increase in grower promotion levy is enforced.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, there is nothing to prevent the Federal Government, if they consider it in the national interest, contributing towards additional promotion immediately. W.A. growers, however, do not feel justified in requesting the taxpayer to contribute funds which they (the growers) are not prepared to match in 1964-65. This is a decision for the Government alone.

That is a statement signed by Mr. R. V. Sewell, president of the wool section of the Farmers' Union of Western Australia, setting out the position and expressing the feelings of the woolgrowers of that organisation. I want to ask the House: Does it think a Government should interfere with an industry which is organised and which is represented not only in the State field, but also in the international field? Why should we, as a Government, when we have received no request from those in the industry, take any action at this stage?

Mr. H. May: You are using the wrong words.

Mr. NALDER: I would like to mention that in this session of Parliament my own department—to mention only some—has taken action following requests from the Beef Growers' Association; and from the Fruitgrowers' Association, in asking for an extension of the period of the committee set up to advise on apple sales.

Mr. W. Hegney: The Bees Act Amendment Bill.

Mr. NALDER: Yes, there has been a Bill to amend the Bees Act, and there have been Bills to amend legislation concerning bulk handling, noxious weeds, vermin, and wheat industry stabilisation—just to mention a few—as a result of requests from sections of the industry to introduce amending legislation.

Mr. Kelly: They are only chicken feed.

Mr. NALDER: What? Does the honourable member consider the wheat industry to be chicken feed? That shows how much he knows.

Mr. Hawke: Don't they feed chickens on wheat?

Mr. NALDER: Therefore I feel that we can take no other step but to defeat the motion, and I am going to give more evidence on why, at this stage, we should mind our own business in this field.

Mr. H. May: Don't get off your bike!

Mr. NALDER: That is all right. I have known the honourable member for Collie to get off his bike on many occasions.

Mr. Hawke: Which year was that?

Mr. NALDER: This is a letter which I received from the Farmers' Union, and which is signed by Mr. D. A. Dorricott, Executive Officer.

Mr. H. May: Who?

Mr. NALDER: Mr. D. A. Dorricott. I quote—

We are concerned to find that Mr. Kelly has passed derogatory remarks about the composition of the Wool Board and Sir William Gunn as Chairman. It is important to remember that the Board was set up in consultation with woolgrowers through A.W.I.C., and that growers had taken a major part in the appointment of all members of the Board with the exception of the Government nominee.

It was certainly not in the best interests of the industry to be disparaging of the Board and the Chairman at this time. It is important that growers should be encouraged to have every confidence in the Board until such time as their actions indicate that such confidence is misplaced.

Mr. Kelly: In other words, until they find them out.

Mr. NALDER: The letter continues—

We do not subscribe to the statement with regard to the appointment of Mr. Vines, and the inference that he was a Federal Government appointee; in fact he was appointed by the International Wool Secretariat, which is made up of representatives of three member countries, namely Australia, New Zealand and South Africa.

It is disappointing to find responsible people attacking bodies of this nature at this time, more particularly as the Wool Board is of such recent origin.

In view of the appointment of a Committee to enquire into all aspects of marketing, we do not consider that any Government action is required on Wool Marketing at this juncture.

Mr. Hawke: Of course they did not.

Mr. NALDER: There we have it right from the horse's mouth, as it were.

Mr. Hawke: You mean right from the gun's barrel.

Mr. NALDER: Here we have the executive of the wool industry saying that they do not want any interference at this stage; they do not want any action.

Mr. Hawke: Does he give the salaries of Sir William Gunn and the other executive officers?

Mr. NALDER: These are the personal comments of the president of the wool section of the Farmers' Union—

We deplore the ill-informed statements with regard to the establishment of the Wool Board and the appointment of Mr. Vines, which are not in accordance with fact.

With the exception of the Government nominee, the ten members of the Wool Board were all chosen by woolgrowers and approved by the Minister. Mr. Vines was engaged by the I.W.S., which includes the Wool Boards of South Africa, New Zealand and Australia.

I do not think it is necessary, or desirable, that I should take up the time of the House—

Mr. Hawke: What about putting up some arguments?

Mr. NALDER: I do not think I should take any more time when we have evidence that it is not necessary to take action. The wool section of the Farmers' Union, which represents a big section of the woolgrowers in Western Australia, has indicated that it feels it is not necessary for the Government of Western Australia to take any action at this stage. If these people come forward with a proposition—like any other industry in Western Australia—I have already indicated we are prepared to take action to assist them if that is necessary.

Mr. Hawke: Fortunately the woolgrowers will have a decent Government at Canberra after tomorrow, with Mr. Oates there to support them.

Mr. NALDER: I would like to reiterate that this Government has assisted the woolgrowers of Western Australia, and other sections of the industry as well. Since 1959 the Government of Western Australia has assisted agricultural development in this State by almost doubling its contribution to the activities of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Bovell: Hear, hear!

Mr. NALDER: In 1958-59 the amount of money spent by the then Government was in the vicinity of £700,000 to £800,000; but today, five years from then, the amount made available to the Department of Agriculture has been almost doubled.

Mr. Hawke: The value of the pound has gone down by half in the meantime.

Mr. NALDER: In five years the Government has doubled the amount previously made available to assist all sections including the wool section of the industry in Western Australia; and to assist the industry generally to improve its

position by experimental work, by advice, and by the dissemination of information throughout the State by our advisers. The Government of Western Australia has certainly done a great deal to assist the wool industry, and will continue to do so.

So I feel it is quite unnecessary for us to debate a motion of this nature for any length of time; except perhaps that other members might wish to take the opportunity to say something about the contribution that has been made, and what still further remains to be done in this State. I trust the House will not support the motion moved by the member for Merredin-Yilgarn.

MR. HART (Roe) [12.25 p.m.]: I would just like to say one or two words on this motion. It has been suggested that we are short of time.

Mr. W. Hegney: You take your time.

Mr. HART: I feel I would like to take a little time, because this is a subject which I think ought to be ventilated, as it concerns one of the most important industries in Western Australia.

Mr. Hawke: The fellow who made time made plenty of it.

Mr. HART: I cannot agree with all that has been incorporated in the motion, but I do feel that the matter needs ventilating. In support of his motion the member for Merredin-Yilgarn outlined the thoughts of a number of growers. I would agree with some of the views expressed by the honourable member, particularly in connection with the urgent need for the organised marketing of wool throughout Western Australia.

The honourable member did, however, refer in a somewhat disparaging manner to the personnel of the marketing board, and to the manager, and the chairman of the wool industry conference. I certainly cannot agree with those remarks. I think he was a little unfair in that respect. The member for Merredin-Yilgarn also suggested that a certain amount of blame was attachable to the present Government.

I would like to say straightaway that the problem facing the woolgrowers of Australia is indeed a very big one; it is one that has been before them for 40-odd years. I certainly would be very pleased if it could be overcome by a simple motion like the one we are discussing. In the first instance, however, this is a Commonwealth responsibility, though no doubt it will need a certain amount of final backing from this Government; and I am sure that when the time arrives the industry will receive support from both sides of this House.

Mr. Nalder: Hear, hear!

Mr. HART: The difficulties which have confronted those who have wanted to improve the auction system date back to the first world war, and the inability of the

two Federal bodies representing the wool industry to get together. That undoubtedly has been the stumbling block. On several occasions they have almost got together, but there was always dissension, and I am afraid that dissension has been helped along by certain commercial interests which were quite happy with the auction system as it existed, and as it is today. They are not at all concerned about the growers.

The growers throughout Australia—or certainly a big portion of them—have been loud in their representations to try to improve the auction system; they have been trying since the end of the first world war. Perhaps it might be as well for me to run over the history of the position, because this will indicate quite clearly that the greatest obstacle which confronted the growers in their endeavours to improve the marketing methods has been themselves. I will relate as quickly as possible the efforts made by the industry as from the first world war.

After the first world war we had a Government-controlled organisation known as BAWRA. So successful was that system that the growers demanded, and were granted, a ballot from the Government. So the Federal Government did come into the picture. At that stage, 40 years ago, they carried that ballot by 74.2 per cent. of the votes. Strangely enough, according to the regulations under which that marketing system was set up, it required a 75 per cent. majority; and accordingly they lost it by .8 per cent.

In 1925 further efforts were made, and a plan for better marketing was drawn up by Sir John Higgins, who was the man behind BAWRA in the early stages. This also was dropped when, in the final decision, the graziers announced it was unacceptable to them.

In 1931 the Empire wool conference was held at which the representatives from Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa met in Melbourne. They considered an orderly marketing plan for wool, but this was again side-tracked. They also considered other matters, but in the main they dealt with wool promotion under the International Wool Secretariat, and that was agreed to.

In 1933 a strong demand for a Royal Commission was made by many wool-growers, especially the small ones; but the request was denied. A committee of inquiry was then appointed, and it recommended a form of orderly marketing. As I indicated earlier, that recommendation was not put into effect, because the Federal body of the Woolgrowers' Council announced it was not acceptable.

In the years 1940 to 1945 we had the United Kingdom Government appraisal purchase scheme, which lasted during the war years. Then between 1945 and 1950 we had the joint organisation which sold war

surplus stocks and current clips of the three countries under a reserve price, which returned a profit of about £94,000,000 to the Australian woolgrowers. In 1950 a post joint organisation plan involving a partnership between the Governments of Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom was agreed upon by the Australian Wool and Meat Producers' Federation and the Australian Woolgrowers' Council, subject to acceptance by the Australian woolgrowers. This they did accept. The Commonwealth Government agreed to hold a ballot of growers, and it took place in 1951. When the Australian Woolgrowers' Council reversed its decision and opposed the plan the ballot was lost. That was where we fell down; we could not agree at the Federal level.

In about 1958 or 1959 we had the inquiry into wool marketing conducted by Mr. Justice Cook. It was brought into being by the attempt of the Wool Buyers' Association to block the wool sales at Goulburn, New South Wales. There was a lot of ill-feeling over that attempt, and action was taken to institute the inquiry, which highlighted many bad features of the open auction system. However, as a result of the agitation that was displayed, the wool sales at Goulburn were able to continue.

During 1956-1957 in Western Australia considerable agitation continued, and the Farmers' Union was very active in trying to seek ways to improve the marketing system. In March, 1958, a new marketing plan was drawn up by T. G. Hart, and it was submitted to the annual wool conference of the Farmers' Union. This was an eight-point plan, based on straightout marketing methods, similar to those adopted by the Wheat Board. It was to be on an Australia-wide basis. A suggestion was made that the plan be sent over to the Eastern States with a view to support being sought. It was adopted almost unanimously by the 120 delegates who were present at that conference. When that plan was taken over to the Eastern States there was not much support for it.

Following that, we had several years of intense agitation for a reserve price plan within the auction system. This appeared to be very well supported; but just as it seemed to be getting near to a decision, there came into being in 1960 the Philp committee of inquiry into wool marketing and promotion. This dragged on for another 13 months, and resulted in a set of recommendations being made for further inquiry. This committee did not recommend anything definite, and on the question of marketing it had very little to say. I would say it indirectly endorsed the old auction system which thousands of growers, over a period of 30 years, had condemned.

All through those years there had been a demand by a large percentage of the woolgrowers to alter the auction system,

particularly by those in Western Australia, but the two Federal wool bodies could not agree. That clearly indicates, and I hope members of this House will agree, that when we get around to taking a vote on some method of improving the open auction system it must be agreed to by both of the big Federal organisations; otherwise we would be voting on what we previously had not been able to agree on, and we would lose the ballot. As was indicated by the leader of my party, we cannot afford to do that.

I now pass on to where we stand today. I am very pleased to see that the two big Federal organisations have, to a very large extent, come together. We have what is called the Wool Industry Conference, which is an authority set up to control the wool industry. This authority was set up by the Commonwealth Government at the direct request of the two big Federal woolgrowers' organisations—the Australian Wool and Meat Producers' Federation and the Australian Woolgrowers' Council. The basis was that the personnel of this new authority should number 50, of whom 25 should be drawn from each of the two organisations I have just mentioned. This basis was accepted by the Commonwealth Government. The first chairman (Sir John Crawford) was recommended by those organisations.

On this new authority of 50 members for the wool industry, Western Australia has seven members. They are—

R. Sewell, President, Wool Section, Farmers' Union.

L. Forrester, Vice-President, Wool Section, Farmers' Union.

G. Chance, Farmers' Union executive.

R. Oldham, Farmers' Union executive.

A. McCooke, Farmers' Union executive.

Ernest Lee Steere, President, Pastoralists' Association of W.A.

W. Butcher, Vice-President, Pastoralists' Association of W.A.

This authority, in turn, elects the six grower members of the Wool Board and the chairman. It also elects from its members the executive committee, and both of the abovementioned have to report to the Wool Industry Conference periodically.

That point needs to be borne in mind. I know that at the moment we can criticise very strongly some of the proposals coming forward from the Wool Board and its chairman; but we should remember that this is the first time an authority, which both of the big wool organisations support and endorse, has been formed. The decisions of the other committees, even those of the marketing board and the Wool Board, have to be ratified by the Wool Industry Conference. At the present time the woolgrowers throughout Australia have got together, and they have a very great say in the final decision.

We have this new authority set up as a whole by the woolgrowers of Australia, and it is charged with the responsibility of dealing with the problems facing the wool industry. One problem with which we are all very much concerned is some improved method of marketing wool, and those of us who are concerned with wool production cannot do any better at this stage than to assist this new authority with its many difficult problems. To start side issues now could do the woolgrowers a great disservice. That answers the first part of the motion and makes it unnecessary; that is my strong opinion.

