

suddenly faced with a bill for several million dollars, it is beyond the resources of any Government. I accept that gladly, but I do not accept that the Government cannot try to have a programme of continual replacement and upgrading of the coaches in exactly the same way as it should be doing with its other services and equipment. With those comments I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr McIver.

House adjourned at 10.12 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 8th April, 1976

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

ANZAC DAY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Standing Orders Suspension

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [2.36 p.m.]: In moving this motion perhaps I should make a brief explanation to the House. The purpose in suspending Standing Orders is to enable debate and consideration of the Bill to proceed in order that the legislation may be dealt with prior to the House rising for the Easter break, that being the last occasion on which the legislation can be dealt with prior to Anzac Day. The Bill proposes that the Anzac Day holiday be held on the 26th April. I have mentioned to the Leader of the Opposition my intention to move the motion and I hope the House will agree to it. I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended so as to enable the Anzac Day Act Amendment Bill to be taken on receipt of a Message from the Legislative Assembly and to have precedence each day before the Address-in-Reply, and to be passed through all stages at any one sitting.

Question put and passed.

Second Reading

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [2.39 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

I would like to convey my appreciation to the House for its willingness to agree to the suspension of Standing Orders so that we may now proceed with the Bill.

Under the provisions of the Anzac Day Act, 1960-1975, racing and sporting clubs are required to submit statements to the Anzac Day Trust, setting out receipts and payments of their activities on Anzac Day,

and pay a statutory percentage of any net proceeds derived from the holding of their respective fixtures to a trust fund.

This year, Anzac Day falls on a Sunday and, for the first time, the provisions of the Public and Bank Holidays Act, 1972 will apply, making Monday, the 26th April, a public holiday. However, in view of the interpretation of "Anzac Day" in the Anzac Day Act as it now stands, there is no compulsion for racing and sporting clubs to make any contribution to the trust fund from fixtures conducted on that Monday holiday.

As it happens, the Western Australian Turf Club, and the Western Australian Trotting Association, have kindly agreed to conduct meetings on Monday, the 26th April, this year on behalf of the trust and pay over the net proceeds from those meetings.

In view of this, it is considered desirable to make the necessary amendments to enable the provisions of the Anzac Day Act to apply to the Monday holiday, rather than the 25th April when Anzac Day falls on a Sunday. For this purpose the amendments apply to section 5 of the principal Act, which covers payment to the trust of the net proceeds of race meetings held on Anzac Day in the metropolitan area, and to section 7, which requires the club, association or body conducting certain defined sports on Anzac Day to pay 60 per cent of net proceeds to the trust.

I commend the Bill to the House.

THE HON. D. W. COOLEY (North-East Metropolitan) [2.41 p.m.]: Mr President, we on this side have no opposition to the Bill which is at present before the House. We feel it is in accordance with the principle of the Anzac Day holiday, and we have pleasure in supporting it.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Thank you.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (the Hon. R. J. L. Williams) in the Chair; the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short title and citation—

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Mr Deputy Chairman, I would like you to clarify my thinking in respect of this Bill. I understand it provides that when Anzac Day falls on a Sunday, then racing and trotting meetings may be held on the Monday. At those meetings the TAB will operate, from which the Government will receive revenue. Could it be said that this is a revenue producing Bill that has been introduced in this Chamber?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I assure the honourable member that the Bill was introduced in the other House and is the subject of a message in this place.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice), and passed.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SEVENTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 7th April, on the following motion by the Hon. N. McAleer—

That the following address be presented to His Excellency—

May it please Your Excellency:

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

THE HON. G. W. BERRY (Lower North) [2.45 p.m.]: I rise to support the Address-in-Reply. Before commencing my remarks, I would like to offer my congratulations to Miss McAleer on the address she gave in moving the motion. I also congratulate the Hon. Des Dans upon his election as Leader of the Opposition.

I will direct my remarks in this debate to a few matters which concern the province I represent. I refer first of all to a hardy annual; that is, the water supply for the irrigated areas of the Gascoyne. I will not give a long dissertation on this matter today. However, to get the record straight I would like to repeat once again that investigations were commenced in the Gascoyne River as a result of an undertaking given by the Brand Government. That undertaking resulted in the first money being spent on a pilot scheme which it was hoped would be the forerunner of a more grandiose scheme. It was the Brand Government which committed itself and future Governments to this work.

While I do not wish to enter into controversy regarding which Government has spent the most money, I want it to be known that the Brand Government commenced the work and was the instigator of the pilot scheme. That Government prepared a submission to the Federal Government in the first place. I understand that as a dam was not feasible, the Public

Works Department recommended the scheme that was finally accepted by the Federal Government.

I wish to refer to another happening in the saga of the Gascoyne River, and this concerns the announcement made by the Federal Government. Firstly, I refer back to page 480 of *Hansard* of 1974. When speaking in the Address-in-Reply debate on the 13th August, 1974, I said—

This is the seventh year I have been in this House asking for assistance to be granted to stabilise the water supply of those people residing in the irrigated areas surrounding the Gascoyne River, but to date there does not appear to be any assistance forthcoming—with one exception, which was on the occasion of the opening of the Federal Parliament prior to the election on the 18th May. In her speech, Her Majesty the Queen mentioned that provision was to be made for the allocation of money to be spent on the irrigated areas of the Gascoyne district and the conservation of water from the Gascoyne River.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Nobody denies that.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: That is correct; I am not asking anyone to deny that. I am merely pointing out that, as is recorded in another part in *Hansard*, an announcement was also made after a meeting of Cabinet in Carnarvon.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: It was made in the Federal Parliament.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: When the Hon. J. T. Tonkin made the announcement he had just received word from Canberra that the Queen in Her Speech, either by coincidence or by design, was able to inform the people that provision was being made for the allocation of \$6 million for the scheme that had been recommended by the Brand Government. Following the passage I have just read out, the Hon. R. Thompson interjected and said—

You will be the first member on the Government side who will praise the Federal Government.

In reply to that, I said—

I am not praising it. We have not received the money yet. I will praise it when the money is received.

I had little to say during 1975, because I was waiting patiently for the money to come through. I think I was very, very patient.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: So were the people of Carnarvon in the 1960s.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: Mr Dellar should be quiet for a moment. I also asked a question in this House on Wednesday,

the 3rd September, 1975 which appears on page 2457. The question and answer read as follows—

The Hon. G. W. BERRY, to the Honorary Minister representing the Minister for Water Supplies:

What is the present position of the Commonwealth Government in regard to the funding of the Gascoyne Irrigation Groundwater Scheme?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

Contrary to early expressed intentions, the Prime Minister has informed the Premier by letter dated 15th August, 1975, that the Commonwealth Government will not be providing funds in the 1975/76 budget for the Gascoyne Irrigation Groundwater Scheme.

In retrospect only a day or two ago the Hon. Ron Leeson mentioned a similar matter in regard to the people of Kalgoorlie and the assistance that was promised to the goldmining industry. I think this is a sort of parallel because the answer is that no provision has been made. I hope that before my time finishes in this House we will see this scheme completed. So much for the Gascoyne groundwater scheme.

One other matter which does not concern my province very much but does concern me is the matter of R-rated films being shown at drive-in theatres. I remember that when the then Chief Secretary, the Hon. Claude Stubbs, was introducing a Bill regarding R-rated films it was mentioned that R-rated films would not be shown at drive-ins and would be shown only at city theatres. It was said that drive-ins would be reserved for the family to enjoy. We have come a long way since then because I think that at almost every drive-in there would be an R-rated film of some description.

As a matter of interest, on page 33 of the *Daily News* of Wednesday, the 7th April, there is an article with the heading, "Red faces when the movie turns blue". The *Daily News* is a very authoritative newspaper which is quoted quite extensively in this House. I am not interested at all in the article but I am interested in that it says—

Brittany unionists threaten to boycott all Paris-made films until "The Warmth of Julie" is withdrawn.

We will not be lucky enough to see that film, I suppose. The article continues—

Mr Korber said: "In my opinion this film is not pornographic. It does not show as much as 'Emmanuelle' (the most successful French soft porn production so far).

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: What is soft porn?

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: That is something which is not quite as blue as blue; a lighter shade of blue.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Is this a hangover from Carnarvon's dirty water?

