

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 8th May, 1979

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

ABORIGINES: BEAGLE BAY RESERVE

*Entry by Esso Australia Ltd.:
Tabling of Statement*

THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South—Minister for Lands) [4.35 p.m.]: May I have leave to make a statement in relation to a paper for tabling?

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: By way of explanation, I am tabling a statement by the Minister for Community Welfare which concerns the requirements of regulation 8(3) under the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority Act in relation to the entry of Esso Australia Ltd. into the Beagle Bay Reserves. That statement requires tabling.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

SUPPLY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 3rd May.

THE HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [4.44 p.m.]: We support the passage of the Supply Bill through the House, but I want to avail myself of the opportunity to correct a few impressions given during the Address-in-Reply debate to date.

I would like to deal with the few comments made by Miss Elliott during the adjournment debate, relative to a statement made by a member of the upper House of the State of Victoria, and the confusion they caused in this House.

With your permission, Mr President, I would like to remind members what occurred during the time when Mr Arthur Griffith (now Sir Arthur Griffith) was the Leader of the Opposition. He was speaking to the Supply Bill. If members will bear with me I will read some of the relevant portions of his speech which he delivered on Tuesday, the 14th August, 1973. I will be reading from page 2541 of the bound volume No. 3 of *Hansard* for that year. The then Leader of the Opposition said—

In 1959, when it was traditional for two Supply Bills to be submitted to Parliament in the one year, the amount of money involved in the two Supply Bills was something like £40,000,000. I have a graph here and if members take the trouble to study it they will find that each year from 1960 onwards that figure increased; just picking one year, it increased to £51,000,000 in 1965. Then the currency changed and in 1969 the amount involved was \$101,000,000, and in the last three years the amounts have been \$210,000,000 in 1971, \$235,000,000 in 1972, and now \$265,000,000 in 1973.

So it can be seen that this Government has had more money available to it than has any other Government in the history of the State; and I am not referring to other forms of income such as grants or assistance from the Commonwealth Government or from any other source.

The Supply Bill affords members the opportunity to talk on many matters of interest to members themselves and to their electorates, on problems which are facing them, and on matters of State. On this occasion I think perhaps I ought to spend my time on this Bill talking on one particular aspect—as to whether or not the Bill should pass through this Parliament.

I want to remind members of what Miss Elliott or someone else said regarding the threat to which the Tonkin Government was subjected. On page 2542 of the same *Hansard* is the following—

First let me say that there is no question, and to the best of my knowledge there has never been any question, about the fact that this Chamber has a constitutional right to deal with the Bill. In fact it must deal with it as it must deal with all Bills before they can become law. This House cannot amend the Bill because the Constitution Act provides that the Chamber cannot amend a money Bill and, as members know, this is a money Bill. This Chamber can make requests to the Government to amend the Bill, but in the present instance I think it would be a useless course of action to take because the Government has already indicated its attitude on that aspect. Therefore this House can either pass or defeat the Bill. Of course the legislation can be delayed; and this Chamber on one occasion did delay a Supply Bill for a considerable time. I have forgotten for how long, but at the time there was abroad a very deep-seated sense of dissatisfaction with a Labor Government

which had closed 860-odd miles of railway throughout the State and, I repeat, there was a great sense of dissatisfaction among country people particularly who were suffering as a result of the closures. Consequently the Supply Bill was held in abeyance for some time during which the Government was asked to supply answers in respect of the questions which were raised concerning the railway lines.

I repeat that this Chamber has the right to defeat the Bill . . .

I am making those quotes because of the interest aroused by Miss Elliott's comments. What I am saying is, as I have said previously, that in essence this Chamber, which is supposedly a House of Review, acts only as a rubber stamp during the times of Liberal Government and as a delaying or rejecting Chamber during the periods of Labor Government.

There was an open threat in 1973 which we were all well aware of. It is now a matter of history and I suppose it will remain a matter of conjecture, but that was the popular rumour at the time. The then Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) did not bow to pressure from the then Leader of the Opposition in another place who had implied to the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber that he should deny supply to the Labor Party and, therefore, force it out of office.

Perhaps from that moment onwards the idea of using upper Chambers in Australia simply for that purpose was resurrected, because we saw what happened in the Federal Parliament. I noted the actions taken by the Victorian Parliament previously, which perhaps gave rise to the threat in Victoria not so very long ago.

I find it necessary to mention these matters, because it seems to me we are on the verge of having to determine, once and for all, whether or not upper Chambers should be able to force Governments out of office. That determination will have to be made in the not-too-distant future; on just where the Governments of this country—State and Federal—reside. Do they reside in the upper House or in the peoples' Chamber, the lower House?

The point I am making is that if one reads correctly the debate which occurred in 1973, one will see that we were taken to the brink of doom and then returned to safety. I recollect sitting over there on the other side of the Chamber and thinking, "Well, here it comes", because the rumour had been running around the corridors of this place for some time.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: It did not come.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: It did not come! If I might be permitted to point out, despite what we say about one another in this place, one becomes aware of the integrity of certain people, regardless of the side of the Chamber on which they might sit. I must go on record as saying that the integrity of the then Leader of the Opposition in this place was qualified at least in my eyes. I do not want any substantiation of my viewpoint, but that was the opinion I expressed to myself—whatever else I might have argued in this Chamber. At least the then Leader of the Opposition (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) in my opinion did measure up to what I thought was a good member of Parliament who had the interests of local government at heart. I want to remind the Chamber of that little incident.

Some of those now present in this Chamber were here when that incident occurred, and I have heard plenty of people speak about it since it occurred and went on record.

A subject about which I wish to speak tonight is that of unemployment, and I want to correct some of the misconceptions held by members on the Government side particularly, with regard to some of the speeches I have made. In particular, I want to refer to some of the gross misconceptions held by the Hon. Gordon Masters. I have read in *Hansard* the speeches made by Mr Masters. I do not intend to quote them, but if any member does wish to read those speeches he will see, I suggest, that I in particular have been referred to as a prophet of doom, and that I speak about nothing constructive. Mr Masters said he would love to hear something constructive.

Strangely enough, I take notice of what people say about me here. I read Mr Masters' speech very carefully, word by word, and I thought that in examining his speech I would be able to find out where I was going wrong, and why I was not getting my message over. I decided I had to read Mr Masters' speech to find out just what I was doing incorrectly. When I read it I was staggered, because of all the unconstructive speeches I have read that was the most unconstructive. Normally Mr Masters makes a very good contribution to debates in this Chamber.

In case any member wants to read that speech—and I might add it is not very interesting—

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I think it is.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: —it appears at page 721 of *Hansard* proof No. 4. That is the page at which the dreary chronicle begins.

The point I want to make to Mr Masters is that we on this side of the Chamber do not happen to be the Government.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: That does not prevent you from being constructive, surely.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Members opposite are the Government, and the Government is in its second term. The Government at two elections made certain promises, which I do not intend to repeat chapter and verse, because that has been done to death already many times. A number of promises—false promises, I might add—and empty rhetoric have been presented to the people as representing some kind of policy to clear up all our economic ills. Not once—I repeat; not once—has anything been introduced into this Parliament, by way of being constructive, to prepare the people of Western Australia for the future. Not once has anything like that been introduced into this Chamber by the Government. I add that if the Government comes along with something constructive, so that we may look into the future with some hope, I go on record as saying that it will have my utmost co-operation.

I was very impressed when I saw the former Prime Minister of the United Kingdom being interviewed on television just recently. He said that his party was going into Opposition, and that it would be a vigorous Opposition. He said it would be a constructive Opposition, and would not be just an Opposition for the sake of opposition. He said that the United Kingdom was destined for greatness, and that the Parliament would make it great.

The idea that anyone in any political party in Australia should make a statement like that is beyond comprehension. I admired the former British Prime Minister for making that statement, and I imagine that even people who did not vote for him felt pride on hearing that statement, and felt some measure of security in the fact that, although the Government had changed, their members of Parliament in a representative Government were quite prepared to get on with the job and do something in the right and correct manner.

From my reading of the daily Press, it seems to me that all through the western world—and I cannot speak for the other parts of the world—Governments of all persuasions are paralysed, either out of fear or for other reasons, because they may have to come forward with something of value to the people.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: They are paralysed by strikes.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I was waiting for that comment, but it came a little earlier than I anticipated.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Predictably, it would come.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The answer to everything seems to be that of strikes. The amazing part of it is that the half million people in this country who are unemployed do not go on strike, because they do not have the wherewithal to do so.

We should be telling the people—instead of this bunkum and rhetoric—that a new social order is appearing in the world. I do not know what form it will take, But I have heard the Premier make the same statement to the pastoralists and graziers. There will be a change. The Government should be telling the people how it will lead them into that change. We are still trying to fit square pegs into round holes.

The Government has said there would be 100 000 more jobs; there should be no more strikes; and that would provide more work! The Government has said people should take less wages and, somehow or other, there would be more work!

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Who said that the people should take less wages?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I will tell the member in a minute; I will come to that one. There already has been a reduction in wages in Australia, but no more jobs have appeared. If, in fact, we do get the North-West Shelf development going then 5 000 jobs will become available during the initial construction period. That will not help us very much at all, because there will have to be a real, new dimension in the way we will work and the way we will live.

I can assure members that with my limited knowledge it is obvious the days of full employment are over and will never return while we have the kind of society we live in today, no matter which party is in Government, unless there is a change and a whole new attitude adopted by every arm of Government and every political party.

The point I am making is that the fiddling around with rhetoric and false promises will not do any good at all.

To deal with what Mr Withers has said I shall quote from a report which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 7th May. I intended to quote from it briefly, but in view of what Mr Withers has said I shall go into it more deeply. The report is headed, "Future is rosy, says Premier." The

Premier says that, notwithstanding the fact that for every job vacancy there are 40 people seeking it. The report states—

The WA Premier, Sir Charles Court, has again painted a rosy picture of the State's future.

I should point out that this report was relegated to page 31 of the newspaper, in the hope that few people would read it. To continue—

In an address to the Liberal Party's Canning division during the weekend, he said that the State was on the doorstep of a dramatic new breakthrough in development.

Wonders could be achieved in agriculture, minerals, metals, gas, uranium, petrochemicals and possibly oil.

"But if we are to succeed, we must have a Government in WA committed to private enterprise, as we are," Sir Charles said.

There is nothing wrong with what he has said up to that stage. However, he is reported to have said further—

He said that investment was hesitating for fear of what a Labor government would do.

Sir Charles said that people wanted:

The upward spiral of wages—

That seems to answer what Mr Withers has said. To continue with the report—

—and payments halted because it led to higher prices and fewer jobs when the economy was not growing and generating greater wealth.

Thriving and growing businesses. This would provide wages and job security.

The Premier forgets to say how many people will be provided with wages and job security. He has not told us how many people will be disgorged into the work force not very long from now; I refer to the entry of the school leavers into the work force.

The Premier is reported to have said further, and this should enthuse the young people in our community who are out of work—

New development projects to get under way because they would create jobs.

An end to the overpayment of inexperienced junior workers because this made it harder for young people to get jobs.

What qualifications has the Premier to make that statement? He has not qualified that statement; he simply says that if we reduce the wages

payable to the junior workers we will be able to provide them with more jobs. It does not follow that if we halve the wages payable to the junior work force, some benevolent employers will employ twice as many. I have yet to see benevolent employers doing that! In my opinion that statement by the Premier is spurious.

The report continues—

An end to unrealistic penalty rates in industries that had to operate seven days a week. The rates were killing the tourist and travel industries and threatening many essential services.

That is another unqualified statement made by the Premier.

Let us take into account some of the industries that have to work a seven-day week. I suppose the first is the Police Force. Will the Premier say to our very excellent Police Force, "Because you work seven days a week you will be the first human sacrifice and your penalty rates will cease." Perhaps the Police Union will reply, "That is all very well. We do not want a seven-day week. We will work a five-day week from Monday to Friday of each week." In those circumstances what would happen?

Let us take into account the public hospitals, the transport industries, the ambulance drivers, and a whole host of other people. However, they do not appear to be the ones the Premier was talking about, because in an all-embracing statement he simply said, "An end to unrealistic penalty rates in industries that had to operate seven days a week." Then he went on to give a slight sting by saying, that it did not apply to the Police Force, the MTT drivers, the train drivers, or the hospital workers. He said the penalty rates were killing the tourist and travel industries, and were threatening many essential services.

Mr Withers has asked where had people spoken about reducing wages. I point out to the honourable member that the Premier spoke about it, as reported in *The West Australian* of yesterday. Whilst I would like to believe that we could tighten our belt a notch, that is simply not working out in practice. There was a dampening of wages in the USA, and the unions in that country virtually said, "We will go along with the Government and retard any wage thrust, and we will be prepared to assist." Some two years ago an American diplomat said to me, "The inflation rate in our country is down, but wait till the wage explosion gets under way." The wage explosion did get under way; and seven or eight weeks ago the inflation rate in the USA was up to 13 per cent and was still rising. That happened because

the people did not like to have their standard of living eroded.

In fact, experiences in other parts of the world in which wage restraint has been practised, particularly in Japan where the cost of living has shot through the roof, have illustrated the point I am making. Nowadays when visitors arrive in Japan, instead of wanting to buy transistors they find that when they land the Japanese people want to buy transistors from them. Where once people flocked to Japan to buy these goods, they no longer do so nowadays.

I want to go on record as saying that it is possible to repair and fit a ship quicker and more effectively in Fremantle than anywhere in Japan. I heard of the case of a ship being repaired in the Singapore dock. The job was shocking and it was not carried out effectively, but the cost was astronomical.

If we talk about inflation, and mention only wages and strikes, that is a crazy attitude. I repeat if this Government comes forward with a cohesive policy for the people of Western Australia—possibly after it has arrived at some consensus with the Commonwealth Government—that will take them into the 1980's I will be agreeable to it. The whole question before us is not "Are we to change?" but "How are we to handle the change?" At this stage we are doing nothing; we are merely swapping words. We hear comments such as, "Do not go on strike; do not increase prices." Yet all the time we have growing unemployment in the community, and it is unlikely that unemployed people will be able to obtain jobs. I say that five to 10 years from now, the social and economic climate not only of Western Australia, but of Australia and other parts of the world, will not be able to deal with that problem.

The Government has charged us with not being co-operative and with being doomsday people. I say that nothing would please me more than to adopt any sensible method that will bring some hope for the future. At this stage I can see no future for those people.

I now refer to an article which appeared in *The National Times* either last week or the week before. It is the first of a series of three such articles. They are very informative, and for that reason I should draw the attention of the House to the first one, because it contains some very pertinent points. It states—

IN 1971, the Intel Corporation of California developed the micro-processor, possibly the most significant invention of modern times. Within four years of its

creation, this seemingly innocuous flake of silicon had catapulted technology 50 years into the future.

I have been assured by Bob Hawke that, despite the number of circuits involved, one of these micro-processors costs \$5 to produce.

To give an example of the changes in technology, if one goes to the Fremantle wharf today one would find the labour force is much smaller. It was not so many years ago when 2 700 waterside workers were employed there. I am not sure of the exact number today, but the registered strength is about 900 with an effective 800. The present-day labour force at Fremantle wharf is probably handling more tonnages of cargo than were handled previously, despite a reduction in the labour force of about 2 000 workers. Of course, that number have been taken out of the work force in the Port of Fremantle. Without dotting every I and crossing every T, one must surely realise what effect that reduction in the work force has had on businesses, particularly small businesses, and the trades people of the area.

Indeed, one of the greatest advances that has been made over a number of years—I see that Mr Gayfer is in his seat, and no doubt he is aware of this—is in the technology of loading wheat into ships. It was not very many years ago that I used to see hordes of men lumping bags of wheat on their shoulders into the ships.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: That was in 1934.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: At Kwinana we see probably the most modern wheat-loading facility found anywhere in the world. I do not want to go into all that is involved in applying such new technology, except to point out that it has resulted in a dramatic reduction in the number of people employed.

In the article by Simon Davies, to which I have been referring, the following appears—

Why will we have permanently high unemployment? Quite simply because the pace of technology has surpassed the standard of living: we have a technological "overhang."

I have heard this repeated often, and I am sure the writer of that article has put the matter in a nutshell. These are the matters to which we should be facing up. To continue with the article—

Consider this in the historical perspective. Never before has there been such a fantastic technological surge as the one we are now

witnessing. In the past, change was inexorable, but slow.

For example, in 1803—20 years after the development of steam-powered rotary movement—there were still only 330 steam engines in the entire United Kingdom. In fact, although many people believe that the first industrial revolution took hold quickly the truth is that factory production in the non-cotton industries did not become general until 1850.

What I am trying to demonstrate is that this great technological surge, coupled with other things, has proceeded at so fast a rate that we cannot keep up with it. We are using old methods to correct new situations.

I shall not go further into this aspect other than to repeat the words of the leader of the United States Automobile Workers Union (the late Walter Reuther)—and his words apply today—

You can automate all you like, but robots cannot buy Ford cars.

I want Mr Masters to understand fully that the Labor Party is not in Government, and that the party to which he belongs is the senior partner in a coalition Government. It is up to that Government to come forward with policies to provide some hope for the future, particularly for the young people; and those policies might have to be revolutionary, and even radical. I am not referring to radical in terms of the left versus the right.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: There will have to be big changes.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: There will have to be big changes on the part of the whole of the community, if the people want to live in this land of ours, and want to live gainful and useful lives.

There is no substitute for coming forward with properly put together policies that will lead us into the 1980s. It is not a substitute to say there will be 100 000 more jobs. I have no doubt when that statement was made it was made with the best of intentions, but that situation simply will not occur. I do not want to be a prophet of doom, but it is not much good saying that inflation can be beaten State by State, because that will not happen. We have seen in the six years since the statement was made that it simply has not happened.

It is not much good saying Liberal-Country Party coalition Governments make better economic managers than Labor Governments, because in the past three years the Canberra Government has shown that is not so. Despite a

decrease in the CPI we find there have been massive salary increases for one section of the community—not the least of which is composed of members who sit in this Chamber—and a large decrease for the vast masses of people so that their purchasing power is being eroded day by day.

No doubt, the future looks bleak and dreary to our young people. They are not turned on by the talk that if the unions do not go on strike and if the North-West Shelf project gets off the ground this or that will happen. There is an Irish saying that if the sky was not propped up it would fall. That is the kind of thing that seems to be said in this State today.

I want to refute the suggestion made not only by Mr Masters but by others within the Liberal Party, that members on this side of the House knock everything that is put up. There is nothing to knock; only words are put up. Once again I record in *Hansard* my offer to the Government that if it brings forward something constructive which can be proven beyond a shadow of a doubt to hold some hope in the future for those people at present unemployed—particularly our young people—it will receive support from this side of the House.

However, the problem is not confined to Western Australia. Indeed, it is not confined to Australia; it is found throughout the world. Who are we to assume that the Premier is an oracle, with his Canute-like attitude to the waves of change that wash our shores? Who are we to assume that he can sit on Cottesloe beach, hold up his hand, and say to the waves, "Go away, roll on no more"?

Any thinking person must view very gravely the consequences that will emerge if we have two or three generations of people—and I refer particularly to educated people—who have not been employed. That is the situation that is emerging in the United States and the United Kingdom; and it is the situation which leads people to say that after the election of the European Parliament in June, Europe—and I include the United Kingdom—will be well on the way to Euro-communism. I do not really know what Euro-communism is. However, Mr Masters was with me at a luncheon recently when a senior member of the Department of Foreign Affairs agreed that what I have said is so; and, in fact, it is well canvassed overseas. We must remember that talk is cheap and that shortly we will run out of puff.