There are one or two other points on which I would like to touch. I mentioned earlier I felt the member for Merredin-Yilgarn was a little unfair. There has also been criticism of Sir John Crawford, O.B.E. As I see it, he was not appointed by the Federal Government but was selected by the heads of both Federal growers' organisations and recommended for appointment. His appointment has been well received by both organisations, and his ability is beyond doubt. Sir John is a professor of economics. He was Secretary of the Commonwealth Department of Trade from 1956 to 1960, was Secretary to the Commonwealth Department of Commerce and Agriculture, and was Director of the Commonwealth Bureau of Agricultural Economics from 1945 to 1950. I think it would be hard to obtain a man with more ability to fill the position of chairman; and beyond doubt his appointment was recommended by both of these big organisations. It has been well received, and is still well regarded.

I will pass on to deal with the criticism made by the honourable member concerning Mr. Vines, the General Manager of the International Wool Secretariat. The mover of the motion made disparaging remarks regarding Mr. Vines's appointment to the position. The honourable member outlined Mr. Vines's early career and said he went back to accountancy with a paint firm after the war and then became a salesman. From there he was elevated to the £15,000 a year job he now holds, and was promoted to his present position by the Prime Minister; and his department is under Mr. Aderman.

Actually—and I think I am quite correct in saying this—Mr. Vines was appointed to his present position by the International Wool Secretariat itself. That organisation realised it needed an outstanding man for the job, so world-wide applications were called. Although a number of people applied, they were not successful as the International Wool Secretariat considered none had the ability considered necessary for the job. Finally, Mr. Vines was directly approached by the International Wool Secretariat and asked to consider the position. Negotiations followed, and he was appointed.

At the time of his appointment he was managing director of a paint manufacturing group with 13 subsidiaries and 17 factories throughout the world. He is 47 years of age, and was born at Terang, Victoria. Since he has been in this position I have heard nothing but praise for his management and direction, and wherever he has gone he has been well received by woolgrowers.

The honourable member also made some unfair criticism of the wool board members. He criticised the ability of these grower members because of their lack of promotion knowledge. As I see it, if a grower is appointed to a marketing board or an export board his job is to see that the work of promotion, or any other matter, is done properly by qualified men. They do not have to do this themselves. That is the position in this case. The grower-members have to see that the job of promotion is carried out.

The member for Merredin-Yilgarn overlooked the fact that these grower-members come from the Wool Industry Conference, or are endorsed by that body; and that in the first place they only get onto the Wool Industry Conference after belonging to various State organisations. That should be enough to justify their standing. This conference is composed of 50 men, and of that number seven represent Western Australia. If the honourable member does not think these men are sufficiently qualified, who else would he suggest should be appointed? In view of the control that these 50 growers have on other committees, I find the criticism of the board by the honourable member hard to understand.

In conclusion, I would say the present set-up is satisfactory to growers. We do have this combined authority from the two big Federal bodies, and I am hopeful that the strength and authority of its 50 members will develop the interest of those controlling the other committees to a point where we do get a chance to have a vote on a marketing plan which they will recommend. I am sure the Government concerned, whichever it might be, will accept the recommendation of that authority. I think the Federal Government will undoubtedly accept it; and that we will have a chance to vote; and will carry it. That is what I am hoping for and I cannot support the motion.

Sitting suspended from 1.45 to 2.15 p.m.

MR. H. MAY (Collie) [2.15 p.m.]: I want to support this motion because I think it will do a lot of good. I am going to disregard the Minister's nasty remark to the effect that it is not necessary. I feel it is necessary. The Minister referred to what is being done by other bodies interested in the selling of wool, but he left out entirely any reference to what the State Government is doing. I can understand why, of course.

Mr. Kelly: Because it is not doing anything.

Mr. H. MAY: Someone suggested that the Minister could be suffering from an apple bellyache. Having regard to his nasty comments on this motion—

Mr. Brand: The Minister's remarks were not as nasty as some I have heard.

Mr. H. MAY: —I feel he knows that he and his Government have done nothing on this wool question. If it does nothing else, the debate on this motion will have directed attention to the lack of interest on the part of the Government in connection with the problem. What about the proposal to increase the levy by 34s. a bale? Has the Government any ideas on that? The Minister did not even mention it. He did not say whether the Government approves or disapproves.

Mr. Nalder: The Government has not been asked to make any comment.

Mr. H. MAY: Does the Government always have to be asked?

Mr. Kelly: This Government does, but others don't.

Mr. Nalder: You are completely off the line.

Mr. H. MAY: This Government sits down and waits to be asked. If it had any initiative it would have—

Mr. Nalder: I keep my nose out of other people's business.

Mr. H. MAY: That is one of the silliest remarks the Minister for Agriculture could have made—he keeps his nose out of someone else's business! I wonder how often he does? Probably only when he cannot fathom a solution or offer a suggestion on a matter.

The Government's attitude in regard to this wool problem reminds me that two years ago I raised the subject of the European Common Market. I asked the Minister what information the Government could give us in connection with the matter, because it was a real hot potato at that time. The Minister said he did not know a thing about it. I asked whether there was a file on the subject and the Premier said, "I think I saw a letter about it somewhere."

Mr. Brand: What is the Labor Party's policy on this?

Mr. H. MAY: What has that to do with the matter?

Mr. Brand: I thought it might have something to do with it.

Mr. H. MAY: The Premier can get on his feet later on and criticise the Labor Party. In the meantime the Minister for Agriculture, in connection with this problem, has to take his medicine, whether he has a bellyache or not.

Mr. Brand: You keep smiling, that is the main thing. It is getting near Christmas.

The **SPEAKER** (Mr. Hearman): Order! The language of the member for Collie is not very nice.

Mr. H. MAY: Neither was the Minister's language this morning. He was not very nice to the member for Merredin-Yilgarn.

Mr. Kelly: He can take it!

Mr. H. MAY: I accept the fact that we are both square now, and will not say any more. When I raised the question of the European Common Market, I was just brushed off. That is another matter that the Minister keeps his nose out of. I say that, especially at that time, it was everyone's business to know what was being done by the State and Federal Governments. The European Common Market will have a material effect upon us later. The Minister was completely silent on that subject, as he is on this, although he was forced to say something this morning in reply to the motion. I point out that the wool industry in this country is one of the most flourishing and financial industries. Can the Minister deny that?

Mr. Nalder: That is one thing with which I can agree.

Mr. H. MAY: It is just too silly for words that the Government should say that the problem regarding the selling of wool in this State does not concern it. I think if I were a Minister or a member of the Government I would make it my business to find out all I possibly could from all over the world regarding this matter, and then advise the wool section of the Farmers' Union accordingly. Those concerned could then please themselves whether they took any notice of the information supplied. However, the Minister is not giving them that chance.

The Minister will be surprised when I tell him, in a minute, the number of organisations that have suggestions in regard to the marketing and selling of wool. The Government should be very much alive to ensuring that the marketing of the product of our main industry in this State is properly organised, and growers should be advised of the best method to adopt. The Government should support a selling organisation.

So far as I can understand from the Minister, no action in any shape or form has been taken by the Government in connection with this matter. Woolgrowers are being continually pestered by people who have developed brainwaves in regard to the selling of wool. I intend to quote a few of those people. First of all, I refer to the auction system that is in operation today. I quote as follows:—

This system is the one by which most of the wool in Australia is sold today, although other forms of selling are rapidly overhauling it. It has certain very apparent drawbacks.

To begin with when a grower elects to sell by Auction he is allowing the buyer to dictate to him the value of his product. This is so obviously wrong that it hardly needs discussing.

And I agree. That is the auction system. To continue—

The Auction system is open to abuse, particularly when "Pies" are formed. This alone eliminates competition. The existence of the "Pies" has been discussed and proved in recent years. The publicity given to it was so great, that to combat the move to outlaw "Pies" at the Auction the main buyer countries are forming their own "Pies." For example, where one country has a number of woollen mills they were in the habit of sending a buyer from each mill. Today those mills are getting together for the purpose of sending one buyer, with one limit to represent all the mills. Competition has been reduced.

Does the Minister agree with the auction system? Does he agree with the "pies" system? Here is another one—

It is significant that the Victorian State Government, under Bolte, a pastoralist himself, is now designing legislation to combat "Pies" as a result of the Portland enquiry.

Would the Minister suggest that Mr. Bolte, the Premier of Victoria, is sticking his nose into somebody else's business? No. He has the initiative to make suggestions to the woolgrowers as to the best way for them to sell their wool.

Mr. Bickerton: The Minister knows something about apple "pies."

Mr. H. MAY: He knows something about the bellyache that apples give.

Mr. Gayfer: Who asked Bolte to carry that out? I think it was the growers.

Mr. H. MAY: It does not say so; but he is very interested. Evidently he has no time for the "pies" system. I will continue to read—

If England should join the European Common Market competition will be reduced still further. Then we will see perhaps four or five buyers only at the Auction. One each from Japan, the E.C.M., America and Russia. Competition will then become very restricted.

Does the Minister approve of that one? There is complete silence. Now we come to private selling. I know that at one time the Minister believed in private selling. Is that not so? Of course it is. This article reads—

Because of the complete uncertainty of the price at which wool will be sold at Auction, an increasing number of woolgrowers are selling their

wool privately on the farms or stations. Under this system a buyer visits the woolgrower and offers him a price for his wool.

The grower can accept or refuse. If he accepts he knows just how much he will receive for his wool and he knows that the only charge which will be deducted is the Wool Levy which is, at present, twelve shillings per bale. He will have no deductions for freight, insurance or commissions. Therefore, when a price is offered which appears to the grower to be a reasonable one he generally accepts. He receives his money in approximately three weeks. He does not have to wait for an Auction to take place or longer sometimes, if the Auction catalogue is full. He is in no doubt as to how much he will get for his wool. All this makes Private Selling very tempting.

I would be tempted, too, as was the Minister. He was tempted in connection with it. Reading further—

But once again the woolgrower is allowing the buyer to dictate a price to him. Without in any way wishing to be derogatory to the woolgrowers it would be interesting to know how many of them are capable of valuing their wool.

The next one is from the Woolgrowers Co-operative, which issued this pamphlet. It reads as follows:—

In 1959 a number of woolgrowers who had sufficient vision and were capable of foreseeing the trend in wool-marketing formed this Company. It was insisted that the Company should be wholly owned and controlled by woolgrowers and it was, therefore, formed as a Co-operative. Not a compulsory Co-operative but a voluntary one.

That is another system.

Mr. Norton: Would the Minister know anything about that one? Of course not.

Mr. H. MAY: He does not believe in sticking his nose into anyone's business; he has already told us that. To continue with this pamphlet—

The manufacturer would welcome a stabilised price because then he would not have to allow in his costings for violent fluctuations in the wool market.

If you have any questions or doubts in your mind, why not write to us, or better still, next time you are in Perth call in to see us.

Out of that maze of different methods of selling wool the farmers have to make a choice. My line of argument is that in regard to all of these propositions the State Government is not prepared to do anything at all. It is not prepared to help the farmer; it is not prepared to suggest to the farmer which is the best method of disposing of his wool clip.

Mr. Nalder: Why didn't you do something about it when you were over here?

Mr. H. MAY: Yet because members of the Opposition make a suggestion the Minister says it is none of our business. But the Minister is always poking his nose into somebody's business. He went to the markets the other morning and poked his nose into somebody's business; and I bet he will wish he had not done so before it is finished.

Mr. Brand: It was his business.

Mr. H. MAY: It was not until he was forced to do something about it that he went down there.

Mr. Brand: He was not forced. He accepted an invitation from your side to go down to the markets.

Mr. Kelly: Why didn't he know about it before? It was because he was too dull to know about it.

Mr. H. MAY: I do not want the Minister to get nasty about this; I want to discuss the matter with the idea of the Government taking some action, or showing some initiative, to instigate inquiries into all these various methods of marketing wool, so that it will be able to advise the growers what, in the opinion of the Government, is the best channel through which they should market their product.

I think it is definitely somebody's business, and the Government should interest itself in the marketing of wool. It may be the Federal Government's prerogative, but that does not mean to say that the Minister should not poke his nose into the business. He should be prepared to make suggestions to the Federal Government, if the problem is to be tackled on a Federal basis. I ask the Minister: Which form of selling does he think would be the best to recommend to the woolgrowers?

Mr. Gayfer: The best one.

Mr. H. MAY: I will follow that up by asking which is the best one? Answer that one!

Mr. Gayfer: You tell me! You're the expert.

Mr. H. MAY: I am no expert—

Mr. Nalder: You sound as though you are.

Mr. H. MAY: —but I can see that the woolgrowers of this State are very much confused—

Mr. W. A. Manning: They are not as confused as you are.

Mr. H. MAY: —as a result of all these propositions which have been put up to them; but not by this Government, because it did not stick its nose into any of these propositions to find out and suggest to the woolgrowers the best method to use. Who is in a better position than the Government to ascertain, through the channels it has at its command, the best method to adopt? The private individual could not

possibly obtain all the information that the Government would be able to get through the facilities it has.

Mr. Nalder: I think you would be better if you stuck to coal.

Mr. H. MAY: I know the Minister is not enjoying this, but he will have to take it just the same. Perhaps later on this afternoon I will get on to the question of coal. As regards organisations, can anyone tell me a better organisation than that which represents the Collie miners? If the Minister wants to know something about coal he can have all he wants; but at the moment we are discussing wool. It is of no use the Minister, on behalf of the Government, trying to sidestep this issue; because, although he does not believe in poking his nose in, this problem is very much the Government's business, as I have already pointed out.

I invite the Minister to ask the wool section of the Farmers' Union whether it knows the best system for the growers to adopt for selling their wool. That section has not made any recommendation, but it has discussed the problem over a long period. If a Minister or a Government sees the State's best industry becoming confused in regard to the sale of its product, it should certainly take some action in connection with it. I certainly would if I were the Minister, and at least I would give the woolgrowers the chance to knock me back. If they knocked the Minister back he would know that he was sticking his nose into somebody else's business; but he has not even done that.