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: The film "Emmanuelle" has been at drive-in theatres, which might have been bad enough. I have not seen it. Other members might have seen it and can probably tell me whether it suited their tastes. But I understand that even worse films are being shown at drive-ins. The Chief Secretary has informed me that he has no power to do anything. I think it is about time he did have the power to do something about the matter. If we are beholden to the Commonwealth in matters of this nature, I suggest it is about time we looked after our own affairs.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You want to look at the distributors. They are the ones who make or stop these things.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: I agree with the honourable member. He said in his speech that all the distributors wanted to do was to get these R-rated films shown. It is a sorry day that we ever gave them the right to show such films.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Of course you were one of the people who supported the motion picture industry.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: With bad grace.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You supported these people fully.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: I supported the motion picture industry in its fight against daylight saving, but I do not remember that I supported R-certificate films. If I had done, it would have been with bad grace.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I drew attention to all the R-rated films which were shown at drive-in theatres on that occasion.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: We did not have them at drive-ins then. That was something that was to come in later.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I drew the matter to the attention of the House. Do not be stupid.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: If everyone has finished I will get on with my speech. I should like to mention some matters that are taking place in the Lower North Province with the development at Agnew of nickel sulphide deposits, which are on a reduced scale but are at least going ahead, and also with the prospect of an open-cut uranium mine being developed at Yeelirrie which we hope will get under way now. This is an area which was opened up by the advent of the Poseidon mine and the open-cut mine at South Windarra where they also produce nickel. The point I wish to make is that

this will mean there will be quite an influx of people into these areas. There is already quite a substantial population in the town of Laverton. I make a plea to the Government to endeavour to upgrade the communications services which consist at present of a land line which comes from Kalgoorlie, serves Leonora and goes on to Laverton. It is time to look at the upgrading of that service through either a microwave system or a co-axial cable which will allow television to be utilised throughout those areas. I think it is time we got busy now to get these facilities established instead of waiting until such time as the people are there and have them get upset because they cannot get the same facilities as are being offered in the metropolitan area.

I think it would be a good time now to start.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Not much hope with this Government.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: As with Agnew and Yeelirrie one would hope that in the future Mt. Keith will go ahead. I hope very much that the Government will make a protest to the authorities concerned to start making these facilities available.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: They will make plenty of promises.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: Another matter which concerns the area is the diesel fuel tax which shires have to pay on trucks engaged on road construction. On Wednesday, the 7th April, I asked a question of the Minister for Fuel and Energy through the Minister for Education. The question and answer are as follows—

The Hon. G. W. BERRY, to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

Further to my question 6 on Thursday, the 1st April, 1976—

- (a) have any representations ever been made to the Commonwealth for Fuel Tax exemption to be given to registered trucks when engaged solely on roadmaking; and
- (b) if not, would the Government consider making such representation?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (a) No. Registered trucks engaged on road making themselves use existing roads and therefore it is considered that they should be liable for fuel tax. The Department of customs and Excise will not exempt registered trucks used solely on road making if they are used for transporting goods over existing roads. The fuel tax paid by

the Main Roads Department is currently only about \$30 000, which is less than 4 per cent of their annual fuel bill.

- (b) In view of the above the Government does not consider that representations to the Commonwealth for exemption are warranted.

I think this is a matter that could be given some consideration by the Commonwealth. It affects not only the shires in the area which I represent but also every shire in the Commonwealth. Shires are hard-up enough as it is and I think this concession could be given to them when they are using vehicles solely for road construction.

It has been stated in a letter to me from the Shire of Sandstone that it costs that shire \$2 000 in fuel tax every year. If we take together all the other shires in the area that would make a considerable amount of money. While the Main Roads Department might need to spend approximately \$30 000, a lot of their work is done by contractors as the department itself does not engage many trucks in this sort of operation. I make a plea to the Government to make representations to the Commonwealth for some alleviation of this tax.

This problem has been a hardy annual, and the representation has been going on for years. No-one seems to be able to get anywhere and I do not know the cause of the trouble. I have written to the Hon. J. W. Howard, M.H.R., the Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs and no doubt I will receive a stereotyped answer saying it is not possible. I am sure there must be some effort by this Government, in conjunction with other State Governments, to have the fuel tax wiped out.

While listening to the speakers on the amendment to the Address-in-Reply yesterday I found it passing strange that while I was present I did not hear one word from the members who represent the Lower North Province and the South-East Province.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I refer you to page 2859 of *Hansard* for 1975.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: In view of those remarks I take it that the honourable member supports the abolition of this House, and that he also supports the move for less representation.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: If you read the report you will see what I said.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Was the honourable member not in the House on that occasion either?

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: I am not often out of the Chamber. As is the case with other members, I have to leave occasionally.

I am conscious of the fact that Mr Dellar and I represent a very large area. I believe it is 450 000 square miles or thereabout.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I would like to discuss that point with you later because I believe the area is 327 000 square miles.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I gave the correct figure in square kilometres last night.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: I understand that the word "kilometres" should be pronounced differently. It was the subject of some discussion between Mr Whitlam and Mr Cameron last year. To return to the subject: We do have a very large area to represent and there are not many people in it. The Hon. Grace Vaughan calculated that we would have to visit four people each day for 250 days and that would be a mammoth task. In fact, it would be impossible in my electorate because it extends to the South Australian border and takes in the trans-line.

I think the people in my electorate need to be well represented and I am proud to be able to represent them. There are many other matters which I could speak to but it is not my intention to weary the House at this time.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Before you resume your seat, which is the best "R" film you have seen?

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: As a matter of fact, I have not as yet seen an "R" film at all. I would be interested to know which "R" films Mr Thompson has seen, and I would pass judgment on his views. With those remarks I support the motion.

THE HON. D. W. COOLEY (North-East Metropolitan) [3.04 p.m.]: Before speaking to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply, I would take this opportunity to sincerely congratulate, in his absence, our new leader in this Chamber, the Hon. Des Dans, on his elevation to that position. I hope his appointment is short lived, as I am sure it will be, and that next year he will be occupying the seat which Mr McNeill now occupies.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Most unlikely.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Highly possible.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I would also take this opportunity to commend Mr Ron Thompson, our former leader, for his dedication to the task of leading us, and on his leadership qualities. He was an inspiration to me in this House, when I was a new member, and if I have made any contribution to the debates which have taken place that contribution has been as a result of his leadership. I thank him very much indeed.

I think Mr Ron Thompson is to be commended for the reason for his resignation. He stepped down to enable a new leader to be groomed in anticipation that we will be

in Government next year. Our leader will now be well equipped for the position of leading this House.

Despite the policy of our party in respect of the appointment of Governors in this State, I take this opportunity to congratulate our new Governor (Sir Wallace Kyle), and express my pleasure at his appointment. While it is necessary to appoint Governors in Western Australia, it is well in keeping with the policy of our party to appoint people who are Western Australian born, and who are distinguished citizens of our State, and who have excelled themselves in a particular field both here and overseas. I think his is a very fitting appointment.

As a result of my association with him in the brief time he has been here I have come to the conclusion he will be a most popular Governor. What I will say during the rest of my speech will not be disrespectful to him or to any Governor. I had a personal relationship with the past two Governors, and on many occasions I promoted good relationships between them and the organisations I represent. I refer to Sir Charles Gairdner and Sir Douglas Kendrew.

However, I feel I must comment on the garden party held on the 4th December last at Government House to welcome our new Governor. The purpose of the party was to give the people of Western Australia an opportunity to meet the Governor. That being the purpose of the exercise, I must say it failed miserably. That type of function suits only the people who are social climbers, or those who want to take an afternoon off so that they can say to their friends that they have attended the garden party.

In answer to a question I asked, it was stated that the Governor, and Lady Kyle, met between 800 and 1 000 people. They must have been very fleeting meetings because I do not think the Governor and Lady Kyle were present for very long. The garden party started at about 3.30 p.m. and to the best of my knowledge it concluded about 5.00 p.m. I am sure nobody enjoyed themselves. It was an extremely hot day, and conditions were worse than they are in this Chamber today.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Unfortunately, no-one has control over weather conditions.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It would be better if some other means were used to enable the people to meet the Governor.

