

Noes—9

Hon. R. F. Claughton	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. S. J. Dellar	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. J. Dolan	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. J. L. Hunt	(Teller)

Pair

Aye	No
Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. Lyla Elliott

Amendment thus passed.

The clause was further amended, on motions by The Hon. A. F. Griffith, as follows:—

Page 2, line 10—Insert after the passage “tombola,” the words “on specified premises for such length of time and”.

Page 2, line 13—Add the following proviso to proposed new subsection (1a):—

“Provided that a permit shall not be granted to hold or conduct the game at any time on premises licensed under the Liquor Act, 1970, or during the time in which liquor may be sold or supplied in the case of unlicensed premises.”

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 17th October, 1972

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

BILLS (2): ASSENT

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

1. Land Agents Act Amendment Bill.
2. Fuel, Energy and Power Resources Bill.

RESERVES (UNIVERSITY LANDS) BILL

Tabling of Plan

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Minister for Education) [4.36 p.m.]: When speaking to this Bill, I gave an undertaking to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that I would lay on the Table of the House a map detailing the extent and location of the land concerned, which would remain on the Table of the House until a final determination is made by this House in relation to the Bill. I now present it for tabling.

The plan was tabled (see paper No. 425).

QUESTIONS (14): ON NOTICE

1. ABORIGINES' WELFARE NEEDS

Royal Commission: Terms of Reference

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

Further to his reply to my motion for a Select Committee to inquire into Aboriginal affairs—

- (1) Will he now set out more clearly the proposed terms of reference?
- (2) Is it intended to appoint more than one commissioner?
- (3) If not, will he consider the advisability of appointing a commission of three to ensure that any recommendations are firmly based, practical and capable of implementation?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) These have not yet been finalised but it is intended that they will be widely based.
- (2) No.
- (3) No. It is proposed to obtain the services of a Judge.

2. YUNDURUP CANALS DEVELOPMENT

Height of Blocks

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Premier:

- (1) Is it a fact that the height of required filling of the proposed blocks at the Yundurup canal development has been reduced by approximately two feet?
- (2) If so, what are the reasons for lessening the previous requirements which were set for health reasons in connection with sanitary and stormwater drainage?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Since the original filling height was approved, the developer has negotiated to provide an outlet drain for the area upstream of the subdivision. The effect of this drain will be to lessen the flood heights in the canal system, and it has been possible, therefore, to reduce the required levels of the blocks.

3. PADBURY BUILDINGS

Request for Land

Mr. HUTCHINSON, to the Premier:

- (1) When did the State request the Commonwealth Government for the land presently occupied by the Padbury Buildings in Forrest Place?
- (2) Has there been any response by the Commonwealth Government?

- (3) Is it a fact that the Padbury Buildings are to be demolished and the site re-developed for use by the Postmaster-General's Department?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) No formal request for the Padbury building site has been made by the State. However, there have been informal discussions between senior officers of the State, the Perth City Council and the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth representatives are aware of the proposals of the Perth City Council for the development of the central city area, particularly in regard to pedestrian access at the level of Hay Street, through the City Arcade and the Padbury building site to the future cultural centre.
- (2) There has been no official response from the Commonwealth Government, but Commonwealth representatives have indicated a willingness to consider State and Perth City Council views.
- (3) There are proposals for future development of land owned by the Commonwealth in Forrest Place which could involve a possible exchange of land owned by the State. State Department representatives have been advised unofficially of these proposals, but no official negotiations can take place until the State is officially informed. It is understood that the Prime Minister will write to the Premier indicating the nature of the proposals.

4.

HEALTH

Compulsory X-ray Examinations

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What was the last period for compulsory X-ray examinations in the metropolitan area under section 293A of the Health Act?
- (2) What was the number (nearest estimate) of people who were compelled to submit to this examination?
- (3) How many did submit to the examination?
- (4) How many were reminded to submit at a later stage?
- (5) How many of the examined people were found to have any illness which required compulsory treatment?
- (6) What were these illnesses?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) The last metropolitan compulsory chest X-ray survey of persons of 25 years and over on which action has been completed was conducted in the City of Subiaco from 24th to 29th March and 12th to 30th June, 1972. Population of area (25 years and over)—8,650. That figure is a rough estimate.
- (2) 8,050 were required to submit to examination (600 inmates of aged person's homes etc. having been X-rayed separately in special surveys).
- (3) 6,000 attended for initial examination.
- (4) 1,950 non attenders were sent reminders.
- (5) (a) Illnesses diagnosed requiring compulsory treatment—1.
(b) Illnesses not requiring compulsory treatment—86.
- (6) (a) Pulmonary tuberculosis.
(b) Pneumonia and other acute inflammatory conditions—9.
Lung cancer—4.
Heart conditions—20.
Other (including minor abnormalities)—53.

5.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE

Vandalism

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

- (1) Has the police apprehended as yet the people who defaced Parliament House on the night between the 29th and 30th September, 1972?
- (2) Will the police endeavour to find out what organisation instigated this vandalism?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Yes. Investigations are proceeding.

6.

CONSULATES

Privileges and Immunities

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Attorney-General:

Can he disclose the results of recent consultations between the States and the Commonwealth regarding consular privileges and immunities?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin (for Mr. T. D. EVANS) replied:

Consultations have not yet been completed.

7.

YUNDURUP CANALS DEVELOPMENT

Government Guarantee

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Premier:

- (1) Is he to open the Yundurup canals project on 27th October, 1972?

- (2) Does he consider this project part of the Government's initiatives to retain or reduce the price of land to home builders?
- (3) If "No" to (2), what is the expected average price these blocks will realise?
- (4) What is the Government's present liability for this project?
- (5) Is it expected the full loan of \$1,750,000 will be used under the Government guarantee?
- (6) Will he remove the doubts relating to the Government's reasons for approving the \$1,750,000 guarantee to the Yundurup canals project by producing evidence—
 - (a) that a serious offer of finance was available after 4th September, 1970 and consequently withdrawn after 9th December, 1970;
 - (b) that the project principals or agents were not aware of the Government and departmental development conditions before the 4th September, 1970?
- (7) If "No" to (6), is it a policy and practice of the Government to grant guarantees to speculative projects without full documentation?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) This is not the reason for the Government's support for the project.
- (3) It would not be ethical for me to disclose the price the developer expects to obtain.
- (4) The contingent liability is \$1,750,000.
- (5) Yes.
- (6) As I said in answer to a similar question on 10th December, 1971, I have no reason to doubt Miss Watters's written advice to the Department of Development and Decentralisation that a first mortgage loan of \$1,500,000 had been negotiated with a finance company in Switzerland.
- (7) No.

8. FACTORY AT ROCKINGHAM *Establishment by Mr. E. Peluso*

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

- (1) Has Mr. Peluso been seeking guidance and assistance from the department for the past 18 months to establish an industry at Rockingham?
- (2) Did the Premier request examination of the proposal towards helping this new industry?

- (3) Did Mr. Peluso ask to lease Rockingham industrial site No. 1358 to establish his lingerie factory?
- (4) Has the department a feasibility study of this proposed industry?
- (5) What encouragement and help does the department intend to extend to Mr. Peluso?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) Mr. Peluso first discussed his proposal with officers of my department on 9th March this year.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) No formal application has been lodged with the Lands Department, which is responsible for the allocation of this land.
- (4) My department has recently received a report on the proposed lingerie factory, but additional information has been requested.
- (5) No decision can be made until adequate information is submitted for consideration.

9. CO-OPERATIVE BULK HANDLING SITE

Kwinana: Dewatering

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Referring to my question 13 on 4th October on the subject of dewatering the Co-operative Bulk Handling site is he now in a position to supply the information sought?
- (2) What are the effects expected of the dewatering upon the adjoining residential land at Rockingham and Kwinana Beach?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

This question has been referred to me for a reply. As the answer is lengthy I request permission to table it.

The answer was tabled (see paper No. 424).

10.

POLICE

Sex Acts: Charges

Mr. R. L. YOUNG, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

Why were charges not laid against the men involved in sex acts with women recently gaoled for committing those acts at football club functions?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

Charges were not laid against the men as, in most cases, insufficient evidence of identification prevailed. The identity of only one male participant was known. He gave

evidence for the prosecution and received a certificate from the court freeing him from any charges.

I might add that to the best of my knowledge no Claremont footballers were involved.

11. NAVAL BASE HOUSING PROJECT

Rezoning of Industrial Land

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Premier:

- (1) Will he advise the House his Government's decision upon the rezoning and development of the Naval Base industrial land for residential purposes as intimated by his Minister?
- (2) If not, when can his announcement be expected?
- (3) Will he table the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority and Environmental Protection Authority reports upon this project?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Cabinet has decided that consideration of the proposal to re-zone the land be deferred pending the carrying out of certain monitoring by the Clean Air Council.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) The Member may see the reports upon reference to the chairman of the committee for the development of Cockburn and Kwinana. The Minister for Environmental Protection advises me that he has today tabled the environmental protection report, so that report is readily available. (*See paper No. 423*).

12. SUPERPHOSPHATE

Rail and Road Cartage

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

- (1) What were the tonnages of superphosphate carried by—
 - (a) rail;
 - (b) road,
 in years 1970-71 and 1971-72?
- (2) What areas in the State are not subjected to transport permit requirements for the road transport of superphosphate?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) In 1970-71, 379,565 tons by rail and 722,786 tons by road.
In 1971-72, 386,455 tons by rail and 802,276 tons by road.
- (2) Areas within a radius of 50 miles from places of manufacture, as well as deliveries from Picton Junction to the Shire of Augusta-Margaret River.

13. INDUSTRIAL STOPPAGES

Iron Ore Projects

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Labour:

- (1) What number of strikes of a half day duration or more have taken place at ore sites from—
 - (a) 1st July, 1971 to 30th June, 1972;
 - (b) 1st July, 1972 to 2nd October, 1972?
- (2) What were the total number of man days lost during the times (1) (a) and (b)?
- (3) What were the reasons for each strike?
- (4) During each period what has been the total loss in—
 - (a) wages to employees;
 - (b) production to companies and shareholders?
- (5) Which unions were involved in each case?

Mr. Bickerton (for Mr. TAYLOR) replied:

- (1) (a) 6.
(b) 3.
- (2) During period 1 (a)—3,721;
During period 1 (b)—5,424.
- (3) 1 pay dispute,
1 production bonus,
2 over award payments,
1 dismissal of workers,
1 manning of shift,
2 terms for resumption of work,
1 work conditions.

—
9
—

- (4) (a) and (b) Actual figure not known and difficult of assessment.
- (5) Detailed information as to the unions involved is not recorded in the statistics maintained in this department.

14. INDUSTRIAL STOPPAGES

Engineering and Steel Fabrication Plants

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Labour:

- (1) What number of strikes of a half day duration or more have taken place at structural engineering or steel fabrication plants during the periods—
 - (a) 1st July, 1971 to 30th June, 1972;
 - (b) 1st July, 1972 to 2nd October, 1972?
- (2) What were the total number of man days lost during periods in 1 (a) and (b)?
- (3) What were the reasons for each strike?

- (4) During each period what was the resulting loss in—
 (a) wages to employees;
 (b) production to companies and shareholders?
- (5) Which unions were involved in each case?

Mr. Bickerton (for Mr. TAYLOR) replied:

- (1) (a) 23.
 (b) 12.
- (2) During period 1 (a)—43,674;
 During period 1 (b)—21,077.
- (3) 8 wages or rates disputes,
 1 production bonus,
 1 overtime,
 6 dismissal or suspension of workers,
 8 demarcation of duties,
 1 work on public holidays,
 1 shift work,
 3 work rosters,
 1 work conditions,
 1 excessive dust,
 3 safety,
 1 communication routine.

—
 35

- (4) (a) and (b) Actual figures not known and are most difficult of assessment. For example, as regards effects on companies and shareholders, the iron ore companies earn revenue on ore shipped so that if stock piles at ports are high, a stoppage of work for several days may not be of the same consequence had orders been high, stocks been exhausted and ships waiting.
- (5) Detailed information as to the unions involved is not recorded in the statistics maintained in this department.

QUESTIONS (9): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Dossier on Financial Affairs

Mr. BRYCE, to the Premier:

- (1) Has he seen the series of articles entitled "The Charles Court Papers," "The Creation of a Demi-God," "The Way the Dynasty Works," and "The Homeric Dossier," published in the newspaper, *Nation Review*, Vol. 2, No. 51, dated the 7th-13th October, 1972?
- (2) If the answer to (1) is "Yes"—
 (a) Has he in fact received the document of complaint referred to in the articles as "the dossier" from a Perth public relations consultant

alleging a conflict of interest between ministerial responsibilities and personal involvement in certain companies on the part of the Leader of the Opposition during his period as Minister for Industrial Development and the North-West?

- (b) Has he yet sighted a copy of the document referred to as "The Homeric House Dossier" described in the article as being one of interest to those closely concerned with Western Australian political or financial affairs?
- (3) In view of the serious nature of the charges made in the articles, will he assure the House that the matter will be thoroughly investigated?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) Yes.
 (b) Yes.
- (3) I am not satisfied, from an examination of the material referred to in (2) (a) above, that it is necessarily to be inferred that Sir Charles Court has acted improperly as a Minister. The "Homeric House Dossier," referred to in (2) (b) above, is being examined, and further investigation will be made if sufficient evidence is forthcoming to justify this action.

2. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Dossier on Financial Affairs

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Premier:

Mr. Speaker, I preface my question by saying that I have always thought it is customary in this House when questions without notice are taken to call upon the Leader of the Opposition first.

The SPEAKER: The member for Ascot rose before you.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Well, I rose twice, Sir. I ask the Premier—

- (1) Will he table the dossier about my financial affairs, which he is reported to have, and from which he is alleged to have obtained information from which he made allegations about me when he was speaking in answer to a motion I moved on the 13th September, 1972, about Government proposals of financial support and tenancies in a new Trades Hall building?
- (2) If not, why does he refuse?

- (3) Will he please advise when he received the dossier, from what source it was received, and who prepared it?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) to (3) I shall discuss the request of the Leader of the Opposition with His Excellency the Governor, Sir Douglas Kendrew, with whom the dossier containing certain allegations against the Leader of the Opposition was lodged, which His Excellency quite properly referred to me for advice.

Sir Charles Court: And in regard to which you told him not to take any action.

3. ABORIGINES

Coolbellup: Unruly Behaviour

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Premier:

I would point out that my question relates to a tent which within an hour or so ago was erected in the grounds of Parliament House. I ask—

- (1) Did he receive a complaint today from Mr. Ken Gordon of the unruly behaviour of natives who have been placed in a State Housing Commission home adjacent to Mr. Gordon's residence in Coolbellup?
- (2) Is he aware that although Mr. Gordon has made complaints over a considerable period of time to the Department of Community Welfare, the police, and the State Housing Commission, he is not able to obtain relief?
- (3) Will he state what action he will take to ensure that residents in the vicinity are not left exposed to abusive language, threats, and the like?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) I am aware that Mr. Gordon has made complaints—he says over a considerable period, but I have not been in a position to check the actual period.

I cannot accept the statement that no action has been taken in connection with the matter, because when this question was first referred to me—and this was just a few days ago—and referred by me to the Minister, I was informed that an inspector would be sent down to look into the position with a view to finding a solution to the difficulty.

- (3) Following a discussion I had earlier today at the entrance to Parliament House I gave an assurance that I would have a further discussion with the Minister for Housing in an endeavour to see whether a satisfactory solution to the problem could be found.

4. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Dossier on Financial Affairs

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Premier:

Arising out of the answer he gave to my question earlier, in which he said—

I shall discuss the request of the Leader of the Opposition with His Excellency the Governor, Sir Douglas Kendrew, with whom the dossier containing certain allegations against the Leader of the Opposition was lodged, which His Excellency quite properly referred to me for advice.

am I to take it this is an additional dossier to the one that was previously lodged with the Governor by a certain person, which was referred to the Government for its advice, as a result of which the Governor was then told that the Government could not advise him that action should be taken for the appointment of a Royal Commission? As I understand the position, the Premier is now saying there is a current submission before the Governor which has been referred to him. Is this additional to the previous one, or is it the one which has been deliberated on by his Government and in respect of which His Excellency was advised?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

I understood from the question of the Leader of the Opposition that he was referring to a dossier which has been alleged was the basis of a statement I made in the House in connection with a certain motion. I do not think this allowed of any other interpretation. That is the only dossier so far as I know which His Excellency the Governor has received, which he referred to me.