Mr. Nalder: Apparently you didn't listen to the letter I read from the Farmers' Union.

Mr. H. MAY: I have heard so many Dorothy Dix letters before that I did not intend to listen to that one. It is very easy to say, "Send me a letter and I will read it out when I reply to the motion in this House."

Mr. Brand: That is grossly unfair.

Mr. H. MAY: There is nothing unfair about it. It was written for the Minister to make the necessary reply in this Chamber in regard to the motion moved by the member for Merredin-Yilgarn.

Mr. Nalder: We don't always do what you do.

Mr. Brand: It was very unfair, both to the union and the Minister.

Mr. H. MAY: How would the Premier know?

Mr. Brand: According to ordinary ethics that should be adopted in this House.

Mr. H. MAY: I ask the Premier whether he would like to suggest which is the best method of selling wool?

Mr. Brand: I am talking about the letter.

Mr. H. MAY: And I am talking about the sale of wool, a matter which this State cannot afford to postpone. I can remember the time when we could not sell wool. I am sure the Minister and the Premier remember that time.

Mr. Brand: I can remember when we could not sell wheat.

Mr. H. MAY: So can I. But the wheat-growers got organised; and, at the present time, that is the difference between the wheatgrowers and the woolgrowers.

Mr. Court: You will be reading the member for Mt. Hawthorn's poem soon.

Mr. H. MAY: Now we have another one coming in.

Mr. Court: About the men that got organised.

Mr. H. MAY: I think the Minister for Industrial Development should stick to his industries.

Mr. Kelly: Which industries?

Mr. H. MAY: This subject is quite outside his prerogative.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order! Address the Chair, please.

Mr. H. MAY: Any interjections members care to make I think should come through you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Interjections are most unruly.

Mr. H. MAY: I agree, Mr. Speaker; but you must answer them.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): No.

Mr. H. MAY: Not you, Mr. Speaker. I would not expect you to answer them because they have been some of the silliest interjections one could get. All one can do is to give them a silly answer; that is the best reply to them.

Mr. Brand: "Silly answers" is right!

Mr. H. MAY: I am trying to put the Minister in a good humour; how far I have succeeded in this attempt I do not know. I am suggesting to him that he and his department, the Department of Agriculture, should take an interest in these matters and advise the growers, to the best of the Minister's ability, the best method that they can adopt for the selling of their product. The farmers themselves are confused in regard to it; they admit that. So why not try to help them?

I am suggesting that it is within the province of the Government because I believe that the Government has many channels through which it can make inquiries regarding the various schemes that are put forward for the selling of wool. Wool is a very important item to this State, and the farmer is a very important individual to the State. So I would strongly recommend that this Government in particular, and all the other Governments

throughout Australia, take a definite interest in this item for the purpose of making their own inquiries through the various channels at the Government's disposal. It can then advise the farmers through their organisations accordingly.

We do not want to get back to the days when we could not sell wool, as might happen if we do not do something about the position. At that time buyers would not buy wool; as a matter of fact, there were no buyers to buy it. It would be a tragedy for this State if that situation arose again. I can remember the time when wheat was 1s. 6d. a bushel. In those days a bag cost 10d., and the balance of the 1s. 6d. was paid out on cartage. There was no margin for the farmer to live on.

What happened? They immediately organised themselves, and today wheat-growing has become a profitable occupation. And so is woolgrowing at present; but it is allowed to be picked over by every Tom, Dick, and Harry, and the farmers are confused as to what they should do. It is up to the State Government to say to the farmers, "Tell us what you want and we will provide it for you", even if it is provided through Commonwealth channels.

MR. GAYFER (Avon) [2.41 p.m.]: Speaking to the motion moved by the member for Merredin-Yilgarn, at the outset I fully recognise the sentiments which lie behind his motion. I also recognise the frenzy that has been whipped up by noticing how the gallery has been filled and, indeed, by the way this whole Chamber is packed by members. It is such an important motion that indeed the whole State recognises its great significance.

However, there is one aspect of which we must never lose sight; namely, that wool is the growers' property, and it must be protected and promoted by grower-control; indeed, all the machinery that is used to reach that stage must be brought into being and operated by the growers themselves. It is well known in this State that the growers generally are divided in their attitude towards the promotion levy as outlined by Sir William Gunn. In this State—disregarding what has happened in other States—at a recent Farmers' Union meeting attended by the representatives of woolgrowers from all agricultural areas of Western Australia—who produce about 82 per cent. of the wool grown in this State—it was decided, by a large majority, that an orderly and improved marketing system must be introduced before they will agree to any increase in promotion by way of a levy.

Their representatives on the A.W.I.C. were instructed to convey that resolution to those attending the next meeting of the A.W.I.C., this being the Australian Wool Industry Council. The Australian Wool Growers' Council, representing 28

per cent. of the woolgrowers in this State—who are mainly situated in the pastoral areas—on the other hand, have endorsed Sir William Gunn's proposal to increase promotion by way of levy. Therefore, in view of such a division of growers in this State on this one point, I think it would be most unwise at this juncture for any Government—and I repeat, any Government—clearly to define its attitude on this question.

Perhaps it would be appropriate at this point to mention that all the members of the Government, at least, wholeheartedly support the Commonwealth Government's announcement of financial support towards effecting an increase in promotion, if the amount of levy is increased.

Mr. Brand: Too right they do!

Mr. D. G. May: Why do you say, "All the Government members, at least"?

Mr. GAYFER: It is not clear that Opposition members wholeheartedly support the Commonwealth Government's announcement, but support has been indicated by members on the Government side.

Mr. D. G. May: By whom?

Mr. GAYFER: By us. We agree, the Farmers' Union agree, and the woolgrowers' representatives agree. Therefore I can say that not only do we accept this, but also we want marketing before promotion. That has already been decided at a meeting. I quote the following, being an extract from the *Farmers' Weekly*, of Thursday, the 17th October, 1963:—

**Conference Stands Fast for Wool
Market Reform
"Entirely Opposed" to Increased
Levy Before New Market Plan**

The Farmers' Union Wool Section, representing about 8,000 W.A. woolgrowers, has decided that until a more satisfactory marketing plan is in force it will not support the proposed increase in the wool levy for promotion.

The article went on further to state that whilst they appreciate the Government's gesture, it is marketing reform they want.

In my opinion, an improved marketing system ranks number one at any conference that is held anywhere in this Commonwealth when wool is the topic of conversation. As far as the second part of the honourable member's motion is concerned, I am not too sure whether he means that we, in Western Australia, through State Government direction, should introduce a new and greatly-improved wool marketing system in Australia. I cannot see how this would work. It could be submitted in the form of a direction, but I do not see how it could be implemented.

In June, 1950, Mr. McEwen who, at the time, was Minister for Commerce and Agriculture, put forward a motion in the

Commonwealth House of Representatives "that the rate of the charge be such percentage as prescribed from time to time of the sale value of the wool, to provide the funds for a reserve price plan". It is history, of course, that this proposal was supported by the Opposition of the day, and it was decided to put it to the growers by way of referendum.

It is interesting to know, however, what at that time Mr. McEwen said, and I quote the following from the *Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates*, volume 208, page 4144:—

I remind honourable members at this point that this Government is quite fixed in its intention not to deal arbitrarily with other people's property.

It is also interesting to note what Mr. Pollard said in his reply to the Minister, which reply appears at page 4442 of the same volume of the *Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates*. He said—now I cannot find the quotation.

Mr. Bickerton: Perhaps you have the wrong volume, or perhaps you have had the wool pulled over your eyes.

Mr. GAYFER: I now have the reference. It is as follows:—

It is unfortunate that the Minister has said that his Government will not implement the scheme unless it has the assent of the wool-growers.

One side says, "We want to ask the growers"; and the other side says, "We do not want to ask the growers."

It is also interesting to note that when this referendum was put to the growers, all States, with the exception of Western Australia, turned it down. I will now quote from the remarks made by Mr. C. P. Ball, one of our authorities on wool, which were published in the *Farmers' Weekly* on Thursday, the 21st November, 1963, and which are as follows:—

It was turned down on the specious grounds that it embodied Government control.

In other words, Mr. Ball has expressed what we all feel; we do not want Government control—we want grower control.

Mr. H. May: So do we.

Mr. GAYFER: Those on the other side of the House want to fire the gun, but I want to express our sentiments. That, of course, is our position today. We have elected representatives on the A.W.I.C.—the Australian Wool Industry Council—and, from that body they have appointed, together with other representatives, the Australian Wool Board; and, from them, via the Australia Wool Industry Council, the next step must be made.

Perhaps I should sum up the position by reading the observations I made in my Address-in-Reply speech, and when this motion was already on the notice paper in front of us. In that speech, I said—

... right throughout Australia there is a recognised demand by woolgrowers for the improvement of wool marketing. The first objective of that industry at the present time is to improve the method of selling wool. Whatever be our thoughts on the need for wool promotion, there is no doubt that an improved marketing method for selling wool is the very foundation of the future of the wool industry. Such an improved marketing system must be on an Australia-wide basis.

For many years the woolgrowers of Australia and the federal organisations have been divided on this issue; but I am happy to say that, today, they are closer together than ever before. We have one overall authority, and if that authority will make improved marketing its first objective there is hope that individual organisations of woolgrowers will soon be able to put forward a marketing plan which all will support. Given that lead from the woolgrowers, the way will then be open for the Federal and the State Governments to come in strongly in support of the woolgrowers' cry for a better method of marketing wool.

This is the woolgrowers' commodity. Let the woolgrowers decide its future; let the woolgrower experts—and there are no experts in this chamber on wool—evolve desirable marketing changes; so that when we ask for grower support they will know it is going to be grower controlled. Therefore, principally because this motion smacks of Government interference, I oppose it.

MR. NORTON (Gascoyne) [2.51 p.m.]: I support the motion moved by the member for Merredin-Yilgarn. In doing so I wish to put a few points forward. I would first like to say that when the Minister for Agriculture spoke on this motion he only referred to the first part. He did not in any way comment on the second part. The second part of the motion has been commented on by all other speakers, and, if my interpretation is right, they support it.

So I can only take it that the Minister himself did support the second portion of the motion, which has relation to the selling of wool. Apparently he did not support the first part, and we can probably understand why. I wish to deal chiefly with the second part of the motion, which I think is probably the most important part, because even in *The West Australian* we see quite a long article on the

selling of wool. We see that the Australian Wool Board is making a special visit to Western Australia, because the wool-growers of Western Australia are selling over one-third of their wool privately, rather than at auctions.

I think that in itself proves that the wool-selling method in Western Australia has quite a bit in its favour; and the only scheme for selling today, as far as I can see, is the auction scheme, with the exception of the new co-operative which has been formed, and which has been operating over the past few years. That seems to be working very well. I understand it has over 500 shareholders, with directors stationed throughout various parts of the State, extending even into the Murchison area.

Our present system of marketing of wool by auction leads to quite a bit of abuse because of the pie buying which takes place; about which all members know. As the member for Collie said when he was speaking, it was the practice to have pie buying by wool buyers from any one country; but now we find that various countries are sending one buyer to purchase the wool they require for all their various mills. We will find that pie buying will be adopted by many more countries, and we will have no control whatever on our competition; and the price for the wool will be fixed at one which suits them.

Any commodity which is not perishable could have a selling system which is peculiar unto itself. I know quite a lot about the buying of wheat in the early days, having been an agent for Louis Dreyfus at one time, and having worked also for John Darling. In those days the buyers took turns to buy at the various sidings. We would have the position where at some sidings certain buyers would not operate at all. Where one buyer was buying heavily at one siding, there would probably be another buyer buying heavily at one of the other sidings. There is no doubt that the method of purchase was pie buying.

The farmers saw that that type of buying was detrimental to them, and, accordingly, they formed their own organisation to operate under the new bulk wheat handling system. There is no reason why a similar system cannot be organised in this State for wool. There is no reason why the Government should not give the woolgrowers a lead and some assistance in this respect. Wool is particularly easy to handle, because, like wheat, it has a universal grading. It does not matter where wool is sold—whether it be in America, England, Russia, or China—there is still this universal grading. These are not grades that are put out by pastoralists or farmers, they are grades which are known throughout the world, by all the wool buyers.

There is no reason why the clip offered by the farmers should not be taken on to the floor and examined to see what its grading will be; and having then decided on the count and the combing, a price could be assessed at which that wool should be auctioned. Australia could establish such a system where the wool could be graded and the yield appraised, after which it could be offered to mills in America, Russia, and indeed all over the world, without the buyers having to look at it. There would be no necessity for them to look at it, because they would know from the branding, and the yield, what it was worth on the market today. We would then also have a chance of getting some competition where certain gradings were in short supply; whereas today the buyers operate under the auction system, and there is very little bidding. If they do bid, they run the price up a little, just to make it look genuine.

If they cannot get all they want at the auctions they go to the private sellers—one of them being the wool co-operative—and give them the price they have placed on the wool, which is usually above the auction price. This is one way in which the Government could very easily give a lead to encourage the farmer and the grazier to get together and bulk their wool.

When we come to the auction system, we find that the small grower is paying twice the commission for the sale of his clip than the big grower. I wonder whether anyone can explain the reason for that? Is not one man entitled to pay as much commission for the sale of his product as the other man selling a similar product? There may be only one bale of the clip sold, but because the man concerned happens to have a big clip, he pays approximately half the commission that is paid by the small grower.