In all fairness, I cannot say I know what form the policies of the Labor Party will take to meet

the needs of change. What we must tell people is that the world will change and a new social order is on the way. We must tell them how we propose to handle the change; and the change must be handled delicately and humanely. If we do not handle the change very carefully we will have hundreds of thousands of disadvantaged people on our hands who may want change to occur in a manner that is not good either for them or for the country. This could happen in the not-too-distant future.

It is amazing that changes have always taken place in a disorderly manner in countries which have conservative Governments that have stood flat-footed and done nothing. Really, conservatives have been the greatest promoters of change throughout the world by virtue of their conservatism, because it goads people into taking the law into their own hands.

I refute very strongly and seriously the charge levelled by Mr Masters that the Opposition does nothing constructive. I found nothing constructive in his speech. There is nothing constructive we can do, because the Government brings to us only words and empty rhetoric. Let the Government submit a policy that gives some hope for the future; let the Government submit policies which, no matter how radical they may seem, can be properly debated and explored in this Chamber so that we can go to the people and tell them the truth about the changing world we live in and explain to them what are our plans for the future. If the Government did that it would have all the support it wants from those who sit on this side of the Chamber.

This must be done in a hurry. Let every member consider this matter and consider how this Chamber can play a useful role by instituting Standing Committees to consider problems which will arise in the change and to report to the Parliament what they have achieved by talking to the people and hearing their views at first hand. We hear a lot of talk about small businesses and about changes in the iron ore industry, etc.; but all the talk in the world will not stop the Dampier pellet plant closing down and 200 or 300 people being put out of work. I do not care which party is in Government; that plant will close because the pellets cannot be sold. People who are well versed in the iron ore industry say the first glimmer of hope for some upturn in the industry will not be seen before 1985. I would like it to occur five minutes from now, just as I am sure every other member of the Chamber would like it to occur.

However, to conclude: On the day the Government is constructive the Opposition will be constructive and will support the Government.

But if the Government continues to bring forward empty rhetoric then, as a properly constituted Opposition, we have every right to criticise it for doing nothing.

THE HON. R. G. PIKE (North Metropolitan) [5.22 p.m.]: We have heard the Leader of the Opposition speak this evening, and in the first part of his address on the Supply Bill we saw him with his claws unsheathed. He did what he often does in this House; that is, he made a misstatement of fact without regard to history or truth. In order to put the record right, I will speak very briefly.

I say in the first instance that the matters to which I will refer are on record. I am sure the Hon. Bob Hetherington will agree it is the case that when Mr Whitlam was the Labor Party Leader of the Opposition he made a statement to the effect that if he had the numbers in the Senate he would unquestionably refuse supply. That attitude is well recorded but, because Mr Dans has retreaded it tonight, it must be restated.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Has the Labor Party ever refused supply anywhere?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: Yes. That is the very question I anticipated. I go on to make my next point: In 1952 when the Labor Party was in Opposition in the Victorian Parliament and Mr Cain was the leader of that party, it refused supply in the upper House to Black Jack McDonald's Country Party Government.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: They never had a majority in the upper House in Victoria.

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: I am sorry, but Mr Cooley had better check his records.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: If you recall, I said "having regard to Victoria".

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: That is a lovely panacea! For the benefit of Mr Cooley I repeat in categorical terms that in 1952 the Cain Labor Party Opposition refused supply to Black Jack McDonald's Country Party Government in Victoria. This fact needs to be placed on record, because it illustrates the political posturing and counterfeit attitude of the Leader of the Opposition. It emphasises that one simply cannot trust the Labor Party or the manner in which its members present their arguments. They will bend the rules and the facts of history at any time to make a political point—in this case one that is clearly untrue. That is my reason for speaking.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Are you saying *Hansard* is incorrect?

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: I am not saying *Hansard* is incorrect. As I said in answer to Mr

Cooley, I am saying categorically that the Labor Opposition refused supply to the Victorian Government in 1952. That is the fact of the matter.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [5.25 p.m.]: I have no intention to debate the matter raised by Mr Pike, except to say that the exception he quoted is the one that proves the rule.

Following along the line pursued by Mr Dans, I would say also that we hear a great deal of rhetoric from the Government, particularly when it throws out terms such as "socialism" and says it is extremely bad, giving the impression that it is one of the worst things imaginable and that the Government's policies are the ones that will achieve the best for the country.

I would like to refer briefly to an industry for which the present Government is particularly hopeful; that is, oil and gas exploration. If we look at the statistics regarding oil and gas exploration in Australia and compare them with the statistics of other countries in the world—including those which have acknowledged socialist Governments—we find the propaganda line the State Government tries to sell the public is way off the track. In fact, it is misleading and it indicates that our present Government is very likely the worst Government we could have if we want to get the best for our country and the greatest possible activity in it.

If we look at the figures in respect of oil exploration over a number of years we find Australia has a particularly poor record in comparison with other countries. The disadvantages to Australia have been quite marked over the last few years.

For example, if we look at the international statistics for the various continents of the world we find that the United States undertakes a colossal amount of oil exploration. Liberal and National Country Party members would say that proves their point; but what I wish to highlight is the comparison between what is done in America and what is done in Australia. Unfortunately I have not the figures for the most recent years; however, in 1976 the total number of wells drilled in the United States was 41 455. In Canada, which is next door to the United States of America, the number was 6 221.

I am sure members of the Liberal Party would say, "That is not a good year to quote" if I referred to the Australian scene in 1975; therefore I will take the following two years in which we had Liberal Governments both in the State and in Canberra. In 1977 a total of 41 wells were drilled

in Australia—not 41 000 or even 4 100—whereas in America 41 000 wells were drilled in 1976. The provisional figure for 1978 was 43 wells drilled in Australia. The best year for Australia was 1970 in which 152 onshore wells and 63 offshore wells were completed, making a total of 215 for the year. That was Australia's best year and since that time there has been a continuous and steady decline.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: In oil exploration?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Yes, since 1970.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: What about this year; have you seen the latest figures? It is quite a considerable percentage. It shows 82 per cent of oil exploration is being undertaken off the coast of Western Australia.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: In what would be regarded as a socialist State—I refer to South Australia—there were more wells drilled than in Western Australia. The numbers of wells drilled are still quite small, but it made no difference to the exploration companies that South Australia had a Labor Government.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I think you will find the figure has increased.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I said there had been a continuous decline since 1970. I would agree that over the last couple of years there has been a resurgence of activity.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: In the last six months it has been quite fantastic.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Over the last two years, in fact, there has been an increase in activity. The factors for this increase have nothing to do with the Government in power at the time of exploration; it is more to do with the business decisions of the companies.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: That is not entirely true.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: If the member is trying to suggest the exploration companies will not deal with a Labor or democratic socialist Government his statement is disproved by the figures of exploration undertaken around the world.

The Hon. G. E. Masters interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! **The Hon. R. F. Claughton** will address his comments to the Chair.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: There is no question that Labor Governments are quite able to undertake amicable and successful negotiations with the large international companies. The

companies themselves deal with far more State-centred Governments than the Labor Governments in Australia.

I could quote a great number of figures but it would not add much to the debate except to incorporate more factual information in *Hansard*. Any member who wishes to question the statements or figures I have put forward can ask to see the statistics I have available including those to be found in oil industry publications.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: How many years do you believe it takes to establish an oil drilling programme?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It would vary. It could be one month—

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: No way.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It depends on what sort of programme the member is thinking of.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Drilling a hole to explore for oil.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: If a company had the equipment and the lease it could quite easily go out and drill a hole. This is what we call wild catting. This is done frequently in America and other parts of the world.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: No hole could be put down without two years of preparation.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It would depend on the situation. If the member is talking about the North-West Shelf he is talking of a programme that might take up to 10 years before a well is drilled.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: I am speaking of onshore drilling.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: This whole question would depend on the nature of the country the exploration company was going into, the company's past experience, and many other factors. One cannot give a specific time as the variables are quite numerous.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer interjected.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I realise Mr Tozer would like to carry on a debate across the Chamber, but I am not interested in doing that.

The oil industry in Mexico is completely Government-controlled; it was expropriated by the Government of that country in the late 1930s. That country is currently having a pipeline constructed to the United States so that it can supply the United States with gas. Obviously the USA has no objections to dealing with a country which has this sort of arrangement, whereby the Government controls the industry. I mentioned

this to illustrate it is quite false to state that these companies will not deal with a country in which there is government investment in the industry; reference to what is happening in other parts of the world will quite easily disprove such a statement.

The bulk of the oil industry in the Middle East is controlled by Governments. This process of expropriation took place in a rather traumatic manner over the last couple of decades.

Mexico is likely to receive huge returns from its oil reserves. It has a colossal deposit of oil and the returns will be put back for the purpose of industrialising the country and creating employment for the people who will survive after the oil has gone. That is entirely sensible.

If this Government is intending to put investment into the North-West Shelf by the use of public moneys to create community infrastructure such as housing, schools, harbour facilities and so on, it is not doing the best by the State unless it has a return by investment in the companies themselves. That is a well established business practice. If one provides an amount for infrastructure where oil exploration occurs one should earn a share of the profits which arise.

This would be done by any Government in any other country which is prepared to accept the facts of industrial life. As it is, with the sort of Governments Australia is saddled with it seems highly unlikely this will occur.

I turn now to a matter which is quite different but which has still something to do with the sea; I refer specifically to the fishing industry in its various forms. There are competing factions in the industry. In the main these involve the commercial fisherman and the amateur fisherman; it is the commercial versus the recreational uses. There is a third interest involving tourism.

The fish resources of the State are highly important. In 1978 Western Australia gained \$71.7 million from the industry; the gain from the crayfishing sector amounted to \$49.3 million. This State figure can be compared with the New South Wales figure of \$39.7 million income from fishing. There is no question that the fishing industry is highly important and that the conservation of fish stocks is also of importance.

There is a continual contest for access to these stocks between the amateur and professional fishermen. Antagonism and frustration develop on the part of the amateur fishermen when they see the professionals gathering large quantities of fish and so reducing the quantities they themselves are able to catch. Of course, many professional

fishermen complain in much the same way; they believe the amateur fishermen are taking away their livelihood, because they do not observe the fishing rules and do not pay fees. They believe the amateurs are ruining the business from which they draw their income.

This is not a new story; the argument has gone on for a considerable time and applies to all States. Both groups complain about another facet of concern, and that is the sham amateur. This is the person who does not have to pay any fees, does not have to pass the same sort of rigid examination as does the professional with respect to seagoing expertise, and is not subject to the investigations by the taxation people and so does not have to pay tax on the return he gets from selling his catch. Not only the professional but also the amateur sees this person as depleting fish stocks.

When fishing clubs hold competitions they find at times that no fish are being caught, thus making the journey to the particular area anything but worth while. An incident was related to me concerning a group of people who flew to the south coast, went out in their boat, brought in a haul of fish which they very quickly loaded onto the plane and then flew out again. Of course, there was no way an inspector would have had time to apprehend them, if indeed an inspector had been in the area. The catch subsequently was landed, probably on a farm—

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Why on a farm?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It was in a non-metropolitan area.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Why a farm? Why, when you believe there is any skulduggery involved, do you think a farm is concerned?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I regret the honourable member is so sensitive about this. The load of fish obviously had to be landed in a cleared area, very likely a farm. I regret the honourable member felt I was making some derogatory reference to farmers.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: It could have been on a beach.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: That is possible, but unlikely. If the plane had landed on a beach there was a possibility of being apprehended by inspectors. It is far more likely the plane was landed on a rural property.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: It could have landed on an aerodrome in the country; there are plenty of them about.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am sure Mr Gayfer could dwell on this point for some minutes. I accept all the different places the plane could have landed. Obviously it would have been a non-metropolitan area, away from people who would be a cause of concern to those involved. The point is that the story illustrates the extent to which the sham amateurs are operating with the use of aeroplanes, but are still able to make a profit.

The Secretary of the Hawthorn Angling Club wrote to me referring to illegal catches by amateurs. He referred to one instance of three men who brought in 93 jewfish and sold them; another instance of four men bringing in 63 and selling them; and another where two men brought in 36 jewfish and sold them for \$80 at a fish shop. This was an amateur fisherman complaining about other amateurs who are really making a business of it.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer interjected.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Is the honourable member talking about the exploit with the plane or about what I am referring to, which is the catching and selling of jewfish?

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I am wondering where all the jewfish went.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I have no doubt they went to cafes and fish shops where they were sold to the public in the normal way. The point is that they were purchased by these outlets and the individuals who caught the fish were not liable for any of the costs applicable to professional licensed fishermen.

The person also complained that the clubs themselves have very strict rules which they observe and that therefore it is rare for club members around Rottneest to catch many jewfish which weigh over 20 lb. The other catches to which I referred were made around Rottneest.

I have had correspondence with a number of amateur clubs about this matter and they all claim there is insufficient policing of the existing laws.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: This is what the amateurs say?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: No.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: They told you there is not enough policing?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Yes. I expect the clubs have an interest in ensuring that the laws as they stand are observed, because all club members are suffering as a result of a depletion of fish stocks, for whatever reason. Nearly all those who contacted me have indicated that they know

these illegal catches are being made mainly by non-club members.

The gentleman who wrote to me from a group called the Conventional Officers Angling Club claimed that people, mainly well-off businessmen who could afford large expensive boats, would take off to an area like Shark Bay, make their considerable catches, freeze the fish, and then return to Perth and sell the fish at a profit. Very often these people use the money from the catches to defray the cost of the boat. It is claimed that this practice is possible because of a lack of adequate policing of the current laws.

They say this is one aspect to which the Government should pay attention. One suggestion which has been made and which perhaps the Government should examine concerns a system of control at the point of sale. The purchasers of fish should be required to keep records which should be available for inspection. In this way it would be possible to detect where illegal purchases were being made and the offenders could be prosecuted. This would help to control the situation.

I might add that my present interest in this matter was sparked by a letter from the Shark Bay Progress Association, I think it was, claiming that the amateur fishermen were—

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: This came through in your normal electorate business?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Large numbers of boat owners reside in my province. The most popular recreational sport is fishing. In fact, at least half the population, if not more, indulges in that sport.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: The more people who fish, the fewer fish there will be.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: That is not necessarily so.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: They would not belong to clubs.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Not all of them. The angling clubs are disturbed about the situation. They would like more control.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What do all your friends who go to Shark Bay to fish say? Do they believe there should be more policing too?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: None of my friends owns a large boat of that nature. The only person of my acquaintance who has a large boat has not completed it yet. It is in his shed at Karrinyup and the neighbours complain that it has been there for too long in the process of being built. It has a certain notoriety in the district.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Was not Mrs Vaughan talking about the fish she caught at Shark Bay?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: If so I am sorry I was not here to listen to her comments. The original complaint arose in Shark Bay.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Have you read the report of the South Coast Fisheries Study?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I must admit I have not.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It contains one or two interesting recommendations in connection with what you are dealing with.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I know it covers a good deal of valuable material.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It actually touched on that aspect of pseudo amateurism about which you made reference.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I do intend to study the report, but as the Leader of the House would know we are expected to read a great deal and we cannot always manage to do so.

This problem is not confined to our State. In the March, 1977, issue of the *Australian Fisheries* an article sets out pretty well the claims and counterclaims made. We often hear the sort of comment Mr Oliver made; that is, that if a large number of people fish, the stocks will be depleted. However, that does not necessarily occur. The article states that in Botany Bay, where amateurs have made this complaint, a study of the fish stocks has been made and it has been revealed that, despite the expanded fishing activity, the catches have increased over a period of years.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: It depends on the species, because sometimes, when an increased number of people fish in a particular area at a given time, more fish are found.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: In some cases that is so, but most varieties produce a vast amount of spawn and not many survive to maturity. In fact, heavy fishing can improve the fish stocks, because if the smaller fish are caught then those remaining have a larger food supply. As I have said, a reduction in the number of fish can, in fact, improve the catches.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Amateur net fishermen have an effect.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Yes. One of the common complaints by amateurs and professionals concerns the netting by amateurs in estuarine waters. The article to which I have referred deals with two estuaries in New South Wales which were closed some 70 years ago. The current experience is that the fishing has not improved in those two estuaries compared with

the fishing in other estuaries which have remained open.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: The fish migrate.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: That is really what we want to know. It is not sufficient to receive complaints about a certain estuary or about netting in other estuaries. We must know the life cycle of all species, because one species feeds on another.

Last week I asked whether the Government was prepared to declare herring as a food fish. This has been advocated strongly by the amateur fishing clubs, because they envisage a serious depletion of fishing stocks which is following an earlier depletion of salmon stocks. They claim the depletion of the salmon stocks was due largely to uncontrolled overfishing. They say that because there are fewer salmon available the professionals are netting herring as crayfish bait—earlier they used salmon for crayfish bait—and thus the herring stocks will be depleted as were the salmon stocks. These two species are related. Somewhere along the line in the breeding and feeding cycle—it might have happened in South Australia—the fishing in South Australian waters might have had an effect on the fish numbers in Western Australia.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Mr President, before the tea suspension I mentioned that these matters originally arose out of an item which appeared in *The Sunday Times* of the 3rd December, 1978, under the headline "Fishermen want laws amended". Mr T. W. Hargreaves was the Secretary of the Shark Bay Progress Association. So, I had all the essential details right from memory but not the specific date or the name of the newspaper.

Several years ago I made representations in relation to bag limits for fish, and the Government at that time amended the relevant laws. I was therefore particularly interested in the reaction of angling clubs to the change, and to know whether they found it satisfactory. In fact, all the amateur clubs I contacted expressed satisfaction with the current limits and the way they are operating. They would like some action to be taken in the matter of policing, and the licensed fishermen want some control over sales by what are termed "sham amateurs" to outlets such as fish shops, restaurants, hotels, and so on.

Immediately before the tea suspension I was referring to a rather comprehensive article in the March, 1977, edition of *Australian Fisheries*, which deals with most of the accusations made by

amateurs against professionals, and vice versa. The article disproves, on the evidence, much of the mythology that has arisen in relation to this matter. As a consequence of similar accusations levelled in South Australia, the Government of that State set up an inquiry headed by Dr G. K. Jones, a biologist in the South Australian Department of Agriculture and Fisheries.

An article in *The Professional Fisherman*, volume 1, No. 6 of April, 1979, referred to the report of that inquiry. It says in part—

The report, through biological evidence, shows that fish stocks could easily be depleted without controls on effort.

With reference to the fact that recreation needs are likely to be increased, the following recommendation was made—

Further investigations of the recreational scale fishery should be undertaken to determine the effort and proportions of the scale caught in this fishery.

If the total fishing effort can be constrained, the following proposals could be implemented:

Abolition of seasonal closure.

Closures of nursery areas.

Netting of snapper in upper Spencer Gulf.

Changes in the mesh size of nets.

I believe there was value in undertaking a biological survey of the fisheries in South Australia. There is no question that problems are arising in the Eastern States fisheries. While we recognise that not all the accusations are based on fact, the evidence provided by the local amateur fishing clubs, relating specifically to herring, is that the fishermen have difficulty in achieving their bag limit, which is 50 fish. Membership of the Offshore Angling Club has decreased from 150 last year to 80 this year as a consequence of the poor catches in competitions. The game fishermen state that at present only 20 or 30 members out of a membership of somewhere around 120 may turn up on a competition day.

These facts make the point that the catches are in fact decreasing, reflecting in a loss of membership. One makes a great deal of effort to get to Shark Bay and does so at considerable expense, but one is lucky to catch half a dozen fish. That is the state of affairs.