The Hon. N. McNeill: You will recognise that the Governor has been meeting people constantly since that time.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The people attending the party reminded me of sheep standing under trees out of the heat—and I do not mean to be at all facetious. I journeyed to the country not long after the garden party and I saw some sheep

in a paddock on a hot day. Quite honestly, those sheep reminded me of the garden party. Nobody enjoys drinking hot tea and eating stale sandwiches on a hot day.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Did you go to this party?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes I did.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: That might be biting the hand that fed you. Usually you do not criticise your host. Someone spoke of chivalry last night, but is it not un-chivalrous to bite the hand that feeds you?

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Mr Tozer did that the other night.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I have a great deal of respect for the Governors of Western Australia, both past and present, and I will continue to have that respect while we have a Governor. I am not seeking to reflect on them. There were 11 police officers standing at the gates; would not these officers have been better employed trying to solve crimes? Also, I believe the Air Force personnel would have been better employed doing the work for which they were engaged, rather than playing lilting tunes all afternoon to a large number of social climbers.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: That is a band's job, to play lilting tunes.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Certainly the Governor of the day should meet the people. Perhaps Mr Lewis would care to listen for a while.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I thought bands were paid to play music.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If the honourable member would listen for a while, he would be able to interject intelligently.

The PRESIDENT: I ask the honourable member to address the Chair.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am trying to address the Chair, Mr President, but there are too many interjections.

The PRESIDENT: Do not worry about the interjections.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Many opportunities exist for the Governor of our State—

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: This sounds like a lilting tune!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: —to meet the people. On Saturday mornings the Governor could visit the shopping centres, and also perhaps on Thursdays, when the housewives do their shopping. I am sure this man who is our present Governor would enjoy it if he were given free rein to go out and meet the real people of our State.

The Hon. N. McNeill: He is doing a tremendous job at this very thing.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: He should not be meeting just 4 402 selected people who go to Government House to have a cup of tea.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: After the way your Government stirred up feelings about Governors, we need an army of security men.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is not true—surely not yet in Western Australia anyway.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Look how the people got riled up about Sir John Kerr.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Surely it would be part of the job—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You would make security essential for every Governor in the nation.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Look, Mr MacKinnon, as a young man—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is disgraceful, the programme you have indulged in.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I ask the Minister to listen to me. I was a swamper on a brewery truck in the late 1930s. When I was making city deliveries, hardly a day went by that I did not see Sir James Mitchell walking along St. George's Terrace.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That was before you people started your vicious campaign against Governors.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We used horse drawn lorries in those days—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Sensible people in the Labor Party in those days.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Governor would talk to the drivers of the lorries, admire the horses, and converse with people walking by. He was a very distinguished Premier of this State, and although I do not know the name of the party to which he belonged—the name changed so often—I know it was a conservative party. He did his job well, and he was quite often seen in the streets of Perth. What a wonderful opportunity this would be for our Governor to meet a large number of people. He could walk down the Hay Street mall, attend sporting functions, and many other places where he would meet the public.

I do not think it is necessary for a Governor in permanent residence to have a garden party, such as the one held on the 4th December. Perhaps when we have a fleeting visit from a member of the Royal Family, it is a good idea to hold a garden party so that people may meet such a person. However, I do not think it is necessary for a Governor who is in permanent residence. I thought I should say that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It would have been better left unsaid.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The answer I was given in reply to my question about the garden party was that it cost \$4 754.35, and possibly this excluded wages paid to the Air Force and the Police Force. Also, we must have regard for the lost working hours of the people who attended that party. Surely many of them would have been better employed in attending to the people as Government members are always saying they should.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Did you say that about the people who struck and walked up the Terrace about the fuel and energy Bill? Would it not be better if they had attended to their work?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: They had a cause.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are getting childish.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: What about the storemen and packers?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I would like to refer now to another very distinguished Western Australian—

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: That is why 760 bales of wool are on the wharf at the present time.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Disgraceful!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: —who today has celebrated his 43rd anniversary in the Parliament, and I refer to our leader (Mr John Tonkin). I have had an association with Mr Tonkin for a long period of time, as I did with his predecessor (Mr Wise). I had also a very amicable relationship with a former Premier (Sir David Brand). These Premiers were respected by all sections of the community. Mr Tonkin has the same sense of purpose and dedication as did those Premiers before him. His main attribute is that he is a man of the people. He mixed with the people, and he appreciated his role of looking after the wants and needs of the underprivileged. He never forgot his origin, and he appreciated always the fact that the Australian Labor Party was born from the trade union movement to give effect to its objectives and aspirations. He never wavered from this course. I take this opportunity to thank him for his leadership and to wish him well in the future months he spends in this Parliament, as well as many years of good health in a long and happy retirement. I am certain the members of Parliament will recognise his worth in some appropriate way.

It is not my custom to search through *Hansard* in order to be critical about things people have said in this House, except to refer to some matters that are topical at this particular time. In regard to two speeches made recently in this House, I would like to make some brief comment.

In his contribution, Mr Withers supported the proposition that people in his province who were in receipt of district allowances should be exempt from taxation in regard to those earnings. I support his proposition, but I wish he had some thought for the needs of these people when a Bill before this Parliament last year took away from the people concerned the right to have the district allowance included in their weekly workers' compensation payments.

I was surprised to hear Mr Tozer talk about musical chairs in this Chamber, because I do not think Opposition members changed seats until the recent leadership alteration. Mr Tozer spoke of the evils in the industrial relations in the Pilbara, and mostly he directed his comments against the policies of the trade union movement and the trade unions in that area. He spoke about the great industrial upheaval which is bedevilling in particular the Newman area. I would like to have had another day to research the matter, as I would have been able to supply him with some figures, because he did not draw any comparison between Newman and Hamersley Iron Pty. Ltd. I do not know whether Mr Tozer is aware of this, but Hamersley Iron Pty. Ltd. has established a very good agreement with the unions, called, of all things, the IRA agreement—the Industrial Relations Agreement.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I thought we were going to have bombs.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: No bombs. Meetings are held every month, without fail. The company makes provision for representatives of all facets of the work force to meet and to discuss the problems confronting the unions at that particular time.

If Mr Tozer makes a comparison between the number of working days lost through strikes at the two companies, he will find that the record at Hamersley Iron is very much better than it is at Newman, for the simple reason that the labour force at Hamersley has reached understanding and agreement with the management. To the best of my knowledge, Newman refuses to enter into such an agreement with the workforce.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Would the performance over the last few weeks reflect your claim?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I do not know; I am talking about the overall situation.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Would the 1964 situation reflect this?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The agreement was not reached until 1975. Hamersley Iron has realised that by regular and meaningful consultations with unions it is possible to avoid industrial disputes, and it is a pity Mr Tozer's Government does not follow the same practice.

I have attended several discussions between the officials of Hamersley Iron and representatives of the work force; the agreement gives people the right to sit around a table on a common footing, and discuss their problems. This is the basis of industrial peace. It has been achieved without the Arbitration Court, or interference from the Government or anyone else.

We would find that the time lost through strikes and other industrial problems would be considerably reduced if members opposite used their influence to encourage other companies operating in the area to enter into similar agreements. I do not say the system is perfect, but certainly it is better than that operating elsewhere. As I indicated earlier, had I been able to speak on Tuesday I would have had the figures available.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: I could have provided the figures.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: But Mr Tozer did not.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: The companies asked me not to.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Tozer spoke about union officials being out of touch with workers in the iron ore industry in the north-west because they were situated in Perth, and the scene of action was in the north-west. In every walk of life, it is not always possible for people to be fully acquainted with all aspects of their particular fields of endeavour. One has only to consider the Ministers on the other side of the Chamber. For instance, I would not like Mr Baxter to start performing an operation or some complicated medical practice on me; but he is the Minister for Health. It is not quite fair to say that union officials resident in Perth should not have the membership of that union in the north-west.

Such a statement is equally unfair when one realises how many of these companies are controlled by multi-nationals, thousands of miles from the shores of Australia. Many other examples can be brought to light. West Australian Newspapers, of all people, recently appointed the Commissioner for Taxation as its general manager. In my experience with the Swan Brewery, I know that at one time it appointed some person from a lingerie department to be in charge of its fleet of vehicles.