There is another aspect in which a substantial saving can be made on the entire clip in Western Australia. I refer to the insurance side. The insurance premiums are far too high. It might be interesting for members to know that insurance paid by the woolgrowers co-operative is exactly half that charged for the stock firms. That in itself could be quite a big saving. With the saving in commission and insurance, and with better prices under controlled marketing as compared with the auction system, it would not be very difficult for the woolgrowers to pay the extra levy which is being sought by the wool promotion organisation for promotion purposes. That would be preferable to taking the money out of the pockets of the wool-growers.

The Minister said this motion was unwarranted, and wasted the time of this House; but in my view it has been the means already of bringing out a number of points which are worthy of consideration. There is no reason why the motion should not be agreed to.

An article on wool marketing appeared in this morning's issue of *The West Australian*. It states—

The Australian Wool Board's wool marketing committee will make a special visit to this State soon.

The committee was studying the possibilities of marketing the Australian clip in four ways, which were:

A reserve price scheme within the auction system.

I take it to mean that each woolgrower will put a reserve price on his wool, under which price he is not prepared to sell. It is difficult to determine the reaction of wool buyers and stock firms to such a move. The article continues—

A central appraisement scheme as described by the Wool Marketing Committee of Inquiry.

I do not know what that is. I take it to be a scheme somewhat similar to the one I have described, where the wool is all taken from one floor, appraised for yield, and graded according to world-wide standards. To continue—

An acquisition scheme with sales at negotiated or quoted prices.

I presume this is somewhat like the Joint Organisation scheme which operated during and after the war. I understand it was very popular with the woolgrowers when it was being wound up, although it was not so popular when it was in operation. When it was wound up the pastoralists and woolgrowers received quite a good return from the profits made under the scheme. The article goes on—

Retention of the present auction system, with possible improvements.

How the present auction scheme can be improved, I do not know; because no matter what auction system is adopted "pie" buying will not be prevented. Half a dozen people may go to a clearing sale. They may be friends and decide among themselves which particular lots they will bid for. If that it not "pie" buying then I do not know what is; but a person is entitled to bid what he thinks reasonable.

The only auction system which, in my opinion, works reasonably well is that which operates in respect of the sale of fruit and vegetables. These are perishable commodities, and a large number of buyers attend the auctions, each one buying for himself, for different parts of the city or the State, and for his own clients. These buyers do not have to manufacture into goods the lots which they buy.

A great deal more can be done under wool promotion to ensure that an article which is branded "pure wool" is, in fact, pure wool. At the present time a purchaser does not know whether an article is genuinely branded. Over the past two or three years I have bought several pairs of socks which were branded as pure wool. Although they were washed carefully they

shrank, and the six pairs I purchased lasted only two washings before they were even too small for my son. They were branded "pure wool" and were made in England. That does not serve to advertise wool. Many people contend it is preferable to buy socks made of synthetics rather than of wool.

If the Minister were to analyse this motion very closely he would not disagree with it so viciously. The Government need not stick its nose into other people's business—to use the words of the Minister—but it can give a lead and offer assistance to create a better marketing system which, in all probability, would result in a higher profit to woolgrowers, and thus help to defray the cost of the wool promotion system that is to be developed.

MR. MITCHELL (Stirling) [3.5 p.m.]: I would like to add a few words to this debate. At the outset I want to say that I cannot agree to the motion, because it seeks to criticise the Government for its handling of this situation.

Mr. H. May: The Minister has said he would not poke his nose into other people's business.

Mr. MITCHELL: I thank the member for Merredin-Yilgarn for giving members an opportunity to make some comments on wool marketing and on how it will affect the State and the woolgrowers in general, and to let some of us air our knowledge on what we do, and do not, know about these problems.

The member for Merredin-Yilgarn made some severe criticism of Sir William Gunn, the Chairman of the Australian Wool Board. I agree with much of the criticism, but at the same time it is neither his place nor mine to criticise and condemn one who has been appointed by the woolgrowers throughout Australia to be the chairman of their organisation. The member for Merredin-Yilgarn, like most of us, realises that some form of organised wool marketing has to be brought into being in the near future. He thinks that by moving this motion the Opposition might be able to jump on the band wagon and declare that it thought such a system should be adopted.

I believe that an organised wool marketing scheme will be adopted, for the reason that the woolgrowers of Australia have at last got together to a greater degree than before, because more growers realise the necessity for some improvement in wool marketing, and because the brokers and those in control of the marketing system appreciate the necessity for some improvement to the system. It would be idle for this House to jump on to the band wagon by saying, "We will bring this into being." It is the duty of woolgrowers themselves to bring into being improvements in the marketing system, and to make recommendations to the Government. If they

require action by the Government, then I am sure this Government and the Commonwealth Government will take the necessary steps to put into effect those recommendations.

It may be wondered why I, as a parliamentary representative of such a southern part of the State, should bother to speak on wool marketing, but this subject does affect my electors, perhaps even more than it affects the people in many other parts of the State. It is not generally known that in the small area I represent approximately 10 per cent. of the sheep in the South-West Land Division are depastured.

Mr. Gayfer: Eleven per cent. in my electorate.

Mr. MITCHELL: The sheep numbers have risen very rapidly in my electorate. In the district of the Mt. Barker Shire Council the sheep numbers increased from 100,000 in 1947 to 611,000 last year. Therefore the people in my electorate are more vitally interested in any new system of wool marketing that is adopted than the people in many other parts of this State.

This particular area which I represent can be regarded as being one of the worst offenders—if it is an offence—in respect of selling wool privately; approximately 75 per cent. of the wool production there was sold privately in the last and the current season. I think that is to be regretted. The owners of the wool felt they had to have some sort of stability in their selling and know what they were going to get for their produce, so they decided to sell privately.

One grower believed he had the right to sell wool in his own way; and, because he sold it privately about three months before he sheared his wool, he received 62d. per lb.; but if that wool had been put on the market in the normal way he would have received 74d. He lost 1s. per lb. on 300 bales of wool, and this represented a loss of £4,500. This will indicate to the House that there is a need to have a marketing system.

Mr. H. May: It shows how silly you can get.

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not deny some of the assumptions of the member for Merredin-Yilgarn, but I do deny that it is the job or duty of this House to tell the wool-growers how they are to sell their own produce.

Mr. Kelly: That was never suggested.

Mr. MITCHELL: I have often said that as far as I am concerned—and this is my own personal opinion—the auction system of selling, particularly with regard to primary produce, is outmoded, outdated, and of no further use. I know it is said that the auction system provides a basis on which private buyers can operate; but when I challenged the representative of a big firm as to why his company did not

sell machinery, tractors, and so on by auction, he said the company could not possibly do that because it would not know what it was going to get for its products. I think that is quite right. A company could not do it, because it would not know what it was going to get. However, the producers of wool are expected to use the auction system.

I said earlier, and I repeat it, that I believe the time is approaching when we should see whether there is any possibility of having a better system for the selling of wool. The growers have got together, and a new committee has been formed. This committee will investigate and make inquiries throughout Australia for the purpose of recommending a marketing system. Because of the activities of this committee, I think it would be bad luck if there were any interference on our part that might prevent it from making the recommendations which the growers are looking forward to.

Mr. Kelly: My motion does not ask for any interference at all.

Mr. MITCHELL: When this system of selling comes into effect, I believe it will have to be on a Commonwealth-wide basis. If this inquiry and move to form an improved system is successful, I believe the State Government, on the recommendation of the growers in this State, will have to take action in an endeavour to introduce a scheme on similar lines to the Wheat Pool. I am of the opinion that we must give this new organisation a chance to make the recommendations which the growers are looking forward to. I think we would be mischievous in the first degree if we, as a Parliament, were to interfere with the arrangements already in hand for the recommending of a better system of selling than we have had in the past. I hope the House, on the grounds I have put forward, will not agree to the motion.

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin) [3.15 p.m.]: The few words I intend to say have been prompted by some recent interjections. I am unable to understand why the member for Merredin-Yilgarn should have moved a motion like this. I should have thought he would know better. He understands the position better than to move a motion like this. I can understand the member for Collie supporting it, because he would not know what the position is.

Mr. H. May: Thank you.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: In the first part of the motion the mover talks about Government support for a levy on our growers. Why should the Government support the imposition of a voluntary levy on the growers of wool?

Mr. Kelly: You cannot read straight.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I can.

Mr. Kelly: You have not read it.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: The motion says—

That the Government has failed lamentably in its duty to Western Australian woolgrowers, by sidestepping its obligations to clearly define its attitude to the proposal to increase the wool promotion levy.

What does that mean?

Mr. Kelly: There is nothing wrong with that.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: That is the gist of the motion. What right has this Government to interfere? It is the second half of the motion about which I am most concerned, "that there should be an early and thorough move made to establish a new and greatly improved wool marketing system in Australia." By way of interjection just now, the mover of the motion, and the member for Collie, said that it does not mean there should be any Government interference or control. If it does not mean that, what does it mean? Does it mean we should have someone else prepare a scheme or should the Government prepare it? It obviously means that the Government should prepare a scheme; because we cannot move a motion for somebody else to do it.

This is exactly in line with what the leader of the Federal A.L.P. mentioned only last week. I was travelling home in my car; and while I was listening to the wireless I heard a speech by Mr. Calwell—and I think the honourable member must be inspired by Mr. Calwell's thoughts on the matter. How he considered it to be an election speech I cannot understand, because he would not have gained one vote on account of the speech he made on wool marketing, as he told the listeners that if his party were returned to Government, he would prepare the scheme. He would do it! I suggest that the essence of this motion is just the same as what Mr. Calwell had in mind. It would not be a growers' scheme at all.

Mr. J. Hegney: Is this an election speech?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am answering the member for Merredin-Yilgarn, who was so ably supported by Mr. Calwell, whose speech enabled me to understand this motion. It is quite clear what it means; the Government will do it if it gets into power. This can be seen as clearly as though one were looking through a window.

Mr. H. May: You will not have long to wait now.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: According to Mr. Calwell the Government wants to get control of the promotion and sale of wool, and the means of selling it. Why should a Government have any part in this whatsoever? It is for the growers themselves to decide the scheme that is best for them. Why should we interfere? Are

we more capable than the growers that we should try to formulate a scheme? How many members in this House are expert in the marketing of wool? Yet that is the object of this motion—the object of the mover of this motion and the object of Mr. Calwell. Mr. Calwell wants to have control of the scheme.

I have added my few words mainly because of some of the interjections I have heard. After Mr. Calwell had finished speaking there was very little doubt left in listeners' minds that his objective was to control the sale, promotion, and everything else that had to do with wool. I do not think that would receive the support of any decent thinking citizen in this State, and it certainly would not be supported by woolgrowers.

Mr. Tonkin: Why would Mr. Calwell want to do that? What would he gain?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I cannot understand it, but that is what he said.

Mr. Kelly: You cannot understand anything.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: He apparently wants to gain control.

Mr. Tonkin: What for?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: He did not say. Had he told us we would understand him.

Mr. Hawke: If the honourable member says he does not know, we understand what he means.

Mr. Tonkin: That is where it finishes.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: Mr. Calwell did not tell us why; but he said it, and that is what matters.

Mr. Bovell: Socialistic control.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: He said he wanted control, and why he wants it is a matter for Mr. Calwell. But we can see through the scheme.

Mr. Graham: He will tell you all about it next week, as Prime Minister.

Mr. Brand: Wishful thinking!

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I wanted to add those words because I felt we should strenuously oppose a motion of this nature.

MR. KELLY (Merredin-Yilgarn) (3.20 p.m.): Might I first thank all members, including even the honourable member who has just resumed his seat, for their contribution to the debate on my motion. Before embarking on a general reply, I feel I should say a few words in connection with the outburst of the member for Narrogin because obviously he either had not read the motion or could not understand it. He made it perfectly clear that he decided on the spur of the moment to speak without realising the importance of the motion. I feel I should read parts of the motion to clarify in the mind of the

honourable member and perhaps others, what it actually means. The motion commences—

That in the opinion of this House, the Government has failed lamentably in its duty to Western Australian woolgrowers, by sidestepping its obligations—

I did not enumerate those obligations. If I had, I would have taken more than one page and still would not have enumerated them all. The motion continues—

—to clearly define its attitude to the proposal to increase the wool promotion levy by 34s. per bale—

This Government has never defined its attitude on this matter. It is a Government's duty to give some indication of its intention, or otherwise, to support woolgrowers. It should indicate whether it is prepared to help in a situation.

This is not new from the woolgrowers' point of view. This situation has extended over a few years; and the scene alters from time to time. Every now and then a new aspect creeps in. For instance, for a while everyone was talking about "pie" buying. That has now died down. As I said, various aspects come under discussion from time to time.

Woolgrowers everywhere have expressed their opinions as to what they feel should be done, and it is the duty of any Government to declare its intentions. The motion indicates that the Government should clearly define its attitude. Is this Government behind the growers? Is it prepared to give them moral support when they are submitting a case to the Commonwealth? Of course not! This Government has not indicated its willingness to assist in the slightest way.

The member for Narrogin stated that this motion asks the Government to support the woolgrowers to pay a levy of 34s. There is nothing further from my thoughts, much less the written word, in that connection. The motion is as clear as daylight in its intentions. The reference to the 34s. was merely made because that was the amount being advocated by Sir William Gunn throughout the whole of his Australian tour, and, more particularly, at our own door in Western Australia. He advocated that the woolgrowers must pay this amount for promotion if the industry were to get anywhere.

Of course, Sir William Gunn received such a very unfriendly response in Western Australia that he modified his ideas. He saw there was absolutely no possibility of achieving what he came over here to achieve. He had been here probably nine or 10 days when, after being approached several times at meetings in Western Australia with the idea of getting the Commonwealth Government to subsidise the amount, or pay it in full, he took it to the Commonwealth Government to see what

could be done. The Commonwealth Government, facing up to a rush election, made the decision. There is no doubt in my mind that this decision to pay a pound for pound subsidy to woolgrowers was very definitely made with one eye to coming events.