Similar problems are faced on the south coast. From their experience, fishermen say a serious problem is arising which warrants the Government's declaring herring to be a food fish

only. In addition, more detailed studies are needed of the ecology of all the fish life along the coast, to enable us to make reasonable judgments about what should be done.

We should examine a range of matters, partly assisted by the records of the angling clubs themselves. They have records, going back for a number of years, of the catches of their members. I imagine that information has already been made available to the inquiry the Minister mentioned earlier.

On the 1st May I asked in a question on notice whether herring would be declared a food fish only, and the Minister replied—

(1) The south coast fishermen's parliamentary study committee recommended as follows—

- (a) The committee has found no support outside the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife for any proposed use of the powers in section 38 of the Act to require that certain species of fish be used only for food (human consumption); and accordingly no further declaration in terms of the section is recommended.
- (b) In particular the committee has been told—

- (i) that a declaration of herring as a food fish would distort the market as certainly less than 50 per cent of the catch of that fish is used as food;
- (ii) that a declaration of tuna as a food fish would not affect the present practice as all tuna can be sold profitably for processing for human consumption and practically none is used as bait; and therefore it is recommended that no declaration be made in respect of these species.

The committee's decision is based on the information in the last two paragraphs, not on biological studies of what is actually happening to the fish populations. The decision is based on what is possible once the fish are brought ashore. The committee is looking at the marketing aspect and not at what is actually happening in the oceans. We probably need more information on this aspect. I believe there is a need to go deeper into that aspect to determine where the dangers to the fish stocks lie.

Much has been said about the need to protect estuaries. The article in *Australian Fisheries* of 1977 questions that argument. If the protection of some areas is more important for the conservation and maintaining of fish stocks, we need to know what those areas are, and that information can be gleaned by close scientific study of the problem.

Most members know of the problems in trying to understand the crayfish cycle. We must also understand that the bulk of the \$71 million a year which the State receives from the fishing industry comes from crayfish. I am speaking mainly about scale fish. A considerable section of the population is involved in the manufacture and retailing of all the fishing equipment used by amateur fishermen. A member of the Legislative Assembly said he recently took his son fishing and had to spend \$150 on equipment before he left. Not all of us do that. However, every time we go fishing we make purchases of one sort or another. That represents a considerable business and it is one which is decentralised in these coastal towns.

Not only do we have the fishing industry and the tackle trade; the important aspect of tourism must also be considered. Tourists are people from the city going away on holidays; in many cases to enjoy some fishing. In fact, if they travel to the more remote areas of the State such as Shark Bay, Kalbarri, and so on, the principal attraction of the area is the fishing which is to be had there. So, the pastime of fishing is an important part of the tourist industry in this State and I believe it is important we should be taking steps to ensure it is protected.

It is possible those two industries—the tackle trade and the tourist trade—in fact may be more important economically than the export and local markets for the fish catch in general; certainly, they are more important from the point of view of promoting decentralisation. There are areas which are greatly in need of interest being taken by the Government to see what may be done to allow all sectors of the industry to operate more co-operatively and to ensure our fish stocks are conserved.

I believe both the professional fishermen and the amateur fishing clubs are strongly interested in conserving fish stocks. The professional fisherman wants to be in the industry perpetually; he does not want to regard it as a quick profit industry. The people involved in amateur fishing clubs are interested in seeing that their clubs continue in the long term; they do not want it only for themselves but also for their sons and grandsons. So, there is strong interest on the part of both sides for the conservation of the industry,

and the Government needs to take a great deal more interest to this area than it has done to date.

Mr President, I could go on to speak more about the boating side of the industry; however, there are Bills coming through in which those matters may be raised. Just to give an example, a professional fisherman at Mandurah has said he believes it is rather foolish for the fisheries inspector to go through the outlet and miles out to sea in order to catch offenders when he could locate himself near the entrance through which people must pass, whether they be going out to sea or returning with their catch. The inspector could check people going out to sea—particularly the amateur fishermen—to ensure they are properly equipped to go out into open water and he could check the catches of people returning after a day's fishing. He would more readily be able to apprehend people in this manner. To the layman, very often these things seem simple; however, in practice, it does not always work out that way.

The last point I wish to mention concerns the herring fisheries. The amateur fishermen are concerned that herring is used not only as a food fish and crayfish bait but also as a fertiliser and as pet food. They see this industry being developed as an exploitive industry, where the operators go out, clean out as much as they can, and wipe out the stocks in a particular locality. The amateurs believe the professionals will not regard the herring fishery as a conservation industry, but rather as an industry to be exploited.

I was informed recently by amateur fishermen, who have fished at the Swanbourne sewerage outlet for years—it has always been a favourite angling spot for rod fishermen—and who have been getting good catches of late, that trawlers have come close inshore and netted fish. Of course, the sport for the amateur has been completely ruined; after the trawler had been through the area, not a fish has been taken by the amateur. I understand from the amateur fishing clubs it is illegal for trawlers to operate so close to the shore. This reinforces their argument that there should be better policing of the current laws.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We have an awful lot of ocean out there.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: We are not talking so much about oceans. The clubs understand that point; that is why they put forward the proposition that there should be some docketing system which will enable fish purchases to be traced.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I think that proposition was put forward by the committee; that is the point at which it should be handled.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: We all know that the amateur who brings back fish for sale goes to the local fish shop or hotel and sells his fish. If those people are required to keep records and are able to prove by their documents where the fish was obtained, it would be much easier to police this law than to attempt to cover thousands of miles of coastline.

Another proposition which was put to me—again, by a professional fisherman—is that, in fact, it would be better not to open the south-west coast to professional fishermen, because it is predominantly enjoyed by amateurs at holiday and tourist resorts. I believe the industry in this area is more valuable to the State from the aspect of the number of tourists it attracts rather than from the catches made by professional fishermen.

If we are looking at the future of the fishing industry, perhaps we should be looking at the fisheries which are further offshore. For some reason, the professional fishermen located in this State seem to be unadventurous. It is sad in a way that, through the Australian Government, currently we are entering into arrangements with fishing companies from Taiwan and Japan to exploit our fishing grounds off the coast within the 200-mile limit. Surely we have fishermen of enough competence to go out, beyond the few miles off our coast in which they normally fish, and exploit these grounds.

With those remarks, I support the Bill.

THE HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [7.53 p.m.]: I support the Bill, and wish to discuss two subjects. Firstly, I wish to enter the discussion about the State's slogan. "The State of Excitement" does not appear to have gained universal acceptance throughout the State. While I believe the slogan shows great enthusiasm and perhaps engenders a state of inquiry, it certainly has not received universal acceptance.

Let me say at the outset I have never got into a great personal hassle about a slogan; it does not really concern me a great deal one way or the other. However, if we are to have a slogan it should be universally acceptable which is the purpose of my discussing the matter now. Any slogan should be simple, logical, and easily understood. Therefore, I believe the slogan should be simply, "The Great State". After all, Western Australia is not only great in size in that it comprises one-third of the continent of Australia; it also has claims to greatness in many other respects.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: It has the highest unemployment rate.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I was waiting for an interjection of that nature from the Opposition. If the Hon. Lyla Elliott wishes to read that interpretation into my suggested slogan, that is her prerogative. I suggest "The Great State" could be read in any way one likes and would be universally acceptable—even to people like the Hon. Lyla Elliott.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: We have the highest employment record.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer interjected.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: It seems this topic is very much in the minds of members; I am pleased to think they are giving it their attention.

Greatness may come in many ways. If one lifts one's sights, one can obtain high goals. However, if a person's "greatness" is of mediocre proportions, so be it. While the present slogan appears to show commendable enthusiasm it does not meet the requirements of the citizens of our State.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What about "The Wildflower State"? Wasn't that mooted by somebody down your way this morning?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: Western Australia's slogan used to be "The Wildflower State" which was superseded by the present slogan "The State of Excitement". Yesterday I attended the half-yearly meeting in Bunbury of the Western Australian Country Tourist Bureau Secretariat. Delegates came from a number of tourist bureaus throughout Western Australia.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: From 33, in fact.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon attended the meeting. As Minister for Tourism, he takes a great interest in this area of endeavour as well he may; he is to be commended for that interest.

The State slogan came up for discussion and it was moved and carried that we revert to the slogan "The Wildflower State". There are many reasons that that slogan could be acceptable: Wildflowers do grow over practically the entire State at one time or another during the year. Whereas the season in the south is relatively short, wildflowers do grow in the wheatbelt area and in the Pilbara, the Kimberley, and other northern areas. In fact, at almost any time of the year one can find wildflowers of one sort or another, wherever there is vegetation.

However, it is a matter of opinion whether this is a complete selling point for Western Australia. If "The Wildflower State" were once again to

become our State slogan, it could be the medium of promoting that sort of garden throughout the State. We would need encouragement, particularly by way of gardening on roadside verges and on reserves, which already is being done in a limited way by the Main Roads Department and by some private people. Perhaps, with the passing of time, we could turn Western Australia into a garden of wildflowers, and that slogan could have application.

I come back to the point I made earlier: I believe our slogan should be quite simply, "The Great State". Whichever category one applies the word "great" to, the slogan fits, and is appropriate.

I refer now to the fishing industry which was mentioned by the previous speaker, the Hon. Roy Cloughton. I totally agree with some of his remarks. He referred to the south coast fisheries. Last year, a rather unique committee from this Parliament, the South Coast Fisheries Parliamentary Study Committee was established. In brief, its charter was to study the fisheries from the South Australian border to Cape Leeuwin. That was the geographical dimension of the inquiry. Of course, we realise that fish know no boundaries, and swim beyond the eastern border with South Australia, probably to Tasmania and back again. They also swim around Cape Leeuwin to Geographe Bay and the west coast, and some swim back again if they are not caught or do not meet some other fate. It is a very wide area of endeavour.

Mr Cloughton referred to the question of amateur fishermen. During the course of the inquiry into the south coast fisheries, the members of the committee were disappointed that only one amateur body saw fit to give evidence. That amateur body gave evidence at Esperance, if I remember correctly. It was particularly disappointing to me as a member of that committee to find that amateur clubs and amateur fishermen did not take the opportunity to give of their time and knowledge in dealing with the amateur fishing industry on the south coast. Notwithstanding that, some members of the committee were keen fishermen. I am sure most of us had some knowledge of amateur fishing along that stretch of coastline in any event. From our private inquiries, we were able to come up with some sort of assessment. Nevertheless, I reiterate that amateur fishing clubs failed to give of their best in that exercise.

The Hon. Roy Cloughton has been referring to clubs operating on the west coast, probably from Cape Leeuwin to Shark Bay and Exmouth Bay. If a similar study were contemplated in relation to

that stretch of coastline, I hope that the amateur fishing clubs would give evidence to the committee.

In relation to the question of herring being declared a food fish, Mr Claughton read the recommendation of the South Coast Fisheries Parliamentary Study Committee. I do not wish to duplicate what he said. However, it was quite clear to the members of the committee that there was no need—last year, at least—to declare herring a food fish, because the bulk of the herring catch was used for other purposes. As he has mentioned, it was used for bait, fertiliser, and so on. Therefore, at that stage there was no need to declare it a food fish.

Subsequent to that report I had an approach from a shire council acting on behalf of a fishing club. It asked to have herring declared a food fish. I have referred this matter to the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife for its consideration. I understand that the department has the matter under review, as it has any number of other fishing matters. We must bear in mind that the fishing industry is an ongoing industry and, as Mr Claughton pointed out, there is need for continuing research at all levels into all species of fish.

I am satisfied that the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, in association with the CSIRO and other bodies, is fairly competent in this area. As time goes by, I am sure that the correct determinations will be made.

I refer particularly to the problem on the south coast in respect of salmon fishing. It is quite evident that there is no clear-cut solution to the varying catches of salmon on the south coast, season by season. A lot more research needs to be done to establish the true pattern of the salmon coming from South Australian waters, and maybe from the far eastern seaboard, and migrating to Western Australia. There are all sorts of theories and all sorts of factors. Some of the theories have been proved, and some have yet to be proved.

The salmon problem is an ongoing problem. The committee recommends that this matter be kept under review, and that further investigations take place in the next five years. One would hope that following further examination more will be known about the habits of the salmon.

Mr Claughton also referred to fish being purchased by hotels, restaurants, fish shops, and others, and the fact that they should keep an account of their purchases. I will refer again to the recommendation of the South Coast Fisheries Parliamentary Study Committee which reads—

5.2.3 The Committee recommends that suggestions to require commercial purchasers of fish (hotels, restaurants, fish shops, etc.) to record details of vendors from whom they purchased and purchases made be adopted for a trial period of five years.

Members will realise that the committee was aware of the sort of difficulty to which Mr Claughton referred. Whether it is possible to introduce this sort of control, if one could use that word, is another matter.

The committee was of the view that an educational programme should be instituted through publicity, through departmental pamphlets, and by enlightened enforcement, stressing the law. That would probably be preferable to bringing in some hard and fast determination at this stage.

We have to remember that the fishing industry is a rural industry. People obtain a livelihood from this source. We also acknowledge, as Mr Claughton does, that the fishing industry has a place in our community for recreational purposes. There needs always to be a balance between professional and amateur fishing.

We should be mindful of the fact that amateurs have that status. They should not become "shamateurs", selling their catch and being in competition with professional fishermen who have to pay licence fees and spend a tremendous amount of money on boats and equipment. There is need for a balance.

I am confident that the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife has an understanding approach to these matters. The department should be complimented for its guidance to the fishing industry in this State, particularly over the last 15 to 20 years. We are fortunate, indeed, to have some very competent officers in that department. Although there is room for improvement—and I acknowledge that—I believe that, by comparison with the fishing industry in other parts of Australia, we in Western Australia are served rather well. Long may it be so.

With those remarks, I take pleasure in supporting the Bill.

THE HON. LYLA ELLIOTT (North-East Metropolitan) [8.08 p.m.]: I rise to support the Bill.

It is appropriate to raise a matter which I believe is of great importance to Western Australians. It is the matter I dealt with last Tuesday evening on the adjournment debate. I refer to the way certain members of the Liberal Party in this country are treating the system of Parliament. By their actions and statements they

have begun to show contempt for the democratic processes in this country.

As I said in the adjournment debate, the recent actions and statements of certain members of the Liberal Party in the State and Federal Parliaments can only make me fearful for the future of democracy in this country. We saw what happened to the Whitlam Government when the Liberal-Country Party-controlled Senate blocked supply on two occasions in three years. As a result, ultimately we saw the destruction of that Government.

I am becoming tired of people telling me that Mr Whitlam was put out by the electors of Australia—

The Hon. W. R. Withers: What did he do to the electors?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I said I am becoming tired of Liberals telling me that we should not complain about the defeat of the Whitlam Government in 1975, because it was the will of the electors of Australia.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Are you saying it was not?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Just give me time, and I will continue my theme.

If we accept the reasoning that when the people of this country no longer support a Government that Government should resign, the Fraser Government should resign now and allow Labor to govern. Let us have a look at the latest opinion polls. In *The Bulletin* of the 8th May we read on page 22—

Federal: ALP stays in front

In mid-April approval of the Federal ALP was steady at 48 percent, well ahead of the L-NCP, according to the Morgan Gallup.

If an election had been held the ALP would have been elected with preferences from the minor parties.

Prime Minister Fraser's approval rating was up 2 percent to 37 percent while Bill Hayden's approval rating was 45 percent.

That answers some of the specious arguments that we hear when we refer to the dangerous precedent established by the Liberals in the Federal Parliament during the time of the Whitlam Government. That precedent was to refuse supply, and ultimately to force the Whitlam Government out of office at a time which suited the then Opposition parties.

The other matter I referred to last Tuesday evening was the disgraceful statement by Mr Crozier, a senior Liberal Minister in Victoria,

that should Labor be elected last Saturday the Liberals should use their numbers in the upper House to reject supply and destroy or sack the Labor Government. I am still waiting for someone to refute my statement that I made on the adjournment debate.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: It was refuted.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I am still waiting for the Leader of the House or for someone else to refute my statements and to answer my challenge for him to deny that the present Premier (Sir Charles Court), when he was the Leader of the Opposition during the term of office of the Tonkin Government, tried to have this House reject supply. I would like the Leader of the House to deny that categorically if he can. If he cannot, that would confirm what we have always suspected.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I thought you wanted me to accept the dictum of your Mr Whitlam, that any means is satisfactory and suitable. He is on record as having said that with regard to the blocking of supply.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The Leader of the House is dodging the issue again. It is obvious he will not answer the challenge I threw out to him.

The Hon. R. G. Pike interjected.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I am not answerable for something that happened a quarter of a century ago.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Mr Whitlam's statement that it was a perfectly good thing to do did not happen a quarter of a century ago.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (the Hon. R. J. L. Williams): Order! The Hon. Lyla Elliott will continue, and ignore the discussion going on.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I am not answerable for things done by previous Labor Governments 25 or 50 years ago. I certainly would not support a number of things that have been done by Labor Governments of the past.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: By their record you shall know them.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I am speaking of the 1970s and the future. Not only has the Leader of the House not answered my challenge about Sir Charles Court's endeavour to block supply for the Tonkin Government, but he has not answered my request for an assurance that, should Labor win the election in 1980, the Liberal Party would not use its numbers in this House to destroy that Labor Government. He dodged both issues.

In fact, the Leader of the House took two minutes to reply. His statements in those two minutes were nothing but personal abuse of me. I

did not raise the matter frivolously. I was seriously concerned about the future of democracy in this country.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No, you were not really, because if you were you would have been concerned when Mr Whitlam told Mr Murphy the same thing.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I have been seriously concerned, and I still am, about the future of democracy in this country.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Did you write to Mr Whitlam about it?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: If we are unable to change the Government by orderly constitutional means, what is the alternative? Will we see violence in this country such as that we have seen in other countries? That is the only alternative. If the conservatives are determined to hang onto power—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Have you put in your Press release about this?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I have come to the conclusion that—

The Hon. G. E. Masters: That is the first time you have come to a conclusion.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: —the Leader of the House is a male chauvinist.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What a terrible thing to say. You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The Leader of the House has developed an unfortunate attitude—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are a sexist.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: That is what she is saying you are.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: —which is that when I try to raise serious issues in an orderly way under the Standing Orders of this House, for example if I exercise my right to move an amendment to the Address-in-Reply on a serious matter such as nuclear power and uranium, I am accused by the Leader of the House of prostituting the Standing Orders of this House. If I raise an issue relating to the democracy of this country, the Leader of the House accuses me of engaging in gutter politics.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: If you put that piece about chauvinism in your Press release, you will get a headline.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The Leader of the House is a male chauvinist and I can well understand why Fred Lavery punched him on the nose on the floor of this House because he insulted the Hon. Ruby Hutchison.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He was not a female; he was a male.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I believe it was on Wednesday night that the Hon. Fred McKenzie read to this House, in part, an editorial which appeared in *The Age* of the 2nd May. When the Hon. Fred McKenzie showed the editorial to me before he read it to the House, I could not help feeling that it could have been written about this Chamber.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What was that?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I intend to read part of this editorial again for the benefit of the Leader of the House, because it is so applicable and relevant to this House that it deserves to be quoted again.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Who said this?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I will not read the whole matter about Mr Crozier, because we have dealt with that already.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: Except that you have dealt with it in your usual way without being fair to the proper authorities.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (The Hon. R. J. L. Williams): Order! Will the honourable member address her remarks to the Chair?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I could read the whole article, but it is not necessary. We have another male chauvinist opposite who has never said anything constructive in this Chamber.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: And another one over here.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The honourable member is always destructive when he stands up to speak. I have never yet heard him make a constructive comment. I will not read the whole editorial. I shall quote what I believe to be very relevant to this House. The editorial appeared in *The Age* of the 2nd May and it reads, in part, as follows—

It is not good enough for Mr. Hamer to say that Opposition parties naturally vote against legislation they dislike, and that the Legislative Council has rarely brought down a Government on Supply.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Would you read it a bit slower for *Hansard*, please?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I will give the article to *Hansard*.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: As we always do.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: It is already in *Hansard*. It is the same piece that Mr McKenzie quoted.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Mr Pike is not interested—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I have read it already. *Hansard* can get it from last week's book.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Members opposite cannot bear to listen to other members' speeches. To continue—

What the people of Victoria should realise is that while the Council may usefully review legislation, it is a grossly undemocratic and unrepresentative chamber.