On the Federal scene, we find that a millionaire squatter is purporting to look after the interests of the working people of this country when he has no appreciation at all of their needs and requirements. It does not necessarily follow that because a union official is not resident in the north-west, he cannot do his job properly.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: But you would accept it would help?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I appreciate it was the 1st April when Mr Tozer made his speech. Perhaps he was trying to perpetrate a joke on this Chamber. However, he is not fooling anybody on this side; the purpose of his argument was to fragment unions into smaller units. Mr Tozer believes that Hamersley Iron should have its own separate union, as should Newman, BHP and the Swan Brewery, thus weakening and tearing apart the entire structure of the union movement. I think this is becoming the policy of all conservative politicians and people; they wish to tear down the trade union movement.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What is your alternative to the word "conservative" which you use all the time?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: A conservative politician is a politician who does not agree with change.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: But what is your alternative to that word?

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Progressive.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Not "socialist"?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We are socialists, of course; nobody denies that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The word is not "progressive" but "regressive".

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Some of the socialist countries are better off than we are, at present.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I do not know whether you are a socialist, a communist, a progressive or what.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I take exception to Mr Gayfer suggesting I may be a communist.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I did not say you were a communist; I said I didn't know what you were.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I thought all communists were socialists. They call themselves socialists.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the honourable member please address the Chair and avoid responding to these interjections. He will make more progress with his speech if he does so.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: When reading the eight pages of the Governor's Speech and the one page of proposed legislation—it does not look as though we are going to have a very busy session—I looked in vain for any reference to some form of electoral reform and industrial legislation reform. I did not really expect to find it there, but I thought perhaps a miracle may have occurred.

The Government of this State and people everywhere place a great deal of emphasis on the necessity for good industrial relations; they talk about what unions are doing to the country, and all

the rest of it. However, when a conservative Government produces a policy in support of its forthcoming programme, no mention is made of industrial legislative reform. This is the third Governor's Speech we have heard since this Government has been in office, and three times this important passage has been missing. However, throughout its existence, this Government has had a tendency to sneak in, in some form or another, anti-union legislation.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Are you referring to the present Government?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes, not once has it indicated that it would give effect to a better system of industrial relations. If the honourable member cared to examine the record of the Tonkin Labor Government he would find that its policy speeches contained a great deal with respect to industrial reform.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I remember the great reforms introduced by the Brand Government in 1964. The Industrial Arbitration Act was a magnificent reform.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I have said it before and I will say it again: Not once during its 12 years of Government did the Liberal-Country Party coalition introduce legislation to provide benefits to the working people of Western Australia. Despite the escalating costs and the boom period through which the Brand Government passed, not once did that Government go before the Arbitration Court and advocate an increase in the base wage or in any other wage.

Their colleagues in the Federal field went for 23 years without taking such action; its performance was the same as that of this State Government. I do not like to repeat myself, but when Mr Gayfer makes suggestions of that nature, they cannot go unchallenged.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: In times of financial difficulty, has your party ever supported a decrease in wages?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Let Mr Pratt tell me when his Government has ever done the things I said it has not, and I will never again raise this matter.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: I repeat: Have you ever sought a decrease in wages during times of financial difficulty?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Was not Mr Pratt around during the 1960s and the 1970s? Western Australia experienced its greatest boom during that time.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: And the greatest reform of the 1960s with the introduction of the Industrial Arbitration Act in 1964 by the Brand Government—a Bill which members opposite supported.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The wages in this State went from being the lowest to the highest in Australia.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Some people talk about what happened in 1964. The fact is that complaints have been made about the situation.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: It went through, and you did not alter it when you were in Government.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Have you ever asked for a reduction in wages, because of the financial difficulties confronting the country?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I cannot recall in my time any reduction in wages or prices in this country, except on the occasion when the basic wage was reduced by 4s., and that was some time in the 1950s. That happened because the prices went down.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Did the unions ask for that?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Of course, they asked for that.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: They asked that the wages be reduced?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The unions have a long-standing policy over many years that quarterly adjustments should be applied to wages. That applied right through the 1950s to the 1970s. Of course, when prices fell they were advocating it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Has Mr Pratt refused a wage increase as a teacher or as a politician?

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: It is typical of the honourable member that when he cannot answer a question he tries to sidestep.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: He does not have to answer you when you are sitting down.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Do I have to answer the interjections, Mr President?

The PRESIDENT: I would point out to the honourable member that he is creating substantial provocation for interjections to be made.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: You, Mr President, always seem to say that.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I say it when I regard it as being true.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I do not want to disagree with you in this respect. In many cases I am provoked.

The PRESIDENT: It does not take very much to provoke the honourable member.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I refer to the Court Government style of industrial relations, but I do not blame the Premier personally for everything that has happened.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You recognise he does have style!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We have an instance where the Trades and Labor Council made an application to the Industrial Commission to increase the minimum wage by 20 per cent. I hope members

are aware of the level of the minimum wage, because it is far removed from anything they are receiving.

In the *Daily News* of the 12th March appeared a report under the heading of "Court's double attack on TLC". The report states—

The Premier, Sir Charles Court, today attacked the TLC over its call for a new minimum wage and its opposition to migrants for difficult work areas.

He branded the TLC's decision to seek a 20 per cent rise in the \$83 minimum wage for workers under State awards as an attempt to break down wage indexation.

The Premier said it was only a few days ago that the Trades and Labor Council was "accusing other people of trying to destroy indexation."

He said Australia was going through a difficult period as a result of the three years of Whitlam rule, and would not get out of this situation if it had to face proposals such as those of the TLC.

He said of the call by TLC secretary, Mr Peter Cook, for a new minimum wage:

"If he wants to create further unemployment he is going the right way about it."

What the TLC was seeking was a 20 per cent rise in the minimum wage of \$83 per week. The amount was \$16 or \$17.

The minimum wage is based on the need to enable a man, his wife, and two children to live in reasonable comfort in accordance with modern standards. The application by the TLC sought to increase the minimum wage from \$83 to \$100 per week. Can anyone imagine a man, his wife, and two children living in comfort on \$100 a week?

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What percentage of the work force has to do that?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: About 0.2 per cent.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I was pointing out the type of industrial relations in which the Court Government engaged. That was its reaction to an application to increase the minimum wage by 20 per cent, or \$17 a week.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: If you do not know that what you are talking about is utter rubbish then you ought to read a couple of elementary books.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Why?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The question put to you by Mr Gayfer is pertinent. Of the total work force only 0.2 per cent were on the minimum wage. That question was answered in this House by me 18 years ago.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Why was it necessary for the Premier to make those remarks reported in the Press, if nobody would benefit from an increase in the minimum wage?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is based on calculation, and you know it.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It was a case of workers on low incomes making an application for an increase in the minimum wage. Several weeks ago a local brewery made an announcement that it would retrench 350 of its employees. The Government did not offer one word of comment on those sackings. All those people are now in permanent employment. That is the type of industrial relations in which the Court Government believes.

Another type of industrial relation in which the Government believes is importing workers into this State to work under substandard conditions. What wage will be paid to the unfortunate people who will be brought up to the Carnarvon area?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What do you mean by substandard wage?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Government wants to bring a captive work force into the State, and pay them \$83 per week in wages.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They cannot be paid less than what has been laid down by the Industrial Commission; so, they cannot be paid substandard rates.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What do you mean by a captive work force?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We can all recall the situation at Port Hedland when a dredge was brought in by the Brand Government to carry out some work, and a number of Japanese workers were employed on it. That was a captive work force.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: They were not in irons and chains.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Virtually that. The Japanese workmen lived on the barge; they were not allowed to come ashore; they were sent back to Japan when they became sick; and no provision was made for medical treatment here. Those people took away work from our people.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: You say that is being virtually in chains!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Virtually in chains. Then the authorities sent scabs up to Port Hedland to break up the strike.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am not involved in those interjections.

The PRESIDENT: I would ask the honourable member to address the Chair.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: In *The West Australian* of the 12th March appeared a report under the heading "Court defends migrant plan". I quote from that report—

The Government has asked the Federal Government to relax immigration rules to allow southern European farmers in the Carnarvon area to bring out relatives and friends to relieve the labour shortage on the plantations.

That takes us back to the days of the deep south in the United States of America. At that time the civil war was going on. To continue with the report—

The Premier said yesterday that the migration idea was sound.

"These people make a basic contribution. They produce the fruit and vegetables we need for our very existence," he said.