Mr. W. A. Manning: Was it not a good decision?

Mr. KELLY: An excellent decision. If it had paid the total amount, it would have been a much better decision and, probably, a more justifiable one.

This motion does nothing but ask the Government to show some animation in helping along the desires of the woolgrowing section of this State. It asks the Government to give some indication of what it thinks of the position. But the Government has remained mute throughout the whole controversy—not one single utterance has indicated what the Government is likely to do.

When it was known that Sir William Gunn intended to approach the Commonwealth Government for assistance for the woolgrowers, this Government should have come in behind him in an endeavour to help. There is no way of knowing whether if the Government had taken that action, we would have obtained the full 34s., with, perhaps, something more for research. At present the woolgrowers are being denied assistance for research beyond a miserable 4s. Where will that amount go in unravelling some of the great problems in connection with wool and its presentation?

Mr. H. May: It will not pay Sir William's wages.

Mr. KELLY: It would not pay for the £6,000 a year mannequin who shows off the woollen garments! That is just one aspect it would not cover. I think I have given enough time to Narrogin.

I was rather amused at the outset of the Minister's speech. He chided me and stated that during the period when I made my speech on the motion he had done me the great honour of not interrupting or interjecting at any stage. Of course, that was for a very obvious reason. He was away from the House! The Minister for Education took the adjournment of the debate, not the Minister for Agriculture, who was in the south-west. He did not interject. That was very nice, and I appreciate it!

Mr. H. May: Come in, sucker!

Mr. KELLY: I now come to the member for Stirling. He said that a new wool marketing system would be introduced in the very near future and that I was inclined to get on the bandwagon. This motion that the House is discussing is one which I have been building up for the last 12 months, ever since the last session of Parliament. I have been preparing my contribution in

the normal manner in which members prepare their addresses here; that is, by making notes as I went along.

If one had listened to the Minister for Agriculture, one would have thought that I had read my speech and that most of my comments came from Press articles. There is nothing further from the truth. I have visited many of the branches, and met many of the farmers over this period. I have visited the various farms. I suppose I am as well-known to farmers in this State as the Minister for Agriculture, who is an agriculturalist.

The majority of my ideas have been gleaned from people in the industry, and not from the Press. The Press have come into the matter in a secondary position, after it has had expressions of thought and opinions from many of the branches throughout Western Australia. Nothing is further from the truth than the member for Stirling's reference to bandwagons.

The member for Avon indicated that he could not understand the last part of the motion. I am surprised he made that statement. No-one understands better than he does the ramifications and the implications of the marketing system that we are endeavouring either to prove is the correct and best system; or is one that should be replaced by a system that would be better and more acceptable to wool-growers.

The motion is worded very clearly. It indicates that we on this side of the House think there should be an approach by all the authorities, and there should not be the position where the Government would take control. That was never thought of. The first I heard of that suggestion was from members on the other side of the House; and I would not think members over there would want control in any industry any more than we one this side of the House would want control, if the industry was doing the right thing.

We know there have been obstacles in the wool industry, in connection with the handling of wool, and arising out of the divisions between sections. We know, too, that Governments, both Federal and State, have used the split among the woolgrowing sections as an excuse to say that wool-growers did not appear to be very interested. The Minister for Agriculture last session made use of that very excuse—that because the woolgrowers did not know their own minds, why should the Government step in and do something? But the woolgrowers had not made up their minds as to what they wanted.

The Government could have helped by making some worth-while suggestions, if it had any, which would have eliminated the long delay that has taken place. The honourable member, in a very fiery wind-up to his remark, said that wool is a producers' product and growers did not

want Government interference. Of course they do not! None of us want to see that. It would be a bad day in the industry if we had Government interference.

But do we classify the stabilisation of wheat by the Government as interference? Of course not! We know that it has meant the saving of the wheat industry in Western Australia and in the Commonwealth. In no shape or form could this matter be construed as meaning interference by the Government; and I am rather surprised that the honourable member should have looked at it in that way.

Mr. Gayfer: There should be grower control.

Mr. KELLY: I agree 100 per cent. There was no suggestion that the Government should step in and interfere. I would be the first one to fight tooth and nail against Government interference in this industry.

I got away rather too smartly from my remarks concerning the member for Stirling, who said that in the very near future we would have this marketing scheme and everything would be apple pie. But let us look at the current position. The member for Gascoyne made some reference to it. The member for Stirling said that in the very near future this matter would be resolved and that I had climbed on the bandwagon. Let me say this: The motion which we are now discussing has been on the notice paper for over three months—long before this committee was given the opportunity of investigating and reporting on the industry.

Mr. Lewis: When was the committee set up?

Mr. KELLY: It was set up about three months ago, and this motion has been on the notice paper for more than three months.

Mr. Lewis: I think the committee was set up more than three months ago.

Mr. KELLY: No it was not. The Minister should read my speech and find out when it was set up. This is not a matter of a bandwagon, surely! We are surely not so small in outlook that we have to look for a bandwagon to get on! Surely we have enough thoughts of our own to investigate something which needs investigating, particularly when there is so much clamour for an alteration to the system! Surely there is a growing need for somebody to do something about it!

The only reason why this matter of investigating the marketing system has been delayed for so long is that the two fraternities could not get along together. Pastoralists do not agree wholeheartedly with what they consider to be the smaller rural section. That is the reason why they have not got together in times gone by.

How close are we to solving this problem and in getting a system which will suit both the growers and the producers? The following appeared in today's issue of *The West Australian*.—

The Australian Wool Board's wool marketing committee will make a special visit to this State soon because of the extent of private selling of wool in W.A. outside the auction system.

The committee, appointed by the board to report on the best method of selling the Australian clip, will give its findings in about June.

Growers throughout Australia are eagerly awaiting the report.

We can agree with that. There is a lot in the article that does not apply to the point I am endeavouring to make. Further down it says—

Any new system would have to ensure that wool was not available to the industry except in controlled and allocated amounts.

Yet this is an industry that does not want any control. The committee is prepared to dictate just how much wool shall come on to the market and how much shall be retained. But the industry itself does not want any control. The committee has taken this upon its own shoulders, without any help from the industry. The article continues—

The committee was studying the possibilities of marketing the Australian clip in four ways, which were:

A reserve price scheme within the auction system.

A central appraisalment scheme as described by the Wool Marketing Committee of Inquiry.

An acquisition scheme with sales at negotiated or quoted prices.

Retention of the present auction system, with possible improvements.

Further down it says—

The committee was prepared to receive written evidence from any person or organisation.

Does that look as though a new marketing system is just around the corner, as the member for Stirling would have us understand? Of course it does not! It shows that a lot of water will have to flow under the bridge before we get down to anything definite with wool marketing.

I think a thorough examination should take place. When we do get to the point of deciding what is the best approach to this problem—this very acute problem, and one which is causing a tremendous amount of worry to nine out of 10 producers—and the best method of solving our difficulties, and we have some acceptable recommendation, then, and

then only, will we be able to go forward in this matter of the marketing of this very important product.

I think it is significant that although we are debating this motion today, as I remarked earlier it is three months since it was moved in this House, and some significant alterations have taken place since then. I do not want members to get the idea into their minds that I am making any excuses, because that is not the attitude I am adopting at the moment. What I am saying is that there have been circumstances that have prevailed in this industry since the motion was introduced that could put a different construction altogether on the actual outlook.

Well before Sir William Gunn's crusade into Western Australia, we had time enough to give a lot of consideration to the outlook that he endeavoured to engender through this State. One point I mention is that of the levy, and the manner of its application. After frustration in this State Sir William Gunn went back to Canberra and advocated that the Federal Government should put its shoulder to the wheel and assist the industry. Of course, that in itself has, to some extent, ironed out the necessity for immediate action on anybody's part; because the Federal Government has made a determination that it is prepared to support the wool industry in its desire to continue promotion, if that be the industry's desire, and that on a pound for pound basis the Commonwealth would come in in an endeavour to ease the burden on woolgrowers generally.

Of course, the advent of the Commonwealth Government in the matter of the 34s. levy, on the basis I have indicated, relieved the tension tremendously on Sir William Gunn; and on a similar scale it has relieved the tension on wool producers throughout the State. I said at the commencement of my remarks that it was at the stage when Sir William Gunn was putting the case to the Commonwealth Government that the State Government should have put its shoulder to the wheel in support of an assisted scheme; and the finding of the 34s.—or the best part of it—by the Government, should have been the aim of the State Government at that time. But no support was forthcoming, either to the wool industry or to Sir William Gunn. The Government sat back, as it has done in all matters of this kind, and it made no pronouncement whatever.

I want to emphasise, too, that at no stage in the moving of the motion did I suggest that the Government interfere in the machinery for handling wool. All I asked the Government to do, and all the motion asks it to do is to support the woolgrowers by some comments and some moral support. That, I think, could have turned the scales much more quickly.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.5 p.m.

Mr. KELLY: Before leaving the subject of Sir William Gunn, I was wondering if there was any significance in the position that has developed over the years, despite the fact there has been a denial that the Prime Minister had anything to do with his appointment. I wonder if that is a fact, or if what I am about to say is the true position. In October, 1958, the then Deputy Leader of the Opposition in this State—The Hon. A. F. Watts, M.L.A.—in speaking to a motion he had put before the House, said that the Commonwealth Wool Inquiry Committee reported on the 26th October, 1932 on that motion, which then was dealing with the cost of wool production. He said—

This body was set up by the Commonwealth Prime Minister of the day. It was not given the powers of a Royal Commission.

The interesting part of this statement goes on to list the members of the committee, and right on the very top of the list is The Hon. John Gunn, chairman. History must be repeating itself, because he is now Sir William Gunn. I said that there had been several significant factors which had altered the premises of this motion to a certain degree. I did not say that they had altered the necessity for the motion, but there have been several happenings in the last few months which have affected the position.

The second significant factor is what has been recently achieved. This has been spoken of in the Chamber this afternoon. I am speaking of the fact that the two chief wool organisations are now on the same side of the fence. That is certainly an achievement, and I believe it will assist greatly towards placing this industry on a far firmer footing than it has ever been on in the past. When it is realised that two of the chief wool organisations are pulling together in the same direction, I do not think there can be any excuse by either the Commonwealth of the State Government in the future for their non-intervention in assisting towards solving some of the problems of the primary producers.

I now come to the last section of the motion. The Minister, when speaking, skirted completely around the question of marketing. As a matter of fact, at no stage of his comments did he come to grips with the motion itself. He quoted from Mr. Russell's statement, and from several other—as I thought—inspired letters which he had received. I say "inspired" because it is almost unknown, in the history of this Parliament, that a motion discussed before the House has become a subject for people to write to the Minister for Agriculture about, decrying the activities of one particular member in Parliament. That has never happened in the history of this Parliament, and I question strongly the motive behind

the inspired letters, of which the Minister made some capital during the course of his very limited remarks on this motion.

I particularly noticed that the Minister did not quote from the criticism that was levelled by the same Mr. Russell in several other statements he made during the past few months. No mention was made of some of the caustic criticism he levelled during the course of making those statements. The Minister quoted only one of the letters he received: the one that suited his own purpose.

The Minister, throughout the whole of his limited remarks, made little reference to marketing. I think the Minister hoped that the marketing problem would have been resolved before now, and that, with the three months intermission between the introduction of this motion and its discussion here today, there would have been time for the committee to reach a conclusive recommendation. But that is not the case; and the Minister had to come here without any concrete evidence, and tell us that we would achieve nothing by a full examination of the present marketing system.

I think I have said enough to let members know that the rather puny reply to the motion made by the Minister had very little substance. It was built on a completely unsound premise, and to my way of thinking would do nothing to convince open-minded people that there was not a necessity for this motion, and that its wording did not cover the lack of activity by the Government. I have every confidence that there will be sufficient support for my motion from the members of this House.

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

Ayes—19

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Davies	Mr. Moir
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Norton
Mr. Graham	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. H. May
Mr. Jamieson	

(Teller)

Noes—20

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Brand	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Cornell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Craig	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Crommellin	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Dunn	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Wild
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Williams
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. O'Neil

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Curran	Mr. Burt
Mr. Evans	Dr. Henn
Mr. Hall	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Rowberry	Mr. Hart
Mr. Sewell	Mr. Court

Majority against—1.

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1963-64

In Committee of Supply

Resumed from the 28th November, the Chairman of Committees (Mr. I. W. Manning) in the Chair.

Vote: Legislative Council, £16,371—

MR. H. MAY (Collie) [4.16 p.m.]: I have diligently searched the items in the Estimates; and, though I may have made a mistake, I have found nothing in them that is going to do Collie any good. I propose, this afternoon, as quietly as I can, to tell the members of this Chamber what has happened to Collie over the last three years.

Mr. Nalder: Now don't get off your bike. That's what you said to me.

Mr. H. MAY: I will leave that for the Minister. It would never do for two of us to get off our bikes. We must maintain some decorum in this Chamber, if that is at all possible. As members know, three years ago we had a dreadful upheaval in Collie in relation to the new tenders for coal; and the final result was that those tenders caused, in Collie, one of the greatest disasters that could ever befall a town.

It is a coincidence that, at the present moment, the question of coal tenders for the next three years is supposed to be receiving consideration; and it is interesting to see the answers I received to the following questions which I asked, on the 13th November, of the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:—

- (1) Is he now in a position to announce the tenders for coal contracts submitted by the Griffin Coal Mining Company and Western Collieries of W.A. Limited?
- (2) If not, what is the reason for the delay?
- (3) Which company is holding up the finalising of the tenders, or are both companies responsible?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) A three-year contract has been completed with Western Collieries Limited for the supply of 360,000 tons per year of deep-mine coal for the railways and power stations and for 20,000 tons per year of gas-making coal.
- (2) and (3) Negotiations are still in course with the Griffin Coal Mining Co. Ltd. for the purchase for three years of 235,000 tons of deep-mine and 235,000 tons of open-cut coal per year, but some other points are not yet settled.