That could be referring to the Legislative Council in Western Australia. To continue—

Its staggered six-year terms of membership and its gerrymandered boundaries have ensured that the Labor Party has never yet been able to win a majority there.

It could apply to this House. We have not had a majority—

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Go back and have a look at the Labor debates.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: If they could not form a majority, how did they do that in 1952? Apparently *The Age* editorial is incorrect.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: They did not have a majority then. Labor has never had a majority in the upper House in Victoria.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: You are talking about Victoria?

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: They have never had a majority in the upper House in Victoria.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I shall continue from where I left off prior to being rudely interrupted—

For most of its history it has been an asylum for irrelevance, indolence, pomposity and mediocrity. The suggestion that this chamber, originally designed as a bulwark of propertied interests against the demands of democracy, should use its stacked numbers to thwart the mandate of a freshly elected Government is little short of outrageous.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Did Mr McKenzie say this?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: To continue—

Not only outrageous but downright dangerous to the principle of parliamentary democracy is the assumption that it should, when it so pleases, force a Government prematurely to the polls without necessarily itself having to face the electors.

That sentence could be referring to this Chamber again. To continue—

People's faith in the democratic process would not easily withstand a repetition of the 1975 Senate crisis in this State. Unless, of course, such a crisis precipitated either the drastic reform or, better still, the abolition of this presumptuous and unnecessary chamber.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Who will read that next week?

The Hon. R. Hetherington: You can if you like.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Are you going to take it in turns?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Mr Cooley will read it next week.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: We will certainly be able to hear it.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I should like to refer to an article which appeared in *The National Times* of the week ending the 12th May this year. It was entitled, "Farce and force in Vic's Upper House". An excellent cartoon appears on the same page. It is by Cook who is one of the best, if not the best, cartoonist in Australia.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I have never heard of him.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Have you not heard of Bill Withers?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: That just shows that members opposite do not read very widely if they do not know who Cook is. Obviously they have never read *The National Times*. The cartoon depicts certain elderly gentlemen in the upper House and there is a notice on the wall which says, "Government of the people by gerrymander for the Liberal Party."

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Would he not be a sexist?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: As I said, I could not help thinking that the newspaper references I have referred to could easily be applied to the Legislative Council in Western Australia.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: Will you be completely fair and tell the House that the author of the article was the Secretary of the Labor Party in Victoria?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I believe the bicameral system in this State has turned Parliament into a farce.

The Hon. R. G. Pike interjected.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The honourable member is being destructive again.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: I am telling you who wrote the article.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Mr Pike represents the members of this House who do not believe in freedom of speech and who believe that only articles written by Liberals or conservatives should be read.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: I am inviting you to be honest and tell us who wrote the article.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Does the honourable member deny the facts in the article?

The Hon. R. G. Pike: Some of it is right and some of it is wrong.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Did the honourable member not quote it to the House earlier? If he did not believe it, why did he bother to quote it?

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the honourable member direct her comments to the Chair?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: It is very hard to let some of these silly interjections go by.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: As I was saying before I was rudely interrupted—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I thought you were rudely interrupting our comments.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: —the bicameral system has become, and probably always was, a farce. As in Victoria, we have a conservative upper House here which has been entrenched since the 19th century, initially by the power of the property vote, and now by malapportionment of the electoral boundaries or gerrymander. Some votes are now 16 times—it used to be 15, but now it is 16—more powerful than others.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: It was the basis of government in Western Australia throughout the years.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: That interjection is not worth answering.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the honourable member to ignore the interjections altogether.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: How can I, Sir, when six speeches are going on in competition with mine?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are not getting much support. You have only four of your own people listening.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The Minister is being insulting again, as usual.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I am just being factual.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I hope the members who are interjecting will stand on their feet and make their own contributions later instead of just sitting there interjecting.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Today I telephoned the electoral office to obtain the latest enrolment figures. I found that in the Lower North Province 5 752 people are now on the roll. In the North Metropolitan Province 94 211 people are on the roll; that is, nearly 100 000 people are on the roll in the North Metropolitan Province compared with nearly 6 000 in the Lower North Province. Members can see this proves what I have been saying which is that some people in this State have a vote 16 times more powerful than others.

The boundaries of the Legislative Assembly electorates are bad enough. We find that two-thirds of the State's population is represented by less than half the members of the Legislative Assembly. Twenty-seven members in the Legislative Assembly represent two-thirds of the population of the State, whereas the other third is represented by 28 members; that is more than half the members. We could have a situation where one-third of the people of this State elect a Government in the Legislative Assembly. Of course, the position in the Legislative Council is worse. The votes of the vast majority of the electors voting for members of this Chamber are devalued seriously. Two-thirds of the population is represented by approximately one-third of the members; that is, 12 out of 32 members.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: We are going to change that a little at the next election, of course.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I was looking at the 1977 *Hansard* and in particular the part dealing with the amendment to the Address-in-Reply moved by the Hon. Roy Cloughton dealing with the need for electoral reform. I quoted from an editorial in *The West Australian* which appeared on the 30th March, 1977. It referred to the Government's proposed legislation to alter the powers of the Legislative Council. I want to quote this, because I should like to show it is not only the Labor Party which believes this Chamber is undemocratic and unrepresentative. On the 30th March, 1977, the following comments appeared in *The West Australian*—

The basis on which the Legislative Council is elected gives the ALP virtually no prospect of winning control of it . . .

The proposed legislation would have far greater significance if it signalled a willingness on the part of the Court government to embrace genuine reforms of the Legislative Council. Unfortunately no such intention is apparent.

The minimum reforms needed are to break down the grotesque—

These are the words of *The West Australian* newspaper; they are not the words of the Labor Party.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Are you filling in time until Mr McKenzie gets back?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Members opposite are not interested in this very serious subject.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: We can read that ourselves.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It sounds like a filibuster to us.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Members opposite do not care about people.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: What a terrible thing to say.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You are a female chauvinist.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: To continue—

The minimum reforms needed are to break down the grotesque weighting of non-metropolitan votes and to match the Council's powers with responsibility.

The powers are extreme; the Council should be directly accountable to the electorate for their use.

Till those things are done the Legislative Council will remain an apology for a democratic chamber.

Those words come from *The West Australian*.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Do you know Pat Weir?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Of course, I do. I am not interested in what Mr Oliver has to say. He can make his speech when I have resumed my seat.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Well, sit down and let him get up.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: No way in the world! Miss Elliott has every right to speak.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Of course, she has. I did not think she wanted to continue.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The present electoral system produces a pretty absurd and totally unjustifiable situation in the metropolitan area. We sometimes hear arguments that distance

and disadvantage are responsible for the weighting of country votes. But, why should a person living in Kalamunda or Mundaring have a weighted vote over three times the value of the vote of a person living in Dianella or Midland? That is the position. The Hon. Gordon Masters and the Hon. Neil Oliver represent only 26 614 electors.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Very well, too.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The Hon. Don Cooley and I represent 85 535 electors.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Mr Hetherington has not yet given us our helicopters.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: But how large are the areas concerned?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The standard of the comments made in this Chamber reveal the intelligence of the people making them.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: How far do you travel each week?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: This is a serious subject and I am trying to deal with it seriously. I am getting nonsensical interjections.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Having to travel a distance of 5 000 kilometres is not sensible, and not in the interests of looking after an electorate?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Members opposite do not listen to what I am talking about. People living in Kalamunda or Mundaring have a weighted vote.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: But it is the same principle.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It is quite different.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Members opposite hate this subject, because they know what I am saying is so true. How can members opposite justify giving people who live in the metropolitan suburbs of Kalamunda and Mundaring a vote which is over three times more valuable than the vote of people in my electorate and in Mr Cooley's electorate. Members opposite try to tell me that the voters in the other electorates are disadvantaged. However, they have the same telephone services, the same morning newspaper, the same television and radio reception, and the same transport services as people in any electorate.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: I do not.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Then change your television set.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Why then should the vote of the electors in my province be less than one-third the value of the vote of the electors in Kalamunda? In Armadale the situation is even more absurd. That suburb is cut in two, so that the people living on one side of Albany Highway have a vote half the value of people living on the other side of Albany Highway.

I also obtained from the Chief Electoral Officer the figures for the South-East Metropolitan Province and the Lower West Province. In the South-East Metropolitan Province there are now 73 940 voters.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You are probably one or two out.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: In the Lower West Province there are 30 672 voters. As the dividing line is Albany Highway in Armadale, people on one side have a vote which is worth double that of their neighbours, in the same suburb, living on the other side of the road. That is a ridiculously absurd and unfair situation.

The continued rigging of electoral boundaries through the provisions of the Electoral Districts Act, which controls the fixing of the boundaries, is denying the large majority of people in this State electoral justice. It is no good saying that the boundaries are set fairly because the work is done by electoral commissioners. Of course, the commissioners do the job to the best of their ability within the restrictions imposed by the Electoral Districts Act. If the Government wants to dispel the charge that it is perpetuating its control of Parliament or this Legislative Council in particular, through unfair undemocratic methods—

The PRESIDENT: Order, order! There is far too much audible conversation.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: —it should state quite unequivocally that it will not reject supply if a Labor Government is elected next year; that it will not use its numbers in this Chamber to reject supply. I also would like to see a statement from the Government that it intends to amend the Electoral Districts Act to provide an electoral system which will enable all votes to carry equal weight.

I support the Bill.

THE HON. D. W. COOLEY (North-East Metropolitan) [8.35 p.m.]: We on this side support the Bill now before us. It is a very important Bill and it surprises me very much indeed to see the levity displayed on the other side of the Chamber in respect of this measure, particularly when somebody as sincere as Miss

Elliott tries to put forward a reasonable argument.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: She should have told us she was being sincere.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It behoves members opposite to be a little more courteous. We would rather cut out our tongues before we behaved in that manner while listening to an address by Miss McAleer or Mrs Piesse.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I recall Miss Elliott moving a very serious motion in this Chamber with regard to unemployment, and Mr Oliver and Mr Masters were giggling like schoolgirls while she was talking. It seems the hazy memory of members opposite has made them forget this is a serious matter before us tonight. It is all the more serious because of statements which have been made in respect of supply. We have to look at ourselves in this regard. In case members opposite do not know, this measure will grant supply to the Government to enable it to govern. If the Government does not continue to govern, certain people in the community will not receive their wages or salaries.

I think it would do members opposite a great deal of good if they were to do a little reading in respect of supply and the things that happened in 1975 with regard to it. Without being biased, they should engage in some proper reading in order to understand the meaning of supply. I do not say that in any disparaging manner, because it takes a legal person to fully understand the implications of the Constitution. Sometimes members of the legal profession cannot interpret it either.

Since 1975 I have taken upon myself to do some reading on this question. I know a little more about the situation now than I did prior to 1975. The events of 1975 caused me to make an examination of the situation. I read several books, including one by Donald Horn. Another book was written by Alan Reid. Another written with regard to Whitlam's attitude was by Fred Daly.

Of course, they were biased attitudes, but it would do members opposite much good indeed if they got hold of Sir John Kerr's book, *Matters for Judgment*, and read it.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I could not bring myself to do that.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The books are available in the library.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: Are you assuming that no-one else has read them?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: No. Obviously, Mr Pike has not read them. I am sure of that. Otherwise, he would have a more balanced view of the situation. The policy of the Labor Party in respect of reform in this country will never be put into effect while the party opposite has a majority in this House. That is the proposition of members opposite, because they are unbending in their attitude towards the policy of the Labor Party.

I will not be told there are not some good policies in the Labor Party. Members opposite would benefit terrifically from a reading of the books I have mentioned. It would do them good indeed if they had an unbiased mind. Members opposite should read Sir John Kerr's book first, without any bias. I did not read it with any bias and at the conclusion—as other members from my side will confirm—my attitude was that I felt for the man. I felt there was not any justification for his actions, because I will never forgive him, but I did feel for him with respect to the problem of the position which confronted him, and the problems he had on his mind at the time.

I believe Sir John Kerr felt quite honestly that an upper House could block supply, and I do not think anybody can argue against that. I think there is a provision in the Constitution for the Governor General to sack his Ministers, and he did that. He took that action believing he was right, and he did it thinking that the Australian people would decide. That was his argument when he dismissed the Government. I am not saying he was right, but those were the thoughts in his mind despite the fact that previously twice in the course of 18 months the Australian people had endorsed the Whitlam Government. His view was that the people should do it again; a third time in three years.

When I concluded reading his book I had a little feeling for the man and his position. I felt that a man who had reached the height which he had reached, as Chief Justice of New South Wales—as an eminent man in his profession—in most situations would do the right thing. Our country would be in a terrible state if corruption was involved.

I think it would then do honourable members opposite a lot of good if they read Mr Whitlam's book, *The Truth of the Matter*. After reading that members opposite would have a balanced view with respect to supply, because supply had not run out when Sir John Kerr dismissed the Whitlam Government. It is almost a certainty that if rejection of supply had been put to a vote, it would not have gone through. There were several Liberal senators who would have voted for the passage of supply. I believe Sir John Kerr could

have been advised better than he was. However, he hid behind the proposition on the basis that he should not be political in respect of his dealings. Perhaps he was right in that respect.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: He did not mind taking advice from Sir Garfield Barwick.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is right. There were certain people in the community who wanted to get rid of the Whitlam Government. I believe members opposite should read the books to which I have referred, because they contain a certain amount of fairness. Their viewpoint should not be biased.

Members opposite should read only one final paragraph of one chapter in which Mr Whitlam said that Sir John Kerr suggested to him that he should do a "Wilson". In his book Sir John Kerr confirmed this. For the benefit of those who do not understand the term, he was suggesting that Mr Whitlam should resign and allow Mr Fraser to come in to govern for a certain period and that he should then kick Mr Fraser out. This is what Mr Wilson did to Mr Heath when Mr Heath took on the miners' union. He was dismissed and Mr Wilson went back into office.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What do you call this?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am not reading it from the book, but if the Leader of the House reads it, and if he has an attitude of fairness, it will bring tears to his eyes.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Did it bring tears to your eyes?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes, it did. I do not mind admitting that.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: The Leader of the House is made of sterner stuff.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Whitlam said that this man had the effrontery to suggest that he should leave his office. That was after 23 years of Liberal Party rule. Two decades of young people had passed through the Australian scene without seeing a Labor Government. Then along came a Labor Government and straightaway it got the boys out of Vietnam; it brought in social reform the like of which had never been seen before in this country.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: And something we don't want to see again.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Whitlam Government fortunately brought a great deal of relief to the people who had suffered under 23 years of Liberal Government rule. The Governor General wanted the Prime Minister to give all that away. Any person who believes in the

philosophy of good for the people would find it hard to believe a person would take such action after the progress made by the Whitlam Government. God knows the state the low-income earners, the pensioners, and the health and education of our nation would be in, had it not been for the three years of the Whitlam Government. The Labor Government reformed the whole system and brought in decent conditions for underprivileged people.

The Australian people had waited for years and years for something like a Labor Government, but then it was suggested that Mr Whitlam should give it all away. That is what we are talking about tonight. The view has been put forward that in a situation where a Government is elected democratically by the people and introduces a Supply Bill, when the upper House debates that Bill—a measure to give the Government the sinews of war to carry on with—the Opposition should have the right to reject it. That would be an immoral act, and almost illegal. It is disturbing for members opposite to suggest that they would block supply in 1980 if we became the Government.

This is precisely what a Victorian member of Parliament said, even before an election was held. What sort of attitude is that? It is reflected in the attitude of members opposite that Mr Pike has defended on two or three occasions in this House, and it is very disturbing indeed to think that it should happen. The whole balance of democracy is at stake, just as it was at stake in 1975. Had it not been for the good sense and responsibility of the Whitlam Government at that particular time, this country could have been thrown into a state of chaos.

Let us consider what could have happened if, after Mr Fraser had been appointed the caretaker Prime Minister, Mr Whitlam had called Parliament together and it passed a vote of confidence in his Government. What would have happened then? We could have seen the involvement of the Army or other serious steps taken, but the Labor Party was responsible enough to resist the temptation. The result of blocking supply could have been to throw the whole country into chaos, and it ill behoves anyone in this Chamber to treat the matter too lightly. Tonight we are discussing a Bill which will be supported unanimously, but the time may come—and it may come more quickly than many members believe—when this Chamber is discussing a Supply Bill introduced by a Labor Government. I hope then that Liberal Party members, in the interests of democracy, will have second thoughts about blocking supply.

Mr Ferry referred to the State of Excitement, and I would like to touch briefly on this matter. I was speaking to some people last night, and although they support my party they are not really well informed politically. We spoke of Mr Anthony's attitude to the export of our iron ore, and the conflict between him and our Premier. These people said to me that they believed the attitude of our Premier is right on this matter, and they asked me my opinion. I expressed the view that although we can certainly be proud of the achievements of our State in the sporting field and in a number of other fields, I believe firmly that we all ought to be proud of Australia. While we want to have pride in our State, we want to have more pride in our nation.

In a debate here last week, the Opposition was accused of a selfish attitude towards the distribution of uranium and the development of nuclear power. We were told we should be helping people less fortunate than ourselves. We live in the richest State in the Commonwealth, and we ought to be prepared to share our resources with the rest of the nation. In many respects Mr Anthony is right in his proposal to control our natural resources in the interests of Australia. We should not be parochial in our attitude to our resources simply because we are thousands of kilometres away from the centre of government.

I do not suggest we should give all the control to Canberra, but we should share our good fortune with everybody in Australia. Surely no fair-minded person would suggest otherwise. We are one country and one people, and surely we should share our wealth with, say, South Australia, if that State is not having a good run.

I would like to make a final point before I resume my seat. A week or so ago I asked a question in this House about traffic signs. I was concerned particularly about the "30 Km/h" and "End of 30 Km/h" signs. I asked who was responsible for the erection of these signs, and whether it was mandatory for an "End of 30 Km/h" sign to be erected.

The Leader of the House, on behalf of the Minister for Police and Traffic, replied that the road building authority carrying out the roadworks was responsible for the erection of the signs. I would ask the Leader of the House to do me a favour and refer this question to the Minister for Police and Traffic, because it appears to me that there is a good deal of laxity in regard to the erection of these signs.

The other day I drove to Mandurah, Roadworks were in progress, and although a "30 Km/h" sign had been erected, there was nothing

to denote the end of the speed restriction. I like to drive within the speed limits although, like most other drivers, sometimes unconsciously I drive over the limit. I would like members to visualise the situation coming around the garage at the end of the plain driving from Mandurah to Perth—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I will ask the Minister to bring it to the attention of the foreman so that he can speak to the workers and see that they do their job properly.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am speaking on the situation generally, but I was referring members to an incident that had happened to me. I had not seen a sign or, indeed, any roadworks, while driving up a hill, and I was probably doing about 100 kilometres an hour. When I went over the hill I came across this "End of 30 Km/h" sign. Had a patrolman been on duty there at the time, God only knows how many demerit points I would have lost.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: If it had been me there would have been a patrolman for sure.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You would have gained the points, not lost them.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is quite correct. Something should be done about these signs, because in the situation I have described I could have been apprehended by a traffic patrolman for an offence I had not committed.