However, one possible supporter of Mr Gayfer's political party did not have a similar reaction, because the report states—

However, the secretary of the Carnarvon Fruit and Vegetable Growers' Association, Mr G. Van Der Plaats, said that imported workers at Carnarvon in the past had been treated as indentured labour.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Did he use the term "captive labour"?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: He mentioned indentured labour. To continue—

"They were paid extremely low wages by the big plantation owners and many of them never learnt to speak English," he said.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The big plantation owners referred to were people like the late Mr Harry Strickland, who was a member of this House. That statement is rubbish.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What are you quoting?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: From *The West Australian* of the 12th March. I am quoting the words, not of a union secretary or anyone associated with a union, but the Secretary of the Carnarvon Fruit and Vegetable Growers' Association—a Mr Van Der Plaats.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is *The West Australian's* report of what he said.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You mean it might not be factual?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It might not be.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: He said—

... that his association did not oppose market gardening families in Carnarvon bringing their relatives to Australia to work in the industry.

But it opposed the importation of total strangers who would find it difficult to enter into the established community.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: It is terrible to think we were importing women and children to work as captive labour on a large plantation. That is terrible.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Is this not what Mr Grassby wanted?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I thought it was his idea to bring in relatives and friends.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: From the Philippines, was it not?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Another aspect of industrial relations in this State which is crying out for some attention is section 132 of the Industrial Arbitration Act. It should be repealed as it is outdated and should not apply in a western country.

It is a section under which people are mandatorily fined for going on strike. There is no argument about it. If a person goes on strike, he is fined. If he cannot pay the fine and he has no goods and chattels of the same value which can be seized, he goes to gaol.

Last year in this Chamber I said I would write to the Prime Minister of Australia, who was then the Honourable Gough Whitlam, requesting him to ask an ILO committee of freedom of association to investigate the position here, along with a number of other pernicious provisions of the Act and some other pieces of legislation this Government has introduced since it has been in office.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: If you stick to your principles you must also agree with lockouts. Is that right?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: They are also forbidden under the Act. I am trying to make a point without any interjections. Section 132 is contrary to the principles laid down in the ILO convention which has been ratified by Australia and has the approval of the Western Australian Government.

Unfortunately Mr Whitlam was out of office by the time the letter could be given attention so I drew it to Mr Fraser's attention in late January and asked him to communicate with the ILO to request it to send the committee here. I received a brief acknowledgment of the letter and was told it had been passed on to Mr Street for attention, but I have heard nothing more in connection with it.

I cannot understand why in the Governor's Speech no reference was made to it because there was a big upheaval—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: To your letter to Mr Fraser?

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: You believe the Governor should have mentioned that? That is what you said.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am sorry about that. I meant to say that there should have been some reference in the

Speech to section 132 of the Industrial Arbitration Act because certain undertakings were given to both the trade union movement—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Read section 132 to refresh our memories.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I wish I had it, but I do not, so I cannot read it. However, I think the Minister knows its general implication.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What is its general implication?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Is the honourable member not listening?

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Yes, I am listening very closely.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are a confusing speaker to follow.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I will repeat myself. Section 132 states that any person or organisation which goes on strike is subject to a fine.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Strike or lockout. It is not just one. Both sides are included.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: There is no way to escape it. If the offender cannot pay the fine, a comparable amount by way of goods and chattels is seized from the appropriate union office or taken from the worker's home.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Or from the employer's if it is a lockout.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If the worker does not have goods to the appropriate value and cannot pay the fine, he goes to gaol. That is the long and short of it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Like anyone else who breaks the law.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: There is no other country in the western world which subscribes to this principle.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The employer would go to gaol if he could not pay the fine, too.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Minister can look after the employers; I will look after the workers.

Sitting suspended from 3.46 to 4.02 p.m.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The International Labour Organisation has established a convention known as the Convention concerning Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise. As I have said before, these conventions are not made lightly or without due consideration. They are given attention by a committee for almost three weeks and are then presented to the plenary session of the ILO. If the deliberations of the committee are adopted by the plenary session, they are sent out to every member country during the succeeding year to obtain the opinions of those member countries as to

whether the committee's report should become a recommendation or a convention. In the succeeding year, or perhaps two years later, the committee meets again. The same procedures are adopted and the plenary session, having regard to the response it has received from the member countries, decides whether the report will become a convention or a recommendation or whether it should not go forward at all to the member countries.

The Convention concerning Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise was adopted as a convention and came into force in Australia on the 28th February, 1974, after agreement to its ratification had been obtained by the Australian Government from each State Government. The convention could not be ratified unless every State Government agreed to it.

Section 132 of the Industrial Arbitration Act prohibits the right to strike and confers upon workers or organisations, if they take part in this activity, certain penalties. A number of recommendations in respect of the right to strike, which the committee has examined, are contained in the digest of decisions of the Freedom of Association Committee of the Governing Body of the ILO. The one which I think is most significant, and which was adopted by the Governing Body of the ILO, is—

The right to strike is one of the essential means through which workers and their organisations may promote and defend their occupational interest. The right to strike has virtually been recognised by the ILO.

Article 3 of the convention gives workers and employers the right to draw up their constitution and rules, to elect their representatives in full freedom, to organise their administration and activities, and formulate their programmes. It also states that public authorities shall refrain from any interference which would restrict these rights or impede the lawful exercise thereof. When the State Government gave approval for the ratification of this convention it must have been aware of that condition.

On Tuesday of this week I asked the Minister representing the Minister for Labour and Industry the following question—

Is it the Government's intention to repeal Section 132 of the Western Australian Industrial Arbitration Act in order to dispel any doubts that this section is in breach of I.L.O. Convention No. 87 or 98?

I must say the Minister's reply is rather confusing, to say the least. His reply reads in part—

Section 132 of the Industrial Arbitration Act is a law which makes it an offence to take part in a strike

or lock-out, for that is a logical corollary to the fixation of industrial conditions by Arbitration Tribunals. It is not right to claim the right to strike or lock-out was exchanged for the benefits of arbitration.

Yesterday I asked this further question of the Minister—

- (1) Is the Minister aware that Article 3 of the International Labour Organisation Convention concerning Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise (I.L.O. Convention No. 87) which came into force for Australia the 28th February, 1974, provides that . . .

Workers and Employers' Organisations shall—

- (b) elect their representatives in full freedom;

The Minister replied—

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes. The transfer of control of a union election to the Chief Electoral Officer alone is consistent with the protection of community interests particularly as large numbers of persons, as members of unions, are affected and will ensure that they can exercise a vote democratically and in fuller freedom.

It must be remembered that the principle purpose of registration as a union under the Industrial Arbitration Act, whereby laws have to be conformed to in order to obtain registration, is to gain the benefits of the arbitration system.

Article 8 of Convention No. 87 specifically states "In exercising the rights provided for in this Convention workers and employers and their respective organisations, like other persons or organised collectivities, shall respect the law of the land."

The Minister quoted only part of Article 8 of Convention 87. The article goes on to say—

The law of the land shall not be such as to impair nor shall it be so implied as to impair the guarantees provided for in this Convention.

The convention lays it down that the union or organisation shall select its own representatives. The point I am making is it is high time there was an investigation in this State by the ILO Committee on the Freedom of Association of the legislation which existed before the Court Government came to office and legislation which has been introduced since the Court Government came to office.

I now turn to another aspect of industrial relations in this State; that is, wage indexation. I was under the impression

that wage indexation was reluctantly introduced into this State by the Court Government, but when the Government realised that the Consumer Price Index was not moving as fast as was anticipated, the Government ultimately agreed to wage indexation.

In March, 1975, the Consumer Price Index moved by 3.5 per cent, and so did wages. There were no objections to it. In the June quarter of 1975 the Consumer Price Index rose by 3.4 per cent, and no objection was raised. Very little objection has been raised and nothing has been said about wage indexation in the September quarter of 1975 because the Consumer Price Index rose by only .8 per cent, and that denied the unions the opportunity to make any application to compensate their members for that movement. In the December quarter of 1975 the Consumer Price Index rose by 5.6 per cent and the Industrial Commission had to give consideration to a movement in wages of 6.4 per cent.