This happens to be the company which, three years ago, was offering open-cut coal to the present Government at £1 per ton.

It would be interesting to refer to an article which appeared in the *Weekend News* of the 28th September. It is as follows:—

Griffin Coal, whose production already has jumped from 146,000 in 1960 to 559,000 tons last year, has been given added appeal through its contract to supply the new Collie power station from the nearby Muja open-cut.

It is news to me and to many people in this State to know that a contract has already been let to the Griffin Company for 559,000 tons of coal, apart from that supplied to the State Electricity Commission and the Government railways, contracts for which have not yet been finalised.

Mr. Brand: It has now.

Mr. H. MAY: I had a promise from the department that as soon as the Griffin Company had come to some satisfactory arrangement in regard to its tenders I would be advised—not that I should be advised. I wanted to tell the people of Collie the result, because they have been going through a very anxious period as the result of that company not agreeing to the tenders.

Mr. Brand: The agreement has just been finalised.

Mr. H. MAY: I was to have been advised when it was finalised, because I wanted to ease the minds of the people in Collie. These tenders affect their employment; and we may well remember what happened three short years ago when tenders had not been finalised. Between 300 and 400 men—most of them married—found themselves on the scrap-heap.

One can imagine the feelings of the people in Collie, particularly the women-folk, who want to know if men are to be displaced from the collieries as a result of the tenders. It was for that reason that I tried to elicit information by asking questions in this House as to when the coal contracts could be made known, so that I could, through the newspaper in Collie, tell the people that everything was all right. I am thankful to the Premier for informing me that the tender has been signed by the Griffin Company.

I have no interest in Western Collieries or in the Griffin Company, which are still operating. Western Collieries is a very good company to deal with, and I am sure this sentiment will be echoed by the officers of the Mines Department. Today the position is very different from that of three years ago when the Griffin Co. in effect declared it would ruin Amalgamated Collieries by offering open-cut coal at £1 a ton. That is a fact.

Mr. Brand: The company made a very good offer of £1 a ton.

Mr. H. MAY: The Premier should have been informed. Very soon afterwards that company approached the Premier for an increase in the price of open-cut coal, because it had no possible chance of supplying coal to the State Electricity Commission and the Government railways at £1 a ton. Some record should be kept of instances like that, which affect a vital part of the State.

I do not hold any brief for Amalgamated Collieries, but I say that the offer of the Griffin Company made three years ago of £1 a ton for open-cut coal made it necessary for Amalgamated Collieries to go out of existence. The result was that two coal mining companies were left. The fact remains that Western Collieries could not at present, or three years hence, supply all the coal requirements of this State if the Griffin Company had not come to some understanding in regard to the tenders. That was the peg on which the Griffin Company hung its hat, because it knew the Government could not get sufficient coal from Western Collieries. There were only two companies to supply the coal, and as a consequence the Griffin Company had the Government by the throat. That was the reason for the negotiations dragging on. I do not know what took place, but I have a fair idea in view of what happened three years ago.

We have the statement which was published in the business section of the *Weekend News* indicating that the Griffin Company has been granted a contract to supply coal to the Muja power house when it starts to operate. No other publicity has been given to this matter; and outside of the Government nobody would know that the Griffin Company has been given a contract to supply coal even before the power house is anywhere near completion. I shall probably want to know more about this later on.

To revert to what happened three years ago, on the 13th November I asked this question of the Minister representing the Minister for Housing—

- (1) How many—
 - (a) State rental houses;
 - (b) State purchase houses;
 - (c) War service houses,
 are unoccupied at the present time at Collie?
- (2) How many of the above have been vacant since July, 1960?
- (3) What is the estimated loss in rentals of the abovementioned houses since January, 1960?
- (4) Does the State or Federal Government suffer such losses?

- (5) What is the estimated amount paid to the Shire of Collie on these vacant houses in the nature of rates, and from what source is this met?
- (6) What is the estimated amount paid to the Water Supply Department on these vacant houses and from what source is this met?
- (7) What is the estimated cost of repairing these empty houses and paying for fire safety measures, and who pays for these costs?

Members will bear in mind the upset that was caused three years ago. From that time until now the result is as indicated in the answer given. The reply given by the Minister was—

- (1) Houses unoccupied at present at Collie—
 - (a) State rental—55.
 - (b) State purchase—38.
 - (c) War service—2.

Those figures have no relation to the private houses that have been vacated as a result of the coal tenders of three years ago. Continuing with the answers—

- (2) Only one State rental home has been vacant since July, 1960.

I do not know how they arrived at that figure. To continue—

- (3) The estimated loss in rentals on State rental homes since January, 1960, is £37,000.
- (4) The State bears the loss in this case, and a claim cannot be made on the Commonwealth as there were no losses in the overall operations under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement.

That answer implies that in spite of these empty houses, no loss was made. What would have been a loss must have been paid by the rest of the State Housing Commission tenants who occupied houses over the last three years. Is that fair to the people who are still living in those houses? Obviously the State makes up the loss from the unoccupied houses by charging extra rent to the tenants who remain. That is apparently the way the game goes on. Continuing—

- (5) £1,450 paid to the Shire of Collie on vacant State rental homes. These are paid from Commonwealth-State revenue. Rates are not paid on vacant purchase homes.
- (6) £2,850 paid to the Water Supply Department on vacant State rental homes. These are paid from

Commonwealth - State revenue. Water rates are not paid on vacant purchase homes.

Because the Government does not pay the rates, it indicates that there is no loss. The last answer was as follows:—

- (7) £4,500 to £5,000 estimated cost of repairing and paying for fire safety met from Commonwealth-State revenue.

All of this is the result of the upset which this Government caused three years ago in regard to coal tenders, to say nothing of the fact that hundreds of people lost everything they possessed in a personal way, apart from what I read out. It would be difficult to estimate what some people lost. Some houses were half paid for, while others were 75 per cent. paid for; and the people lost the lot. In addition, they lost their employment, as well as the amenities they were buying on time payment, because being on the basic wage which they obtained in the Forests Department they could not meet their payments. There was a wide difference between the basic wage and the wages they were receiving whilst working in the mine.

Whilst these people were working in the mine they were entitled to say to themselves that they could afford to buy this and buy that on time payment, but all of a sudden in December, 1960, as a result of the coal tenders being finalised they found they were redundant so far as the coalmining industry was concerned and that they would have to go all over the State in order to find employment. This necessitated their leaving their homes. Those who were buying motorcars, as well as other amenities such as washing machines, and so on, lost the lot.

I want to know why Collie has been selected for this sort of treatment. During the regime of the Hawke Government, arrangements were made whereby £500,000 per year was saved as a result of a re-adjustment of coal orders. An amount of £500,000 per year was saved for three years! Then this Government took over and, as a result of the tenders of three years ago, another £500,000 per year was saved. Can anybody tell me what other industry in this State could afford to give to the Government £1,000,000 per year?

The Government did not provide any means by which these men could be engaged in other employment; it simply said, "You are out of work and we will employ you if we can, in the Forests Department on the basic wage." But the men had to go far and wide to obtain employment; and some had to go up north. I want to know why this particular industry has been selected for such treatment, while other industries are being subsidised by this Government to the extent of millions of pounds in order to

encourage them to come to this State. The Government subsidises industry on the one hand, yet it did this cruel thing to a town in this State—a town that has given yeoman service to this State so far as the coalmining industry is concerned.

I am going to quote some figures later on, and I hope I will not bore the Chamber. The figures are amazing and they amply demonstrate to what extent oil is replacing coal. We all know that oil is an enemy of the coal industry in this State. The figures I propose to give to the House are a comparison as between the use of oil and coal, and they are quite remarkable. For instance, in 1959-60, oil was used by the State Electricity Commission—I have not got the figures for the railways—to the extent of 12,172 tons and, for the same period, 5,662 tons of coal. For 1960-61—and this is a revelation, remembering the year before—the figures were 85,060 tons of oil and 76,936 tons of coal. Those figures show an increase of 72,888 tons of oil, and 71,274 tons of coal.

In 1961-62 oil was used to the extent of 43,971 tons, and coal to the extent of 35,675 tons. These figures show a variation of 41,089 tons of oil, and 41,261 tons of coal. In 1962-63, the consumption of oil was 40,201; and of coal, 31,270 tons. This represents a variation of 3,770 tons of oil, and 4,405 tons of coal.

Now we come to the cost of oil as compared with the cost of coal. This is very important from the State's point of view, and it demonstrates why the State should continue to use coal instead of so much oil. In 1959-1960 oil was £21 4s. 3d. a ton and coal was £4 13s. 4d. a ton landed at East Perth and South Fremantle. It is estimated that one ton of oil equals two tons of coal, or near enough. It is 2.17 tons of coal actually. Therefore two tons of coal cost £9 6s. 8d. The difference between the two tons of coal and the one ton of oil was £11 17s. 7d.

In 1960-61—in January, 1960, the new coal tenders came into force—the price of oil was reduced from £21 4s. 3d. to £9 18s. 9d., and the price of the two tons of coal was £9 6s. 8d. Members can realise what capers the oil companies were up to! Before the tenders were finalised at the beginning of 1960 the oil companies were charging £21 4s. 3d. a ton for their oil. Taking it on the basis of two tons of coal to one ton of oil, they were overcharging this State £11 17s. 7d. a ton for oil. Can members imagine any Government of this State, having such large quantity of coal at its disposal paying £11 17s. 7d. a ton more for oil than it would have to pay for coal?

I have some further illuminating figures here. Why is the Government doing this? It is not because the coal cannot be used, because I will in a moment demonstrate

the tonnage of coal which could have been used and would have been used had it not been for the oil. I think it is a revelation! This Government was asking the taxpayers of this State to pay £11 17s. 7d. more to purchase oil.

Mr. J. Hegney: Is that to suport local industry?

Mr. H. MAY: Previous Governments of this State have always said that they would use 100 per cent. native coal—but not this Government. The McLarty-Watts Government did. It stated it would use 100 per cent. native coal for our State instrumentalities. I want to know why this Government has departed from that policy. Is there any answer to that question? There must be one, and I want to know what it is!

In 1961-62, coal was £4 3s. 5d. a ton, and oil had been reduced to £8 10s. As a consequence on a 2-ton to 1-ton basis, it was still undercut. Oil was dearer by 3s. 2d. per ton for that period. In 1962-63, coal was £4 4s. 9d. a ton, while oil was £7 19s. 11d. a ton, which is near enough to £8. As a result, coal for that particular year was 9s. 7d. dearer than oil. I think there should be some explanation forthcoming in regard to that.

On Tuesday, the 15th October, I asked the Premier the following questions:—

- (1) Is it a fact that oil companies operating in this State are, in order to secure trade, supplying oil burning equipment at no cost to companies and industrial establishments and then supplying oil at a price with which coal cannot compete?
- (2) Does he realise the coal industry in this State is fast losing private trade through the unfair trading actions of the oil companies?
- (3) Will he have this matter investigated; and if the position is found to be as stated above, will he take some immediate action to protect our native coal against such unfair competition?

The Premier's replies, which were illuminating, were as follows:—

- (1) and (2) The Government has no information about the supply of oil burning equipment at no cost to companies or industrial establishments or trading methods which could be classed as unfair.

Why leave it at that? Why not have some inquiries made to see if that is true? I want to know if the statement is true. But nothing has been done. The public are

entitled to know because they are paying for this oil. The answers continue—

It is realised that the supply of various forms of fuel is competitive, and it is reasonable to assume users weigh up all factors before deciding on a particular fuel.

Why assume? Why not find out what these oil companies are up to? The Government should find out in the interests of the public. The answer to No. (3) was as follows:—

- (3) I understand the Tariff Board has inquired into matters of this nature and the National Coal Board was represented. Presumably the Tariff Board was satisfied that no special protection for coal was necessary.

I ask members: Is that a satisfactory reply to the questions I raised? Earlier this afternoon we were talking about initiative. Surely the Government should recognise that the coal industry of this State needs some protection from these avaricious oil companies which are prepared to drop their oil price just below the price of two tons of coal, in order to keep coal off the market!

This reminds me of the Holden motor company. When it started it indicated it would produce a working man's car at a working man's price.

Mr. Davies: You have to work to get it.

Mr. H. MAY: But what happened? Members all know what happened—the company kept the price of the Holden just below the price of the imported cars. Working man's car, my foot! The oil companies have adopted the same system. Surely, on behalf of the coalmining industry, I am entitled to ask why this Government has not taken action to give some protection to the coalmining industry of this State!

That brings me back to this point: Why is Collie being singled out for this particular treatment? We have a large town, and a very good class of people living in that town.

Mr. Craig: And a very good member.

Mr. H. MAY: I will accept the statement of the Minister for Police that Collie has a very good member. That interjection did not escape me.

Mr. Craig: I did not intend that it should.

Mr. Brand: There are some very good people in all towns, and some very good members.

Mr. Craig: It came from my heart.

Mr. H. MAY: I could tell the Minister where his heart is. The present Government is prepared to bend over backwards—

Mr. Brand: To get cheap electricity.

Mr. H. MAY: —to assist financially—not by £1,000,000, or £2,000,000, but by millions of pounds—in bringing industry into this State; whilst, at the same time, it allows the Collie coalmining industry to languish for the sake of a shot in the arm. I am not asking for anything we are not entitled to. I have some figures here somewhere. The S.E.C. agreed that it could have used coal instead of 90 per cent. of the oil it used in one year. It was in either the second or third year that the S.E.C. admitted it could have used coal instead of 75 per cent. of the total oil used. That was an admission. I should have thought that a product of the State would be recognised by the Government; and this commission is burning a foreign fuel to the extent of 90 per cent., to the exclusion of coal which it admits it could have used.