I will conclude on the note that the Opposition supports the Bill.

Point of Order

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy President. Under the provisions of Standing Order No. 76, I claim that the honourable member made a misstatement of fact. In his speech Mr Cooley said that the Liberal Party would use its majority in the upper House to defeat a Supply Bill, and he said the Mr Pike had supported that attitude three times. I repudiate that statement. It is quite wrong for a member to say that in his speech, and it should be put right.

Debate Resumed

THE HON. G. E. MASTERS (West) [8.58 p.m.]: I will be very brief. We have listened over the last half an hour or so to a rehash of an old argument from Miss Elliott and Mr Cooley.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: The argument is just as pertinent today as it was yesterday.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We have just listened to Mr Cooley churning it all out again.

We can read the newspapers and *Hansard* if we want to.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: We are glad to know you can read!

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Nevertheless it was a rehash—

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You don't care.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Of course, we care. Mr Cooley made the comment that some members of the House laughed during a discussion on unemployment. It is quite wrong to say such a thing, because there is no member of this House who is not concerned genuinely about the present unemployment situation. It is not a good thing to suggest any member feels other than concern for the situation.

Of course, Mr Cooley then went on to talk about the events of the Whitlam era. The Opposition has refused to accept the umpire's decision on that matter, it was, after all, the decision of an umpire.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: It was not an umpire.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: It was a decision of the public of Australia.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: To call the Governor General an umpire is a denigration—

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The people vote in the ballot box. That is the ultimate decision.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Do you think Fraser should resign now?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Of course, not.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: There you are then.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: He has total control. He is an excellent Prime Minister, and the public would not want him to resign. They would vote him back in tomorrow, and members opposite know that.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Obviously it is time for comic relief.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We should be used to the comments of Mr Cooley. He talks of people being unbending, but I do not think I have ever seen a more rigid attitude than the one he put forward in this House. Let us consider the way he behaved in the debate on the Essential Foodstuffs and Commodities Bill. If one wanted an example of someone who was unfeeling, it would be Mr Cooley in that debate.

The Hon. R. Thompson: He has compassion.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: He has no compassion. He is a ruthless and tough man.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Compassionate and tough.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: That is not what I wish to speak about. I feel I should make comments in relation to the speech of the Hon. Des Dans. He mentioned my name on a number of occasions, and he took exception to the suggestion that he was a doomsday man. His speech started fairly brightly, and after five minutes we realised he was going back to his old form. Indeed, the speech turned out to be what I would describe as a doomsday speech once again.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I am just reading it in *Hansard*. It does not seem that bad.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: At no time did he bring forward anything that was constructive.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: We do not have to.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: If the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting he does not have to bring forward anything that is constructive, is he suggesting that the Opposition should not make any constructive comments?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I can tell you, if you bring up anything constructive, we will support it. We cannot introduce legislation.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Mr Dans missed the point.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You can introduce legislation.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Yes, I know, provided it is no charge on the Crown, and all the other strings attached to it.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We are back to where we started. I said that Mr Dans was a doomsday man. He indicated that in the way his speech finished up. We bring our handkerchiefs along when Mr Dans makes a speech, because he is so miserable.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It is miserable to have 500 000 people out of work. Mr Pike laughs, and half of them are in his electorate.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: It is a tragedy when a member of this House talks about disorder—

The Hon. D. K. Dans interjected.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Mr Dans speaks of disorder, disorderly conduct, and disorderly changes—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It will happen.

The Hon. R. G. Pike interjected.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Of course, it will not happen.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You get off your tails and do something constructive. All you bring into this Chamber is talk. That is all you are on about tonight—"gasbagery".

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We are constructive—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Constructive about what? You have got 40 people looking for every job vacancy.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Nothing constructive about that. Tell me one of the constructive things in your last speech. I have it in front of me.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: If the Leader of the Opposition will allow me to make some comments, I will tell him—

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: All your comments are destructive.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Tell us what you are going to do about unemployment. You are on your feet, and you are a member of the Government.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! There are too many unruly interjections.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You tell us—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! If this House is to function, honourable members will need to obey the Standing Orders. I call on the Hon. Gordon Masters to continue, and to address the Chair.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We believe that the first thing members of Parliament should do is to show enthusiasm, and to be positive in any matters we put forward.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Shades of the depression! Prosperity is just around the corner!

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Premier is enthusiastic, not like the doomsday man who is the Leader of the Opposition—

The Hon. D. K. Dans interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! Honourable members, I have called for—

The Hon. R. Thompson interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I ask honourable members again to obey Standing Orders so that proper debate may ensue, and so that members on their feet may be recorded properly in *Hansard*. I ask all honourable members to respect that. The Hon. Gordon Masters will please continue.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We believe that changes are taking place in the world today. They

are very great changes. Mr Dans touched on these changes—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I got a fat five pages in *Hansard*.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: There is a changing technology in our world. Its impact is enormous. I do not think any one of us fully understands how important the changes will be.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I agree with you.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley interjected.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: They will change our whole way of life, our working patterns, the leisure time we have, and our working hours. Our lives will change out of sight. We will not have any set patterns. We will not have any traditional methods of employment or ways of life. It will be a whole new concept. Mr Dans touched on this. I think we as members of this House must try to assist with the changes as much as possible. If anyone has recognised this fact in the House, it is Mr Dans. He is well read, and he is able to speak clearly and lucidly. We are keen to learn from his discussions on this subject.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Flattery now.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am prepared to criticise Mr Dans whenever it is necessary.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I am prepared to accept it, too.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am prepared to recognise that he makes a great contribution on occasions. On other occasions, as I have said, I am sad—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I am sad for all those people who are unemployed.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Get on with your speech and tell us what you are going to do.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: First of all, Mr Dans said that we sought to erode wages. What we seek to do is to control wages and conditions. There is no way that we can agree with Mr Cooley who said in this House that he would support all wage claims.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: But you do not make that claim about profits?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We do not seek to erode. We seek to control, because that is the greatest protection one can offer in the long term. One of the positive steps which the Fraser Government is taking is to control inflation, because everything depends on the success of this programme.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It has gone up again, and we have half a million people unemployed.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We must work to retain our markets and to create employment—

The Hon. R. F. Claughton interjected.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We want security; we want long-term improvements. Inflation is one of the areas that we must conquer.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: The trouble with that is that you tell us to be constructive—

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: It is no good the Labor Party saying that it would support matters put forward by the Government in this House—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Give us a chance to support something. You haven't brought anything in.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I do not really think it is necessary, but for the record let us talk about bauxite again. There are many members on the opposite side of the House who do not support bauxite mining.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: That is not true.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: We signed the bauxite agreement, and the woodchipping agreement. What is wrong with you?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I will state again that there are members on that side of the House who do not support bauxite mining.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: No. We do.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: If members look at *Hansard*, they will see that the Hon. Grace Vaughan is recorded as saying she does not support bauxite mining.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It just shows you we are not a regimented party.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: When one comes into this House, one would expect that a party as a whole would support this sort of project, because it means massive employment and the placing of millions of dollars into the pockets of the work force.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You will not admit it was a Labor Government which signed the agreement. What are you talking about?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am pointing out a project not supported by the Opposition.

Opposition members interjected.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: When there are members of the Opposition who fail to support this sort of industry, then it is one of the areas in which they fail miserably. Let us talk about uranium—

Opposition members interjected.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We have a source of power which the world needs. There is no point

in burying our heads in the sand. If the Arab countries decide to close down all the oil wells and refuse supplies to the world, then obviously those people needing power would have to take it. The same thing will happen with uranium. If we do not sell our uranium—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Who to?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: If we must sell our uranium to the people who need it—the people in the countries members of the Opposition are so concerned about, where there is hunger, and where there is a desperate need for industry and power—it is a sad reflection on Mr Dans who fails to support this project which will create jobs and put money in the pockets of the work force. They are the people that Mr Cooley is concerned about. They are the people about whom I am speaking.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Then we will hear the sirens sound, and in comes one of those intercontinental ballistic missiles with a big lump of it on the end.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Mr Dans is a doomsday man simply because we bring these matters forward.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley interjected.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That is only the start of it—the 100 000 people.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: How many people are there in America?

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: They do not all live in Washington.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Mr Dans does not seem to understand that there is a shortage of power. We have to supply it. I do not want to keep repeating myself. If we do not supply power and develop our resources, people will come and get it.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Come off that one. If you believe in that, I suggest you had better get on to Mr Killen, because he is shaving down the defence budget all the time.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Mr Dans should not ignore the facts. He cannot survive if he says that sort of thing. When Mr Dans comes into this House and talks about something constructive—something I have not heard him do yet—I shall be pleased. If Mr Dans comes into this House and encourages the public, then I will say, "Well done, Mr Dans."

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Would you like me to bring in something constructive by way of a

private member's Bill? Will you guarantee to support it?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I have just made my point. Mr Dans can bring anything forward, and I will consider it very carefully.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Thank you very much. Next week!

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I did not say I would support it. I said I would consider it very carefully.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You will look at it as carefully as you looked at the Liquor Bill!

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order. The honourable member would do well to address the Chair rather than having a private conversation across the Chamber.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I apologise, Mr Deputy President.

Mr Cloughton made some comments about the oil industry. He said that there was a lack of support or lack of interest in the oil industry in Australia. By way of interjection I said that something like 82 per cent of all the money being spent on oil exploration in Australia was spent in Western Australia on the North-West Shelf. There is an enormous enthusiasm and interest in oil exploration in that area. The companies would not be involved in such projects unless there were very clear indications that the risk involved was worth it. The cost of services is quite enormous; the cost of putting down one well would be in the region of \$6 million to \$8 million, and that is not chicken feed. Hundreds of millions of dollars are invested in exploration. The exploration is being carried on; it is continuing; and it is increasing.

New technologies are involved in the equipment and in the drilling rigs. The use of these technologies has resulted in greater safety, and more chance of the exploration being successful.

I have been involved in the oil projects as far as being interested and being advised by some companies in the field. The tragedy is that in the Whitlam Government's time it frightened off many of the people interested in oil exploration.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Bull!

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: There is no doubt about that at all.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Bull!

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Mr Dans knows it is the truth as well as I do, and it is not becoming of him to use such language. He must be upset,

but what I have said is fact. He has only to go out into the field or into Perth down St. George's Terrace and discuss with these companies just what happened to their experts and expertise. He will be informed that the experts went overseas when the Whitlam Government sought to nationalise the industry.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Where did they go?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: They went to Borneo, South America, the USA, and Europe. That is a fact. We lost geologists, analysts, and oil exploration experts.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: From what companies?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Companies such as BP and Woodside Burmah. They left the shores of Australia because of the Whitlam Government's threat to nationalise.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: What happened to the oil computer?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I will come to that later.

The Hon. R. Thompson: They left before that.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: No, they left because of the threat of nationalisation.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The areas were too big.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Even sadder is the fact that, now, while they are carrying out more exploration work because of their confidence in the Government, it is necessary for them to analyse in Singapore the computerised information they receive. That is where the expertise and the equipment are located to analyse this computerised information. I know of one particular company which has to fly its records and information collected by its computerised ship to Singapore for analysis.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What ships?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: One is up the north now with 124 men aboard. It has been there for some weeks.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: A drilling ship?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: No. It is a survey ship with computerised equipment which is fed onto a graph. The sheets could run right around this Chamber.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It was never here.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Yes, it was. If Mr Dans wants to come with me tomorrow I can take him to the company concerned.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: There are not 124 men on the *Western Endeavour*.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I did not say the *Western Endeavour*; Mr Dans knows the ship.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I know of a ship which was laid up recently because of lack of work.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: With those comments I support the Bill.

THE HON. R. HETHERINGTON (East Metropolitan) [9.18 p.m.]: I rise to support the Bill. Like other members on my side of the House, I believe we should support a Supply Bill. I believe a House of Review—a second House—should not under any circumstance reject a Supply Bill. I do not want to dilate on that tonight. I have said lots on it before and I will say it all again at another time in one way or another.

I was interested to hear the Hon. Robert Pike rise to speak to this Bill and do what he seems to like doing; that is, to nitpick. I would like to hear from him what he considers to be the role of an upper House, the correct way for an upper House to behave, and whether or not an upper House should reject supply. I do not know the events of 1952 to which the honourable member referred. One thing I am sure of is that there was no Labor Party in control in that it had a majority in the upper House in Victoria.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: Labor combined with two Luke Hollway Liberals to refuse supply.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: In that case, joint control. I will look into that further and see what the facts are. If that happened I think the Victorian Labor Party is to be condemned for turning against its own principles.

Unfortunately, the Leader of the House seems to have picked up Mr Pike's bad habits. Mr Pike interjects to tell me that, because in South Australia with its preferential representation the party with 47 per cent of the first preference votes gets six out of 11 seats, it is a rigged election. Somehow he seems to think the House we have here is not unsatisfactory. The Leader of the House talks about what Mr Whitlam said when he was Leader of the Opposition. I think a Leader of the Opposition at times say things that would be better left unsaid.

If the Leader of the House wants more quotations perhaps he could look to Senator Murphy who made several comments about the powers of the Senate. At various times when the Labor Party had control of the Senate with the Democratic Labor Party, it was finessing, but I cannot remember any time when it seriously moved to reject supply. I do not suggest we will see it happen and I would hope that if the upper House was ever controlled by the Labor Party it would not move to reject supply.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: How often has it happened in Australia?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I think about six times, but I will check and let the Leader of the House know when next I am speaking on this subject. I believe it has happened three or four times in Victoria, once in Tasmania, and twice there has been a serious threat of rejection of supply in the Senate. On neither occasion did the Senate actually reject supply. The first time it threatened to reject supply the Government had a double dissolution. The second time it threatened to reject supply, but before it could take a vote one way or the other the Governor General saw fit to dismiss the Government and use the prerogatives of the Crown in a way in which the Queen in England would not use them.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: For the record, two supporters of the previous Liberal Premier joined with Labor to refuse supply to the McDonald Country Party Government.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I will have a look at that. If they are the facts I will not shrink away from them. I am not going to support them. But to say that hardly answers the argument that there were two or three other times when conservative parties in control in the Victorian Legislative Council threw out Supply Bills. I am looking forward to hearing Mr Pike answer the argument one day and develop an argument for a second House. I could help him with the research, because I have an argument for an upper House.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: It seems to me it would be a futile exercise.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I wish to comment on two things which are in conjunction. One is unemployment and the other is the Williams report. I shall not give any thorough analysis of the Williams report, because it is

rather thick and I have not had time to analyse it thoroughly.

Yesterday I was at the Murdoch University for a meeting of the Salaried Staff Association. I trust the Leader of the House does not mind my going there, as it is not in my electorate; however, I was invited.

I point out that when the Williams report recommendations with respect to the Murdoch University were published I actually was reported as supporting the Government. That is not the first time I have supported the Government, but it is the first time I have managed to be reported as doing so. I did, in fact, ring the newspapers once and ask if it was news that the Opposition shadow Minister for Education supported the Minister for Education, but I was informed it was not news.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: You will lose your job.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: In this case I was very glad to hear the Premier, when he was opening the veterinary school, supporting Murdoch. I am concerned, and the members of the Salaried Staff Association at the university are less than overjoyed, with the letter they received from the Minister for Education which wound up by promising them he would not let Murdoch be closed completely. They are a little worried about what this might mean.

They are wondering if the Premier's wholehearted support now has been whittled down by the Minister for Education. I hope this is not the case. Just so that we know what was said, I shall quote from two sections of the Williams report. I shall quote from the thin summary and from volume 1 of the report proper. Referring to universities, the report in its summary at page 10 states—

S.22 Since 1961 the Australian Universities Commission (AUC), now followed by the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC) with its constituent body, the Universities Council (UC), has advised successive Governments on balanced development influenced by four precepts of long standing:

- (a) that every young person of appropriate ability who desires a university education should have a fair chance of getting it;
- (b) that universities should restrict their teaching to degree and higher degree work and expand higher and research activities;

- (c) that universities could not be efficient and economical with less than 4000 students in those providing courses in the humanities, sciences and social sciences, or less than 8000 when courses were also provided in medicine, dentistry, veterinary science, agriculture and engineering;

Apparently we had many years in this country when our universities were not efficient or economical.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That does not necessarily apply. Williams is talking about today. You were talking about 20 years ago, and so your statement about his comment is not really valid.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: It may or may not be; it is a comment. I am not stating it is fact.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You said it as though we were expected to believe it to be valid.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I said it so that we could consider it. To continue—

- (d) that where, for reasons of location or recency of foundation, universities are of less than the optimal size, they should receive relatively higher grants per student.

I think that last statement is unexceptional. The third precept is the problem, and this is where Murdoch University comes in. I am sure the House will forgive me if I read a rather lengthy extract from page 204 of volume 1 as follows—

R5.32 Some problems arising from the precept that universities of less than optimal sizes for their range of activities should receive larger than average grants per student are a consequence of retarded growth. The high cost universities were meant to be of two kinds—the new universities such as Griffith, Murdoch and possibly Deakin that were in the process of growing to an economic size, and universities such as Tasmania and James Cook that would remain high cost universities because of their locations. The revision of the precept that universities should not provide subdegree courses and that there are significant disadvantages of smallness for universities of less than 4000 students, would affect the judgment on grants to universities of less than 4000 students. Griffith University could become effective and economical with less than 4000 FTE students.

FTE means full-time equivalent. To continue—

The development of sub-degree courses at James Cook University could reduce its 'excess costs' somewhat and add to educational opportunity in North Queensland. The rationalisation of the roles of the University of Tasmania and the Tasmanian College of Advanced Education will have the same effect.

R5.33 The prospect that Murdoch University could be raised to an effective and economical size by the revision of the third precept is not good. The Partridge Committee judged that the Western Australian Institute of Technology had developed too far in the non-technological areas and recommended that its growth in these areas should be controlled so that future developments would be shared by Murdoch University and the teachers colleges. Even with the second projection of student numbers, growth to an economic size now seems unlikely, and the most promising line of development seems to be the integration of the activities of the two universities in Western Australia (5.87).

The Committee recommends that the Tertiary Education Commission discuss with the University of Western Australia and Murdoch University and the Western Australian Post-Secondary Education Commission an integration of the activities of the two universities.

This is the recommendation which has caused all the worry in Western Australia. Obviously there are problems in that Murdoch is at present below what is regarded as an optimal size. I must say that I have always regarded 8000 as a rather high figure for a university and have regarded it as the maximum rather than the minimum number.

I was one of those who, when Murdoch was founded, thought its foundation was too early. However, now that it is established, I consider that the problems of integration are too great and that we have advantages from Murdoch which we do not want to lose. It has developed a good veterinary school which is recognised throughout the world. It offers alternatives in arts courses and it offers something different from that offered by the UWA.

One of the problems has been the growth of the Western Australian Institute of Technology, and some people criticised the Western Australian Post Secondary Education Commission, because

it had not followed the recommendations of the Partridge report to inquire into WAIT to see whether it should be rationalised and some of its courses removed. I gather that there is a current suggestion—and this is one of the aspects which could be studied by the new committee the Government has established—that teacher education be taken from WAIT and placed with Murdoch. What else will occur, I do not know.

It seems obvious that if Murdoch is to remain as an autonomous, separate university it cannot be allowed to lose any of the things it has already and it must gain something. I hope this is the intention of the Government.