Prior to that the Western Australian Industrial Commission had granted to the work force automatic quarterly adjustments to their wages based on the Consumer Price Index, and this applied up to February, 1976.

I believe in going before the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in the recent national hearing the Court Government not only betrayed the workers of the State by asking for an increase of less than 6.4 per cent, but it also betrayed its own Industrial Commission which had made these increases automatic. By its betrayal the Government was creating a situation whereby some sections of the work force—those working under State awards—would have received an increase of 6.4 per cent, while those covered by Federal awards would receive something less. But happily the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission rejected the submission and granted the 6.4 per cent.

For the life of me, I cannot understand why the Court Government took that action after the State Industrial Commission had granted the 6.4 per cent. I can understand Mr Fraser, after coming into power, suggesting that the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission should grant a rise amounting to only half of the rise in the Consumer Price Index. That can be understood because Mr Fraser is a treacherous person. He made promises to the Australian people, one of which was that the wage indexation system would be retained. But he went before the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission and advocated something else. We cannot expect anything better from him; he has no conscience about what he does. He destroyed Gorton and Snedden, and, with the Governor General, he destroyed the Australian workers' Government which was elected in 1974.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Whitlam did that.

The Hon. J. Heitman: They ruined the country.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It was only a minor matter for Mr Fraser to revoke wage indexation.

The Hon. J. Heitman: He had to take over a Government which was \$4 500 million in debt.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That does not take away his infamy in conspiring to get rid of a properly elected Government in this country.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Thank God he did.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That will never be erased from his infamous record. I cannot understand how fair-minded people like Mr Heitman can support such a proposition.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: The public made the decision.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The public did not.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: The people answered on the 13th December.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: What was the percentage of votes for your party?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It was only a minor matter for him to deny to the poor suckers who voted for him—the little people—the tax investment allowance he said he would give to them, but did not. It was only after some pressure that he brought it down to \$500. He did not suggest \$500 before he went to the people of this country. The people who voted for him can only be described as poor suckers who have been betrayed.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Do you mean that all the people who voted for Fraser were suckers?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I did not say that; I said that the poor suckers who put trust in him have been betrayed by him, and there are many of those people in this country. He delayed the increased payment to the poor pensioners of this country by one month. What a noble act! He did that for the purpose of financing a superphosphate bounty from which he himself receives substantial benefit.

The Hon. J. Heitman: He doesn't get the benefit; the manufacturers get it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is about time you woke up.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Fancy saying all the unionists who voted for the Liberals were suckers.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is correct; they voted for him, and they are beginning to realise now that they were suckers. They were under the impression the Liberal Government would raise

no objection to the 6.4 per cent wage increase. For the first time in the history of Australia a conservative Government was going to appear before the Industrial Commission and advocate increases in wages based on the Consumer Price Index—at least that is what the people believed. Were they not suckers? They voted for him, and he tried to have the increase reduced to 3.2 per cent.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: They voted for responsibility.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Then why doesn't Fraser show some responsibility?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yet Fraser went before the commission—as would the Liberals in this State—to destroy indexation.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There are far too many interjections.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: How did wages affect the Consumer Price Index to the December quarter? Bear in mind that the adjustment in the December quarter was for six months and not for three months. Good Lord! When one has regard for the way wages increased in 1974, the total increase under wage indexation was something like 13.3 per cent; yet before indexation I think it was around 26 or 27 per cent and people were screaming their heads off about it. Then the Whitlam Government introduced a system to regulate wages in some way, and after a great deal of persuasion, managed to get the trade union movement to accept wage indexation. As a result of the Fraser Government's betrayal of the work force the unions are now turning away from wage indexation. I do not know what members opposite want if they do not want wage indexation; it is a reasonable thing and in my opinion it could be improved upon considerably.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: What did you think of Hawke's view on television the other night?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I feel a great improvement could be made in wage indexation. We could apply a ceiling. For example, if wages are increased in accordance with the Consumer Price Index a ceiling could be placed on, say, the average weekly earnings—although I am not suggesting that—so that people on high incomes would not make a profit out of indexation.

The Hon. R. Thompson: On politicians' salaries.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: My word! Members opposite did not advocate a 4 per cent increase before the tribunal in this State. The Court Government did not go before the tribunal and say, "For the purpose of determining our wages you should deduct from the Consumer Price Index the increases imposed in the last Federal Budget."

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: We didn't go for holiday pay, either.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: If members opposite had been sincere they would have gone before the tribunal and advocated that; but they did not. They apply a standard for one type of person and a different standard for another type of person.

The point I submit is this: Did wage increases in this country force up the December Consumer Price Index figure? That could not be the case, because there were no wage increases in the December quarter of last year. Yet prices still increased even though wages were frozen from June to December.

I think we should be looking at other means of confronting the problem which faces us. Wage indexation is an excellent idea if it can be given a fair go and if properly applied, and if it can be improved it would be so much the better. However, no-one who supports the conservative policies wants to give it a go.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: That isn't so.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is so.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: How do you know that?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Because statements have been made to that effect. I think I am correct in saying that the Western Australian Government instructed its advocate in the national wage hearing to apply for an increase which was less than 6.4 per cent.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It was 4.3 per cent.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes, they deducted the Budget charges.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: There is a difference between a Government and a member of Parliament. You are a member of Parliament too.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is not wages that are forcing up the price of goods and services; certainly wages are not forcing up the price of land. We should look around and see what is causing inflation. It is caused by millionaires wanting to sell properties and make millions within two or three years, just as we saw the other day in the case of Action Waste Disposals, the proprietor of which has boasted outright that he made \$1 million within a short period.

Perhaps we should look at the 276 per cent increase in profit made by Jennings. How did that come about? Would not that affect the price of goods and services, and especially housing materials? Let us consider BHP.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: How did that affect the percentage?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I do not care about that. Now that Mr Lewis has returned to the Chamber, I ask him why a major steelmaker in this country is allowed to make a profit of \$2 million a week.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Why does a major steelmaker in Australia lose money at the moment? You don't know the facts.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is the same old story; if they can see some advantage accruing to the workers they want to change the rules in the middle of the game.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: What percentage do you expect to receive on the money you invest?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I have no money invested.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You would want 10 per cent at least.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I would like to conclude by saying that industrial relations in this State are in very bad shape.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is as wrong as everything else you have said. Industrial relations in this State are not bad. You do your colleagues a gross injustice.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I said they are in very bad shape, and they are not helped at all by the so-called responsible people who support the conservative policy. The very first words spoken in this Chamber in this session by way of interjection came from Mr Wordsworth when he attacked the trade union movement in this State. Mr Masters, by insidious questions, is on his old tack of union bashing again. These are the conservatives in this Chamber.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Mr Masters is too kind a man to do a thing like that.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: He is the member who, in 1974, said that in smashing unions we will protect the public. That is to be found on page 1688 of the 1974 *Hansard*.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Would you like to read the next page?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Tozer in his speech in this debate advocated the fragmentation of unions by splitting their membership into industry or company unions.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Would you like to quote the next page of my speech? You are taking it out of context.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I repeat: Mr Tozer's speech advocated the fragmentation of unions by splitting up their members into industries or company unions—not country unions, but company unions. That would suit him right down to the ground.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Would the honourable member please address the Chair. He is not addressing the Chair, but every member of the Chamber other than the President. I have asked him at least six times during the course of his speech to do this.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am sorry, Sir, if I have shown any discourtesy to you; I can assure you that was not intended.

The PRESIDENT: It appeared to me that way.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Perhaps I can repeat in silence that Mr Tozer's speech advocated the fragmentation of unions by splitting their members into industry or company unions. He wants unions all over the country! Having regard for the nature of his politics, I think he would prefer that. The Premier is continually on the attack against unions. He continually criticises their efforts to obtain better wages for low paid workers. He says all the ills in this State are caused by unions trying to get a better deal for workers. The question I would like answered is this: Is this the new policy of the Liberal Party now that it controls Canberra? I am pretty certain it is. I believe the Liberal Party is now substituting a continual attack upon unions for the previous continual criticism of the Whitlam Government. The reason for this is that it is to satisfy their affluent masters and to make their dominance complete.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Are you talking about me again?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: They would do that by devious means.