Why does not somebody give some attention to this sort of thing, instead of filling our newspapers with airy-fairy stories about the State marching ahead; pushing ahead; the great plunge forward? But the Government lets an industry like the coal industry in Collie perish—because that is what it amounts to.

So long as the oil companies are prepared to sell their oil at a slightly cheaper rate than coal, then the Government is prepared to accept that position. If that is so, then all the more shame to the Government. It would not hurt the S.E.C. or the railways to ensure that the utmost possible use is made of our coal in this State; yet we hear of the price factor, and the fact that we can turn on a tap for oil and it does not make our hands dirty, and all that sort of racket. Are we getting to the stage where we should not handle coal with a shovel? The man who produces the coal still uses a shovel; and I am quite sure that if the men in the Railways Department were asked about the matter they would be prepared to use Collie coal in preference to foreign fuel.

Mr. Brand: Are you sure about that?

Mr. H. MAY: The Premier should test them.

Mr. Brand: Are you sure they would not sooner have diesels than coal? You are speaking with great authority.

Mr. H. MAY: I would ask the Premier through you, Sir, whether he approves of oil being used to the extent that it is being used.

Mr. Brand: Yes; to the extent that it gives cheaper electricity, it should be used.

Mr. H. MAY: But it does not give cheaper electricity.

Mr. Brand: Doesn't it?

Mr. H. MAY: No; not by any means.

Mr. Brand: You go on with your story.

Mr. H. MAY: In effect, the Government is saying that provided the oil companies keep the price of oil just below the price of coal, then oil should be used. I do not think there is much loyalty to this State attached to a statement like that.

Mr. Brand: If there is a change of Government, will your Government use coal and stop the use of oil?

Mr. H. MAY: When Labor becomes the Government I will treat it the same as I am treating you. If it is prepared to sacrifice an industry, like the present Government is sacrificing the Collie coal industry, then it would deserve everything that was given to it. Can anyone on the Government side tell me why Collie, which is a good town in this State, is being subjected to this? Does it mean that eventually the oil companies might get this State into such a position that there will not be any coal used at all?

Mr. Brand: No.

Mr. H. MAY: The Government is prepared to sacrifice millions of tons of coal in favour of the oil companies in this State. This is a repetition of a procedure that the oil companies have adopted in regard to the purchase of homes—some of them very large homes.

Mr. Brand: I should think that if we don't find some new deposits of cheap coal, then within the next 30 years we will be using oil entirely.

Mr. H. MAY: Oil companies have been buying homes and pulling them down so that they can build garages to sell more oil. Are we going to allow that sort of thing to continue? I can only repeat that if this Government continues to do that sort of thing, then the people of this State will realise what the Government is doing—wasting the ratepayers' money—and they will determine, when the time comes, that there must be a change of Government, in order to see whether a change of Government will do anything to help the situation so far as the use of Collie coal is concerned.

I wish to draw the attention of the House to another matter. I have received very serious complaints from two settlers in the Collie district. This would interest the Minister for Lands; but, as usual, he is not in his seat. The two people to whom I am referring live in the Collie Shire Council district. They are being rated on their properties—I forget the exact figures—to the extent of four or five

times the amounts being paid by residents in the Blackwood and West Arthur Shire Council districts. These two people are being rated to this extent simply because 75 per cent. of Collie is occupied by the Forests Department, and the department pays no rates. This forces the Collie Shire Council to rate the people of Collie to the utmost and to the limit it is allowed to go. The council cannot finance all the work required in the district—simply because it does not receive any rates from the Forests Department, which occupies at least 75 per cent. of the area.

Members can imagine the dissatisfaction of the people. Water rates and shire council rates cost me over £1 per week. I pay more for water rates in Collie than I do on a house in South Perth that is worth double the price. My shire council rates in Collie cost me approximately £18; whereas in South Perth the rates cost me approximately £14. We talk about decentralisation. Decentralisation is just a glib expression. How can we expect people to go into country areas when they are penalised to the extent that people in Collie are penalised? I do not know about other districts, but I do know what I am talking about so far as Collie is concerned.

I have a property in South Perth which is worth double the home I have in Collie; yet I am paying more for rates on the Collie property than on the South Perth property. How do we expect people to go into the country? Is that any encouragement for them to go into the country? Of course it is not! Eventually the metropolitan area, as a consequence of what is being done to country residents, will be overburdened with people, and before long it will reach saturation point. The only outlet for the population then will be for them to go into the country, and I am illustrating the sort of treatment they will get.

If there are any other country members who are receiving the same sort of treatment as I am, then I think it is up to them to get up in this Chamber and tell the Government what is going on. I am not prepared to sit down and let it continue without giving my views on the matter; and I do not think any other member who comes from the country should hesitate to get up and express his views regarding what is occurring in his district.

I notice there is a little smile on the face of the member for Narrogin. Let him get up and tell us what rates are being charged in the Narrogin district. It is no laughing matter. I bet the member for Narrogin is not paying £1 a week; if he were he would very soon sell out, if he could.

Mr. Brand: The way he has been talking to us I thought he was paying £2.

Mr. H. MAY: Then he is a bigger mug than I thought he was. That is the only comment I have to make about that.

Mr. Brand: A very unfair one.

Mr. H. MAY: Is the Premier referring to my remarks about having to pay £1 a week?

Mr. Brand: No.

Mr. H. MAY: If the member for Narrogin will bring along his rate notices, and his water rate notice, and let me have a look at them, and I find he is having to pay £2 a week, he will find no better backer than I in a fight for the reduction of his rates.

Mr. Brand: United we stand!

Mr. H. MAY: The Premier is lucky. He lives in the metropolitan area where the rates are cheaper than they are for the people whom we send out into the country. But it is the people who live in the outback areas of the State who are keeping the people in the metropolitan area.

Mr. O'Connor: I will swap you your rates for mine.

Mr. Heal: So will I.

Mr. H. MAY: Those members probably live in mansions. I am not talking about mansions. I am talking about a working man's home. I will go out one day and have a look at the honourable member's home, and if I think he is being overcharged he can rely on me. If he kicks up a noise about it, I will support him. That is fair enough.

Mr. Brand: It is too near Christmas for that.

Mr. H. MAY: It is of no use mumbling. We have to face up to these things. Some members have never lived in the country. They go there for a holiday, but one has to live in the country to appreciate what happens. If one is a family man living in the country, and a member of the family falls sick, one does not take that person to the hospital in a taxi; it is necessary to make a trip, probably hundreds of miles, to get the child to hospital. That is another disadvantage of having to live in the country, and all these aspects should be taken into consideration.

I believe everybody is entitled to pay his fair share according to the conditions under which he is getting a living. There is nothing fairer than that. But these days, as soon as migrants land at Fremantle those in charge say, "You can't stop in the metropolitan area. You have to go out into the country." I agree that that is a good thing. But what happens to the poor devils when they get out into the country? I know the circumstances

under which some of them are living—I know them only too well—because immediately they are in difficulties they come to their local member. He comes to Perth to see the department and says, “I would like you to do something about this”; but very seldom is anything done in connection with it.

But if something happens to a street in Perth, or to the lights in the metropolitan area, there is an army of workmen on the job in no time. When that sort of thing happens in the country the people have to put up with it. What I am saying is perfectly true, and I would be more satisfied if members representing country districts would do the same as I am doing now and draw attention to the disadvantages and the drawbacks people have to suffer as a result of going into the country to live. Migrants do not have any choice now; they have to go to the country. At one time a migrant could elect to stay in the metropolitan area, but now there is no choice. Immediately migrants arrive at Fremantle they are sent out into the country to live under the conditions which I have described.

Then we say we are living in a civilised State. Civilised, my foot! I wish some members who live in the metropolitan area would take time off and go to the country to see what some of the people are putting up with. I do not think I should have to be the champion for everybody living in the country, but I am prepared to do my whack, alongside other country members, in an endeavour to have the situation rectified. The cost of living in the country, particularly for the family man, is enormous.

How often do I have to go to the Premier's Department to obtain a rail ticket to bring some sick person to Perth because he or she has not sufficient money to buy one! The doctor says that a person has to go to Perth to attend the hospital, or to get some specialised treatment, and frequently the poor devil has not enough money to get there. Consequently, I have to go to the Premier's Department to get the cost of a rail ticket to Perth. That sort of thing should not be going on in a young State like this. There is no need for it. Why do we allow it to go on? One could almost think, if not say it, that the people concerned are not interested.

I hope, as a result of what I have said this afternoon, some interest will be shown both by the Railways Department and the S.E.C. Those departments should not be using foreign fuel when at our very back door there are millions of tons of fuel for the asking. What is going to happen if a third world war breaks out? The same as when the second war broke out, I suppose. We could not get oil from overseas because the boats were being torpedoed as

fast as they sailed. Then we saw a mad rush to use coal in this State and we could not get enough of it. It is going to happen again, but in the meantime, with the exception of three deep mines and one open-cut mine, there is no opportunity of obtaining the coal supplies that will be needed. This has all been brought about because the Government is prepared to use a foreign fuel in preference to its own native fuel. As a consequence the industry has declined. We cannot find coal in five minutes.

Mr. Brand: What would be your attitude if oil were discovered in this State?

Mr. H. MAY: I will meet that when I come to it. I am not hoping that oil will not be discovered in this State. Do not think that for a moment! I am too broad-minded for that.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): The honourable member has approximately five minutes to go.

Mr. H. MAY: I wish I had another couple of hours, Mr. Chairman. I am trying to impress upon the Premier and his colleagues the seriousness of the fuel situation in this State at present. Are we to allow all those houses in Collie to remain empty? Bunbury is crying out for more houses; it cannot get enough of them. In Collie we have them to burn, and that is what is going to happen to them eventually. Those houses were well kept, and were surrounded by lawns and fruit trees. Now, however, grass is growing up the sides of the houses, windows and front doors are broken, and the interiors are in a terrible state. Are we to allow all this deterioration to continue among the Collie homes just for the sake of a few lousy pence when making a comparison between the price of oil and coal? I say: Shame on those who are responsible!

I can only hope that somebody, very soon, will realise the hardship that is being created in Collie because oil instead of coal is being used as a fuel in this State, and that that person will take some action to remedy the position so that the State instrumentalities will be glad to use Collie coal as a fuel.

MR. O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley) (5.12 p.m.): At this stage I would like to make some remarks pertaining to the used-car industry in this State. One can appreciate how far this industry has progressed since the war when it is realised that approximately 18,000 new vehicles are being placed on the road in Western Australia every year. Apart from those, approximately 20,000-odd motor vehicles change ownership every year, and that there are approximately 300,000 vehicles altogether using the roads of this State.

Prior to 1957 there were no regulations which required used-car dealers in this State to be licensed to sell motor vehicles, and at that time there was a great deal of unrest among those engaged in the motor trade. In 1957, however, the Government of the day provided that each used-car dealer had to hold a license to operate, and had to keep records of all transactions for the information of the Police Department. At that time, also, it was decided that each used-car dealer had to enter into a bond of £3,000 before he was permitted to operate within the State. This provision, however, was eventually waived, and I think that those in the used-car industry have since been operating fairly well without it.

Nevertheless, I would like to point out to the Minister several unsavoury features still associated with the used-car industry, and I wish to ask him to give them serious consideration during the forthcoming year. I consider it is our duty, as a Parliament, to endeavour to have this industry operate as smoothly as possible, and also to protect, as much as possible, members of the public who purchase used cars from the dealers engaged in the industry.

When, in 1957, the regulation was introduced to provide that each used-car dealer had to hold a license, every dealer was compelled to apply to the Police Department for such a license. The license fee of £5 is quite reasonable. Each dealer operating in the industry today has to keep particulars of each vehicle he buys, sells, or destroys. Each week—and, in some cases, each month—he is required to forward such particulars to the Police Department. This entails quite a good deal of work and, quite frankly, I would say that a dealer who sells approximately 500 vehicles a year would find it necessary to employ one person full-time keeping the records that are supplied to the Police Department up to date.

This work involves the inspection of each vehicle, recording the plate number and the engine number, and arranging transfers. Further, it is necessary for each dealer to pay a £1 transfer fee for each vehicle he buys or sells. The particulars of all these transactions are forwarded to the Police Department. There is a further provision that any person who sells fewer than 15 vehicles in any one year is not required to hold a used-car dealer's license. I feel that this provision, to some degree, has been abused, because there are some backyard dealers who operate along the lines of selling 15 vehicles every year in their own names, 15 vehicles in their wives' names, and 15 vehicles in the names of other members of their families. Therefore, it could so happen that such a backyard dealer could be dealing in a total number of 60 or 70

vehicles every year without having to provide any of the particulars which are required to be provided by those used-car dealers who are licensed.

In some instances, when a backyard dealer transfers a vehicle the transaction is not carried out in his own name, for the purpose of avoiding the payment of the transfer fee which is due to the Police Department. I consider this is one feature of the industry which could be investigated by the Minister because I think this figure of 15 vehicles per year which such a person is permitted to sell without being licensed is an excessive number, and, in my opinion, a more realistic figure would be five vehicles per year.

I also believe that whilst the majority of used-car dealers conduct their business in an ethical and decent manner by trying to do the right thing for each of their clients; namely, by dealing only in roadworthy vehicles, there are a few dealers who are not so ethical in their operations and who do not care what kind of vehicle they sell. At the moment the Police Department has no authority to enter the yards of used-car dealers to ascertain whether the vehicles available for sale are in a roadworthy condition. I realise there are many dealers who accept unroadworthy vehicles merely for the sake of passing them on to motor wreckers. In such an instance, of course, no action is required by the Police Department. It does not matter whether the vehicle has faulty steering or faulty brakes, because it is only going to be broken up for scrap or for spare parts.