In my answer to the question from the member for Ascot I referred to another dossier which only came into my possession this morning.

Sir Charles Court: What a place this is turning into!

5. DAIRY INDUSTRY BILL

Adjournment of Debate: Request

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

Has the Minister received a telegram arising from a public meeting of dairy farmers held at Waroona last night which requested that the Minister be asked to defer the debate on the Dairy Industry Bill until the next session of Parliament? If so, can the Minister give me any indication of his intention?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

No, I have not received such a telegram.

6. POLICE

Sex Acts: Charges

Mr. R. L. YOUNG, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

Referring to question 10 on today's notice paper, I would like to make it quite clear that in no way am I trying to canvass the opinion of the Minister as to the sentences handed out to the people involved. That is not the issue. I am only referring to the charges. My question is—

(1) In view of the answer I received can the Minister give me an assurance that he will request the Minister for Police to ascertain from the members of the Police Force who were at this particular function that it was impossible under the circumstances to obtain the identification of the men involved?

(2) Can the Minister advise me whether or not the person, whose identity is known and who gave evidence for the prosecution, went to the function for a particular purpose, or whether he was an invited guest who simply attended the function?

The SPEAKER: As this question concerns a Minister in another place I suggest it be placed on the notice paper.

Mr. R. L. Young: With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I am merely asking the Minister to give me an assurance that he will ask the Minister for Police.

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

(1) and (2) I suggest the honourable member put this question on the notice paper.

7. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Dossier on Financial Affairs

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Premier:

We on this side of the House are somewhat confused over the answers the Premier has given. I am referring to my question without notice relating to the dossier that he is reported to have used to extract the information on which he made certain allegations in speaking to a motion on the 13th September. In his reply the Premier has said, "I shall discuss the request of the Leader of the Opposition with His Excellency the Governor."

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: That is correct.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I merely want to clarify the situation. Is that the dossier the Premier used for the basis of his unfair allegations?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: It was not unfair, and you will hear more about this later on in regard to the statement you made.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We will be saying something on another day which will cause some embarrassment to the Government, but that is another issue. I want to clarify the position that the dossier from which the Premier has extracted a point to make certain allegations against me is, in fact, the dossier which is now before His Excellency; and is not the dossier which was dealt with back in February last by the Governor in respect of which the Government gave certain advice to the Governor, if the report in the publication referred to by the member for Ascot is correct. I want to have this clarified for myself and my colleagues, as to whether there are two separate dossiers.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: That is so. One dossier came to me this morning.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I want to have the position clarified as to whether the dossier which was referred to His Excellency is the one which the Premier used for the purpose of extracting information in speaking to the motion on the 13th September.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

So far as I know there has only been one dossier before His Excellency, and that is the first one referred to. This was referred to

me, and according to the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon he is aware of the advice which I gave to His Excellency.

Sir Charles Court: That is in the publication. You gave this advice in February.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: Oh no, it is not in the publication.

Sir Charles Court: I am saying it is in the publication.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: Which publication?

Sir Charles Court: The one referred to by the member for Ascot.

Mr. Rushton: The Premier does not know where he is.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The member for Dale need not worry about that.

Sir Charles Court: It is very important to have the position clarified.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: If the Leader of the Opposition wants the position to be clarified I will spell it out. In the first instance a dossier was submitted to His Excellency some time ago, which he referred to me for advice. On that dossier I gave His Excellency certain advice and I assumed that he replied accordingly to the person who had supplied the dossier. The question asked by the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon referred to that dossier.

Sir Charles Court: No, it referred to the dossier you mentioned on the 13th September.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: That was the dossier.

Sir Charles Court: That means there is another one before His Excellency?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: No, it does not. That is the dossier which the Leader of the Opposition asked me to table. I suggest he read his question again.

Sir Charles Court: I have read it.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: That is the dossier which the Leader of the Opposition asked me to table. Surely it will be appreciated that before I gave an answer to that question I would need to discuss it with His Excellency, and obtain His Excellency's permission. I would point this out: If His Excellency refused to grant permission then it is open to the Leader of the Opposition under Standing Order 231 to ask for it to be tabled.

Sir Charles Court: I am asking for it to be tabled, and you have still not answered my question.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I will consult His Excellency.

Sir Charles Court: You have not answered the question.

Mr. Graham: Rubbish!

8. PADBURY BUILDINGS

Request for Land

Mr. HUTCHINSON, to the Premier: Arising out of the Premier's answer to my question this afternoon, whilst being surprised and dismayed that no formal request to the Commonwealth for the Padbury Buildings site has been made by the State, and appreciating the Premier's understanding that the Prime Minister will be writing in regard to the proposals relating to this site, will he consider not waiting for the Prime Minister's letter, and put things in their right perspective by writing to the Prime Minister first? When I said I was dismayed I was not criticising his Government; I am somewhat critical of my own, because I always understood that a formal approach had been made.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

More than once I have considered the desirability of writing to the Prime Minister and asking whether the land referred to could be made available to the State Government. When I examined the file, closely, I discovered that discussions had been taking place between departments which indicated that a plan was under consideration—following a feasibility study—which would require a submission from the Commonwealth Government to the State Government, and State acquiescence would be required before it could be proceeded with.

It seems to me, in view of the discussions which are proceeding, and the consideration which is being given to this matter, that the time to request some alteration—if we disagree with the proposals—would be, when the proposals were before us. My understanding of this situation is that there will not be any great difficulty in obtaining the land upon which Padbury Buildings are located for the purpose of a walkway through to the Cultural Centre, and generally opening up the area. It does not appear to me, at this stage, that we would advance the situation at all by making a formal request to the Prime Minister that the land be made available.

Mr. Hutchinson: But we were alarmed to hear the Commonwealth's reply to Mr. Berinson's question.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I often get alarmed at the replies given to questions by the Prime Minister. It is on record that he twice refused a request of mine and subsequently stated in Parliament that he would agree to my request.

9. PILBARA REGION

Plan of Development

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

The Minister will recall that on the 3rd October I asked the following question:—

Is the Minister prepared to arrange an appropriate and suitable appointment, and provide an opportunity for me in conjunction with him, to interview the senior officers and advisers to the Brand Government, and also to be given access to the appropriate papers so that I can demonstrate to him that his comments about the "Pilbara plan" of the Brand Government are, in fact, incorrect?

Has the Minister considered my request and, if so, what is the result?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

I have considered the request and the answer is in the negative.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. R. L. Young, and transmitted to the Council.

ACTS AMENDMENT (ABOLITION OF THE PUNISHMENT OF DEATH AND WHIPPING) BILL

Third Reading

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Attorney-General) [5.03 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Leader of the Opposition) [5.04 p.m.]: I rise to comment briefly mainly because of the observation made by the Attorney-General in what I believe was an indiscreet manner whilst the Bill was in Committee. I do not think the Premier was present at the time.

This is not the first occasion that members on the Government side of the House have taken advantage of the co-operation of the Opposition and implied that because we did not hold up some particular issue, or divide on some particular clause, we were not sincere in our approach to legislation. The Attorney-General commented in reply to my observation that we were endeavouring to facilitate the passage of the Committee stage. No good purpose could be served by the Opposition again going over the points raised. We could have held the Government here for a week on the clauses—and without tedious repetition—had we so desired.

It has always been a principle of mine, ever since I have been in this place, that there is no real purpose in repetition once one has stated one's position very forcibly and at the appropriate time. It is unnecessary to reiterate what has already been said when one's opinion is known to the public, to the Press, and to Parliament.

If it is the desire of the Government that we oppose every measure and every procedural matter in this House I will gladly make such arrangements.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: That is not the desire of the Government at all.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am glad to hear the Premier say that, and I am glad he is present because this is not the first time this has happened. On a previous occasion a very indiscreet remark from the Government resulted in a debate lasting six hours longer than would otherwise have been the case. We had to take that course to demonstrate to the Government that we were not fooling and that we were sincere, as we are now.

I want to reiterate the attitude of the Opposition. We are opposed to this measure. We do not think it is desirable at this particular time—although I could not nominate any particular time that it might be desirable. It is certainly not our desire that the death penalty should be removed from the Statute book.

Even legislation introduced in the Commonwealth Parliament in recent times, regarding the question of hijacking, emphasises the international concern—not only the Australian concern—about this matter.

I will not go over all the arguments put forward during the second reading of the Bill. The simple fact of the matter is that we have a situation in Western Australia whereby the Royal prerogative can be used by the Government of the day. The Labor Party when in office is not committed to capital punishment because of the power to invoke the Royal prerogative. That decision is final for all political purposes. For that reason the Government should not be embarrassed by the provision remaining on the Statute book.

Many people in the community believe the death penalty should be retained, and we on this side of the House—or at least most of us—also believe it should be retained. As I mentioned during the second reading debate, some people have strong views of conscience on this matter. It is not the custom of our party to drag members into voting against their consciences. Members have expressed their opinions and they are free to vote with no suggestion of any persecution by our party.

I do want to make it clear that we are opposed to the Bill and we will divide on the third reading to demonstrate to the Attorney-General—if this is what he wants—that we are sincere in our opposition to the measure.

I understood, from the opinion of the Attorney-General as recorded, that he respected the fact that some of us had strong views in opposition to this matter. He did not show that respect last week; he was indiscreet. I have taken this opportunity to state briefly how I stand and, I understand, how most of my colleagues feel on this matter.

MR. NALDER (Katanning) [5.08 p.m.]: I want to speak to the third reading and to indicate that at no stage were members of my party forced to vote either way on this Bill. As a matter of fact, before the Bill was debated it was decided that each member would make his own contribution to the debate and then decide exactly how he would vote on the measure. No pressure has been applied by our party to any individual member in this House as to what he would say and do as far as debate and divisions were concerned.

I want to assure the Government that we intend, also, to divide on the third reading stage of the Bill. However, there are one or two points I want to make at this stage. Several speakers mentioned that debate on a Bill of this nature should take place in an atmosphere of clear thinking and without any suggestion of emotion. I would agree with that view but there are some points which were debated and they appeared to me to be rather curious. I think there were some very unusual features in the debate.

It was interesting to note as I read through the debate as recorded in *Hansard* that there were a large number of interjections. There were more interjections than I have ever noticed in any previous debate in this Chamber. As a matter of fact, there were over 500 interjections recorded in *Hansard*. Nearly half of that number were made by the Minister in charge of the Bill. If that is not introducing some emotional atmosphere into a discussion on the legislation I would like to know what it is.

It is obvious to me, and to other members of the Opposition who are not in favour of the Bill, that the Attorney-General was making every effort to try to emphasise his point of view to all members of the House. That is my interpretation of what occurred, because of the great number of interjections.

I also believe that the members who spoke in favour of the measure endeavoured to use all the words in the English language in their effort to describe the situation. A reading of several speeches made by members on the Government side of the House will support my observation. However, it is the responsibility of the Minister who introduces a measure in this House to describe it fully, and it has been obvious to me that that has been the position with regard to this Bill.

I want to emphasise that I have given this matter a great deal of thought, not only on this occasion but over a long period of time. While speaking to the Leader of the Opposition, after the debate had been adjourned, he pointed out to me that we had the responsibility of carrying out the law when we were in Government. We did not enjoy the prospect of having to make decisions on such an important matter. I am convinced, as a result of all the information which has been made available to me, and as a result of conversations with people who have recently arrived here from England, that we should not change the law in this regard in Western Australia.

The subject of this Bill has been on the lips of many hundreds of people and, without doubt, the majority decision of those people is that they would like to see the present situation remain. The circular which all members received from the Police Union sets out a case which members cannot ignore, or treat lightly. The circular came from people who, under the provisions of the Act, are responsible for seeing that the law is carried out. From my reading of the circular there is no doubt that the members of the Police Union are concerned about what could happen if this measure is passed.

I want to make quite clear my views on this subject and my reasons for taking the action which I intend to take. I also reiterate that my party intends to call for a division on the third reading.

MR. O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley) [5.16 p.m.]: I did not speak to the second reading and I allowed the Bill to go through the Committee stage without speaking because I thought sufficient had been said. Subsequent to the remarks made by the Minister I feel it is necessary for me to rise to my feet and make a few comments in connection with the matter now.

As we all know, there is a sharp division of opinion on this subject. It is an emotional issue, as was indicated during the

second reading debate. For instance, it was strange to hear the member for Fremantle indicate sympathy for a person by the name of Robinson. However, at no stage was sympathy shown towards the policeman who was cowardly shot from a window and then shot again as he lay on the ground after a gun had been deliberately placed against his head. No sympathy was shown for the members of that policeman's family. I feel sympathy for these people as well as for the relatives of the people who were killed by Cooke.

Some people say the death penalty is not a deterrent. I believe it is. For example, if a person commits a traffic offence for which the penalty is 10c, paying that penalty would not make much difference to him. However, if the penalty for the same offence were \$1,000 he would not commit it on a second occasion.

A similar situation applies in connection with the death penalty. The question has been asked: How many convicted murderers have murdered again? In this State we cannot say that anyone has, because the worst of them were not left alive to commit further crimes. Nevertheless, the member for South Perth quoted an instance of a person in the Eastern States who committed one murder and then a second murder when he was put into prison. I recollect an incident of another person who, approximately 10 years ago, was convicted of murder in New South Wales and later on killed a warden with a baseball bat in order to escape. He thereby murdered again. The community at large must be protected from this kind of individual.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR: During the debate we heard arguments advanced that in the past boys were put to death for stealing a loaf of bread. All of us condemn the death penalty for actions of this kind as a ghastly crime. This should never have happened and certainly today it is not possible for it to happen.

Since I have been a member of this House I can recollect two instances only of the maximum penalty being carried out; in one case it was against Cooke and, in the other, against Robinson. I do not think anybody could say that these people were innocent. There was no subsequent outcry that they could have been innocent. In fact, I do not think anybody can point to a hanging in this State where there is any doubt at all as to whether or not the murderer committed the crime.

Today we live in a very troubled world in many respects. In recent times we have seen hijacking, the airport incident overseas, the Munich incident where the Israelis were murdered, the Sydney bomb scare, and a bomb placed in a building in St. George's Terrace. Doubtless many other incidents could be mentioned.

What do we do with the type of person who commits—and continues to commit—this type of crime? There must be a fairly severe penalty. As the leader of my party has pointed out, the Government has the power to say whether or not the death penalty will be carried out. There is no doubt in anyone's mind that it should not be carried out unless the circumstances are extreme.

As far as whipping is concerned, I do not recollect a whipping in this State since the time of Saban, the rapist—and this is going back over 20 years.

Mr. Hartrey: Judge Virtue ordered one a few years ago.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Was it carried out?

Mr. Hartrey: It was a birching, and was carried out.

Mr. O'CONNOR: This must have been a number of years ago; certainly whipping does not occur frequently. I am sure a whipping would be ordered only in an extreme case.

What is best for the person and for the community? Is it best to give a person gaol for life, which I assume is normally 10 years? Is it best from the individual's point of view to go to gaol for 10 years? During this time he will be deprived of his family and the community must keep him; in other words, he is a burden to all. Alternatively, in cases of severe crimes, is it best to give a whipping? In certain instances I believe a whipping is possibly the best course and it could well be a deterrent.

The laws in this State are protective and, I believe, reasonable. I support the retention of the present law. As has been said, members of the Police Force favour its retention. I am quite sure all members have received a letter from the Police Union indicating support for the retention of the existing law. These are the people who run the gravest risks of being interfered with or murdered by a criminal.

Mr. Graham: Do the records show that? How many policemen have been murdered in the last 25 years?

Mr. O'CONNOR: Some have been.

Mr. Graham: In Western Australia?

Mr. O'CONNOR: A case occurred in the Eastern States yesterday, I believe, where a policeman was knifed.

Mr. Graham: I am talking about Western Australia and what has happened under our laws. Dozens of ordinary citizens have been killed, but not one policeman.