I would say to the unions of this State: Stand firm and fight for the rights of every member, and resist with all the strength at your disposal the political forces in this country which see good in profit and evil in social welfare. Let members opposite deny that if they can. They see evil because people are getting a fair go under social welfare; they do not like this, nor do the people who support them.

The united efforts of the unions will bring about social and economic reform in this country.

I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. D. J. Wordsworth.

QUESTIONS (13): ON NOTICE

1. ABORIGINES

David Ross: Imprisonment

The Hon. R. Thompson for the Hon. LYLIA ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Justice:

Further to my question on the 1st April, 1976, concerning an Aboriginal prisoner—

- (1) Will the Minister explain how he and the deputy superintendent of Fremantle

Prison, Mr Shea, can both say David Ross did not attempt suicide in the prison when Mr Shea has also been reported as saying "He cut himself. He had a knife".

- (2) Will the Minister confirm that a prison doctor spoke to Ross on or about the 22nd March and tried to calm him after Ross had cut his (Ross') neck with a knife?
- (3) In view of his reference to hospital treatment for Ross, will the Minister advise which hospital, how often and which treatment?
- (4) Can the Minister explain the legal absurdity of his statement that a magistrate had not dismissed the charge of causing unlawful grievous bodily harm against William Wilson; that Wilson had been discharged from custody after the magistrate had found that the charge had not been proved during committal proceedings at Halls Creek on the 17th March?
- (5) Is it correct that a committal proceeding is solely for a magistrate to decide if there is a *prima facie* case, and that it would be quite improper for a magistrate to consider if a charge is proven or not?
- (6) In view of the Minister's claim that Ross was not called because the Evidence Act offers protection to people facing criminal charges by allowing them to decline to give evidence which may be incriminating, will he confirm that Ross was never asked if he wished to give evidence and that the decision that he should not give evidence was made by the Halls Creek police who prepared the case for the prosecution against Wilson, rather than by Ross and his Counsel?
- (7) Will the Minister also confirm that it is most unusual for a victim not to be called upon to give evidence in such a case?
- (8) Will the Minister acknowledge that his statement that an interpreter "appeared for Ross in his committal" is incorrect, and that the interpreter who was specially flown up for Ross to give evidence against William Wilson did

not in fact appear because Ross was never called to give that evidence?

- (9) Will the Minister acknowledge that his statement that two of the seven Aborigines other than Ross involved in the Billiluna shooting incident on the 6th January used an interpreter who had served nine years at Papunya Native Mission in the Northern Territory is incorrect because in fact this interpreter was used by two Aborigines involved in a quite separate incident when they appeared in Halls Creek court on the 17th March, and that one of the boys involved in the Billiluna incident acted as spokesman for the others because of their language inadequacy?
- (10) Will the Minister advise what action is being taken to review the court cases involving William Wilson and Lesley Verdon?
- (11) Has David Ross been removed from Fremantle Gaol yet in view of the Minister's statement last week that the Department of Corrections was investigating the possibility of Ross being transferred to Wyndham?
- (12) Will the Minister advise what accommodation his Government has available for Ross if he were to be released from prison?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) I can offer no explanation regarding the newspaper report attributed to Mr Shea. I can, however, again state that Mr Ross has not cut himself with a knife while an inmate of Fremantle Prison. I am further advised that Mr Ross frequently has possession of a table knife when eating his meals.
- (2) A doctor was in the ward on that date and spoke to Ross. The balance of the statement is incorrect.
- (3) Since his admission to Fremantle Prison and under the care of Prison Medical Officer, Dr A. Tregonning and prison nursing staff, he was referred to Fremantle Hospital Physiotherapy Department on 28th March, and has attended for treatment 2nd, 5th and 7th April.

- (4) and (5) With respect to the committal proceedings on a charge of causing grievous bodily harm laid against William Wilson, there is no legal absurdity in the fact that Wilson was discharged as to the complaint then under inquiry rather than that the complaint was dismissed. When a dismissal of a complaint occurs, it has certain well defined legal consequences, among which is the consequence that a plea would be available to the accused person to bar any further proceedings.

Such a result cannot under the terms of the Justices Act be arrived at committal proceedings which are simply administrative proceedings by a magistrate who hears the prosecutor's evidence and any further evidence which may be put before him for the purpose of arriving at a decision as to whether or not a *prima facie* case has been established. The phraseology used in the Justices Act requires the magistrate to determine whether or not "the evidence is sufficient to put the defendant upon his trial for an indictable offence". If so, he is committed for trial. If not, under the Justices Act he is "to be discharged as to the complaint then under inquiry". That leaves it open to the Crown or the prosecutor to re-open the case for example if further evidence should become available or, if there is a disagreement with the view that there was no *prima facie* case, the matter may be opened by the filing of an *ex officio* indictment.

The previous answer made it clear that these were committal proceedings and that it was not a trial. Therefore, when it was said that the charge was found by the magistrate not to have been proved, the meaning conveyed was that the magistrate found that the proof of the charge offered by the prosecution of evidence on its behalf was not sufficient to make out a *prima facie* case. It would, of course, be absurd to suggest that any question of the case being proved beyond reasonable doubt as in a normal trial was being embarked upon by the magistrate.

(6) The decision was made by the police prosecutor from Perth who prosecuted, and not by the Hall's Creek police, as the prosecutor believed that Ross could have incriminated himself in giving evidence. His Counsel, Mr Twemlow, was present at the hearing.

(7) It is naturally the usual procedure for the alleged victim of a crime to be called to give evidence at committal proceedings against the alleged offender, but special circumstances can arise in which, for a variety of reasons, that course is not followed.

(8) The interpreter was present but was not required as Ross was not called to give evidence, although he did appear as interpreter in the committal proceedings against Ross later in the same Court. Ross was represented by his Counsel, Mr Twemlow. The interpreter was supplied by Ross's defence, the Aboriginal Legal Service.

(9) There were several court hearings, both in Police and Children's Courts. Could the hon. member advise the date of the actual hearing, and in which Court, in order that the information sought could be obtained?

(10) As to the charge against William Willson, a request has been received from the Police Department for the Attorney-General to consider the presentation of an *ex officio* indictment. The case is therefore under consideration. As to Verdon, the position is slightly different as the charges against him were determined summarily. However, I am awaiting a report from the Crown Law Department.

(11) No. Mr Ross is on remand and is subject of current court proceedings. He will, in fact, be appearing in Broome Court tomorrow, Friday, 9th April. He is further required to attend committal proceedings in Perth at a date to be fixed. When these proceedings are finalised the Department of Corrections will continue its endeavours to have Mr Ross returned to his own area.

(12) David Ross is believed to be over 18 years of age, and he is not a ward of the Department. His management and care is

not the responsibility of the Community Welfare Department unless he were to seek consideration as a disadvantaged person under the Community Welfare Act. That possibility will be explored by an officer of that Department.

2. BUSH FIRES BOARD *Costs and Personnel*

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer for the Hon. T. O. PERRY, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Lands:

(1) What is the total number of staff employed by the Bush Fires Board of Western Australia?

(2) What is the cost of operating the Bush Fires Board?

The Hon. N. McNeill, for the Hon. N. E. BAXTER, replied:

(1) At 31/3/76 there were 31 staff employed by the Bush Fires Board which has an establishment of 34 staff.

(2) —

Designation	Actual Expenditure 1974/75	Estimate 1975/76	Actual Expenditure 1/7/76 to 31/3/76
Operating Costs	346 122	460 700	324 100
Assistance to Local Authority	36 952	252 210	88 766
Total Expenditure	\$383 074	\$719 000	\$412 866

3. JETTY

Busselton: Retention

The Hon. S. J. Dellar for the Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Works:

Will the Minister advise what action, if any, the Government will take to assist the town of Busselton to retain its jetty?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

Since 1973 the Government has been paying the Shire of Busselton \$4 000 annually towards the cost of maintaining the Busselton Jetty.

No assistance beyond the cash grant is contemplated at this stage.

4. ABORIGINES

Special Works Projects

The Hon. J. C. TOZER, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

In North Province, what Aboriginal special works projects have been adversely affected by a reduction of funds becoming available from the Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs sources in—

(a) the current financial year; and

- (b) the planning for the 1976-1977 financial year?

The Hon. N. McNeill, for the Hon. N. E. BAXTER, replied:

The administration of Special Works Projects is a matter for the Commonwealth Government and any relevant inquiries should be directed to that quarter.

5. GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Employees in North-west

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for the North-West:

Further to the reply to my question on the 6th April, 1976, relating to employment opportunities, will the Minister investigate reports that—

- (a) during 1975 the Public Works Department flew approximately 20 unskilled workers to Kununurra when local labour was available; and
- (b) the Main Roads Department appointed a telex operator from Perth when seven local girls applied for the position at Kununurra?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (a) According to records available within the Public Works Department, no unskilled workers were flown to Kununurra in 1975 following recruitment in Perth or elsewhere. Some unskilled workers were returned to Kununurra following annual leave entitlement.

- (b) There were four local applicants for the position of telex operator, Kununurra, none of whom had any experience on telex machines. One was already employed by another Government Department, one was not interested in telex work and the standard of typing of the other two was not at an acceptable level in regard to accuracy or speed. The operator appointed from Perth was fully trained with two years' experience with the PMG.

6. FREMANTLE HOSPITAL

Extensions

The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Minister for Health:

Would the Minister detail the stages reached for proposed extensions to the Fremantle hospital—

- (a) have tenders been called for any ground works, etc.;

- (b) if so, when were they called, and when will they close;

- (c) what is the programming and in what order will tenders be called for the various stages of construction?

The Hon. N. McNeill, for the Hon. N. E. BAXTER, replied:

- (a) Yes.
- (b) Called 7th February, 1976, and closed 24th February, 1976.
- (c) Piling contract scheduled to be advertised 3rd July, 1976 followed by structure and management contract on 18th September, 1976, with completion early 1980.

7. TECHNICAL COLLEGE

James Street: Transfer of Departments

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Will the Minister advise which departments at Perth Technical College will be moved from James Street to St. George's Terrace to allow the demolition of the former?
- (2) How many students will be involved?
- (3) Will the Minister give an undertaking that no courses will be cut or students dropped as a result of such move?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) and (2) Since it is unlikely that students will be transferred prior to the beginning of the 1978 academic year, the precise information which has been requested cannot be provided at this stage.
- (3) The possibility of taking such action has not been contemplated.

8. ORD IRRIGATION SCHEME

Sugar Production

The Hon. S. J. Dellar for the Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Agriculture:

As the Australian Minister for Primary Industry, Mr Sinclair, is reported to have said in a speech to the Annual Conference of Australian Sugar Producers' Association on the 22nd March, 1976, that "Should a commercial sugar industry be established on the Ord, I can foresee many administration problems that will have to be solved"—

- (a) does the Minister agree with this view; and

- (b) If so, what is the nature of these problems?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (a) and (b) Mr Sinclair's remarks probably relate to the administrative problems associated with the participation of a new sugar producing area in an existing marketing arrangement for an industry which has provision for controlling production. The problems are not considered to be insoluble.

The quote from Mr Sinclair's address continues:—

"But I am quite sure that the present industry's ability to organise itself and exercise self discipline will rub off on its Western counterpart, resulting in an Australian sugar industry which is as resilient as the one we have at present."

9. *This question was postponed.*

10. HOUSING

Manjimup

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer for the Hon. T. O. PERRY, to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Housing:

What is the State Housing Commission's programme at Manjimup for—

- (a) new construction;
- (b) upgrading; and
- (c) maintenance of buildings?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (a) Three (3) houses and four (4) pensioner units have been completed, and contracts for a further twenty-two (22) units comprising:—
- 8 houses;
 - 10 duplex units; and
 - 4 pensioner units
- will be negotiated during 1976.
- (b) Contracts have been signed for upgrading eighteen (18) houses and a further twenty (20) houses are programmed for upgrading towards the end of 1976.
- (c) Tenders have closed for the cyclical maintenance to thirty-nine (39) houses.

12. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Mt. Magnet

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR, to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

With the discontinuance by Hill 50 of the supply of electricity to the Mt. Magnet township, etc., will the Minister advise as follows—

- (a) who is responsible for the present supply of electricity to the Mt. Magnet township, etc.;
- (b) how many State Electricity Commission employees are stationed at Mt. Magnet and what is their anticipated period of employment at Mt. Magnet;
- (c) does Mt. Magnet now come within the provisions of the Country Towns Assistance Scheme;
- (d) has any loan been approved for the purpose of assisting the electricity supply at Mt. Magnet;
- (e) if so, what was the amount, and to whom was it granted;
- (f) what was the domestic cost per unit of electricity prior to Hill 50 discontinuing supply; and
- (g) what is the present cost per unit to the domestic consumer?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (a) The supply of electricity to the township of Mount Magnet is the responsibility of the State Energy Commission Country Undertakings Section.
- (b) There are two employees of the Commission at present stationed in Mount Magnet being previously employed by the Hill 50 Goldmine.

It is anticipated that these employees will be employed at Mount Magnet until completion of the new power station in June 1976 at which time a position for one employee will be available at Mount Magnet, and the other employee will be offered a similar position in another town.

- (c) The Mount Magnet electricity undertaking was transferred to the Country Towns' Assistance Scheme on 25th February, 1976.
- (d) and (e) The Mount Magnet Shire Council has received approval and has raised a loan of \$40 000 under the

11. *This question was postponed.*

terms and conditions of the Country Towns' Assistance Scheme in order to finance a new power station at Mount Magnet.

- (f) The previous price of electricity charged by the Council was 8c per unit for domestic lighting and power.
- (g) The present cost of electricity is the Commission's standard tariff for country towns which for domestic customers is 3.83c per unit plus \$5.00 per quarter service charge.

13. HOUSING *Teachers: Rents*

The Hon. S. J. Dellar for the Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Justice representing the Treasurer:

Further to the reply to my question on the 7th April, 1976, regarding teacher housing—

- (a) does the reply to part (1) indicate the decision has been made to amend the regulation (5) referred to; and
- (b) if so, when is it expected the amending regulation will be tabled?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

The amendment was tabled on 6th April, 1976.

House adjourned at 4.42 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 8th April, 1976

The SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Postponement

THE SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson): In order to avoid my having to take questions on notice immediately after notices and papers, and then having some of those questions postponed, I propose to take questions at the appropriate time following the afternoon tea suspension.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SEVENTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 7th April, on the following motion by Mr Tubby—

That the following Address-in-Reply to His Excellency's Speech be agreed to—

May it please Your Excellency:

We, the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of the State of Western Australia in Parliament

assembled, beg to express loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to address to Parliament.

MR McIVER (Avon) [2.19 p.m.]: Once again the curtain has risen on an Address-in-Reply debate, this time of the third session of the Twenty-eighth Parliament. However, before I commence discussing items I wish to bring to the attention of the House, I desire to join other members in extending best wishes and congratulations to the member for Greenough who has taken over from the former Premier of Western Australia, a man who is respected not only by members on both sides of the Chamber, but also by everyone else in Western Australia.

Mr Hartrey: Hear, hear!

Mr McIVER: Knowing the member for Greenough personally, as I have done for many years, I am sure he will make a worth-while contribution to Parliament and for the benefit of the people of Greenough and of Western Australia in general.

The Address-in-Reply allows a member to roam far and wide over many subjects and bring to the attention of Parliament various issues concerning his constituency. Because of the performance of the Government, it is not very difficult to find a commencing point.

First of all I wish to draw to the attention of the Premier the concern of the businessmen of Western Australia in relation to the amendment to the pay-roll tax legislation. Its effect is widespread in the electorate of Avon which I have the privilege to represent.

I wish to give the House an example of its effect and in doing so will refer to a particular company as company A. In 1975 that company had a pay-roll of \$5 085 for one month. With the permissible deduction of \$1 733 then applying the assessable amount was \$3 352. Having regard to the fact that the pay-roll tax was 5 per cent, the amount payable by company A for that month was \$382.85.

Let us consider the situation of the same company since the Government amended the Act under the pretext that it will assist many businesses.

Sir Charles Court: That's right.

Mr McIVER: Such a reason seems all right when it is in a gift-wrapped parcel in fancy paper with all the trimmings attached. However, once the parcel is unwrapped, and the contents revealed, the situation is found to be not so rosy as was predicted.

The imposition of pay-roll tax has had a very detrimental effect on businesses throughout Western Australia. The present Government always parades itself as a lifesaver of private enterprise.