I was a little perturbed by the letter from the Minister for Education which I heard read out yesterday. It was suggested at the meeting I was at yesterday that perhaps the committee of inquiry could be expanded so that Dr Neal should be "diluted". I said that I did not think that could be done. He is too able. However, much as I respect him I do not think he should be on the committee. He is too much involved. He should appear as a witness. We would be far better off if we had an independent committee and did not have on it a person who had already been a member of the Williams committee. I do hope that the committee which is established by the Government is a committee to inquire as to how Murdoch may survive.

I realise, of course, that the Government has a problem, because if the Federal Government refuses to fund Murdoch the State Government has to find the money itself. As the Minister will be the first to admit, this is a real problem.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is a penetrating comment.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I do not underestimate that problem.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Neither does the Government.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: Certainly if the Federal Government decides to accept the Williams recommendation on Murdoch, it will take all the fighting qualities of the Government to maintain it as a separate entity; and in this case the Government would get the support of the Opposition. I hope Mr Masters notes that comment. As far as Murdoch is concerned, the Opposition supports the Government in its efforts to maintain it as a separate entity. However, it will be a long, hard, and difficult battle if the Federal Government decides to dig its heels in.

If Murdoch were closed, it would be a grave loss. The University of Western Australia is quite large enough. A multi or dual-campus university loses out in cross-administration and the fact that the students are not on the one campus. Certainly there has been some integration of courses between the two universities, and this is a good thing. Having established the university at Murdoch, which is in competition with the UWA, it would be a good thing to maintain it, because I believe that in education any competition is a good thing. Alternatives are good, so that people can choose between them.

What is worrying me is that, if it does not become clear soon that Murdoch will survive, the Williams report may be a self-fulfilling prophecy. Students may be so worried about the future of the university that they may not enrol, and their failure to enrol will reduce the numbers, which will mean that Murdoch will become unviable and will be closed. I would not like that to occur.

Murdoch is not out of its teething stage. Whenever a new university is established the inherent conservatism of human beings keeps them to the old institution and quite often they are suspicious of the new. It happened with Monash in Victoria.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: In its early days.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: Yes.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What would happen to the buildings at Murdoch if it were closed?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: They would make a fine extension for the Institute of Technology; a fine high school; a fine—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Technical school.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: Yes. No doubt we could use them, But I would rather they were retained for their present use.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Perth Technical College is grossly underbuilt.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I hope the Minister is not thinking of that seriously.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I merely asked what would happen to the buildings, in your opinion.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I would be the last to say that there would be any problem in using the buildings, because many technical colleges could move in there, or we could establish

new ones. I am quite sure that would be the least of the Government's worries. What we would do with the staff is a different matter.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Perhaps they could be like you and get a job as a member of Parliament.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: There are not too many vacancies.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I am sure Mr Gayfer would be the last person to wish more academics into this Parliament. I have a feeling he thinks that one is enough.

Anyway, I do hope that the Government is serious and that Sir Charles Court meant it when he announced his wholehearted support for Murdoch.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He is not in the habit of saying things he does not mean.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I know that and I did rejoice to hear him, but I have been a bit worried about some of the things I have heard since. Therefore I am looking for reassurance. The commitment of my party remains. I hope we can retain Murdoch and expand it as a useful second university.

I might add that some members of the University of Western Australia do not wish Murdoch well, and they were a bit overjoyed when they thought it might vanish until they realised that if there were a merger some people might be ahead of them in seniority and so their enthusiasm vanished.

The academic competition is highly desirable. Having achieved it, we should not let it slip away. Murdoch was built at the wrong time—in a no-growth period, or a slow-growth period instead of a growth period.

One of the subjects studied by the Williams committee was that of education and employment and unemployment. Bearing in mind some of the things said about unemployment here it would be instructive to ascertain what the report says about unemployment, and from now on I will quote from volume 3 of the Williams report.

On page 6 of volume 3 the report says—

Unemployment among school leavers is high—

We know that. To continue—

—particularly among early leavers. Though retention rates beyond compulsory years have

improved, in 1977 48 per cent of students did not stay beyond Year 10. In February 1978, among those in the labour force in the 15-19 age group, the unemployment figure of 21 per cent was three times the figure of seven per cent for the whole labour force.

The point which interested me was in the next statement, and I had not realised it. It reads—

This ratio of 3:1 has pertained for several years and did so in mid-1974 when the overall figure was two per cent. The recent sharp increase in youth unemployment has not reflected a change in its relation to general unemployment.

This is something I would not have thought to be the case and it only goes to show that we can be wrong unless we study the figures involved. However, I am wondering whether, in fact, it is as true as the figures suggest, because one of the things which may be happening in our industry at present is the growth of what the Japanese call "window gazers"; that is, people who have become redundant through changes in technology but who, because of long-term policy, are not sacked or declared redundant. They are kept on in Japan to gaze through the windows. Here they are given light duties which they can usefully do.

It is possible that our unemployment figure would be higher if people who were redundant were, in fact, sacked. It is possible that the unemployed young people are piling up because of this, but this, in fact, may not be the case. The figures are not sufficient, but they are interesting in themselves.

I now come to the point that has been raised several times by Mr Masters. The following portion is read especially for him—

While changes in the schools cannot have caused the increase on which other factors such as the employment of married women and the falling demand for labour in the manufacturing industry have a bearing, justifiable complaints about school leavers come from many employers. Some critics point to weaknesses in reading and number work corroborated by surveys of State authorities and of the Australian Council for Education Research (ACER). It noted that some 25 per cent of 14 year olds were unlikely to undertake independent learning or read for recreation or information without

remedial instruction which was also necessary in number work for some 15 per cent.

This is an appalling figure, but I have no doubt it is true. The committee recommended—

....that departments of education in colleges of advanced education and universities give greater emphasis to ways of teaching reading and number work; and to ways of identifying children who are handicapped or have perceptual problems that might cause learning difficulties and have need of special remedial teaching.

Of course, it is easy for people to say—and many people do—that we should get back to the old disciplined way of teaching because this did not happen in the past; but this is not true. It did happen in the past except that where we had highly labour-intensive industries people who were not literate could be mopped up.

Another thing that is happening—and I will later quote figures from the report to show this—is that we have a high proportion of children of migrants, I think it is one in seven, whose parents have a native language which is not English. They tend to live in the inner suburbs, which raises problems as one might expect. So our migration programme has also given us problems in the education field.

I would agree that we must do something about remediation in schools and new methods of teaching; and, as I have argued before and will argue again, despite the fact that about 25 per cent of our Budget is spent on education, we do need to spend more, or perhaps we need to spend some of it differently. Perhaps we need to do both. Certainly we need to grapple with these problems.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Spending more, unfortunately, seems to have become synonymous with just giving teachers higher wages.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I am not thinking of giving teachers higher wages. It seems to me the first place we should spend more is in employing more teachers. It is urgent that we have remediation and small classes in years one and two. That is where we could pick up many of our problems. It is not more wages I am interested in but more teachers. I am also interested in integrating more of the physically handicapped into the schools, which means more problems to face and more support staff. I am interested in early diagnosis, which means more support staff. I am interested in more guidance

and psychological help in the upper school, and that needs more staff. I am arguing that we need more and better staff and we must ensure the problems of literacy and numeracy are picked up earlier.

The report points out on page 7 that in Australia 60 per cent of the 15 to 19-year-old age group are in the labour force, which makes our figures different from those of other places. Comparable figures are 24 per cent in Japan and 28 per cent in the United States of America. Therefore a higher proportion of our 15 to 19-year-olds are in the labour force looking for jobs and they probably tend to raise the number who are out of work. I am not arguing here—because I am not prepared to argue it at this stage—that we should have 28 per cent of them in the labour force and the rest still at school. As a matter of fact, I sometimes think we must look at leaving school earlier and encouraging young people to come back to school later on. Whether or not this is the problem, I do not know. I am not aware of all the solutions but I am becoming aware of many of the very important problems.

I think the next point is quite important. I would like Mr Masters to listen to it and read it later. The report says on page 54—

Figures for unemployment show that its incidence varies greatly between sections of the community. The difference between the average figure and that in the age group 15-19 has already been mentioned—

Then it draws attention to other differences. Females have a greater percentage of unemployment than males, and immigrants and Aborigines have a higher percentage of unemployment than white Australians. On page 55 it says—

It should be repeated here that while various factors such as poor standards of literacy and attitudes to work have been cited as contributing to the high percentage of youth unemployment, the basic cause is to be found in the recession which started in 1974 and is deeper than any in the post-war era. When the demand for labour is reduced, employers cut recruitment particularly of the young and when retrenchments are unavoidable those with the shortest service tend to suffer first ...

the Committee recommends general discussions between the Department of Employment and Youth Affairs and the

TEC on the extension of TAFE special programs of education and training for unemployed, especially for 'early leavers', and then more detailed discussions between State Departments of Labour and the TAFE authorities in each State.

The emphasis in the report on technical and further education is most important for retraining, training for new skills, training of people who are redundant, and training of people who want to fill in their spare time. This will be perhaps the most important part of our educational system. We must put more money into technical and further education, and if we cannot use Murdoch for a technical school we might have to build others. I do not particularly want to use Murdoch, so I suggest we build others. However, the development of technical and further education should be a matter of highest priority. I am hoping the new Assistant Director General of Technical Education (Mr Peter Forrest) and his staff can develop and expand the TAFE section of the Education Department, and I will watch what they do with interest.

At the risk of boring the House I want to read this section, which will be educational, particularly for Mr Masters. On pages 52 and 53 the report says—

The effect of technical progress taken overall has been to increase rather than to reduce the number of jobs.

That is not what we on this side of the House have been saying necessarily, because we are worried that the speed of technical progress will raise unemployment to levels with which we may not be able to cope. This is not taking a doomsday attitude. It is being realistic; it is looking at the facts. The report continues—

Part of increased production potential has been absorbed by improved material standards of living, part by greater leisure, aspects of which being shorter hours per week in the work place, longer annual and other holidays, later entry from education into the labour force and earlier retirement from it. In Australia a standard working week of 48 hours established by 1900 has given way gradually to the present ordinary time of 38.3 hours. So important is this matter of hours in a working life that

the Committee recommends that the Department of Employment and Youth

Affairs sponsor research on trends in hours of work (including the effects of changes in ages of retirement and entry to the labour market and in holidays), and seek to separate the effects of higher real incomes and economic recessions on hours worked.

It then says—and I quote it selectively, as the Leader of the House might say, because I agree with it—

Technical change which saves labour in existing activities and creates a demand for it in new fields calls for training in new skills and the retraining of displaced workers. Educational institutions at all levels must be sufficiently flexible to deal with these demands. Opportunities for technical change will come to a country from centres abroad and from domestic research. Australia has problems peculiar to itself and in certain fields of science and technology can make an important contribution.

My leader and I have said that in this House before. To continue—

The Committee recommends that policy on applied research and development be recognised as an important aspect of employment policy, and that there be a considerable increase in operational research designed to identify the fields of science and engineering where the Australian effort is likely to be most effective.

I gather one of these is microprocessors, in which a firm in Perth, which can compete with some of the American giants, is engaged.

The Williams report points out some important problems. It points out the problems of migrants. It points out the problems of women and the need for women to have a wider range of jobs. One of the things I learnt from going to the Pilbara was that even the huge 220-tonne Haulpaks can now be operated by women, and some of them are. The mechanisation of the mining process enables most of the jobs to be done by women, which would not have been the case previously. This provides the possibility, if mining firms are wise, for women as well as men to be employed, thus creating a balanced population which will help to stabilise the communities in the mining towns. All sorts of possibilities are being opened up by technology, which could give greater opportunities to some people; but at the same time it raises problems.

The saddest thing in this report is on page 42, which says—

The circumstances of the Aboriginal people vary greatly and their number of 106 000 in the 1971 Census included 46 per cent less than 15 years old. At that time 26 per cent had not attended school, 53 per cent had received some primary education and only 20 per cent schooling of secondary or higher standard including no more than 1900 who had gone as far as Year 10 or beyond. In 1976, 79 were enrolled at universities and 151 at CAEs. For these numbers to increase relatively, changes from primary level upwards are essential. The ACER survey (see paragraph S.14) found that among Aboriginal children at school the general level of literacy and numeracy was 15-20 per cent below that of the whole school population. Many Aboriginal children are placed in slow learner classes and high drop-out rates show the need for more research. It may be that the conventional classroom is not the best environment for their improvement.

Some of the things I saw at Strelley suggest perhaps there are other ways of doing it. To continue—

Aboriginal students should be selected for training to become teachers and to assist in curriculum development. The establishment of an Aboriginal Studies Curriculum Centre with full time officers in South Australia and of a Diploma of Teaching Course for Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders at Townsville CAE have been important steps.

On page 43 the committee makes a whole range of recommendations which I am sure interested members will read. It is quite important that we do something to solve the Aboriginal problem.

I make the point that it is not a doomsday attitude to look at the problems which face us. I think it is shortsighted to have the kind of optimism that sometimes comes from the Government side of the House—"Let it go, chaps, everything will be alright; just keep developing and we will sort it all out." We kept developing iron ore and then we found the markets dropped. We hope they will pick up again but, as we have said in the past, say now, and will say in the future, we need to plan and monitor the markets, we need to project what will happen, we need to be aware of new technologies, and we need to be ready to solve the problems of technology, to retrain people and bring in shorter working hours

so that as productivity per man increases through increased capitalisation it is not at the expense of people.

Mr Dans has said and I have said—and I will say it again—that computers do not buy Ford cars or anything else. We may have to go into what I have called the "centrifugal bumblepuppy world", which comes from Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*. His brave new world is rather a hideous new world in which are developed all sorts of leisure activities, one of which is the centrifugal bumblepuppy, which requires a great deal of equipment which has to be manufactured; this keeps people in work but, unfortunately, the concomitant of that is that people are discouraged from going out in the fields or walking in the country because it does not cost anything. That is a mad solution, but it is not one that Huxley was actually putting forward.

So we do have to look at the whole matter of changing technology, because we are in a situation in which, as the report to which I have referred says, the western world is not solving its economic problems, its unemployment, and its inflation; we have not got on top of those problems and the solutions that seemed to be working are no longer working.

If we are to believe the Marxists—and I am not saying I do believe them—we are in the final crisis of capitalism. However, whether or not we believe that, we are in a crisis of capitalism, and it is one we must try to get out of without hurting too many people.

When the steam engine was invented the numbers grew very slowly, and still there was appalling suffering in England with the growth of the industrial revolution until productivity made a higher standard of living possible, and the work of the trade unions made possible higher standards in the work place, and a better distribution of the benefits of productivity.

Let us not forget about the trade unions and Annie Bezzant and her match girls. The Leader of the House pointed out an instance of this; it was not the match girls, but the people who licked paint brushes whilst painting luminous figures on watch faces. The match girls developed cancer of the jaw from the phosphorus on matches, and Annie Bezzant took her girls out and, by militant action, obtained better conditions for them.

I am not saying that militant action for its own sake is something I necessarily condone; I am

saying that strong trade unions have helped to increase our standard of living at a time when productivity per man is growing rapidly through changing technology. Unless the trade unions are busy and active we might find more and more people out of work, and this will have ultimately a disastrous effect on our society.

So I am saying: let us not be mindlessly optimistic. Let us face the fact that we now have the real power of nuclear weapons and other things with which to destroy this world. Let us face the problems of the new world which has so many material things and which, because it has so many material things, persuades us by advertising that we should indulge ourselves; so that the decline in morality of which many people speak is the result of the system itself. Let us look at the problems and realise that unless we plan and grapple with them and are not mindlessly optimistic we will be in real trouble in this world.

We could be entering—I was accused of being a doomsday man when I mentioned this during my last lecture at the university—a new age of barbarism; or a new age of higher civilisation. But if we do not look hard at the problems we could destroy ourselves. In fact, I believe we could be better off, but it will take planning.

It is no good saying mindlessly that the world is continuing on happily, because in fact there are grave problems. We are facing a crisis in respect of energy about which we all now know. The only solution many people have is to replace oil and fossil fuels with nuclear energy, which has some appalling prospects for the world. We are not really doing hard research to provide other forms of energy from waste products of all kinds, or from solar energy, which may be our salvation if we can get onto it fast enough.

Therefore, it is time to stop being mindlessly optimistic or Luddite machine breakers, and to grapple with the very serious problems that face this world. If we do that we will have a chance of solving them.

I support the Bill.

THE HON. GRACE VAUGHAN (South-East Metropolitan) [10.07 p.m.]: I wish to speak on two matters during the debate on the Supply Bill. Both matters concern the way in which the electorate is being duped and misguided by this Government and its colleagues in Canberra. I will refer firstly to the way in which the electorate is being deceived about the efficacy of the economic

planning of this Government and of the Government in Canberra; and, secondly, to the way in which the electorate is being deceived about the welfare of the people in Australia who are suffering from the ills of capitalism, about which Mr Hetherington has just been speaking.

I take up a word which the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Charles Court) uses so often. It is a word which rankles with me, because I think it is very much misused. It is the word "sensible" which we hear in almost every speech made by the Premier and Treasurer.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: A simple, clear word.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: It is a simple, clear word, but it is misused by him. I looked up the word in the *Oxford Dictionary* because I was interested in its exact meanings, of which there are more than one. One is, "perceptible by the senses"; I do not think that applies to anything to do with this Government, because it is not sensitive. Another meaning is, "appreciable, great enough to be perceived"; I do not think the Premier means it in that sense, either. Another meaning is, "aware, not unmindful of"; I do not think this Government is too mindful of the things that affect the electorate. I think the interpretation that the Premier places on it is more akin to this: "of good sense, reasonable, judicious, moderate, practical".

I want to ask what is sensible, what is judicious, what is moderate, and what is practical about many of the things the Government is doing at the moment.

One of the things that show the difference between the rules for the workers and the rules for the people who provide the other three factors of production other than labour—that is, enterprise, capital, and land—was noticed particularly in the demonstration mounted by the road hauliers; that is, how they succeeded fairly easily.

I am referring to the subcontractors who made such a successful demonstration of their need to have the road maintenance tax removed. They succeeded fairly easily, considering the length of what could be called their strike, but which was really a withdrawal of their enterprise and not a withdrawal of their labour, because they work for themselves. How successful they were; because the Western Australian Government in particular caved in very quickly at the prospect of goods

which are so urgently needed in Western Australia not being transported. In Western Australia we rely so much on primary industries and have so few secondary industries that road haulage is very important to us.

So the aggression shown by the road hauliers in the withdrawal of their enterprise was very successful; in fact, we saw an announcement in the Press this morning that a petrol tax would be substituted for the road maintenance tax.

It seems to me there is one law for the workers and another for the entrepreneurs; because here we had a very plain analogy of a strike and the rather mild reception of the Premier to the action of the road hauliers was in marked contrast to the vilification we hear of workers who dare to withdraw their labour in order that they may improve their conditions.

I am not talking about what is right or what is wrong. I am talking about the differentiation between those who sell enterprise and those who sell their labour.

I ask again: What is sensible about the way in which unemployment is being handled? If we consider the figures of how much has been forgone by the Federal Government as a result of unemployment since Fraser came to power, we see that an amount of \$2 000 million has been forgone; and that is not counting the \$1 000 million paid in unemployment benefits.

We have seen the punitiveness and the repression introduced by the Fraser Government by way of directives to the Department of Social Security, and by statements by persons such as Lynch—the man who said at a businessmen's luncheon that the only way to get people to go to work was to reduce their unemployment benefits. This in a country which has nearly 500 000 people unemployed and where there are 25 to 30 people waiting for every job vacancy in the skilled area, and something like 100 people waiting for every job vacancy in the unskilled area!