Mr. O'CONNOR: At Bunbury in recent times a policeman was severely injured.

Mr. Graham: Injuries happen every day of the week.

Mr. O'CONNOR: These are the people who normally run the gravest risks because it is their duty to protect the citizens. The policeman at Bunbury heard a noise and,

on looking around, found a person interfering with certain vehicles. As I have said, members of the Police Force run great risks and I can understand their reasons for wanting to retain the present penalty.

Mr. Graham: These antisocial acts are occurring notwithstanding the fact there is a death penalty.

Mr. O'CONNOR: This is so. When the death penalty was abolished in England, members who are now on the Government side of the House brought this forward as a reason for abolishing the death penalty here. Today we see various individuals and organisations in England requesting the death penalty to be reinstated because they are concerned at the crimes which have occurred since its abolition.

I would hate to see an upsurge in crime in Western Australia which could occur if the death penalty is abolished. My own view is that the present situation is satisfactory and I am quite happy to see it retained.

When the member for Boulder-Dundas spoke to the debate he mentioned the Act and said that piracy is a crime which can be committed by a person on land, sea, or in the air.

Mr. Hartrey: I did not say "air." I said "sea."

Mr. O'CONNOR: The honourable member said that it could be committed on land, sea, or in the air.

Mr. Hartrey: No.

Mr. O'CONNOR: At the time the honourable member said a person could be hanged for committing such a crime of piracy. The Act itself states specifically that piracy means a person who commits the crime on the high seas.

Mr. Hartrey: I read the Act to the honourable member.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The member for Boulder-Dundas did not read it in that way. If he looks at *Hansard* he may find out what he said.

Today crime is on the increase and one of the reasons for this is the reduction in penalties, which is a continuing process. An improvement in the economy reduces the price of the penalty. When a penalty is increased, usually there is an outcry against this. Quite frankly, a number of the people who are in gaol today are much better off, in some ways, than they would be if they were outside, because they have regular food and a bed. Some people who are in gaol do not have these comforts outside.

Mr. Hartrey: I refer the honourable member to page 3428 of *Hansard* where he will find my remarks.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Long-term imprisonment has many unsavoury aspects. Many difficulties are experienced in rehabilitating

a person who has spent a long period in gaol and his imprisonment is very costly to the public.

As I have pointed out, I wish to support the views expressed by my leader. I indicated at the outset that I had not intended to speak to this measure but I have done so because of certain remarks which were thrown across the floor at us. I wish to indicate that I will not support the abolition of the death penalty.

MR. HARTREY (Boulder-Dundas) [5.25 p.m.]: I wish to make only one comment, elicited by the remarks of the last speaker. I, too, received a letter from the Police Union in similar terms to the letter to which the honourable member referred. I replied that, as policemen, they would appreciate that rape is a grave crime but that pack rape is a great deal worse. I also said that they would appreciate that murder, too, is a grave crime but pack murder is, in my opinion, a worse crime still. The hanging of a man by legal processes differs not at all from pack murder, which is to say, a lynching. In fact, it is rather more horrible because it is more cold-blooded and deliberate.

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

Ayes—19

Mr. Bertram	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Jones
Mr. Brady	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Brown	Mr. May
Mr. Cook	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Davies	Mr. A. R. Tonkin
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. R. L. Young
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Harman
Mr. Graham	

(Teller)

Noes—17

Mr. Blaikie	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Charles Court	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Coyne	Mr. Runciman
Dr. Dadour	Mr. Rushton
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Stephens
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Williams
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. McPharlin	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Mensaros	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Taylor	Mr. David Brand
Mr. Bryce	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Burke	Mr. Gayfer
Mr. Moller	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Hartrey	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Bateman	Mr. Reid
Mr. McIver	Mr. Lewis

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

INDUSTRIAL LANDS DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Graham (Minister for Development and Decentralisation), and transmitted to the Council.

BILLS (2): REPORT

1. Youth, Community Recreation and National Fitness Bill.
2. Environmental Protection Act Amendment Bill.

Reports of Committees adopted.

**TRANSPORT COMMISSION ACT
AMENDMENT BILL***In Committee*

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Bateman) in the Chair; Mr. May (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short title and citation—

Mr. MAY: When this matter was previously debated, unfortunately I was absent from the Chamber. However, an assurance was given to the member for Mt. Lawley that I would look at the points he had raised and report to the Committee.

I will briefly indicate to the member concerned, the Minister for Transport has assured me that as far as possible the north-west will be protected as it has been in the past. When the State Shipping Service has difficulty in coping with the transport of goods, permission will be granted to take goods by road to the north-west. The Commissioner of Transport has always treated applications for transport of commodities to the north-west on their merits, and where the application is reasonable, permission is granted. This policy will continue to apply.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

**APPROPRIATION BILL
(CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)***Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 3rd October.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Leader of the Opposition) [5.34 p.m.]: The Treasurer introduced his Budget with a fairly wearisome speech. In fact, at one stage it seemed that even he was bored with it.

When we had the chance to study the Budget, we realised it is an amazing document. It is not amazing for what it says or foreshadows, but it is amazing for what it does not say or foreshadow. I say this with good reason, because on this side of the House we have studied the Estimates and the Budget speech as carefully as time permits. Admittedly other pressures occur which restrict our studies, but search as we will, we simply cannot find an inspiration in this Budget likely to give a lead to the people of the State to endeavor

our to get us out of our present depressed economic situation. The Treasurer has budgeted for a \$5,000,000 deficit. This is due to incompetence, irresponsibility, or both.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Victoria has budgeted for a \$17,000,000 deficit.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Most members have been in Parliament long enough to know the sequence of budgeting. The first year after an election the Government is getting into its job. The second year it does all the things it wants to do, both administratively and financially. Then, of course, we come to the third year when the Government is facing up to its electors. The Government's last Budget is normally directed at influencing the electors—that is, of course, if the Government survives for three years.

I want to emphasise that the Government has had record funds at its disposal. It would be less than just if it did not acknowledge that the Commonwealth Government, with a degree of realism, on a number of occasions since the Labor Government took office, has been prepared to depart from earlier decisions. In spite of criticism to the contrary by the Federal Opposition, the Federal Government has departed from earlier decisions and adjusted the finances, not only of this State, but also of other States.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You are conveniently overlooking the fact that we inherited a most substantial financial deficit.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Premier keeps on saying this—he has even convinced himself of this fact. However, he inherited a very sound Treasury—in fact, it was more sound than it had ever been. Sir David Brand very frankly stated the situation of the Treasury before the election, and he outlined the problem which confronted all the States of Australia, with particular reference to Western Australia. At this particular time, wages had taken an unprecedented rise, and Sir David Brand pointed this out. With the change of Government, the Treasurer went to the Commonwealth and was completely amazed at the generosity of the new Prime Minister in dealing with his State's financial situation.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: I do not overlook the fact that Mr. John Gorton told Sir David Brand that he would not give him or any of the other States any assistance to help with their deficits.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I know this to be true.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: It shows that there was a deficit.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Sir David Brand tailored his promises to the finances which would be available. He did not make irresponsible promises as did the present Treasurer.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: He did not take a single step to help the situation.

Sir CHARLES COURT: This has become an obsession with the Premier. He keeps saying it, but no-one is listening now. Members know that the Brand Government took Western Australia out of its claimant status under the Grants Commission. The Premier keeps repeating that Sir David Brand did nothing about the prevailing situation. During our regime we had a good, frugal, cautious Treasurer. He administered the finances of this State better than they had ever been administered. He took us out of our claimant status when the tremendous development of our State took place. When he visited Canberra shortly before the election, he did not need to take any internal action.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Yes he did.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We were on the eve of an election. If I remember correctly, we went to the polls a few days after the Treasurer's visit to Canberra. The rest of the financial year was yet to come, but the Treasurer could take no action in connection with this matter on the eve of an election.

I have seen Sir David Brand in action as Premier and as Treasurer. I know the sense of responsibility he had. He has never shirked a difficult decision.

To return to the economy of the State today, we have seen the Treasurer perform some extraordinary somersaults. I remember one of his early sallies before he went to Canberra—we were to have a Budget deficit in excess of \$30,000,000. This figure then dramatically dropped as though the Treasurer had mysterious skills. Of course, all members know that when the first Budget is drawn up the departments ask for everything. They know they will not get it all and eventually the Budget is pared down to manageable proportions. Our Treasurer then consults with the Federal Treasurer and the Prime Minister and a decision is reached as to a practical solution to the State's financial problems. From then on the State Treasurer has to exercise a certain skill in managing the allocations to the departments if he is to keep his Budget within acceptable limits. The fact remains, in spite of the record sum of money passing through the Government's hands, and without any imaginative moves in the Budget or any action which would break new ground, we find ourselves with a State deficit of \$5,000,000. It must be borne in mind that the Treasurer is budgeting for this deficit at a time when the revenue is at a record high.

If we look at the figures we can see the increase in revenue for this year. I refer to page 13 of the Estimates and members will see that the estimated revenue has jumped from \$424,000,000 in 1971-72 to

\$469,000,000 in 1972-73. This is an increase of \$46,000,000 in one year. Of course we now know that the expenditure will exceed this income by some \$5,000,000, hence the budgeted deficit.

The Treasurer gave us no inkling of how he plans to finance the deficit. I realise that this year's deficit will be added onto the previous deficits and probably the Treasurer hopes that by some mysterious means a surplus will occur one day. However, it may not be a bad idea for the Treasurer to indicate to us his proposed method of meeting this situation. For instance, is he accepting the deficit for economic reasons as the Commonwealth did when it budgeted for a very large deficit? Is he accepting this as a temporary measure which will be adjusted in the following years? Or is he accepting it as a malady which will be with us for an indefinite period?

Members will be aware that in a State with the small population of Western Australia, a deficit of \$5,000,000 should not be treated lightly. I realise that when it is measured against the expenditure of approximately \$500,000,000, it is not such a large sum.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You spent \$5,000,000 on feasibility studies.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I would like the Treasurer to stand up in the House one day and state which of the feasibility studies initiated by the Brand Government he would not have undertaken. I have now looked at the list his colleagues have supplied.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: So you admit you spent this money?

Sir CHARLES COURT: No-one has denied we initiated various studies, such as the major studies undertaken for the Main Roads Department. I ask the Treasurer which studies he would not have undertaken? The present Government is the greatest employer of consultants I have known.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: I will tell you two of them. The first one was the study undertaken in the north-west, and the second one was whether or not to build a crosswalk for students across Stirling Highway.

Sir CHARLES COURT: How much did those two studies cost? The first one cost about \$80,000 and the second study was for a very small amount—a total of less than \$100,000 out of his \$5,000,000 claim. How irresponsible is the Treasurer when he raises this as an issue? He is planning on a deficit of \$5,000,000. The two cases he has quoted show up the absurdity of the situation.

We must keep this \$5,000,000 in its proper perspective. The Loan Estimates show a figure of \$14,650,000 for schools, excluding the \$7,500,000 from the Commonwealth, and members will note that I

am referring purely to State money. In other words we are budgeting for a deficit to absorb more than one-third of the total in the Loan Estimates for schools for one year. However, there appears to be no alarm or concern on the Treasury bench.

I realise quite often Treasurers have to budget for a deficit, and I am not as critical of this as I am of the fact that we have had no explanation of the necessity for the deficit. If the Government had desired to go ahead with an imaginative scheme to activate the economy and set a lead to the community, the situation would have been entirely different. However, this is just a bookkeeper's Budget with the figures churned out mathematically. A percentage increase has been added because of rising wage and salary costs in the hope that the revenue will balance it out. No imaginative breakthrough has been written into the Budget to give it colour and life, or to encourage the community to lift us out of the trough we are in at the present time. We can only assume that the Treasurer and his Government are either scared stiff of an early election or are completely unrealistic about budgetary techniques. Perhaps the true situation is that the Government has some revenue on ice and hopes it will dramatically cover up its Budget deficit later in the year and say, "Look how clever we are! We budgeted for a deficit of \$5,000,000 and we finished up with something less."

This, of course, was the intention of the Government last year when it budgeted for a deficit of over \$3,000,000 and finished up, if I remember correctly, with a real deficit of about \$850,000. Alternatively, I can only assume that this Government must be gambling on the fact that the Commonwealth Government will, in its own good time, play the role of Father Christmas outside of the normal Commonwealth-State financial relationships.

In any case, any one of those factors, or any one of those approaches, represents bad government. Therefore we have to consider this Budget in the light of the implications that exist in the light of no imaginative approach to stimulate the economy—as being bad government.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You say it is bad government, but how would you stimulate the economy in the Budget?

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Attorney-General makes this observation and I remind him that it was his party that kept on screaming both in 1971 and the first part of 1972 that the Commonwealth Government should do something through its Budget to stimulate confidence in the people to get the economy moving. The people belonging to his party never stopped saying that, but they did not put up any positive ideas. It

was the Government of the day that had to solve the problem. In point of fact, in the light of the changed situation, the present Commonwealth Government came out with a Budget this year which, by anybody's standards anywhere in the world, is a dramatic Budget and reflects what a country can afford to do for its electors and the population as a whole if that country has been well managed over a long period of time, and the Government has generated great economic and financial stability.

The Budget that the Commonwealth Treasurer announced in the Commonwealth Parliament this year is a very imaginative Budget; it breaks a large amount of new ground. It will certainly create a deficit, but in a country that can afford a deficit without any financial stress it is a measure of our great strength as a nation, both internationally and internally. We in Western Australia do not have this strength; nevertheless there are ways and means whereby we can take steps, through the medium of the Budget, to stimulate the economy.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Tell us!

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Attorney-General and his colleagues are the Government at the moment, but we will do these things in our own way and in our own good time as my predecessor did.

Mr. T. D. Evans: What do you think about the 1971 Budget?

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Attorney-General asks me what I think about the 1971 Commonwealth Budget. There was good reason for that Budget being brought down in that form. Had the Labor Party been in power in the Commonwealth sphere at that time it would have brought down a Budget much more severe, because such a Budget in those circumstances would have been in line with that party's ideology.

If the Premier is gambling on some help from the Commonwealth Government, it may be he is gambling on the Federal Labor Party winning the election on the 2nd December. I would like to say, firstly, that the Premier will be disappointed, because the present coalition Government will win the election and, in any case, even if the Labor Party did win by some mischance, the Premier would not find that party in office as friendly or as understanding as the present Government, because the Labor Party, as a Government, would be budgeting to implement its social philosophies and would not be worrying about this State and its needs.

State rights do not have a very high priority in the thinking of the Federal Labor Party. It will be a very interesting exercise—if this State Government survives until the next Budget—to see what sort of pre-election Budget it will bring down

in view of its inadequacies and its unimaginative approach to the present one. The most charitable comment I can make about it is that it is a dubious gamble that something will turn up and that by the end of the year the deficit will be met in some way or another.

Mr. T. D. Evans: The Premier is an investor and not a gambler; he is investing in the future of Western Australia.

Sir CHARLES COURT: At the outset I said that I found the Premier's speech rather wearisome. I know that Budget speeches are such that it is very difficult to have them scintillating with humour at any time, but I thought that even the Premier got a little bored with his speech; that it was, in fact, a series of apologia for the Government's own promises. It was rather like one of the Premier's recent letters in answer to a leading article published in *The West Australian*; it was a series of apologia concerning the Government's failure to perform. The best assessment that one can make of it is that it is a very unimaginative Budget and has, in my opinion, displayed some further evidence of the inability of the present Government to govern.

On the one hand the Government fears the Opposition which, when in Government, had a record of success; and, on the other hand, it fears its masters in the State Executive of the A.L.P. and the T.L.C. who, of course, are looking for more doses of socialism, but which, in fact, the public does not want. The Government is in a dilemma. We find these gaps are widening. We find that our unemployment figure is still the highest in Australia; yet our sister State, Queensland, which has the same type of economy and the same internal and external problems, has the lowest rate of unemployment in the Commonwealth.

Mr. May: The three Labor States had the best percentage of unemployment. Western Australia had the best.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I cannot follow the reasoning of the Minister for Mines. He is now saying that the three Labor States in the Commonwealth had the best percentage of unemployment. That statement just amazes me, because the three of them had the highest percentage of unemployment, and the highest consistently!