When a vehicle is sold and goes out on the road, it is most important to ensure that it is in a roadworthy condition—and this applies particularly to the steering and the brakes—so that the purchaser is not likely to have an accident within a few yards of where he purchased the vehicle. Fortunately, there are not many dealers who send unroadworthy vehicles out on the road; but this has been done in some instances, and I feel that the Police Department should be granted authority to enter the yard of any used-car dealer for the purpose of inspecting the vehicles available for sale and to ensure that each and every one of them is in roadworthy condition. This would not entail a great deal of work, and would ensure that members of the public would get a fair deal and be sold a roadworthy vehicle before driving it on the road.

Another point I want to bring to the notice of the Minister is that only one police officer is operating in the metropolitan area on used-car work, despite the fact that there are about 250 used-car dealers in this city. It is impossible for one officer to cover completely the work he should do when visiting used car dealers'

yards. This becomes quite obvious when it is considered that this officer is expected to visit each and every one of these yards to ensure that they are running smoothly by inspecting their records when necessary and ensuring that they are kept up to date, so that at any time when the Police Department wants information about a certain vehicle that has been sold, the information can be made available quickly.

This does happen on many occasions. I have known an instance where a party has been called out of bed at 2 o'clock in the morning by the Police Department to find out who purchased a vehicle sold during that day, so as to enable the police to catch up with the party for, perhaps, having committed some breach of the law.

One man cannot possibly patrol the entire metropolitan area and see that these yards are kept up to date, and ensure that the various records required by the Police Department of the dealers are kept in order. I do know that at times there have been two traffic men on the job, but even that, I feel, is insufficient. The money that comes from this industry will be considerable when one takes into account the number of vehicles that are handled, and put through the Police Department. Even without the actual license fees, about £35,000 or £40,000 a year in actual transfer fees is received from this industry, and I feel that something further could be done to ensure extra policing of these yards.

Dealers have selected certain parts of the metropolitan area which they consider might possibly be the best for yards to operate in. While I have no qualms about that—I think a person should be permitted to operate in the area he thinks best—there are a large number of these firms starting up yards in the metropolitan area in front of dwelling houses. When a firm wishes to open up a yard, there should be some authority from the Police Department to state whether it should or should not open up. I think a suitable yard should be obtained before a license is granted to the people concerned. While most of these yards are kept fairly clean, and are usually in a good condition, there are a number that are not looked after very well; and in some cases they look a little like junk yards.

The only other feature to which I wish to refer on this matter is that of hours. Over the last 12 months there has been quite a lot of unrest in this industry regarding certain dealers who have been operating on Sunday mornings, Saturday afternoons, and at any other time they wish.

I do realise that the recent factories and shops legislation will possibly adjust this to some degree. I do not mind what hours a dealer remains open—whether it

be Saturday afternoon, Sunday morning, or all night—as long as he abides by the law. Up till now a number of dealers have endeavoured to abide by the law in every instance; but there are a few operating in the State—I do not think there would be more than 30—who would be breaking the law every Sunday morning by opening their yards; being fined £10 if they are caught; and then feeling that it does not matter, because they had made £100 during that period.

These people are certainly skimming the cream off the profits—profits which the people who abide by the law should get. Irrespective of what hours are set down, people who break the law all the time should be brought into line. Yet we find that the Police Department, at this stage, has no control over such happenings. I would like to see something put into the Act to give the police some control over the hours to be worked.

Progress

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

ALUMINA REFINERY AGREEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [5.26 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill, with its schedule attached, is made necessary because of the need to enter into an agreement to amend the original agreement dated the 7th June, 1961, between the Government and Western Aluminium No Liability. The refinery Bill is known as the Alumina Refinery Agreement Act, 1961. Members know the industry associated with this agreement in more general terms as the Alcoa alumina refinery at Kwinana, which refinery is established to process bauxite from the nearby hills area. The amending agreement which requires ratification deals with—

The title to the works site.

Provisions related to the effluent disposal areas.

Annual fee payable for the right to occupancy of the temporary reserves.

Variations clause.

Clarification of the expression "Crown land".

Clarification of the areas to be treated as temporary reserves within the meaning of the agreement.

It is regretted that it has been necessary to bring this Bill to Parliament, but in the interests of both the State and the company, and to remove legal doubts about one or two matters that have arisen as a result of practical experience, it was felt desirable to introduce the Bill this session, particularly as the company has made such remarkable progress in the establishment of its industry. Members will recall that, under the original agreement, it need not have commenced construction of the refinery until about 1965. In point of fact the refinery has been completed to a stage where bauxite is actually being processed as part of the plant test run processes.

The railway has been constructed from Jarrahdale to Kwinana. Some of the most modern aluminium trucks have been constructed and are in operation for the transport of bauxite, and the mining and loading terminals at Jarrahdale are in operation. The refinery is costing about £10,000,000, compared with the figure of £5,000,000 specified in the original agreement, and it will be capable of processing 210,000 tons of alumina per annum as against 120,000 tons required by the agreement. It is also important to note that the layout and construction of the plant is such that it will permit expansion to many times the present capacity, without serious dislocation of the operations. This is the type of planning we like to see.

The events that have taken place in the alumina industry throughout the world, have highlighted the value of the 1961 agreement. At the time it became apparent to the Government that it was most important that Western Aluminium No Liability become associated with one of the world's great aluminium processing companies, if Western Australia was to get any substantial economic advantage from its bauxite deposits, in view of the companies interested in the huge Weipa bauxite deposits. The combination of Comalco, Alcan, and now Pechiney in Queensland, would have made the entry into Western Australia of a group of less experience and substance than Alcoa well-nigh impossible, and our deposits would have had little, if any, value beyond occasional export.

Dealing more specifically with the amendments, I have the following comments to make. Under clause 3 (4) of the principal agreement the State was empowered to sell the works site to the company for £250 an acre. This clause in the original agreement appears on page 6 of the ratifying Act of 1961.

At the time this clause was drafted it was not realised that immediately prior to the sale some of the land in question would be Crown land subject to the Land Act. It was felt all of it would be dealt with under those special Acts dealing with

industrial land and Kwinana land. However, some of it has to be dealt with as Crown land, subject to the Land Act.

A further complication is that the company, for domestic reasons, desires the Crown grant to issue subject to the existing mineral lease, and to be limited to surface only except where it is necessary to excavate for foundations. Members will see that in the amendment to the agreement it specifies a depth of 40 feet only, which is different to the normal title that is given. The reasons are related to the fact that the company wants to have a title issued, subject to the existing mineral lease, and be limited to surface only, except where it is necessary to excavate for foundation.

Clause 5 of the agreement is to overcome difficulties that have arisen in dealing with effluent and providing effluent areas. In connection with this amendment it must be remembered that when the principal agreement was drafted the residue areas had not been acquired, nor had the properties or nature of the effluent been properly examined.

Now that effluent is available the company intends to conduct experiments on a pilot scale to determine the degree of natural settlement, whether residue will readily support vegetation, etc.

Members will notice that the amending agreement provides that the land made available by the State under the terms of the original agreement will be filled by the company in such manner and to such level or levels as the parties may agree; or, failing agreement, as provided in the original agreement.

This is to give a degree of flexibility that the original agreement did not give, because it is felt that there will be better methods found from time to time for dealing with this effluent. Under the terms of the original agreement this is too restrictive and this flexibility is important.

However, I emphasise that the new agreement in effect provides that where agreement cannot be reached between the Government of the day and the company the terms of the original agreement shall prevail. In other words, the position is strengthened, not weakened.

The amendment dealing with the rent of temporary reserves is to increase the figure provided in the original agreement from £50 to £100 per annum. This has been accepted by the company in its discussions with the Mines Department, and is related to the amended temporary reserves areas covered by the amending agreement. The variations clause has been amended to give greater flexibility in the administration of the agreement than the original clause.

We have found by experience that the Government of the day will be unduly hamstrung in the day-to-day administration of an agreement such as this one if the original clause prevails, because it is very difficult to be certain what constitutes a "material or substantial alteration of the obligations and rights of either party."

On examination, I am sure members will appreciate that the amended variations clause is in the interests of all concerned, as an agreement of this nature is going to continue for a long time and there will be many problems which should be resolved by the Government of the day without the need for legislative action each time.

I emphasise, however, that this does not mean to say that the objectives of the original agreement can be interfered with. In this regard I have obtained a summary of this particular clause. I think the following summarises the position very well, and should be recorded for the information of members—

Clause 28 of the Alumina Refinery Agreement permits variations only "so long as such cancellation, addition variation or substitution shall not constitute a material or substantial alteration of the obligations or rights of either party under this Agreement".

The expression, "a material or substantial alteration" is not a term of art. It could be argued that unless an alteration were material, there would be no need for a new agreement of variation. In any event, the Courts are likely to give a narrow construction of the expression.

In an agreement of the magnitude and novelty of this Agreement minor variations are likely from time to time to arise—as they have done in relation to many of the other agreements approved by Parliament in recent years.

The problem is to give to the Government of the day some measure of power to make binding minor variations without making the power too wide.

A perusal of the Commonwealth Statutes of 1961 showed the following clause 10 of an agreement between the Commonwealth and the State of New South Wales with respect to certain coal loading works approved by the Commonwealth Act No. 93 of 1961:—

10. To the extent that it is necessary for the more efficient fulfilment of the objectives of this agreement, the Schedule to this agreement may be varied in such manner and to such extent as the

Treasurer and the State Minister agree and all references in this agreement to the Schedule shall be deemed to be to the Schedule as varied in accordance with this clause.

This clause seemed to give the two Governments power to make binding variations of a minor character provided they were necessary for the more efficient fulfilment of the objectives of the agreement. If the variation agreement should conflict with any of the objectives of the agreement, then clearly they would be outside the scope of the authority conferred by the respective Parliaments.

It was thought that a precedent approved so recently by the Governments of the Commonwealth and of the State of New South Wales would be likely to be more acceptable to the Parliament of Western Australia than any new original drafting.

The proposed new clause 28 is limited in its scope by each of the following expressions—

- (a) "to the extent that";
- (b) "it is necessary";
- (c) "for the more efficient fulfilment of the objectives of this Agreement"; and
- (d) by the fact that the parties must mutually agree.

That summarises the import of this variation clause. One of its main objectives is to provide the necessary machinery to make alterations of no great significance which may arise over the years, without having to worry Parliament; but at the same time not giving power which is wide enough to interfere with the original objectives approved by Parliament.

Yet another amendment in the agreement is to clarify the position in respect of Crown land. In particular it deals with land within the leased area and land within the temporary reserves and which lands might be within the boundaries of the water reserves or catchment area constituted under any Act of the State Parliament.

I emphasise that the position is fully protected in view of the wording of subsection (2) of the proposed new section 33—

The Company shall at all times comply with and observe the provisions of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act, 1909, and all other Acts for the time being having application to any water reserve or catchment area within the

leased area or temporary reserve aforesaid and nothing in this Agreement shall be construed so as to abridge, limit or qualify those provisions in their application as aforesaid.

Finally, the amending agreement provides for clarification in respect of temporary reserves 2445H and 2446H. It has always been the understanding that these reserves were part of the project and at the appropriate time could be considered together with the temporary reserve area referred to in the original agreement.

It was always intended that if bauxite in payable quantities was found on these reserves, areas could be converted to lease conditions as part of the special lease provided for in the original agreement. It has been found by reference to the Crown Law Department that this is not so; and although the company held temporary reserves 2445H and 2446H, with a clear intention that at the appropriate time those parts having payable quantities of bauxite of suitable grade in them would form part of the lease area, it is not now practicable to do this without the authority of Parliament. Therefore this amendment has been proposed.

I shall make available to the Opposition, although it is not required by the actual agreement, a plan of these two reserve areas 2445H and 2446H showing their relationship to the areas that are already referred to in the original agreement, so as to illustrate their significance in the general area.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Tonkin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Second Reading

MR. WILD (Dale—Minister for Labour) [5.42 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Following the decision of Parliament during the last few days to amend the Industrial Arbitration Act, this small Bill is consequential to that legislation under which is established the Western Australian industrial commission. Under the present Act, provision is made for decisions of the Coal Industry Tribunal to be reviewed by the Court of Arbitration on leave granted by the president.

This measure proposes that the Coal Tribunal's decisions may be reviewed by the commission in court session on leave granted by the chief industrial commissioner. Another consequential change is that the Coal Tribunal's awards will be

filed in the office of the Industrial Registrar, instead of the office of the clerk of the court.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Tonkin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Hours for Closing Days of Session

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [5.43 p.m.]: With your permission, Mr. Acting Speaker, I wish to make a statement in connection with the sitting hours for next week.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Crommelin): Very well.

Mr. BRAND: It is proposed that the House will sit at 2.15 p.m. on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday; and at 11 a.m. on Friday, with no limitation as to hours. This will allow some prospect of being able to finish the present session next week. It is not intended to rush the session too much at the end of the week, but we have some hopes of finishing; and I am sure every member would agree that if we can achieve that result, it will be highly desirable.

Mr. Tonkin: How many more Bills have you to bring in?

Mr. BRAND: There is one that was indicated when dealing with the electoral Bill; another dealing with workers' compensation; and, as far as I know, there is the possibility of one which has to do with employees' housing. However, this is not finally decided. I suggest that members make no commitments for the time being for the week ending the 13th December.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [5.44 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 2.15 p.m., Tuesday, the 3rd December.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.45 p.m.