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: When did he make that statement?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: It was made at a businessmen's luncheon and was reported fully on the front page of the newspaper a few days ago.

It is not unusual for conservative, reactionary politicians to make such statements. Mr Masters has said there is not one person in this House who is not sensitive and caring about the unemployed.

However, we do not hear members opposite renouncing statements such as that made by Mr Lynch.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I suppose the organiser of the luncheon will claim the cost as a tax deduction, too?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Of course, there is no doubt of that; again it is a matter of one law for the rich and another for the poor.

So we have all this punitiveness and repression within the Department of Social Security and the hounding of people who are unemployed—as if there is not enough stigma attached to the fact that they are not within the economic order to which they have been conditioned since they were tiny children.

People in Australia have been conditioned as children to believe that when they grow up there will be a job available to them, and only people who are employed are worthy to reside in our society. They have been conditioned in this way since they were born, yet when they go out and look for jobs they find there is none. In addition, they are subjected to this inhumane hounding and persecution by members of the Government and the Social Security Department, under instructions.

It is so bad that Senator Baume, one of the Liberal senators and perhaps a liberal with a small "l" who was involved with the committee investigating social welfare—I believe the inquiry he headed lasted three years—has said there is no way that we can check what we are getting for our money. Neither he nor his committee could say there are not lonely, handicapped, sick, and hungry people in Australia who are not being helped. This is despite all the hounding and punitive attitudes. There are still unhappy people, unemployed people, and people entering psychiatric wards, and people committing suicide.

In a recent "Book of the Week" review a certain book was reviewed by Professor Ronald Henderson, the Director of the Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research at the University of Melbourne. He was chairman of the Government's commission of inquiry into poverty which revealed so much for those who wanted to hear. However, there is none so deaf as he who will not hear. There are plenty of words written and spoken and plenty of figures and statistics to show that this lucky country is not lucky for some one million people living below the poverty line. The book reviewed was titled *Unemployment: A Social and Political Analysis of the Economic Crisis in Australia* and was

written by Keith Windshuttle. In his review Professor Henderson said, "It is an important book for it analyses the main social problem in Australia today."

He talks about the rise in society's mental illness and crime as a result of unemployment. In fact, some of the studies he quotes of the causes of crime in Melbourne by unemployed males and of attempted suicides in Ballarat and Dandenong by the Victorian Mental Health Authority show the tragic effects of unemployment. He goes on to say, "The best section of the book is the documentation of the propagation of the dole bludger myth by the politicians and the media." He says, and I hope members will take the trouble to get this from the library—it is from last Saturday's *The Australian* dated the 5th May—that this dole bludger myth has been propagated by politicians such as Lynch and the media who have made such extravagant statements as to say that 30 per cent of the unemployed were dole cheats. More accurate figures of dole cheating are the successful prosecutions by the Social Security Department which numbered 183 in 1975-76. I believe there were some six hundred prosecutions last year and, considering that last year there were 500 000 unemployed, this is a very small percentage indeed. This figure of 183 in 1975-76 can be compared with the number of people who were fined for tax evasion in the same period, and they amounted to 32 800. Yet tax evasion is seen in our society as something rather clever.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Do you people think that?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: It is considered to be lower than a snake's duodenum to be receiving \$50 a week from the Social Security Department without substantiating one's case.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Would you distinguish between tax evasion and tax avoidance?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Tax evasion is a bad thing; avoidance is smart.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: We can euphemistically call it "avoidance" rather than "evasion". I am talking about evasion.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: We do not agree with evasion.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: There were 32 800 people fined for tax evasion and there is still a connotation of cleverness about this.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Only in your mind.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Heavens above, if one walks around with one's eyes closed one can believe anything. Tax evasion is as old as mother-in-law jokes.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Do you think it is clever for people to evade tax?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I do not believe it is wicked or socially deviant to be unemployed. This concept has been propounded and propagated by politicians and the media so that people out of work and receiving the dole are despised. This is done to the extent, as is quoted in the book, that 30 per cent of the unemployed were considered to be dole cheats.

Some of this must rub off on the community. A newspaper front page had a photograph of six bikini-clad girls sitting around a private swimming pool, headlined, "Luxury life on the dole". The author said it was no wonder the public became angry at dole bludgers. The truth was that three of the girls were at work and one other did not live there. The creation and spread of this myth by such stories has enabled the Government to persecute the unemployed. This is because of the help the Press has given to the Government which has made it an easy job to spread this myth within the community. People listen and believe the stories. People will say, "You can say that only 183 people really cheated on the dole last year, but I know Mrs Brown's nephew down the road . . ." This is the sort of unscientific survey of the community done by this sort of observation which anyone with half a brain can see is not to be accepted as fact but rather as what it is, hearsay.

Henderson has said that as successive surveys for the Government's inquiry into poverty and the Brotherhood of St Laurence have shown—but the Press has seldom acknowledged—a substantial proportion of the unemployed do not apply for benefit. Therefore, the percentage of people who are prosecuted and convicted is not a true reflection of the percentage of all the unemployed, and therefore it looks even worse than, in fact, it is. It is not a bad thing to find only 183 people out of 500 000 have received money to which they were not entitled.

By propagating this dole bludger myth the public has been ready to accept high levels of unemployment and to approve of administration which penalises the unemployed.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You have used the term "dole bludger" more than any other person in this Chamber.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I am reading what is said in this extract. It is all right for Mr Withers to try to salve his conscience, but this is a term used in the community. Perhaps it is not used in Kununurra, but it is certainly used in the rest of Australia. If Mr Withers wants to fool himself he can do so, but to fool himself into believing there are not people in the community who are punitive towards those receiving unemployment benefits does not become him. He would be a fool to believe otherwise, and I do not believe he is a fool. He should stop interjecting in that foolish way. It is foolish to say there are not people who are punitive towards those receiving unemployment benefits; the practice is widespread. One of the leading Liberals has been reported on the front pages of the newspapers to say so at length.

Windschuttle quotes a letter from an officer of the Commonwealth Employment Service to *The National Times* describing voluntary leavers who have been declared to be the very lowest of people in our community because they dared to leave a job and then have to wait six weeks for benefits, as the Hon. Lyla Elliott reminds me. The officer from the CES said in his letter, "By far the most common reason is expectation of a new position which fails to materialise or is given to someone else at the last minute. A large number leave for health reasons—allergy to chemicals or dust, prolonged aches and pains as the job gets too heavy for them." This is often as a result of people who are trained for other positions and who find they have to go down the hierarchical scale of occupational prestige in order to get a job. We find a Minister in the Fraser Government publicly suggesting that an architect who cannot get a job as an architect should accept a position as a builder's labourer. He overlooks the fact that while unemployment among architects is fairly high it is far worse among builders' labourers.

We find people down the scale who are less privileged, less educated, less skilled, and more likely to be unemployed are the ones who are less prepared for unemployment. They are the ones with little chance of being able to put away a nest egg for such circumstances and who are less resourceful at being able to live on nothing.

The author said we find many reports of women leaving their jobs to get away from sexual advances by their employers. We know this can happen in the best of well-regulated worlds, but it

seems incredible that rich, civilised countries such as ours should deny income maintenance to such people. This has been brought about by persons such as Lynch and by the media who put forward these ideas and encourage the sort of punitiveness and intolerance we have been witnessing.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Do you think it is possible that some women leave home and go to work because of this problem?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: It could be; we all have our problems. As a result of the harsh measures introduced by the Department of Social Security as a direct result of the Minister's instructions after she had been instructed by the Cabinet, we find the voluntary agencies are inundated with people.

In fact, more than 130 destitute families have had to beg from these voluntary agencies which are now desperately short of funds. I recommend that members examine this book, or at least look at the review which contains some interesting statements. I ask: What is sensible, moderate, judicious, or practical about decisions such as Fraser's to buy two flying penthouses which he now uses? Those aeroplanes cost \$40 million at a time when the Government was saying it could not afford to give twice yearly CPI adjustments to pensioners. Such adjustments would have cost between \$27 million and \$28 million. It is apparent the Government could afford a sum of \$12 million more than that for two aircraft in order to transport Mr Fraser in the manner to which he has become accustomed.

I cannot help making remarks about Mr Fraser, because I believe he is responsible for much of the misery and economic chaos which dominates Australia today. His latest move is to mouth platitudes, as he roams around the third world countries, about helping the third world. Mr Fraser is talking about the need to assist the third world when back in Australia there is a third world also and he does not seem to know it exists.

Mr Fraser mouths platitudes about the third world countries when people such as President Marcos and Kurt Waldheim have said it is no good mouthing platitudes, but we should do something concrete like setting up a new economical structure to assist these countries.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: Do you hold up President Marcos as an example of all that is good?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I do not, but I agree with him in this instance. However, if he continues with his restrictive policies in the police

state he presides over in the Philippines all the great high fences he has built around the beautiful houses to keep out the filthy and hungry people will not be high enough to protect him.

That brings me to Mr Masters' statement about the possibility of disorder which he pooh-poohs. Disorder must eventuate if we continue to look after the haves and disregard the have-nots. In a country which prides itself on its affluent and open society, the differentiation between the advantaged and the disadvantaged in the allocation of resources is a matter of which we should be thoroughly ashamed.

I am among some of the older people in this Chamber and I remember—

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Tut, tut.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I am older than the member who has just interjected.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: But young in spirit.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I remember very vividly the sorts of things Mr Dans was talking about in regard to the Premier, advocating that junior workers should accept lower wages. I recall during the 1930s depression some families in which the only people working were the teenagers. Not only were they receiving lower wages, but also they accepted even lower wages than they signed for.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Do you recall Premier Tonkin taking away the assistance for isolated children in the northern areas? Can you recall him refusing to help the pensioners in those areas?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Mr Withers is adopting some of the defence mechanisms which the Leader of the House has exhibited already with his reaction formation and Mr Oliver has exhibited with his Freudian slips. Mr Withers is now using the most common defence mechanism which you, Sir, as a psychologist will realise is "projection". He is trying to take away attention from the guilt which he feels, because of the likelihood of a depression descending upon us with all its associated miseries, by talking about the assistance taken away from isolated children when, in fact, we are referring to the unemployed.

The Hon. W. R. Withers interjected.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The honourable member should try to consider the children of Australia whose fathers and mothers are out of work. He should try thinking of the

children of Australia whose parents receive unemployment benefits and who can never hope to obtain adequate nutrition to enable them to develop properly. We need to get our priorities in order, and there are a number of children hungry in Australia today.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Do you mean they cannot get community orders for food through the Government? Are you saying they will starve under our Government?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The honourable member is quite pathetic in his attitude.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You are implying something which is not true.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: What is a "community order"? The honourable member does not even know what he is talking about.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: What would you do if you were starving? Would you go to a department and get an order?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I would not be starving, because I have adequate resources to look after myself.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: What would you tell people to do if they were starving?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I was a social worker, Sir—

The ACTING PRESIDENT (the Hon. R. J. L. Williams): I suggest you address your remarks to the Chair and I ask that the interjections cease.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The point I am making is that in times of economic depression we find the people who are least resourceful are the ones who suffer most and, in fact, they are not the people who know what to do about their situation. Of course, one of the factors which has brought about a lessening of the ability of professional people to be able to assist in the matter of dealing with people on lower incomes and attempting to help with unemployment benefits is the fact that the Fraser Government has cut back repeatedly on welfare funding. Therefore, we do not have enough people to advise the disadvantaged and underprivileged people of the resources available. It becomes a vicious circle.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: They have not reduced social security.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The honourable member should try visiting the counter at the social security office. If you, Sir, were an underprivileged or disadvantaged person

trying to convey your problem and you were tongue-tied and did not quite know how to do so, you would find the person who has the louder voice and a few more resources is the one who is helped. There are many examples of this. The people who work on the counters in Government departments are the youngest, newest members of the staff who are least likely to be tolerant with people coming to the counter for assistance.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: In my experience they are all most tolerant and helpful.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I suppose the Leader of the House very frequently goes and applies for what Mr Withers calls "community orders".

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I find the average worker—

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The Leader of the House would know nothing about the average young worker.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You stand up there and sneer at them. They are helpful and considerate. In the main they are polite and certainly they do not deserve your carping criticism.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I am dealing with facts and the fact is that people who suffer most in times of economic depression are the people who are the least resourceful. Of course, the Leader of the House would not suffer. He would go down to the social security office and the staff there would dance to attention on him. If they did not he would thump his hand on the counter and say, "Bring me the boss" because he would know how to act in those circumstances. Both the Leader of the House and I would know how to react.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Why do you knock the workers? They are supposed to vote for you.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The Leader of the House and I know how to get the best out of people behind the counter, because we are resourceful. What I am trying to get through to the Leader of the House, because he is dim,—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Dim!

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: —is that the people who need help do not know how to approach the various avenues through which they can be assisted.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Tell us how to fix it. If you say it is bad under our Government and under your Government, how will you fix it?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: She would not have a clue.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Mr Withers suddenly decides he wants to listen to some sort of advice on how to get over the problem.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I will always listen to constructive suggestions.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: So will I.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: If we do not cut down on the amount of money available for unemployment and sickness benefits, if we are not so rigorous, harsh and punitive, people will not go to the social security office and say, "I did not get my cheque. What happened to it?" The usual reply to that is, "You were cut off because you did not answer the door when the inspector came round and knocked on it." It is a fact that if one does not answer the door and talk to the inspector and convince him that the department's requirements are being followed, one will lose one's unemployment benefit.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I am aware of that.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: If Mr Withers wants to criticise the person who did not answer the door or who did not answer the questions properly, he is free to do so; but I do not like him including the children of that person in his vindictiveness and punitiveness. I would find reason for excusing the father and mother as well, but the honourable member would not. However, I resent that he should say the children should suffer as well because of the paucity of money being made available for welfare purposes.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: But you have not told us how it can be fixed.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The Government should stop being so cautious in the way it hands out its money; it should stop being so miserable; and it should stop being so punitive.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: But you cannot hand out public money willy-nilly. You must have a check on it.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: So what do we do with these resourceless people who cannot find work and to whom we cannot hand out money indiscriminately? What happens when they get to the point where they cannot look after their children any longer? What happens when a social welfare worker or a policeman visits the home and says, "You are not looking after the children properly. They do not have adequate food, clothing, or bedding"? Are we going to take those children into care? How much does the honourable member think that costs?

The Hon. W. R. Withers: How will you solve the problem?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: How much does the honourable member think it costs to look after children in institutions?

The Hon. W. R. Withers: It costs a lot of money.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: It costs approximately \$250 per week to look after a child in a Government institution. It costs something in the vicinity of \$150 a week for the State to look after children in a voluntary agency residential institution. Yet Mr Withers says we cannot hand out money indiscriminately. We have to employ highly paid inspectors to ensure persons do not receive \$100 a week to which they are not truly entitled, because they have not been pounding the streets looking for a job. We have to employ highly paid people to make sure they do not get money to which they are not entitled and when they have not received that miserable \$100 for five or six weeks and there is no food in the larder, what happens to the children? Maybe all that dad can afford is a bottle of plonk to get himself rotten under the tree on the corner. The police come around and say, "Dad is drunk; we will take away the kids."

The Hon. W. R. Withers: How will you fix it?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The Government has no compunction about taking the money out of our pockets and saying, "The children will be looked after in this nice clean institution"; but it would not consider giving even a fraction of that money to the father before he finds himself sitting under the tree with his bottle of plonk. We have to be careful about handing out our money, so we would not consider that! This punitiveness, persecution, and hounding will bring about a situation which will result in much higher costs to the taxpayer than if the unemployment benefit had been paid in the first place. A total of 183 people out of half a million are getting away with \$100 a week they do not deserve. I think it is about time we looked at our logic in regard to welfare.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You are saying we should do away with it.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I am not saying that at all. No matter what area of life we look at, people do things which are not in accordance with the law. We have only to look at tax evasion which involves 33 000 people and compare that with the unemployment

benefits prosecutions of 183 people out of half a million unemployed. The reason for that, of course, is that the people charged with offences with regard to unemployment benefits do not have the resources or the initiative which would allow them to cheat too often. The smart, resourceful people are much more likely to do that, the most underprivileged and most disadvantaged people are more likely to be the ones who are the victims of unemployment. They are the least likely to be able to beat the system and cheat.

I wanted to emphasise tonight the importance of keeping a reasonable part of the budget for welfare commensurate with the decrease in employment and with the economic depression; and that this is the last area we should cut down—welfare and employment benefits.

As Mr Hetherington said in another context, computers do not buy cars. One of the Keynesian principles which cannot be argued against is that the people on lower salaries spend the most money. They spend 100 per cent of their money, and that is what makes the world go round. I support the Bill.

THE HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [10.46 p.m.]: I will be brief in my remarks. It has been a very interesting exercise to observe the passage of the Supply Bill through this House; interesting because I have heard so much said about the upper House as an establishment, and the establishment of that upper House. In fact, that was mentioned often tonight.

Surely now those in opposition to the existence of this House should realise that, without the upper House, at the present moment the number of words said on the passage of the Supply Bill through Parliament would have been extremely negligible indeed.

It is interesting to note that in the Legislative Assembly there were only four speakers on the Supply Bill. The Treasurer introduced it, the Leader of the Opposition spoke to it, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition spoke to it, the ex-Leader of the Opposition spoke to it, and the Treasurer then closed the debate.

So far as I can recall, I am the tenth speaker in the debate in this House. Here we have 10 out of 32 members—about one-third—who have spoken in some way on the passage of the Supply Bill through this House, whereas in the other place four members out of a total of 54 spoke to it. So, it must be noticed that we do have some sense of duty so far as our legislation is concerned which, possibly, was missed in another place.

The Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. D. K. Dans, should be extremely proud of his team, because six of his eight members have spoken on the Bill. Certainly, that was not the case when it went through another place. It is also interesting to note that the debate in this place has lasted for seven hours, whereas in another place it lasted for just over one hour.

I was extremely interested in the speeches made here, because many of us have travelled the wide world. I have learnt a lot, but I also wondered what lay in that debate for supply in the Budget of this State. I suppose that to be honest I should say that the Hon. Grace Vaughan did end her speech by talking about the Budget and mentioned that certain measures should be continued.

"Dr" Hetherington is now looking at me, and I was extremely interested in his speech because he dealt with steam engines and Annie Bezan, and he went back to Huxley. It seemed to me he also read the Williams report from start to finish.

While "Dr" Hetherington was speaking I remembered a story about myself when I left school. My father said to the headmaster, "Well, the boy's education is finished. He most likely will not make use of it. It is a pity he is not like so-and-so." So-and-so happened to be the dux of the class and he was successful in seven subjects with seven distinctions in his Leaving. The headmaster replied, "You know, if so and so follows the books of learning he will never make a living for himself." The other fellow, so-and-so, did a lot of reading and research but he never made a living for himself! So, I always like to hear those who project their thoughts onto others, and start to give some wisdom to what might happen in the future.

Mr Cooley quoted from two books in particular. I thought he tried to be very fair as, indeed, he can be. Nevertheless, after listening to the speeches which have been made it is obvious there is still a lot of ill-feeling about what happened in the Federal Parliament in 1975. I think it will be an argument for many years to come; as a matter of fact I do not think it will ever be forgotten.

In the main, I have learnt a lot. However, I believe the Supply Bill, in itself, is a very important document. It grants a furtherance of available moneys to this State so that the Government can carry on after the 30th June in the 1978-79 financial year, and spend \$720 million. There is also provision for a further \$75 million, and a credit to the General Loan Fund of

\$25 million to enable the Treasurer to make such temporary advances as may be found necessary. I have not heard very many questions asked about what the \$25 million will be spent on, but I am sure the Leader of the House will tell me in due course.