Mr. May: On the Commonwealth figures they have had the best percentage.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir CHARLES COURT: I want to make this point, because it is our duty to make it known not only to the House, but also to the public—the unemployment in this State persists at the highest level in Australia. The figure is 2.66 per cent. Yet the figure for Queensland is only 1.08 per cent., or some figure in that vicinity. That State has exactly the same problems and

exactly the same type of economy as Western Australia has. In fact, Queensland has had worse problems in its rural industry than we have had. At the same time as this cancer of unemployment exists here, we find that most of the economic factors are working for the Government. We have experienced this tremendous lift of prices and markets in agricultural products which has a tremendous and immediate impact on employment. There is no doubt that when confidence is restored in the agricultural industry it results in greater employment being made available in our tractor factories; wire netting factories; the supply of fencing posts; chemical industries, through the supply of fertilisers; the transport industry; the motor vehicle industry with the supply of a greater number of trucks; and so on.

Therefore all these factors are running at a higher level for the Government to assist it to get out of the bog it is now in. At the same time we have the Commonwealth Government pouring tens of millions of dollars into the State, all of which helps to relieve unemployment. It is making great expenditure in the P.M.G.'s Department, developing Garden Island Naval Base, upgrading Air Force installations at Learmonth, etc., apart from the extra money it has provided through its social programme and its other normal programmes.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: There has been nothing from the Commonwealth for metropolitan unemployment.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Every time the Premier mentions that I shudder for him.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You need not shudder for me; I can look after myself.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I also shudder for the sake of the State. The Premier's Government has made a tremendous song and dance about decentralisation, and yet month after month we hear it criticising the Commonwealth Government for making money available in the rural areas and not in the metropolitan area. I should have thought his Government would have applauded this. What does it do? If unemployment is relieved in the rural areas, the drift to the city is immediately stopped.

The whole history of unemployment shows that immediately there is any sign of a recession people head for the cities. For some reason or other they seem to look for the security of being together with their parents or their relatives who reside in the city. If employment is not created in the rural areas, people drift to the city and, as a result, aggravate the situation still further. I applaud what the Commonwealth Government has done in its efforts to keep people in the rural areas during this difficult period.

In the other States the Labor Party is complaining that the Commonwealth Government is artificially keeping down the unemployment figures, because of the large number of people who have been kept in employment in the country. It appears that one just cannot win under this system. So I do not agree with the Premier. The more we can keep people employed in the rural areas where they have set up their homes, instead of allowing them to drift to the city, the better it will be for the State and Australia as a whole.

I now come to the question of the availability of land. In this matter we really see the incompetence of the Government. I can recall the Premier, when he was Leader of the Opposition, criticising the then Government about the prices for land at that time. I know that prices did get out of hand, but we did take some effective action.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Are you saying that prices have already got out of hand again?

Sir CHARLES COURT: If they have not got out of hand, they have gone up very sharply.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: What are you complaining about? Are you complaining because, at one or two sales, there have been increases? That went on for years under your Government.

Sir CHARLES COURT: If the Premier wants to have a discussion on this question we will gladly have it, because I can take him away from the glamorous suburbs which have shown spectacular rises in the price of land over the past few weeks, to those suburbs which are not so glamorous, but where the increases in prices have been considerable, if not spectacular.

It is true that when the price of prestige land goes up the news hits the headlines, but when the total picture is surveyed, the increase in the price of land is due entirely to the fact that the Government has done nothing about it. When we went out of office we left a blueprint as to how the Government could undertake this type of development. This blueprint came about as a result of a Cabinet subcommittee that was appointed to study the problem. We found that the town planners were telling us exactly what the Premier was told recently; because when they told us we had 50,000 blocks of land available for housing, we found that we still had a shortage of land on the market. The real solution came when we formed a Cabinet subcommittee. It took hold of the problem and got in touch with land developers. Placing more controls on land will not resolve this problem. The only way to resolve the situation is to obtain more serviced land and place it on the market.

The Premier told us that 40,000 blocks of land were available and that there was no shortage. His Minister for Town Planning said there was no shortage of land, because I suppose his advisers did what they did to us; that is, showed him plans and aerial pictures and said, "Look at all this land within this radius of X miles of Perth." But, of course, when we get to grips with the situation, the land is not available to the man in the street, or, even if it is available it is not available in the locations that he desires.

Therefore a blueprint was established in a number of locations, and the most important of these was the negotiation that was made in respect of Sorrento-Mullaloo. That negotiation had several unique features. First of all, it represented the bringing together of three major developers, so that their contiguous areas were developed in a total way and not in a fragmented way. That was the No. 1 exercise successfully accomplished.

Secondly, there had to be an imaginative plan setting out how much land had to be surrendered for roads, schools, hospitals, and open space. This was much more generously based than in the past. It was made possible because we were dealing with the three developers together. When the scheme was commenced there was the question of the services, and the type of roads that were to be constructed. As a result we now see that magnificent road that goes through the centre of this particular development. Consideration was also given by the developers and the Government as to how much land was to be left for the development of this road to meet future needs.

Having reached that stage the crucial factor was to negotiate two other vital elements that had never previously been written into this type of negotiation. One was that a certain proportion of the blocks would be sold at a ceiling price and subject to certain conditions. From memory, I think 60 per cent. of the blocks were so committed, so that the average block of land would be available at reasonable prices to attract potential home builders.

The rest of the land was to be allowed to go free as prestige land and it was left to the developers to make their own arrangements. The market would look after that. The most vital feature of that negotiation was the fact that we had to get the developers to undertake the development according to a reasonable timetable. This is the crucial factor; and I well remember the Deputy Premier, when he was Deputy Leader of the Opposition, standing here and telling us about an estate he could get developed the next day. People with money bulging out of their pockets were standing by to develop it, but proceedings were held up because of difficulties with

the administration. Where have all those men gone who would bring a dynamic approach to the development? The Deputy Premier was the Minister in charge until recently when the ministerial change was made. However, the new Minister has inherited the problem of trying to get land onto the market in sufficient volume and in the places where people want to build.

We learnt to our cost that the only way to resolve the problem is for the Government to be months and months ahead. Let us look at the figure the Minister for Town Planning quoted. He said that 33,650 blocks were available, but on his own admission this number included land held by potential builders who were not intending to resell. They wanted to build on it. That type of land cannot be classed as being available land. The Minister said that this type of land is included because the land is available to meet current housing land needs. However, we do not know when those owners will build. It might be this year, next year, or at some other time in the future. Young people buy land three to five years ahead of when they will require it to ensure that they have the block of their choice at the right price ready for when they desire to build. When they build on their land, others will take their place as land owners for later building, and it is wrong of the Minister to include this type of land. It will catch up with him if he does.

This is yet another point we emphasise, when dealing with the Budget, to indicate how the Government has failed to keep up with its commitments, all the promises it made, and all the great projects it intimated would be undertaken. We find now that the clock has not even been kept wound up, leave alone anything new.

I know that some developers do not want to develop until it suits their convenience; but this is when the techniques of government must be exercised. The Government should not hit the developers over the head with a sledge hammer or rule them with an iron hand. It should encourage them so that they go along with a plan for development. I found that the *bona fide* professional developers—as distinct from those who were no good for the real estate business because they were only in it to make a few bob and were not really interested in the industry professionally—were just as anxious as we were for a steady flow of blocks to be placed on the market at a reasonable price. This is their business; that is, to be turning over land. They know they sell more and turn over more if it is available at a reasonably economic price. My experience was that we did not have any problem in encouraging the *bona fide* professionals to get on with development according to a reasonable plan.

Another example of the Government's maladministration is the indiscriminate use of State finance. We have had the Trades

Hall exercise and the Yundurup exercise. So one could go on with one example after another. We have had the loss of credibility in the tender system. Just imagine the situation if the State Electricity Commission calls tenders again and asks people to register to be approved tenderers. The would-be tenderers will be wanting the S.E.C. to give them an absolute watertight undertaking that the tenders will in fact be called; because the last time the S.E.C. made such a request, before the date for registering would-be tenderers arrived, an announcement was made by the State Executive of the A.L.P. that a contract had been let by negotiation. Just imagine what this has done to our reputation! Imagine the feelings of the employees in the firms which hoped they would share in the work. Yet again this is another instance of maladministration.

Then we have had a stop-go policy on environmental protection. I have no doubt my colleague from Dale will have something to say about this one. I merely touch on it briefly while listing instances of maladministration. We had the stop-go antics of the Government in connection with Pacminex and over the Naval Base land project. I see another chapter in that saga was announced today.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Did you not follow a stop-go policy yourselves?

Mr. May: No. That was a stop policy!

Sir CHARLES COURT: I do not know what was meant by the interjection. When we were the Government we made it clear—and we reiterated it in this place—that the Pacminex project would have been subjected to the environmental protection legislation. As to whether that is a stop or go policy, I will not argue. It looked fairly consistent to me.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You played a part in Parliament in regard to the stop-go policy on that.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Far from it.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Oh, no.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Premier made some very brave statements about environmental protection and stated that he would put some teeth in the legislation.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: We adhered to them, too.

Sir CHARLES COURT: He introduced the legislation which we helped him to improve.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: A good thing for the State we did, too.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We helped him to improve it and we co-operated although we had introduced legislation which we believed was more realistic and practical. However, the Premier wanted it the other way in the light of his election policy

speech and we went along with him and helped him and, in fact, improved the legislation. Nevertheless, we find that the legislation is not as all-embracing as we thought it would be.

We have been told, for one thing, that the Naval Base land project did not necessarily have to be submitted to the E.P.A. We understood from the previous utterances of the Government that everything did; and from what I gather from today's paper the Government is, in fact, submitting it to an authority. Whether that authority will be the clean air authority, the E.P.A., or some other specialist body, I do not know, but it is to check on possible pollution factors.

Again this is an example of a stop-go policy. Pressure came from the area. One Liberal represented area and one very strong Labor area rose up together on this matter and expressed their viewpoint to the Government in no uncertain terms.

Then projects are announced which are ill-prepared and unresearched. I refer to the premature, unrehearsed, unprepared announcement in respect of the underground railway.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You ought to talk about premature announcements! Read yours about Amax up on Mitchell Plateau.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I do not back away from that at all.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You don't?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Not at all.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: I will produce it for you in a couple of days and show what was said.

Sir CHARLES COURT: After the Premier's last comments on the matter I obtained a copy for myself. I do not have to wait for the Premier to present me with one. I do not back away at all. Many of the Premier's back-benchers must have some pangs of conscience when they hear him talking because most of them were with me and others when we inspected these projects and all the factors were explained in considerable detail.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: It did not happen when you said it would.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We went out of our way to explain the detail. I remember that the Minister for Mines in his private member's capacity at the time, was one of those most searching in his inquiries about the financial possibilities and practicalities of the Amax project, and I did not quarrel with him in his approach to it.

Mr. May: And I also voiced my apprehension about it getting off the ground.

Sir CHARLES COURT: In fact he was quite helpful to me because he enabled the journalists to get the project in its proper perspective.

The Deputy Premier in a very dramatic way made announcements about steel for Geraldton, steel for Albany, and steel for "X" and other places. These announcements do not do anything to enhance the Government's position.

Mr. Graham: What did the Deputy Premier say about steel for these places?

Sir CHARLES COURT: There is no doubt that when the Deputy Premier left Albany the residents were walking on air. He was to be the great salvation. He would get the \$1,000,000,000 project for them.

Mr. Graham: They were pleased to see me in contradistinction to your absence. The only time they saw you when you were a Minister was when you wanted votes.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir CHARLES COURT: That does not happen to be true, of course.

Mr. May: In 12 years!

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Albany people saw me more outside election times than during them, as did the people in most places.

The Deputy Premier also got the Geraldton people all steamed up, but they were smart fellows; they hopped in their cars and came to Perth to ask the people concerned and they got their answer. Here again, such statements by Ministers break down confidence not only in the Ministers concerned, but also in the Government itself.

Mr. Graham: Don't you believe it!

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am sure the Minister is not terribly happy about his performance as Minister for Town Planning because it was in his regime that this debacle occurred about the lack of availability of land on the market in the right places.

Mr. Graham: You say the most nonsensical things.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It happens to be a fact.

Mr. Graham: Look at the mess you made. That is why you went out of office.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We had reached the situation where land prices had stabilised in spite of the boom period. The Premier announced a figure of 40,000 blocks, and subsequently—

Mr. Graham: I think you are rattled.

Sir CHARLES COURT: —the Minister for Town Planning—

Mr. Graham: All the taxes which would be in the Budget and were not there! You are rattled. You do not know what to say, except basins full of tripe!

Sir CHARLES COURT: We are far from rattled because we can see through the panic stations which beset the Government. It would have its humorous side if it were not so serious. It would be quite laughable if it were not for the serious effect on the State.

Mr. Graham: The bubble will burst before very long.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Let us get back to the problem of the availability of land into which subject the Deputy Premier has seen fit to buy by way of interjection.

Mr. Graham: You named me and I suppose I was entitled to say something.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Members opposite have no rules. We did the Treasurer the courtesy of listening to his Budget.

Mr. May: But he was talking reasonably.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We did the courtesy of endeavouring to be here to hear him; but apparently members opposite do not want to hear the reply or any comments on his speech. However that is fair enough. It does not worry me or rattle me.

Let me refer to land availability, a problem which the Deputy Premier denies was in existence in his time. When the Minister for Town Planning announced that the Premier's figure of 40,000 lots was outdated, he said that that was the figure at the 30th June, 1971. At the 30th September, 1972, even allowing for the basis of including all the land owned by people intending to build and all the land taken off aerial maps and so on, the figure was reduced to 33,650. Even if those figures were correct—which they are now proved not to be—it was during the period of the administration of the Deputy Premier that the nominal figure was reduced from 40,000 to 33,650, and it was during a period when it was alleged that the market demand for land was not as great as it was before because of an economic recession.

I come back to another point involving the Government's administration. We had a wearisome period for months when we heard about the negotiations for U.F.G.A.-T.L.C. abattoirs. All sorts of statements were made. First of all there were to be three established, then it was one at Northam. Then of course it turned out to be none. However in the meantime the confusion which existed in the meat trade was anyone's business. A shadow was hanging over the whole of the meat trade at the time when the Deputy Premier said that prospective new abattoirs were almost "pouring out of his ears." We have not seen them, but at that time when he said that they were more or less pouring out of his ears, this threat was hanging over the whole of the meat industry—

Mr. Graham: Threat nothing!

Sir CHARLES COURT: —concerning whether or not the State would guarantee the U.F.G.A.-T.L.C. project. As it happened the deal was not proceeded with.

Mr. Graham: You were responsible for no abattoirs at Katanning and no extension at Albany.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Mr. Rogers from the U.F.G.A. claims he was promised one at Northam.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I had got to the stage of listing a number of items where I believe, and where my colleagues believe, the Government has failed in its efforts to govern this State. One could go on and on.

Mr. Graham: You are just the one to do that.

Sir CHARLES COURT: For instance, in the transport section of the Budget we got nothing but a threat; we were told we could expect some increases if costs continued to rise, or some other things did not happen. Of course the threat is ominous. But we did not get any positive approach as to how things are being done and how they can be done to try to reduce some of this very heavy transport burden.

Here again we are entitled to assume that the Government is hoping for something to turn up. It hopes that the Commonwealth Government will take off its hands this tremendous burden of transport costs. But there is no indication of this in the Premier's speech. We are expected to accept the Budget in good faith and based on the very wearisome submission which we had of it. It is interesting for members to note the transport situation because the W.A.G.R. budget deficit has been increased from \$12,600,000 to \$19,000,000 and the M.T.T. budget has been increased from \$3,200,000 to \$3,700,000; while the figures for the State Shipping Service have gone from \$4,400,000 to \$3,900,000 which is a slight decrease if the estimates are achieved.

In total we have the transport deficit of \$20,200,000 increasing to \$26,000,000. I know transport services have their difficulties, especially when it is necessary to keep freights to a minimum, and in some way the main freights of the rail system are seasonal and are subject to the vagaries of weather and markets. Nevertheless one is entitled to expect from the Government which is now producing its second Budget, some indication of where it is going.

Mr. Graham: Are you advocating that freights and fares should be increased?