It is interesting to note that the 1978-79 Budget will finish somewhere on stream. In other words, revenue will not be as high as anticipated and expenditure is running at a level slightly less than expected. Therefore, it will balance out. At this stage the Government is hopeful of keeping revenue and expenditure in balance, which is very good. I am one who always likes a balanced cash flow Budget. I sincerely hope that is how the Budget will finish up.

I also believe enough provisions have been introduced before the Budget for it to finish that way. I hope that such necessary moves will not have to be made before the introduction of the next Budget in order that it will finish up squarely. I also believe we can be rather pleased that the State has not had to budget for a deficit.

I did go to my room and bring back my mileage figures for every day of the last five weeks, but I will not refer to them because the honourable member who mentioned this matter has temporarily left the Chamber. Nevertheless, it was interesting to hear the basis of one electorate *versus* another, as really and truly the members concerned do not know what they are talking about when it comes to dealing with an area and looking after a country province.

I support the measure. It has been an interesting debate. Members of this House need to be congratulated for taking seven hours to pass a Bill which was debated for only 1¼ hours in another place.

THE HON. G. C. MACKINNON (South-West—Leader of the House) [10.55 p.m.]: I thank honourable members for their interest in this measure which, as Mr Gayfer has mentioned, has taken seven hours to debate. I am delighted that Mr Gayfer actually spoke about money and about the Bill.

I think I ought to point out to the House that this very long debate has taken me by surprise. It will be necessary for the House to sit at 11.00 o'clock in the morning, which I regret, and it will be necessary also for me, tomorrow, to move without notice to set aside Standing Orders so that we will not be faced with the same situation again.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Keep on sitting tonight.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: We cannot, because of the 11.00 o'clock deadline.

As members are aware, I gave an indication that I hoped to get through a couple of measures. As everyone is aware, it has been arranged that this Chamber should be used by the CPA during the week after next.

It was terrific to see members of this House recognise the importance of this Bill. This measure, debated half-way through the Address-in-Reply, has received a lot of attention and has ranged over a wide variety of subjects. We heard Mr Dans trying to explain away the irrational statements made by the Hon. Lyla Elliott a few days ago. We accept his apologies and explanations for that.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You know, I thought you were getting better when I read one of your earlier speeches, but you have not improved; not one inch.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It seems to me we keep referring back to the stopping of supply as though the Senate refused supply and that led to the downfall of the Whitlam Government. The Senate did not defeat the Supply Bill.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I thought I said some nice things about the Hon. Arthur Griffith.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: We keep on hearing about supply being refused, but supply was not refused here either. The only person I know of who has made an actual firm statement—the only leader I know of in recent times who has made a firm statement—about the effect of defeating supply by the proper use of authority in an upper House was Whitlam. He set in train certain things, through Senator Murphy, and I think it was clearly stated what his attitude was. If that attitude backfired at any time, that was bad luck. I know of no case where it did backfire, or of any other House which has refused supply.

Of course, the Opposition is trying to cover up this suggestion under a rubbish heap of words. Members of the Opposition were surprised when we got a little upset.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I have not noticed that you have been upset.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am not like Mr Cooley; I will not burst into tears about it. However, let me assure the Leader of the Opposition that I am upset.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You would be a better leader if you did show a little emotion.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I have quite enough emotions. Again we heard from a number of people about the new social order and change, as though change were a new state. My reading of history has indicated that if there is anything to look forward to, and ever has been anything to look forward to in the world, it is that we are in a constant state of change.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Karl Marx thought that also. I do not know whether he is right or not.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: The rate has not always been constant.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The rate has accelerated at different times. Certain items have been mentioned as having had a great effect. Amongst these is the silicone chip, the transistor, and the pill. Some of these items have made very great changes to our social lives. The discovery of penicillin in the 1930s changed medicine entirely from the treatment of symptoms to the treatment of disease. The world has always been in a constant state of change.

We again heard reference to the dire calamities that may beset the world with the use of uranium and nuclear fuel. I suggest that even the experiences we had with the nuclear holocaust in Japan at the end of the war pale into insignificance alongside some of the cataclysmic happenings in the world brought about by other wars in other times. We have seen the almost total destruction of entire nations. The peasant wars in Europe—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The War of the Roses and the 100 Years War.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The War of the Roses, bad as it was, pales into insignificance when compared with the devastation that followed when hordes of barbarians crossed Europe killing thousands of men and taking off the women and children. From what I remember of history, even Hiroshima pales into insignificance when compared with the devastation wrought by the barbarous hordes that, at various times, swarmed over Europe.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Try the plague or the Black Death.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The great fire of London.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: All these things brought about change, and as we read

history, we find constantly the world has been on the brink of disaster, on the brink of another barbarian invasion. I think the Hon. Robert Hetherington suggested that.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not think anyone suggested that.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: I did, although I did not say barbarian invasion. Get it right. "Barbarism" was the word I used.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: All right, barbarism, if that suits the honourable member. We have all heard these semi-humorous quotes where a person reads out a reference to the youth of today, how they are shiftless, not working hard enough, relying on patrimony, and so forth.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Who read that out tonight?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Nobody, but one can find these references and when such a quote is read out, everyone agrees with it. But then the reader comes to the punch line which is that the quotation was written by someone like Plato, Hippocrates, or Socrates. So this has been going on since time immemorial.

Here tonight we heard a lady, who claims to be a responsible member of Parliament, a qualified social worker, saying—if I heard the speech aright—that if a poor unfortunate person, lacking in education, lacking in the ability to speak up for himself or herself, seeks advice from an ordinary assistant at a counter in a social welfare department, the worker behind the counter automatically will be rude and unhelpful.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not think she said that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: She jolly well did.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: No she didn't.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: She said that of course if I, as an official and a person well known, went to such a counter, I would receive first-class attention.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Even if you went there as an ordinary person you would get that. She was saying that there are some people who are perhaps backward.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: What I believe she said clearly and without equivocation was that those workers, whom in the next breath she will claim to represent, would not help such a person at the counter. Bear in mind that the people about whom she is speaking are employed to help just that sort of person.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: How many times do members of Parliament get called upon to right some of the wrongs caused by these people?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: She says that people who do not have the capacity to help themselves are brushed aside.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: What she said precisely was that there was the tendency to—

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I heard the lady; I sat and listened to her.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: You misinterpreted her as usual.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I sat and listened to her.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: You are very good!

The Hon. D. K. Dans: He doesn't misinterpret—he doesn't understand.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Are you claiming that sort of thing does not happen?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: So often we blame the system when it is not the fault of the system but the fault of the person. For example, the other day we heard people say that the Ford Motor Company is terrible because its motorcars are not properly put together. Several times tonight we have heard the remark that computers do not buy Ford motorcars.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: They do not buy Holdens either.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The designers, the engineers, and the management of the Ford Motor Company do not get down on the floor to put the cars together. The cars are put together by the workers, by members of the union.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Are not members of the management workers?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Of course they are workers, but they are not doing up the screws and bolts.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: But the workers are well supervised, of course.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: All right, and what happens if the supervisor puts his bib in too much? There is a strike.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The Ford Motor Company said it was a very prevalent thing, but it was denied by GMH and Chrysler.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I suppose the employees about whom the Hon. Grace Vaughan was speaking were the employees of the Commonwealth Employment Service. Long ago,

when nobody knew me from a hole in the road, I used to go to the Social Security Department or to the Commonwealth Employment Service and I never found anyone who was not extremely helpful.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: And neither have I.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: And yet the lady was saying that people who go for help are brushed off.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Mr MacKinnon, you obviously do not do a great deal of constituency work. How many times do you have to intervene on behalf of constituents and sure, you get it fixed up for them where they have been unsuccessful themselves?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The only time I had any trouble was during the three years of the Tonkin Government.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: We are in Opposition now and I never find any difficulty with any department.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Let us leave discussion about the new social order we have been going to have for the last 2 000 years.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Your own Premier said it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: But all the Opposition members went on and on about it. Let us leave that for a moment.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I wish we could.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I would like to deal lightly with one particular matter Mr Dans spoke about. He again made a cursory examination of the Press and then spoke of this matter of penalty rates in the tourist industry.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I never spoke about it. The Premier spoke about it; I just quoted the Premier.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Mr Dans spoke about it in this House.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I quoted the Premier.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I do not care whether Mr Dans quoted Genghis Khan.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: He didn't write in this language—I couldn't quote him.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The committee that looked into this matter on an Australia-wide basis consisted of the chairman—I just cannot remember his name but he is presently the Ambassador to America—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Evidently he was paid off for doing a good job. Was it Sir Robert Cotton?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Yes, Sir Robert Cotton. The second member was Mike Barnard, an Australian Labor Party member of the Parliament of Tasmania, brother of the ex-Federal member, and myself.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I knew there was someone in this—thanks for that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The committee met to discuss the very vexed problem of penalty rates in the accommodation industry as it applies to tourism. We actually met with some members of the union.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The quote from the Premier did not just include the tourist industry—you didn't hear correctly.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: As a matter of fact it did.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You should quote the whole lot.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I was not doing the quoting; the Hon. Des Dans did the quoting.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You were not doing the listening. I was doing the quoting.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: This particular committee made reference to—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Do you think that was what the Premier was quoting from?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am sure that the Premier's reference would have been to the report of that committee because the Hon. Desmond Dans indicated it was to do with the tourist industry.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It wasn't about the Police Force or the MTT?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am fairly certain it would not be.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: By implication he said it was.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I doubt it.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The Police Force and the MTT employees already get it, but not employees in the tourist industry.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: As the Hon. Des Dans mentioned the tourist industry, I took it that was what it was about. It was made clear to

members of the union who attended the conference that there was no indication penalty rates should be denied to any worker who had been employed for the full 40 hours in a week and who was then asked to work extra hours on a weekend or public holiday. Certainly in that case penalty rates should apply.

The situation discussed was that of workers who worked only on weekends or public holidays. Many of these people work only on those occasions, and in other parts of the world they are paid on a piece rate basis. This was the issue discussed, and the proposition always seemed to me to be perfectly reasonable. Why should it cost more to have a bed changed on a Monday public holiday than it does to have it changed the next day? It is totally unreasonable.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: They did not give themselves those rates; they were given by tribunals.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am fully aware that the rates were awards of tribunals. I am fully aware that the rates are paid on the basis that a person works a full 40 hours and is then asked to work extra time. I still consider those rates to be unreasonable.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Mr Masters would say it was an umpire's decision.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Let us consider the situation pertaining in New Zealand, which is a sister nation of ours. A certain sum is paid for making up beds and cleaning rooms, and the sum paid does not vary with the day of the week.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: They have a very healthy economic situation too, New Zealand, I notice. The people are carrying the motorcars around on their backs rather than the motorcars carrying them.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I will say this for New Zealand—it has an extremely healthy tourist industry.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It is not doing much good for the nation.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The tourist industry is really carrying the country. Incidentally, I suggest that Mr Cloughton should have a closer look at the economic circumstances of Mexico before quoting that as a model worth following.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: I was not talking about the economic situation. I was talking about the oil industry.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Mr Cloughton was talking about what Mexico proposed to do when selling its oil.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That's the good oil!

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I was interested in Mr Cloughton's comments on the fishing industry because that is a subject about which I am particularly interested.

I was worried for a little while when Mr Cloughton was talking about catching illegal fish that he was suggesting the "Kakka" trade was rearing its ugly head again; I do not think it is. I was delighted when he said he was not talking about illegal rock lobster fishing but about illegal scale fishing—jewfish and the like. I sincerely hope *Hansard* spells it correctly, because it refers to the Hebrew perch, and is not spelt "dhufish". However, I have almost given up; I realise I am fighting a losing battle with the restaurateurs, who do not like calling it "jewfish".

The Hon. D. K. Dans: There is another "jewfish" on the eastern coast, is there not?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That "jewfish" happens to be a mullet. The Western Australian jewfish is the Hebrew perch, first caught on the Jerusalem Bank; in fact, it was called the Jerusalem Bank because that is where they caught the Hebrew perch.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You will be getting into trouble with Rabbi Coleman if you keep this up.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I have already had that discussion with the learned Rabbi Coleman.

The point Mr Cloughton made was a good one; we are worried about the over-catching of this delicacy, the fish which in the opinion of a number of gourmets—it is an opinion I share, although I do not profess to be a gourmet—is the best table fish in the world.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What happens if you pull one up from 46 fathoms and it is undersized? We all know what happens to that fish.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The fish should not be pulled up so rapidly, but very slowly! There is a need for additional research into the habits of the jewfish—when it comes in from the deep, whether the groups that stay in small areas on the reef are purely and simply

resident there or whether they are replaced by other fish, whether they are being fished out and, once they are fished out, whether they are gone forever, what their life cycle is, and so forth.

I heard rumours that some people are dropping tangle nets over these little coral and rock lumps and taking all the fish that get into them. That is a great shame. I believe there is a need to look at this, from the interests of both the professional and the legitimate amateurs.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: A great number of people, even ethnic people, are cleaning out mussel beds and fishing grounds.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It is a great shame. I am a lover of fishing and wet fish. There is no greater sport than to go out and catch a couple of fish and return home and have a good meal. I deplore the actions of which the honourable member spoke. The Department of Fisheries and Wildlife has done its best by imposing bag limits.

I believe the way the conservation of our fisheries can be achieved is not by additional policing but by a change in the attitude of mind of the people. Perhaps I can explain that statement by saying that in California, most of the people on the coast and near the rivers follow fishing like Western Australian males follow Australian rules football. If they hear the salmon are running in any particular place they will stop on the way to work, return home, get their rods and head for the fish. They are allowed to catch three fish. They will catch the first two and put them in a spot where they can keep them alive. They will then catch their third fish and either finish fishing, or let the smallest one go and continue fishing.

I am reliably informed that if somebody catches four fish, or takes an undersized fish he is as likely as not to find himself thrown in the river with his gear, and not by a policeman but by fellow fishermen, such is their affection and regard for the sport.

We must get that attitude in Western Australia. I am firmly convinced, as is the department, that this attitude must be inculcated, for example, in the people around Collie to encourage them to look after the marron in the area and in people who go out fishing for jewfish and the like. It must be accepted that it is impossible for us to watch over the wide spaces we are supposed to police.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not think you could apply the same rules to jewfish as you do to

salmon in a river. If a person is out at sea hoping to catch snapper and pulls in jewfish after jewfish, what does he do?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He is allowed to catch 10 large fish which, really, is enough for anybody.

Mr Cloughton referred to the herring fishery. This matter already had been considered by the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife but there is reason to believe it could be looked at again. The objection which has been raised is that, such is the price of crayfish bait, it now pays a professional to entice any resident crop of herring—that is, the “tommy ruff”—from a rock and run a net around them. Even if they catch only four, five or six boxes, it pays them. These herring may be the residuals which did not follow the migration schools but remained around a rock, which these creatures like.

These are the fish which keep the amateurs going right through the holiday period. The amateur can sit in a boat and entice them off the reef with a bit of burley; he can then spin around the rock in his boat and catch one dozen or two dozen herring. In this way, the professional net fisherman is ruining the sport and possibly is depleting the fish stocks.

Probably one of the happiest solutions to this problem was the declaration of Rottnest as a closed area to professionals; it has been kept open to the delight of a tremendous number of anglers.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It has improved the fishing at Rottnest tremendously.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Many get down to the last dregs of the fish. I suggest Mr Cloughton read the report of the South Coast Fisheries Committee, which it was my pleasure to be able to set up, and which did a first-class job. The only aspect with which I disagree is their recommendation in regard to the herring fishery.

Mr Deputy President, I sincerely hope you are not successful in your campaign to change the slogan of our State. We have spent far too much money publicising the present slogan on a worldwide basis with quite amazing success and I would hate to change it and go through all that again.

I am afraid the comments of all the other speakers were expressions of opinion on which I really cannot elaborate.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: You still have not answered my two questions.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The Hon. Lyla Elliott's point was one of those I did not consider called for an answer.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Thank you; you have admitted what I said is true.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Miss Elliott probably is trying to entice me to break what I have always made an inflexible rule; in fact, I did refer to that matter. Perhaps as a matter of courtesy I should suggest the honourable member read *Hansard*, where she will find an answer to her question. It may not be the answer she specifically wanted; however, it was an elaboration of the excuses for those questions which Mr Dans put forward in his speech.

I thank members for their support of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Leader of the House), and passed.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Leader of the House) [11.26 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 11.00 a.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 11.27 p.m.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

HERBICIDE: 2, 4-D

Ban, Disposal, and Storage

1. The Hon. TOM McNEIL, to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) In view of the gazetted regulations prohibiting the use and storage of 2, 4-D ethyl ester around Geraldton, would the Minister advise what period of grace will be permitted farmers and stock firms to dispose of full or partially filled drums?
- (2) What will be the penalty for illegal storage of highly volatile 2, 4-D in the prohibited area?
- (3) What safety measures are to be adopted for the disposal of partially filled drums?
- (4) Will farmers be allowed compensation for stocks of 2, 4-D that may be held in partially filled drums?
- (5) Under what circumstances will permission be granted by an authorised officer for its storage between 20 and 50 kilometres of Geraldton?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) to (5) The Department of Agriculture is at present examining these matters and the Minister intends making an announcement in the near future.

RECREATION: SPORT

National Sports Lottery

2. The Hon. TOM McNEIL, to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Recreation:

Having regard to the Federal Government's statement that it is

investigating the possibility of establishing a national sports lottery, which has the support of New South Wales and Victoria, would the Minister advise—

- (a) Is it his Government's intention to agree in principle to such a move?
- (b) If not, why not?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (a) No.
- (b) It is considered that the introduction of a national lottery will not lead to additional funds being available for sport in the future.

QUESTION ON NOTICE

ENERGY: GAS

Northern Gas Depot: Mechanical Services

78. The Hon. W. M. PIESSE, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Is it a fact that tenders have been called by the State Energy Commission for the mechanical services of the Northern Gas Depot at Ballajura?
- (2) Can the Minister advise if these tenders were called publicly or were they called on a restricted basis?
- (3) Would the Minister advise—
(a) when the tenders were opened; and
(b) if and when they were closed?
- (4) If closed, would the Minister advise the number and names of the companies who tendered?
- (5) Do the mechanical services of the Northern Gas Depot include the installation of a solar air conditioning plant?
- (6) If these tenders were called, did the specifications stipulate a preference for a particular make of equipment for this solar air conditioning plant?
- (7) Was the make stipulated, Japanese?
- (8) If so, was the solar panel, specified as being preferred, to be the same manufacture as the absorption chiller?
- (9) Would it thus preclude local participation in the project?
- (10) Is it a fact that a Western Australian company currently is ahead of the rest of the world in the production and design of this type of solar panel?

(11) Is it a fact that the State Government assisted that company with a grant of nearly \$50 000 to instal a demonstration solar air conditioning plant?

(12) Is it not a fact that any local company's direct competitor in this field would be the Japanese company specified as the preferred supplier of the plant to the Northern Gas Depot at Ballajura?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

(1) Yes, through their consultants.

(2) Restricted.

(3) (a) 12th March, 1979

(b) 9th April, 1979.

However, due to special circumstances involving one particular company, the commission has agreed to accept at least one late tender.

(4) No.

(5) Yes.

(6) No.

(7) No.

(8) Not applicable.

(9) No.

(10) to (12) There is one Western Australian company which is in receipt of a grant from the Solar Energy Research Institute associated with a demonstration solar air-conditioning plant.

This company, along with other Western Australian manufacturers of collectors and components, are able to tender for this particular project and should be competitive in comparison with interstate and overseas suppliers.