Sir CHARLES COURT: No, I am not. I am asking what the Government plans to do to keep to the deficit. From the Treasurer's speech we have the threat that we are going to get an increase in freights

and fares, or both. He gave clear indication that if costs continue to rise serious consideration will have to be given to making an adjustment.

I am not advocating an increase of these charges. The Brand Government had a tremendous policy and a tremendous record of keeping freights down in the railway system, while at the same time we were active in bringing in features to increase the efficiency of the system. After all, this is a business, and like all businesses it must learn to live with the realities of the system. There is always a way to better the operation of the W.A.G.R., and I hope the Government is continuing the policy of its predecessor by improving the equipment available to the system so that mechanisation will be improved, which, in turn, will ensure greater carrying capacity and greater haulage capacity, and the like.

In the course of his remarks the Treasurer could not, of course, help but make reference to the very handsome sums of money given to him and his Government by the Commonwealth. He then launched into a critical vein and in fact said that the Commonwealth was not fully appreciative of the situation. He then made some remarks about the Federal system and the danger of its breaking down if there were no rethinking. I am one who believes there will have to be a rethink in connection with Commonwealth financial relations. It is appropriate at this stage to mention the fact that the Australian Constitution convention will be held next year.

I attended the Adelaide steering committee meeting with the Treasurer when the Premiers and Leaders of the Opposition, or their nominees, were present. It was refreshing to see that all parties from all States and the Commonwealth were talking in a sensible way at least to ensure that the convention would be convened in the right atmosphere. I am one of those who believe that the initiative in this matter can and should come from the States. I am not suggesting that the Commonwealth should be left out because in the final analysis it is the Commonwealth which will have to implement the referendum procedure through which the public will have the final say—in the final analysis the public must have the final say. It is a good thing if the States can initiate discussion on amendments to the Constitution, because after all the Constitution came into being because of the initiative of the States and the fact that they were the only people then who could initiate the original discussions.

I hope that when the people concerned assemble next May—the 28th to be precise—in Sydney, we will see progress made. It is not the sort of progress which we may assume will produce resolutions of a binding nature by the end of the week. Some people predict it will take three or even more years to reach a situation of unanimity where the States and the Commonwealth Government could agree

sufficiently to go to the public on the basis of a referendum supported by all States and the Commonwealth. Without doubt the main topic of these discussions will be the question of Commonwealth-State financial relations. The submissions made to the Treasurer by the Liberal Party and the Country Party—which submissions will be passed to the convention—have been divided into two parts—firstly financial considerations; and secondly, nonfinancial considerations.

It would be completely unrealistic if one did not expect that the main body of discussion will be centred around the question of financial relations between the Commonwealth and the States. It is an excellent time in the light of our experience of 70-odd years to review the matter; it should be reviewed by practical people who have had experience of the budgetary problems of the States.

I now want to refer to the question of education. I will touch on a number of subjects generally. The details will be touched on by my colleagues when we get to the education budget debate. Expenditure has increased by 11.7 per cent.—from \$95,700,000 to 106,900,000.

However, very little detail was given in the Budget speech; nor can we find very much from a study of the figures themselves, because really there is no new ground being broken. It seems to be almost a bookkeeping exercise; accepting the fact that there are increases in salaries, wages, and other costs, the Treasurer has virtually just gone through the motions of adding on these extra costs.

I have not been able to obtain statistics from all other States, but those I have give me the impression that in Western Australia there will be a smaller percentage increase in education spending than most States. I hope the Minister concerned is taking note of this point and that he will at the appropriate time be ready to make some comments on matters of policy relating to education, because this is the only time that Parliament has a chance to discuss with the Ministry the policies it is endeavouring to pursue. We can see no new ground being broken here at the moment.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You can see, of course, that the Minister has not yet had an opportunity to do that.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Except that one watches the Press statements and the departmental statements that are made from time to time. I cannot detect any new procedures in our education system which are being made evident at the moment.

I would now like to refer to independent or private schools. Some call these independent schools while others call them private schools, but it matters not; we all know what we mean, and they all come under the heading of State aid for schools.

The aid to private schools is down \$10,000; from \$264,000 to \$254,000. There is an ominous silence from the Ministry in the Budget.

When speaking about the Government's policy towards independent schools we all know that this is one of the red-hottest political issues in Australia today. We cannot prevent it from becoming a red-hot political issue, because there are so many conflicting statements made within the Federal Executive of the Labor Party, which result in people becoming confused.

On the 11th May an announcement was made by the Commonwealth about the future policy of the Commonwealth in respect of assistance to independent or private schools. The basis of this in round terms was that there would be paid to these schools a 40 per cent. subsidy calculated on 40 per cent. of the cost of educating a child at a State school. In round terms, I think the Minister will agree, that was the proposition with 20 per cent. to come from the Commonwealth and 20 per cent. from the State.

Everyone said that this may help us to achieve a breakthrough because at least it tied the matter to a percentage figure and as the costs increase at least that much will project itself into assistance for private schools.

We cannot find out either by way of question, through the Budget speech, or through the Budget figures, what the State Government's intention is going to be.

The Treasurer has said that discussions are still proceeding, but I have yet to identify those discussions. I will ask a question tomorrow with a view to elucidating some of the discussions that have taken place between the Commonwealth and the State Governments.

Mr. T. D. Evans: There is no secret about it. Discussions are due to determine what is the best figure.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We are anxious to find out because it cannot be assessed from the figures released by the Government. Based on an analysis made by potential recipients it looks as though the amount to be received by them is so nominal that at the State level it does not mean a thing. One would have thought that in its own interest the State Government would have made a pronouncement.

For instance, the figures given to me by the Treasurer include such things as living-away-from-home allowance, and the cost of getting the children to and from school.

We ask whether this would be included in one of the costs of educating a child within the State system, or will some other formula be adopted? Because the Minister will agree, that if these schools

are only to get an extra \$1.20 or \$1.30 so far as State money is concerned they will have very serious budgetary problems. They are expecting something better.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Last year they received something they did not expect at all.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Not from the Government.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Capital grants were increased in last year's Budget.

Sir CHARLES COURT: That was no more than they would have expected from the previous Government had it continued in office. The schools were taking it for granted. The new formula is most important. I understand the Commonwealth's 20 per cent. will be paid regardless, and not as matching money.

There is some doubt in the public mind about this aspect. I do not know whether the Minister is informed on this point or whether at present the whole thing is conjecture.

Mr. T. D. Evan: The Commonwealth has invited the States to join it in matching the 20 per cent. The Commonwealth indicated it would do this regardless.

Sir CHARLES COURT: But the Commonwealth is going to put up its 20 per cent. It is now the 17th October and the scheme is supposed to start on the 1st January, which is only 11 weeks away. We believe the Government, in its own interests and in those of the independent schools, should decide this matter quickly so that it can be hammered out.

My understanding from Press and other comments trickling through from the other States is that there is no uniformity between the States as to how they will implement the scheme. I understand Queensland and Victoria are likely to be more generous than some of the other States in relation to their 20 per cent. The position will be known to the Minister because this type of thing is being discussed at the departmental level day in, day out. We ask that while the Budget is before us, and before we reach education, the Premier or his Minister make a statement as to how this 20 per cent. will be assessed and administered. I can assure the Minister there is a tremendous feeling of perturbation at the present time because the information trickling through has indicated to some of the private schools that they will not get much. If that is to be the case, they want to know before the school year commences.

Another query arising from this matter is: What will be the base year? The Government, through its Education vote, is predicting an 11.7 per cent. increase this year. What is the nature of the increases being incurred by the Government? We would assume most of the increases are being incurred in something of

that order by the private sector. If the *per capita* figure is to be fixed on last year's expenditure without regard for the natural—or unnatural—increase in costs through the steep rises in salaries and wages that are taking place at the present time, we would like the Minister to make some announcement on how the Government will handle this point. We do not want a serious time lag.

Whilst dealing with education, I want to make an observation about remote area education. There have been increases in living-away-from-home allowances, fares, and that type of thing.

Mr. T. D. Evans: And the supervision allowance.

Sir CHARLES COURT: And the supervision allowance, with certain restrictions. I acknowledge that these changes have been made progressively over the years and there have been increases in recent times. So that is not in dispute. But I believe we overlook the fact that some people live in the remotest of remote areas. They want to keep their families together. I have always believed in that.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I wish you would preach to your Federal Minister for Education and Science. It is a message we have not been able to get across to him.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I will tell the Minister about that. I have not been idle. I have been interested in this matter for some years. I believe it is infinitely better for the families in the remote areas to be kept together. I believe we have a great deal to do.

I ask the Minister to clarify for us at the appropriate time the extent to which the Government has investigated the use of modern appliances such as cassette TV, and so on, whereby a number of people can be brought together from reasonable distances so that we have a reasonable capital investment being reasonably used by more than two or three people. Twenty people would be almost a crowd under the circumstances to which I refer and, even bringing in some of the Aboriginal children, we would be lucky to have 40 or 50 children in some of these areas. With cassette TV, which will be used more and more throughout the world, I believe we will further reduce the isolation and take to those places some of the most modern techniques in education to add to the very effective breakthrough that was achieved with the School of the Air.

I would like to know from the Minister to what extent this type of technique has been explored. The average station proprietor, especially in the very remote areas, would not be able to finance either the equipment or the replacement cassettes. It would be highly specialised equipment. But I believe the day will come when

we must provide this type of teaching aid to those areas, and that in fact—through this medium—we will be sending some of the greatest teachers of our times right into those remote areas.

I want to tell the Minister I shall be at one with him if he wants to join in an exercise of going to the Commonwealth. It is impossible to equate each of these cases with the money involved. I know it is convenient and efficient to pick children up, take them hundreds of miles away, put them into hostels, and give them communication with other children, better schools, and so on. However, up to certain ages, it is sometimes better to keep them together if possible.

There has been an argument about who should pay for the new type of receiver. I believe people in remote areas should be assisted more than they have been assisted.

I want to correct one matter. The Minister implied by interjection that the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science (Mr. Malcolm Fraser) was not very sympathetic.

Mr. T. D. Evans: He may be sympathetic but he is not giving any assistance.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I have found him very sympathetic and understanding of the points about which I am talking. I would not abandon this matter. I hope the Minister is not assuming, because there was nothing in the Federal Budget, that is the end of it.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Not at all.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Some people are working just as hard as he is to try to make a breakthrough—or at least I hope he is working.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I am glad to hear that.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We are probably being more effective at the moment than the Minister thinks we are. I come back to the point that it is not just a question of living-away-from-home and travelling allowances, hostels, etc. I know they are important.

Mr. T. D. Evans: We must improve the quality of education.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We must try to find the techniques for keeping these families together, because if some of these people move out of the remote areas, whole areas will collapse. People look at the Murchison and parts of the drought-stricken eastern goldfields and say, "That would not matter much in the national scene." That is wrong. They mean a great deal in the national scene because in those places there are people who have stuck it out through good and bad times, and the contribution they make to the national economy is out of proportion to their numbers.

I now refer to textbooks. I want to tell the Minister that we on this side do not accept the costings that have been given to us. I am not suggesting anyone has been dishonest or deceitful. The figures have probably been put up in the normal Government accounting manner. But we have learnt from bitter experience that Government accounting and commercial accounting are two mighty different things. Before one says one has a completely comparable costing for these items, one must make sure one has just that—comparable costings. Therefore, we do not accept the figures that have been put forward as being the real cost to the taxpayer in the final analysis.

Mr. T. D. Evans: No-one has said that. We have said this global amount is the additional amount it has cost the Government to provide the books.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Perhaps the Minister is coming around a little late to our thinking. He is not discounting the possibility that some of these costings put up as so much per book, per student, "perhaps", are not the last word.

Mr. T. D. Evans: We will match promise with performance.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I want to make it very clear, here and now, that we do not subscribe to the present policies of the Government. We would prefer to make a financial contribution to the parents, whereas the Government's system, apparently, is to expand at a very fast rate, and place a tremendous emphasis on, departmentally prepared texts. Some of the people in the department might say, "This is a reflection on us." It is not intended to be a reflection on them.

Mr. T. D. Evans: The Education Department published many books under the Brand-Nalder Government, and they were very fine publications, too.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I will deal with that in a minute. As a matter of Government philosophy, we made it very clear we did not want the system to keep on growing to a point where we finished up with all departmentally prepared texts.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It is something to be very proud of. It commenced during the lifetime of your Government.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Do not get excited! I know there is a group of people who are experts, and within certain limits they produce products of which no doubt they, the department, and the Government can be proud. I do not question that. But if this is taken to the point where variety and freedom of selection of texts no longer exist, there is a great danger. It is not a question of whether it is a Liberal or a Labor Government. At one stage during the life of the Brand Government this question raised its head. Somebody said, "It is a Liberal Government; what does it

matter?" The retort of Ministers was, "It does not matter whether it is a Liberal or a Labor Government; the same danger exists if this approach is applied."

We have had a warning. I am sure *Soviet Society* and *Industrial Society* did not amuse the Minister. The fact that those books could get out sounded a warning. It sounded something to the people of this State and it had repercussions right throughout my electorate. I do not know whether there were repercussions in the Minister's electorate.

Mr. T. D. Evans: This was authorised in 1970, from memory.

Sir CHARLES COURT: That does not make it right. It might have been authorised but to the best of my knowledge it did not circulate at that time. To my mind, the excuses that were made for that publication were completely spurious.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Have you seen the revised edition?

Sir CHARLES COURT: It was withdrawn—

Mr. T. D. Evans: It was not.

Sir CHARLES COURT: —and the revised edition was produced.

Mr. T. D. Evans: A limited number were put into pilot schools in accordance with normal practice.

Mr. A. R. Tonkin: That book was revised more quickly than any other book in the previous 10 years.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I have not seen the revised version but I know the one that was originally circulated was not good.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It was put into a limited number of pilot schools.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Minister will never be able to argue himself out of this one because it is extraordinary that both those texts had the same bias. That sounded a warning.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Would you say the author of those books was biased?

Sir CHARLES COURT: No. Explanations, which I did not accept, were given as to why the books were written in that form, but I did not assume the author—who was unknown to me—was necessarily and deliberately biased.

Mr. A. R. Tonkin: They were biased but they were revised.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am not suggesting the people who produced those books set out to glorify the Soviet and condemn the American nation, but that is what they finished up doing. The danger exists. So we believe there should be very strict control and limitations in this regard. I come back to the fact that it is much better to have a direct Government contribution to the parents—

Mr. T. D. Evans: And a limited amount of relief offered.

Sir CHARLES COURT: —than to have the system that the present Government offers, because in the final analysis there will be greater security and, I believe, greater acceptance of the scheme.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Would you concede the relief offered would be much more restricted and limited?

Sir CHARLES COURT: No, it would not. There is no need for it to be.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It is obvious.

Mr. A. R. Tonkin: At least those texts were revised.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Yes—after strong protests! The Minister can think only in terms of having textbooks departmentally produced and controlled. We have a slightly wider horizon in this matter. It is not a question of the public suffering financially in the final analysis. It is a question of having a different system, and we are philosophically and basically opposed in this regard.

Having dealt with education, I want to deal with a subject far removed from it: that is, betting tax. It is interesting to note that the only tax increase the Government attempted this year was one in connection with betting.

Mr. Graham: I bet you were disappointed.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Government gave the public such a thump last year that one would hardly expect it to have the hide to come up with any more taxes this year. When one looks at the list of taxes last year—some of which are just starting to seep through—with increases of up to 150 per cent. and huge percentage increases in some of the charges made by various Government departments, it can be understood why the public just cannot stand any more. However, it is interesting to note that this was the only tax attempted, and the total effect of it in this year will be about 10 per cent. of the Government's budgeted deficit, so it does not make a great contribution. However, we were intrigued as to why this tax was singled out.

I invite members' attention to the Treasurer's comments on this matter when he set out his reasons for increasing the tax. I have not the printed text of the Treasurer's speech, but the matter is contained on pages 39 to 41 of his duplicated speech notes. I do not propose to read out his comments; I assume members have acquainted themselves with his speech. The import of his remarks is that there is to be an increase of .5 per cent. in the tax on bookmakers. Of course, this affects only on-course bookmakers these days.

That increase in itself is one thing; but on top of that the Government intends to bring down a Bill to confiscate from racing and trotting clubs the whole of their share

of the tax—not just their share of the increased tax, but the whole of the tax. I asked the Treasurer whether any discussions had been held with racing and trotting clubs and the industry, generally, about the possible implications of this move. The Treasurer replied, "No."

Mr. O'Connor: Some of the Ministers did not even know about this.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I suppose normally the Treasurer could plead that one does not discuss budgetary measures with the taxpayers, the public, or the Press before they are imposed. However, there are certain increases and adjustments which a Government should discuss with the people directly concerned because possibly those people could show the Government how to "bell the cat" another way because of their knowledge of the industry. Yet I am assured in the answers supplied by the Treasurer that no consultations at all took place.

The net effect of the increased tax, plus the clubs' share of the old tax, plus the unclaimed dividends which will be diverted to the Treasury—

Mr. T. D. Evans: Not unclaimed dividends, but unclaimed investments.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Yes, I am sorry. If I did not use the exact words. I am trying to find the exact phrase in the Treasurer's speech. However, the total amount of money which used to be divided amongst the clubs will now go into Consolidated Revenue. Of course, the impact of this will be quite dramatic. Whether one likes it or not—and I am not a great racing or betting fan—the fact is that under the system introduced by the previous Government a degree of order was introduced into the industry, and also a great degree of improvement in racing amenities for patrons. The clubs accepted the responsibility and played their part.

Now, without warning, they find that a very important part of their revenue will be chopped off. Here again, we get the question of decentralisation which we were discussing earlier. The clubs which will be hit most dramatically, not necessarily in terms of money, but in terms of practical effect, are the country clubs. I do not know whether members realise that a club such as the Pinjarra Racing Club will lose something over \$1,200 average a meeting. Clubs such as those at Northam and Bunbury will also lose over \$1,000 a meeting, and so it goes on.

Many clubs have committed themselves to substantial investments as part of their bargain to improve the standard of racing, and to improve amenities for the public. That is why I was staggered to find there had been no consultation to see whether the matter could be phased in or some alternative system adopted so that the people concerned could, in fact, conduct their operations in a manner in keeping with the undertaking they had given.

I understand some Government members did not realise that the whole of the tax would be taken from the clubs; they thought only the increased tax would be taken. In point of fact, the Treasurer made it quite clear that the whole tax would be taken and the clubs' share would be taken from them.

If it is the intention of the Government eventually to eliminate bookmakers, it should say so. Some racing interests—not so much those interested in gallopers, but trotting interests—believe that they could function better without bookmakers. I am not quarrelling with that or arguing for or against it because it is beyond me to do so. If it is the intention of the Government progressively to tax the bookmakers out of business, I think everybody should be told—

Mr. Graham: That is not the intention.

Sir CHARLES COURT:—so that the system can be adjusted without causing hardship and unnecessary impact upon those people who are involved in the industry, whether or not we like the way they earn their living.

Mr. Graham: The Treasurer will be having talks with the Western Australian Trotting Association, the Western Australian Turf Club, and the bookmakers' organisation in the course of the next few days.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I hope so, because the impact on them will be tremendous.

Mr. Graham: You do not discuss your taxation and budgetary proposals beforehand. This is where the first announcement should be made, and this is where it was made.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I think we should get the matter in its proper perspective. This tax is different from an ordinary tax because the industry is virtually paying a royalty. Just as we receive royalties from minerals, this is virtually a royalty from racing.

Mr. Jamieson: They have a tremendous privilege from the royalty, one that many others do not have.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am not arguing about that; but the system which is in operation at present is at least more honest than the off-course system which used to operate.

Mr. Graham: That is not under discussion.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I want to make the point that it seems to have been overlooked that last year when this State was depressed, as a result of initiative shown by racing and trotting organisations, the amount of money paid into the Treasury was \$800,000 more than the Government budgeted for. Why? Because the W.A.T.C.

got off its tail and organised a \$100,000 Perth Cup which caused some criticism, but also a great deal of economic activity. Others in racing and trotting did things to activate interest.

The Perth Cup struck a new note and gave a new degree of confidence to the hotel industry, the transport industry, etc. Goodness only knows what those industries received from it. However, the fact that the amount received by the Treasury was \$800,000 more than estimated reflects the result of that initiative taken by the Western Australian Turf Club and others.

This year the Government is budgeting to receive another \$800,000 increase. Admittedly \$525,000 of that amount will come from the new tax and the changed form of taxing under which the clubs will not receive a share. So I think it is most important that the Government of the day should have a good look at the matter to ensure that it is not literally killing the goose that lays the golden egg, because if it is, it will be beyond the Government to redress the situation.

I want to repeat what I said before: if it is the intention of the Government to phase out bookmakers by taxing them more heavily, that should be made known to the bookmakers, the Western Australian Turf Club, and the Western Australian Trotting Association. A phasing out operation should be embarked upon. There is a warning here for the turf club and the trotting association that if that day ever comes and bookmakers are eliminated the Government will look into their existing totalisator fields for a bigger rake-off.

Mr. Speaker, you would be disappointed and the House would be amazed if I did not make some reference to the question of regional development before I conclude. I am referring to regional development in its broadest sense, and not merely the Pilbara side of it, because when we are talking about regional development today we have to talk about the region in the south-west, the region in the Pilbara, and the region in the Kimberley; and we have to think in terms of the eastern gold-fields, the Murchison, and other logical, geographic regions in this State.

I wish to refer to the motion I introduced to the House last session which was forced to remain on the notice paper for months because it was *sub judice*. The time involved may have been only weeks, but it certainly seemed like months. My motion had to be emasculated in order to get it past the Speaker, because of the remnants of a case which existed in respect of Messrs. Hancock and Wright, before it was eventually presented to the House. After reading that motion, which reflected the policies of the Brand Government, and after reading all that was said in support of it, in order to understand exactly how deep, important, and real was the planning

of the previous Government, one obtains a certain amount of quiet amusement when one suddenly finds there is—

Mr. Graham: Where was that plan hidden?

Sir CHARLES COURT: —a so-called "plan" produced by the Government within the last few days.

Mr. Graham: Where is that plan?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Just a moment. We will embarrass the Deputy Premier before this is finished.

Mr. Graham: We have heard this before. Words, words, words.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Now we have been presented with the so-called "plan," which is supposed to be the answer to all our prayers and problems. Now that I have had a chance to study the document in more detail I am amazed that the Government had the hide to produce it in all its aesthetic glory, with pictures, graphs, and so on, and that the Government has the hide to talk about it as a plan.

Mr. May: That is not what Mr. Anthony said.

Sir CHARLES COURT: He was speaking about the broad concept. I know this will really upset the Deputy Premier—

Mr. Graham: Knocker No. 1!

Sir CHARLES COURT: —but there are some things which must be set straight in this place. He has done himself a lot of harm.

Mr. Graham: We have received telegrams, letters, and messages of approval from all over Australia and beyond Australia.

Sir CHARLES COURT: If I may have the floor for a moment, I would like to say that the Deputy Premier has done himself a tremendous amount of harm by not agreeing to my simple and logical request that in his presence and in the presence of senior officers and advisers of the Brand Government I should have access to all the documents I can list here tonight—and that would be only some of them—so that I can demonstrate to him that there is a much greater depth of study, analyses, and information available in his department from the Brand Government period than from his own Government, if he will only read it.

Mr. Graham: The officers were amazed that you had the temerity to make such a request.

Sir CHARLES COURT: They would not be amazed. They must be very embarrassed because some of the fine men who worked with me for many years, and who worked for tremendous hours and at great hardship, know what was done and by whom.

Mr. Graham: They know there could not have been a plan; and there was not.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Government has blown up a great balloon and has put a \$6,000,000,000 tag on it for all to see.

Mr. Graham: Words, words, words.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It has released that balloon and has let go its grip on the string now it is floating away. I say with all sincerity that if the Deputy Premier were good enough and big enough to allow the study I have requested to take place, it would be in the interests of the State. We believe in a plan for the region.

Mr. Graham: You talked about it and did nothing else.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Deputy Premier is upset because he has only to go to that area and everything he sees there—the railways, the towns, the industry—were generated by the previous Government. He cannot deny that.

Mr. Graham: What has that to do with the plan you are talking about?

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Government was desperate because nothing was happening, and to give the impression that something was happening it produced its "plan." It wanted to embarrass the Commonwealth Government and the Opposition. What a damnable way to run the State!

Mr. Graham: That is why the Deputy Prime Minister congratulated us! You are out of step even with your coalition partners.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Deputy Prime Minister, the Minister for National Development, and the previous Minister for National Development discussed the matter with us.

Mr. May: Come on! The Minister for National Development did not know anything about it.

Sir CHARLES COURT: That is not correct.

Mr. May: He said the infrastructure question had never been put up until we put it to him.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I will write to the Minister for National Development (Sir Reginald Swartz) tomorrow and tell him what the Minister said.

Mr. May: He said it at a Press conference.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I will tell the Minister what was said—

Mr. May: You don't have to.

Sir CHARLES COURT: —at a conference which took place in the Pilbara.

Mr. May: Why didn't you tell him two years ago?

Sir CHARLES COURT: If the Minister for Mines will remain calm I will remind Sir Reginald Swartz of what was said in the Pilbara and in Queensland. I do not

lie and I can tell the Minister what happened. The Deputy Premier is not prepared to allow either Sir David Brand or myself—or both of us—in his presence and in the presence of senior officers to view the documents.

Mr. Graham: Do you mean to say it is such an important document and you have not a copy of it? It would have been flashed all around the world.

Sir CHARLES COURT: This is where the Deputy Premier exposes his lack of practical knowledge, because there will never be a plan one can pick up and lay on the Table of the House as one simple document.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Why did you say you were going to publish it?

Mr. Graham: That is, if you have one.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We would publish a plan when it was complete in all its segments. I know this is a touchy point with members opposite, but I hope they will bear with me, because this matter has been unfairly mentioned by the Government on radio and television.

Mr. Graham: No officer has seen it.

Sir CHARLES COURT: If the Deputy Premier is prepared to allow us to meet him and the senior officers of his department we will indicate it to him.

Mr. Graham: Of course, I would not allow that.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We would not attempt to see them privately.

Mr. Graham: You are no longer in charge of the department.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Minister leaves me completely amazed in not being prepared to allow justice to be done.

Mr. Graham: We have heard these vapourings of yours for years and years.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We did produce a plan and performance, but all that the present Government has produced is a balloon filled with hot air which has floated away. We had a plan which was operating in a practical way for the north-west, and we had appointed the North-West Planning and Co-ordinating Authority, which was an *ad hoc* body. If the Minister were to look at the records he would see this was a practical and a sensible approach.

Mr. Graham: It was so practical that this was part of the Premier's Department, but worked under you. What sort of an arrangement was that?

Sir CHARLES COURT: It was a very sound arrangement.

Mr. Graham: Surely the Minister should be in charge of his officers!

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Minister does not seem to understand.

Mr. Graham: This was a subterfuge to enable you to interfere with the functions of the other Ministers, by using the patronage of the Premier.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Look who is talking—the very Minister who is grabbing departmental functions from all around the place, and who wants to keep them under his power, so that they are completely under the control of the Department of Development and Decentralisation. I do not say that is a bad thing.

Mr. Graham: A former Minister had occasion to complain because you interfered with his territory.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Minister is so misinformed. We worked as a team, and we appointed a ministerial committee comprising the Premier, the Minister for Mines and myself for major mineral developments. This was done by mutual arrangement. The Leader of the Country Party will be able to tell the Deputy Premier how harmoniously and efficiently it worked, but fortunately it did not operate under a Statute.

Let us look at some of the things which the Minister has refused to allow us to examine and show to the public. After we as a Government had conceived the basic planning, we brought out David Lillienthal himself—who the present Premier suggested on one occasion since the change of Government might be brought in to do some of this work. He was engaged on the recommendation of some of the best financial brains in the world, not because he was connected with a big firm but because he was a person with a world-wide reputation for this sort of thing—having been the “father” of the great Tennessee Valley project, and who later became the first chairman of the U.S.A. Atomic Energy Commission. He had a great breadth of approach to this type of development where huge quantities of water and fuel had to be brought in over great distances and developments co-ordinated. He was able to convince people to accept development in places where there was none.

Mr. Graham: You did not know where the fuel would come from.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We did. We brought this man out to obtain his general advice. He gave us his general advice, and he gave our scheme his blessing. All that appears in documentary form on the files. We also engaged his firm for some specialised work on the Millstream scheme.

Mr. May: That is not a plan but a normal machinery matter.

Mr. Graham: That happens in other towns and centres.

Mr. May: You admitted the other night that other than the Robe River project you did not have anything in the pipeline.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Minister should not put words into my mouth; I will not take that from him.

Mr. May: You said that I had called tenders. You did not have the decency to withdraw the statement.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Minister should not attempt to put words into my mouth. It appears that the Ministers opposite do not understand.

Mr. May: Your Government did not have one project in the pipeline. What a wonderful plan!

Sir CHARLES COURT: In one breath the Minister said there was no plan, and in the next he said there was a wonderful plan. Members opposite are vulnerable, because the people are now beginning to see their balloon floating away.

Mr. Graham: For 12 years when you were in Government you cackled, but did not lay one egg.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am sure that the Minister would like to lay some of the eggs which we were successful in laying, and to take credit for the hundreds of miles of railway lines, towns, nickel development, and alumina refineries that we as a Government caused to be established. Would not the Minister love to say that those were the achievements of this Government? This Government cannot fool the people, because the people can see these things have taken place.

Mr. Graham: Your words have fooled many people.

Sir CHARLES COURT: They did not fool the people who had jobs, but who are now without jobs and have not had jobs for months.

Mr. Graham: Bill Snedden's unemployed! This was a deliberate Liberal Party design.

Sir CHARLES COURT: These are the people who ask to be given the chance to get rid of this Government.

Mr. Graham: The ones who have been put off by the McMahon Government—a deliberate act.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I can carry on in this vein if the Deputy Premier continues to misbehave, because I have limitless time to make my contribution to the debate. As part of the total exercise look at the Millstream studies that were undertaken. These were very crucial in getting the Dampier-Karratha-Wickham-Roebourne area off the ground. Members opposite should look at the studies that were undertaken at the time in the total scheme.

Mr. Graham: What is this total scheme? These things are there, and there are towns all over Western Australia.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Mr. Acting Speaker (Mr. A. R. Tonkin) can we have a little order? When members on this side interject we are pulled up by the Chair within 10 seconds.

Mr. Graham: You are reflecting on the Chair.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am not.

Point of Order

Mr. GRAYDEN: Mr. Acting Speaker (Mr. A. R. Tonkin), I sit in a remote part of the Chamber. I cannot hear what is being said because of the interjections. I am getting sick of them. I think that you, as the Acting Speaker, should take some action.

Debate Resumed

Sir CHARLES COURT: The other day the Minister for Works and the member for Mirrabooka set out to disrupt a speech I was making to a point where it was almost impossible for the *Hansard* reporters to record it. I appealed to the Speaker, but nothing was done. We on this side are getting a bit fed up with such treatment. We are entitled to say our piece in this place.

Mr. Jamieson: Of course, you are entitled to do that; but when you are provocative you must accept the results that come your way.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We do not mind a few interjections; and if members opposite interject and then take one breath I do not mind. However, some of them must have learnt to blow the bagpipes!

Mr. Graham: You are the champion bugle blower!

Sir CHARLES COURT: It seems that some members opposite can take a deep breath in while they are blowing out and never stop talking.

Mr. Jamieson: If you could suck as well as you can blow we would have plenty of water in the metropolitan area from the Ord.

Sir CHARLES COURT: This is typical of the low character of the Minister concerned. I want it to be recorded that when one is talking about a scheme like this one has to talk about real things. As a Government we were talking about real things, and as will be seen from the records at the time that the Millstream studies were being made other studies were also undertaken to identify seven dam sites, so that there would be no inhibitions about the eventual availability of water if there was a need for it. The technology was not lacking. It was merely a question of finance and development as required. The studies are identified in documents that existed at the time when we went out of office. The studies on the seven dam sites were part of the total studies.

Mr. Graham: Including natural gas studies?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I would pose this question to the Minister: When was the natural gas exploration started?

Mr. Graham: It had not been studied; therefore you could not prepare a plan based on natural gas.

Mr. Hutchinson: The gas on Barrow Island had been discovered.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Oil and gas on Barrow Island were proved, and drilling was proceeding apace on the north-west shelf. I went out to floating rigs at work off the coast. These have since, with others, proved the gas. I shall deal with the bigger question of fuel later, so as to put this part of the record straight.

We caused the Port Hedland harbour studies to be undertaken, which were among the most complex harbour studies ever done. This was not just an overnight occurrence. Some of the best brains in the world—I am referring to Sir Alexander Gibb and Partners; Rendel, Palmer and Tritton; the Japanese companies; the Mt. Newman company; Goldsworthy; our own officers; and others—were engaged on these studies.

Some people said that it would not be possible for Port Hedland to accommodate the large vessels, or to handle the huge tonnages. The Minister will find recorded in the files the results of the studies which culminated in a conference that brought about the final decision on Port Hedland, as part of the regional complex. We had to take Port Hedland into the scheme. Some people tried to stop that. It is interesting to note that I cannot find Port Hedland mentioned in the Pilbara plan of the present Government.

Port Hedland happens to be very much a part of Pilbara; it is not in the Ashburton or the Fortescue. Can the Minister show me where in his plan does Port Hedland appear? Will it be scrubbed or will it be put down the drain? It is a wonder that the member for Pilbara has not been screaming about this, because he is aware of the crisis that arose in the Pilbara when very strong pressure was put on the Brand Government arising from a suggestion not to proceed with Port Hedland, but to concentrate everything at the Dampier end.

Because our Government had a regional development plan we established the two port areas. Today we find great developments at Port Hedland, Dampier, and Cape Lambert, and that was because we resisted the pressures of overconcentration at Dampier under the so-called Ludwig plan which proposed the concentration of the railways to and ports at Depuch. It was fortunate that we had a plan and this

concept of regional development. The ports of Dampier, Cape Lambert, and Port Hedland have not been established by accident.

Now I turn to the question of electricity supplies. Realising that we did not have the funds to provide electricity, we sought to get somebody in the private sector who had the money to invest to come in under a 20-year or more franchise to establish a grid system for the whole of the Pilbara. The economics of the proposition did not add up, because the money from the private sector was too expensive. Coincidental with that study was the study on the nuclear possibilities of the area. All these records are available for the Minister to see. They are in documented form and are indisputable.

On top of that the Government brought in a firm which subsequently did some work for the S.E.C. In fact, the later report for the S.E.C. was commissioned before we as a Government went out of office, and eventually it was completed about the time we left office.

When the Fuel, Energy and Power Resources Bill was before this House the Minister sent me a copy of the report to study, so that I could read it in conjunction with the Bill. The firm undertook an original study for us, and a report was presented. This was part of the total study of the fuel, energy and power needs and resources of the area. We as a Government were not restricted in our thinking to any one fuel.

The giant carrier port studies were undertaken partly by Maunsells, partly by one of the companies concerned, and partly by the Government advisers, under which it was proposed that the 300,000 ton and bigger ships were to use Legendre, which was the tentative recommendation at the time—but not the final recommendation. I notice in the map that has been produced Legendre has disappeared. Presumably it is still in the plan and is an extension of where the railway line is shown pointed towards its location. The plan cuts out at that point; presumably it ran out of space. It appears that the railway line is pointed to Legendre as under Maunsell's proposal.

Maunsells did other work for the then Government, and Bruce Tomlinson worked with them and with the Government on assignments. When one sees lines on this plan they are very familiar, and appear to be substantially the result of these and other studies. The Minister knows that the records are in his office, but he will not run the risk of allowing us to see the records and discussing them with him and his officers.

Mr. Graham: The trouble with you is that in your term of office you had a hundred and one studies undertaken but did not come up with a firm conclusion.

Sir CHARLES COURT: That is where the Minister is wrong.

Mr. Graham: That is where I am so right. You dreamed and talked about these things, but never produced a plan. No departmental officer from the Mines Department, the Railways Department, or the Department of Development and Decentralisation has seen it.

Sir CHARLES COURT: That is an indictment of the officers. If the railway from Newman to Port Hedland is a dream I would not like to be run over by that dream when the trains travel over the line; and if the railway from Tom Price to Dampier is a dream the same remark applies. These were some of the heaviest railway constructions of this length ever undertaken, and they were part of the plan. The Minister will find on the files all these things recorded, but it did not suit the convenience of some people including the Government to regard it as a regional plan.

I now turn to the question of town studies. A departmental committee comprising very competent officers seconded from various departments by arrangements with their Ministers—I say this so as to put the mind of the Deputy Premier at rest—was appointed. We knew that the local authorities at Port Hedland and other places, including that at Roebourne, had no chance of undertaking the developments under the plan; so we did it for them.

And so there was a concept of 150,000 people—which I understand is now down to 120,000 people in the Government's plan—in a complex ranging from Dampier through Karratha, Wickham, and to Cape Lambert and Roebourne. This is no myth. The information is there showing the layout of the towns and the industrial programme is also there showing the development to include West Intercourse Island and Legendre Island.

Mr. Graham: Have you any arrangement with the Commonwealth Government to defeat this Pilbara concept?

Sir CHARLES COURT: No.

Mr. Graham: That surprises me.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Commonwealth Government knows that we supported the original development.

Mr. Graham: Everybody has been talking, but we are doing something; that is the difference.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Not a single ton of anything has gone out of this country as a result of the work of this Government; not a single ton. That is how crazy the situation is. It is said that we dreamed about it, wrote about it, or talked about it. We certainly acted.

A study was made of the overall requirements of the area, and it was carried out by competent people within the Government and outside the Government. We worked on the basis that one day we may find oil. We might find natural gas because we had the Barrow Island prototype. The exploration programme was not conceived by this Government. Good heavens, we were out on floating rigs ages before the change of Government took place. However, we did everything on a sensible and realistic basis.

We assumed that we might not get any heavy fraction oil because none had been found in the other States of Australia or at Barrow Island. We also assumed that we might not find natural gas. I am sorry that the Premier is not present at the moment because he said that the whole concept had been changed because of gas. It has not been changed because we had an alternative worked out. The Premier will find that it is all recorded.

We did not want to be too dependent on Middle East oil because that would be the main source of the heavy furnace oils coming here. It did not seem that we would have our own heavy furnace oil supply so we had to count out petroleum as an indigenous fuel. We had to think in terms of an alternative, and that alternative was available from Queensland and New South Wales in return for what we would term, "A great Australian deal," not a narrow-minded Western Australian deal. We were to use the resources available in Queensland and New South Wales and they in turn would have access to some of ours.

Mr. Graham: What is this narrow-minded Western Australian deal?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I have with me a newspaper clipping of criticism by the Minister of our great east-west steel industry proposal. The Minister said his Government was only interested in a big industry in Western Australia. However, we were interested in bigger things for Australia and Western Australia. That is the concept which we have to come back to.

Mr. Graham: No, it is not. We are not going back anywhere; we are going forward.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I do not care how much natural gas is found in the north-west; any sensible Government would integrate its fuel resources and energy resources to the maximum possible extent. Any country which has depended upon one particular fuel only has eventually rued the day. Even with the most plentiful field of natural gas off the north-west coast and off the Kimberley coast there would still be need for a wise Government to plan the use of resources which were available, such as cheap fuel coal from Queensland. To put the mind of the

member for Collie at rest, I am not suggesting that Collie be left out because I believe that everything which can be found in the way of coal at Collie will be needed in the southern part of the State.

So we come to the question of metallising which was a crucial part of our programme extending on an ever increasing basis including a beneficiation programme. It is all there; the integration and beneficiation programme, and the metallising programme. They are still all part of the great concept.

Whether or not we found natural gas we could still go on. We had identified our resources. This is where we had a realistic attitude. The Government is not doing itself any good internationally because these matters have been discussed in detail with so many people. Many of the Government's own members have had these matters explained to them on the spot in the north during Parliamentary tours.

There is nothing new because it has all been heard before. We offered, in all sincerity, to pass on our knowledge of these projects, and to pass on our connections with overseas firms. However, we were rejected in the form of the very rude statements made by the Deputy Premier in Japan about myself. Ours was a genuine offer to help. There was no suggestion of any political advantage at all. However, our offer was rejected.

Mr. Graham: Of course, that is typical of your arrogance. You felt this Government could not run the affairs of the State without the great Charlie Court.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It was not that at all. What I offered to the Premier, and to the Minister for Development and Decentralisation, was to introduce them to those people and then get out of the way. In fact, if that had been allowed to happen at that stage the Government might have been blessed with me out of this place by now. I would have done my job and passed on to other things. However, what happened?

Mr. Brown: You are better here.

Sir CHARLES COURT: If I heard the remark of the member for Merredin-Yilgarn correctly, it does not become him.

Mr. Graham: He felt we were doing better with you here. That is what he said.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I did not hear him say that.

Mr. Jamieson: That is what he said.

Mr. Graham: He feels you are our greatest ally!

Sir CHARLES COURT: The proposal is a sorry spectacle. It has been presented in an atmosphere that something is happening, when it is not happening at all. Somewhere along the line maybe something can be developed which will eventually get off the ground, but the Government is showing no aptitude.

I do not quarrel with the regional concept. I have advocated it against tremendous opposition over the years and so I am not kicking the idea. The Government has put forward its ideas with no negotiations behind it at all, whereas the previous Government moved forward on a solid basis.

Mr. Graham: Why did the Commonwealth Minister send a message to this State complimenting the Government on its programme?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I would not be surprised at that.

Mr. Graham: You are a champion knocker, that is all.

Sir CHARLES COURT: No, I am not at all.

Mr. Graham: Anything which is produced by us is no good!

Sir CHARLES COURT: Now that I have read the Minister's document in detail I would be ashamed if I presented it to the public.

Mr. Graham: Federal Ministers have applauded it, and we are receiving messages from all round the world. Those people have studied the plan.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I hope the Government will take the hint and start to put some sweat into getting things negotiated.

Mr. May: The senior officers will be disturbed to hear that remark.

Sir CHARLES COURT: They will not be. I did want to touch on another subject but the Premier is not in the Chamber at the moment. I want to deal with the question of Rhodes Ridge but in view of the fact that the Premier is not here I can keep that matter for another occasion.

You will have assumed, Mr. Speaker, that I believe—as do my colleagues—the Government has failed to demonstrate to this State that it is capable.

Mr. Graham: The Premier is here now.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I will deal with the other matter by question at a later stage. The Government has failed to demonstrate to this State that it can, in fact, govern this State the way it should be governed.

I want to reiterate that the matters I have mentioned tonight cover a great many items. They cover the financial mismanagement by the Government, the availability of land, the credibility of our tender system, and other items. There are a thousand other things which have the people of this State extremely worried. The fact is that we are not getting out of this economic bog at a time when the Government should be able to lift us out by means of our natural resources and other advantages. However, we are still bogged down.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Can the Leader of the Opposition explain why the unemployment figures for the whole of Australia are the highest since 1961?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Except for Queensland, of course, and at least one other State.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: No, taking the whole of Australia—the figures for unemployment throughout the whole of Australia.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Is the Premier talking about the numbers or the percentage?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: The numbers.

Sir CHARLES COURT: If that is not a spurious argument, then I have not heard one, because in the life of the Brand Government we had the highest increase in population and work force throughout the length and breadth of Australia. The increase in the work force has been tremendous, by world standards.

Mr. Graham: Until last year, when it was stopped by the Commonwealth.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Using a percentage is the only way the situation can be assessed. The rest of the world uses this system as a means of determining the criteria.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Do you also deny that the percentage is the highest since 1961?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I do not think it is.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: It is.

Mr. O'Connor: It might be in this State.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: No, in the whole of Australia.

Sir CHARLES COURT: For the whole of Australia, it is not a bad figure by world standards.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: It is still the highest since 1961.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I think the Premier is getting his facts mixed between the number and the percentage. There is a mighty difference. The people cannot be fooled because they understand the situation.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: The only one trying to fool the people is the honourable member.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We have the highest rate of unemployment. I believe there are means at the disposal of the Government to do something about this figure and reduce it in its own interests. The figure could be reduced not only by way of new industry, but also by making people more mobile. These are the practical things we would do.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: We have heard about these things.

Sir CHARLES COURT: What is the good of having people out of work and on the dole at Kwinana, when they can be receiving overaward rates only 70 miles away?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: What would you do?

Sir CHARLES COURT: We would encourage the unemployed people to go to the places where work is available. We have found that workers can be encouraged by using inducements and ensuring that housing and good schooling will be provided.

In the light of all this information it is my desire to move an amendment. I understand that no other facility is available to me under the system by which we handle the Budget. I have toyed with a number of alternatives but I have noticed how quick the Premier is to invoke Standing Orders.

We believe that the sooner the people of this State can have another election to make up their minds, the better it will be. Whether they decide for the present Government, or for us, will be in the hands of the people.

Mr. Graham: That will be on the 2nd December.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I ask the Deputy Premier not to be too sure about the 2nd December. The State which the Labor people are most worried about is Western Australia.

Mr. Graham: Some newspapers have been reading the comments of the Leader of the Opposition.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am going on a frank comment by your Federal colleagues in the Eastern States.

Mr. Graham: Such as?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I would not put their heads on the chopping block by naming them. Members opposite know that the Federal members are not happy with the prospects in Western Australia.

Amendment to Motion

In the light of what I have said I move an amendment—

That the word "now" be deleted with a view to adding after the word "time" the passage "on the 31st December, 1972."

Mr. O'CONNOR: I formally second the motion.

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

Ayes—20

Mr. Blaikie
Sir Charles Court
Mr. Coyne
Dr. Dadour
Mr. Grayden
Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Lewis
Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. McPharlin
Mr. Nalder

Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Reid
Mr. Runciman
Mr. Rushton
Mr. Stephens
Mr. Thompson
Mr. Williams
Mr. R. L. Young
Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. I. W. Manning
(Teller)

Noes—20

Mr. Bertram	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Jones
Mr. Brady	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Brown	Mr. May
Mr. Cook	Mr. McIver
Mr. Davies	Mr. Moller
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Sewell
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. A. R. Tonkin
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Graham	Mr. Harman

(Teller)

Pairs.

Ayes	Noes
Sir David Brand	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Ridge	Mr. Bryce
Mr. Gayler	Mr. Burce
Mr. O'Neill	Mr. Bateman
Mr. Mensaros	Mr. Hartrey

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

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate (on second reading) Resumed

MR. NALDER (Katanning) [8.48 p.m.]: I wish to make some comments on the Appropriation Bill (Consolidated Revenue Fund). I was surprised indeed that no-one on the Government side of the House rose to speak to the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I have no doubt the Treasurer was unable to do so because he was not in his seat for a good length of time while the Leader of the Opposition was speaking. Generally this does not happen. When the Treasurer has introduced the Estimates, the usual courtesy which I have known in this House is for him to be present and remain in his seat while members of the Opposition speak. However this position did not apply this evening.

Sir Charles Court: The Premier explained that for a part of the time he had a private appointment.

Mr. Graham: The Premier is one of the best sitters of all members in this House.

Mr. NALDER: That has nothing to do with this.

Mr. Graham: You can be assured that if the Premier is not in his seat there is a good reason for it.

Mr. NALDER: I was not told the reason.

Mr. Graham: You could have assumed it.

Mr. NALDER: When the present Premier was Leader of the Opposition, the Premier and Treasurer of the day (Sir David Brand) always showed the courtesy of being in his seat when the Estimates were being debated. I accept the reason which has been given but, as I have said, I did not know about it. I have indicated what my first reaction was.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Do you know how long I was out of the Chamber?

Mr. NALDER: It was a fair time.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: How long?

Mr. NALDER: I did not watch the clock.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Was I out of the Chamber before the tea suspension?

Mr. NALDER: No, and the Leader of the Opposition was on his feet for approximately 45 minutes before the tea suspension. However, he was also on his feet for over an hour afterwards—and this is quite a length of time. However, I am not now arguing that matter because a reason has been given which I am prepared to accept. I have stated my reaction without knowing the reason and have mentioned that this courtesy is usually extended by the Treasurer to members of the Opposition. However, I now accept the position.

The Leader of the Opposition adequately covered and gave a resume of the situation as far as this side of the House is concerned. However, I wish to emphasise what has been stated this evening with reference to unemployment and the counter-discussion across the Chamber concerning the reasons for it.

Whenever this matter is referred to, it is interesting to hear members of the Government say that it is always the Commonwealth Government which is to blame.

Mr. Lapham: Those are the true facts.

Mr. NALDER: The true facts! I am glad the member for Karrinyup interjected, because the true facts are that confidence does not exist amongst industry in this State. That is the reason.

Mr. Lapham: What would you know about it?

Mr. NALDER: I come into contact with industry from time to time and I have discussed this matter with leaders of industry in this State. They are not sure of their position and that is why unemployment in Western Australia is so high.

Mr. Bertram: What are they not sure of?

Mr. NALDER: There is no other reason. If confidence were displayed, a greater number of people would be employed.

Mr. Bertram: What are they not sure of?

Mr. NALDER: They are not sure of the present Government.

Mr. Bertram: What in particular?

Mr. NALDER: That sounds a dumb remark.

Mr. Graham: Surely you would not have much confidence in McMahon and company?

Mr. NALDER: We hear it again! This is all the Deputy Premier can say.

Mr. Graham: What a mess McMahon has made.

Mr. NALDER: The Deputy Premier wants to blame somebody else. However, he wants to take credit for anything which is good and to blame someone else for everything that is bad. We have heard this comment so often but members of the public do not swallow it any longer.

As far as unemployment is concerned, the Government should make the greatest effort to inject some confidence back into industry. It could be done by deleting some of the legislation which we see on the notice paper.

Sir Charles Court: Hear, hear!

Mr. NALDER: I refer, for example, to the Prevention of Excessive Prices Bill. I am sure confidence would result if the Premier were to say that it is not his intention to proceed with the measure. As a matter of fact, I doubt whether he will proceed with it because it has been on the notice paper for a very long time, but it has not come forward for discussion. The member for Narrogin, who has the adjournment, has been so close to rising to his feet on so many occasions that he must be almost rusty by now. This measure has come close to being debated on a number of occasions, but so far it has not been. If it were taken from the notice paper, this would be the first move to inject confidence back into industry. This is the key to overcoming the problem of unemployment in Western Australia.

Sir Charles Court: The Government is thinking of taking it off the notice paper, because it thinks it can achieve the same result with the consumer protection fellow. I believe it aims to use him without seeking special statutory authority.

Mr. NALDER: This may be the position. I believe this is the key reason for the high unemployment figure in Western Australia.

One matter has been mentioned tonight in connection with which I would like to make some comments. I refer to the fact that the Commonwealth Government made a sum of money available to assist unemployment in country areas. It is obvious to all who have had any experience in this sphere that the Commonwealth Government intended to keep people in country areas. The Commonwealth Government realises, without any doubt whatsoever, that the problem in all the main cities of the various States is that the increasing population is becoming an extremely urgent question. If there is unemployment, the best thing is to offer employment in areas outside the metropolitan area. In this way people in the country are kept in their occupations and this is of value to those areas. This is what has happened and it has succeeded.

There are some observations I wish to make. I believe that, as a result of this operation, some very interesting information has become available. I have discussed this with some of the local authorities. I hope that even in times of plenty when unemployment is not high this type of work will be continued.

From time to time we have all heard that sections of the public are unemployable. There are various reasons for people not being employed. However some of the people who have claimed to be unemployable and who drew social service benefits regularly went out into various country towns when employment was offered to them and they have made a valuable contribution to many of our country towns. We now find these people are getting a new lease of life; they believe they are doing something worth while. As I have said before, probably there were reasons for the people finding themselves in the position of being unemployable. However, because they feel they are of value to the community, they are, in fact, making a valuable contribution.

In the future, instead of money being made available through social services for this type of person, I suggest that work should be made available in country towns so that he may be employed. If this is done I believe we will find that a better situation not only develops but persists in country towns where this kind of person is employed.

The position may be the same in the metropolitan area. I have no doubt that if this system is tried it will prove the point I am making. Quite a few of the people in country areas with whom I have discussed this question agree with me on this subject.

I make the point that I hope the proposal which has proved such a success in times of adversity and of high unemployment in the country will be continued, perhaps in a smaller way, when times are better and the unemployment figures are lower. I hope the Commonwealth Government will be requested to carry on—as I have said, perhaps in a smaller way—to give people who, in the past, have been unemployable some work to do. This has proved to be of great advantage to the country towns where employment has been made available. Some value has come from this and I hope the point I have made will be passed on to the Federal Government. Perhaps it would be advisable to have a survey made of the position to find out the actual value. I am quite certain we will find that there has been a distinct advantage.

I could certainly refer to many aspects of the rural situation. I see that the Minister for Agriculture is coming into the Chamber. I predict difficulties for some producers. This has already been proved in some areas where drought conditions are almost certain to apply. If a survey has not been made already, I believe one should be made so that we do not lose the value of the stock which we have available at the present time.

This will be one of the biggest problems facing the agricultural industry in Western Australia in the next few years

—the shortage of breeding stock. We cannot afford to allow stock numbers to deteriorate further. For many years we have had sufficient sheep, but because of the drought conditions which have existed over the last three or four years, I can see the situation developing where we have insufficient sheep. Many districts will face the problem this year, and there is a need to see that water is available so that stock are not sacrificed.

Mr. H. D. Evans: The Department of Agriculture advisers have been advocating this approach—retaining breeding ewes particularly.

Mr. NALDER: Yes, but it is most important that water is made available in areas where shortages will occur. A number of farmers have already told me that they can now walk through their dams. This indicates a definite shortage and before long much of the stock will be unloaded. If the Government insists that the farmers retain breeding stock, then the problem arises of the availability of water, and where necessary, assistance must be given to the farmers to cart water to enable the retention of breeding stock. An announcement to this effect must be made very quickly because of the deteriorating conditions.

We must admit that this is one of the dry years and unless something abnormal happens, the writing is on the wall. We may have some thunderstorms in the late spring or early summer which will alter the picture, but we should not count on this eventuality.

Many areas in the State will be very short of water, and unless some action is taken and an early announcement is made, many farmers may panic. Perhaps the word "panic" is incorrect, because most farmers have been through the mill and their experience makes them realise how important it is to continue with a sound breeding programme. With a change of season, these farmers will reap the benefits of sound breeding stock.

I read an article in *The Sunday Times* of the 27th August. The article quoted the comments of the Minister for Agriculture, and I was rather amused when I recall his views on the previous Government's handling of the agricultural situation. In his opinion the Government could do nothing right. He criticised everything which was happening or not happening. However, he now makes a statement to the effect that his Government is attempting to do something but there is little it can do because of the bad season. It is satisfying to know that at last he is supporting the action taken by the previous Government with reference to the institution of marketing authorities. Marketing authorities were set up as a result of ballots carried out in

the industry, and I cite the examples of the marketing of lamb and the control of the production of eggs in this State.

I wish to comment on a number of other problems connected with agriculture, and particularly on the increase in killing charges at the Government abattoirs. Before the last election the Labor Party tried to influence country voters with promises of assistance for farmers. However, I believe the increased killing charges will restrict the quantity of Australian meats sold on overseas markets. The cost of slaughtering will be one of the biggest problems in the future. Every time one cent is added to the killing charge of stock, less stock will be slaughtered. In other words, it becomes quite uneconomical for farmers to send their stock to the slaughteryards unless they are of a certain weight.

About two years ago the then Government advised farmers not to send stock below a killed weight of 25lb. to the abattoirs. Farmers would be out of pocket for any stock sent to the slaughteryards below this weight. Every time the killing charge is increased, pounds are added to the minimum weight of stock which can be economically slaughtered. I would hazard a guess that the increase in the killing charges brought about by the present Government at the Midland Junction and Robb Jetty Abattoirs will mean another 3lb. to 4lb. on the minimum weight of stock which can be slaughtered economically. In my opinion the minimum weight of stock to be slaughtered economically is now about 30lb.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You should refer to the shortage of stock for killing.

Mr. NALDER: The Minister should refer to this—it is a different story. I have been waiting very patiently for someone to mention this. It is an amazing situation that when there are insufficient stock for slaughter, nobody complains. Everyone accepts the situation as being normal. However, when the supply is greater than the slaughtering facilities for one or two weeks, the whole world knows about it.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Don't forget this is important in the context of charges.

Mr. NALDER: The Minister is sitting back very happily at the moment.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Fair go!

Mr. NALDER: Two years ago more sheep were coming into Midland Junction and Robb Jetty Abattoirs.

Mr. H. D. Evans: That is an unfair statement.

Mr. NALDER: It is not unfair at all.

Mr. H. D. Evans: You know the difference this makes to killing charges.

Mr. NALDER: Insufficient animals are available for slaughter. It was stated earlier that this is because of drought conditions. However, in my opinion it is not because of drought conditions but because the stock are not available. I predict that many years will pass before we have more stock than the abattoirs can handle. It will be at least five or six years, and possibly 10 years, before we are back to the numbers of two and three years ago.

This situation has arisen for a number of reasons. I am pleased to know that in *The Sunday Times* article the Minister has practically admitted that situations arise in the rural industry over which Governments and people have little influence. The world price of certain primary commodities can greatly affect the rural economy. To take the example of wool, no-one has yet been able to give a satisfactory explanation as to why the price of wool is going up at the present time.

Mr. H. D. Evans: No-one gave an explanation as to why it went down.

Mr. NALDER: That is quite correct. Nobody can explain the rise and fall in the price of primary commodities.

A similar situation has arisen with regard to wheat. I would like to ask the Minister a question about wheat quotas, and he may answer it or not as he pleases. What will be the position as to the negotiability of quotas? Tonight I listened to a news item which indicated that the Wheat Federation is meeting in the Eastern States tomorrow. The prediction of the journalist writing the article is that there will be no quotas next year. I do not know whether or not he is right. Perhaps a member who represents a wheat-growing area is prepared to make a prediction, but it seems to me that the shortage of grain throughout the world indicates that it would be a wise plan to allow quota holders an uninterrupted plan for next year. I hope a decision is made properly, because wheat farmers are already planning next year's crop.

Mr. H. D. Evans: The federation's recommendation will have an important bearing on this.

Mr. NALDER: I understood the federation is meeting in Canberra and recommendations will be made to the Federal minister later in the week. I feel that it will be necessary to allow Australian wheat growers to plant as much wheat as they can, not only to satisfy the market requirements but also to build up a reserve which can be used in years to come. We must plan for the requirements of overseas markets as well as our home requirements.

I wish to comment on other items, but I will refer to them in the Committee stage. I feel that the Minister will be able to answer some of my queries.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Harman.

TOTALISATOR DUTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 5th October.

MR. O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley) [9.12 p.m.]: The Minister's second reading speech took about 10 minutes, including about four minutes taken up with examples of dividend calculations. I realise that this legislation is comparatively simple, and the Minister explained that it was necessary to bring the measure forward in the Legislative Assembly before legislation to permit greyhound racing can be completed in another place. The Chief Secretary gave an undertaking to the Leader of the Opposition in another place that two complementary Bills would be passed prior to the third reading of the Greyhound Racing Control Bill.

In my opinion this is a very untidy way to deal with the situation. I believe all the Bills should have been introduced in this Chamber. It is my view that the Chief Secretary believes members should have been given the opportunity to have regard for all the complementary legislation at the same time. However, I feel we should support the legislation in this Chamber and then debate the measure to permit greyhound racing when it comes here from another place.

From the outset I indicate that the Opposition's support for this measure does not necessarily mean we are obligated to support the Greyhound Racing Control Bill in this Chamber. That legislation will be treated on its merits after members have listened to the debate.

During his second reading speech the Minister explained that the principal amendment in this legislation is to include the words "or greyhound racing" after the word "horseracing" in the interpretation of "Racing Club" in section 2. It is also intended to alter some of the methods of calculating the percentages to be paid to the Government or the clubs concerned. The Opposition has no objection to the alternative method of dividend calculation, and it is my opinion that most members will support this provision.

I consider we should be given some indication of exactly what is happening concerning the introduction of greyhound racing to this State. As the Minister has pointed out, the principal Bill is before another place so in regard to that measure we are left very much in the dark. For instance, we do not know, if the legislation is passed, where greyhound racing will be conducted. We do not know how many tracks will be provided, who will conduct the racing, or any other details. I would like the Minister when he replies to this debate to indicate whether it is correct that the Government has conferred with the Western Australian Cricket Association in regard to conducting greyhound racing on the W.A.C.A. ground

and, if it is correct, I hope he will give us more details concerning when greyhound racing will take place, where it will take place, and how it will take place.

In view of the commitments in another place, I consider it necessary to allow this legislation to pass through this House, and therefore we on this side of the Chamber indicate our support of it.

MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara—Minister for Housing) [9.16 p.m.]: In replying to the questions raised by the member for Mt. Lawley as to when greyhound racing will eventually take place and where it will be conducted, I think it would be better to leave these questions until the debate takes place on the Greyhound Racing Control Bill when it comes before this House. As I have pointed out, this Bill and the one to follow are purely complementary pieces of legislation and I readily admit that there is some difficulty; the whole of the legislation should have been initiated here and then passed to another place for its approval.

I cannot answer the questions asked by the member for Mt. Lawley as to where greyhound racing will take place, because I do not know. After the legislation has been passed, this is a question that will be decided.

Mr. O'Connor: There have been strong rumours that the W.A.C.A. ground will be the place.

Mr. BICKERTON: After speaking to the Chief Secretary I understand that several places have been suggested, and I believe the strongest rumour is that the W.A.C.A. ground will be the venue; but again it is only a rumour, and until such time as the legislation is agreed to by the Parliament no-one can say with any certainty where greyhound racing will be conducted.

In conclusion, I thank the honourable member for his support of the measure, and I hope I will receive the same support for the Bill that will follow.

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.

TOTALISATOR REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 5th October.

MR. O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley) [9.20 p.m.]: I indicated to the Minister previously that he would receive co-operation for the passing of this Bill. It is complementary to the previous measure and virtually seeks the same type of amendments to allow for greyhound racing to be con-

ducted in this State. I have already pointed out the various questions that have come to our minds in regard to this legislation and I can see no need to labour them again during the debate on this Bill. I therefore indicate the support of the Opposition to the measure.

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.

STOCK (BRANDS AND MOVEMENT) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 19th September.

MR. W. G. YOUNG (Roe) [9.23 p.m.]: I preface my remarks by saying that I am amazed that this Bill has been brought on tonight because, being No. 16 on the notice paper, and in view of all the other legislation listed in front of it, I was not expecting it to be debated this evening and therefore I am a little startled and unprepared. I have had exactly 2½ minutes' notice of its being brought on this evening.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: I am sorry about that.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: I thank the Premier, but I had to register my protest. This Bill has been on the notice paper for some time and, in fact, was on the notice paper last year. Its aim is to amend the provisions of the Stock (Brands and Movement) Act, under which regulations were to be gazetted on the 1st January, 1972. However, as a result of various statements that have been made and various acts that have taken place, the regulations were not promulgated until the 30th June. Then, following conferences with the Minister, we found that, in fact, some alterations had been made to the regulations since then. One of the reasons for this is that complete confusion existed concerning what people are able to do and what they are not able to do.

As far back as November, 1971, in the *Journal of Agriculture*, the Registrar of Brands (Dr. M. R. Gardiner) made a statement regarding this new legislation. The statement contained many inaccuracies and, of course, this created a good deal of unhappiness among owners of stock who believed they had to follow the regulations as printed in the *Government Gazette*.

In outlining some of the inaccuracies made in his statement in reference to earmarks, Dr. Gardiner said that the earmark and the eartag would appear on the same ear. In the case of male sheep they would appear on the off or right ear, and in the case of female sheep on the near

or left ear. To make certain there was no confusion about this, Dr. Gardiner went on to say—

This leaves the opposite ear free for any other mark such as age marks, private reference marks etc., authorised under the Regulations, as well as for the registered tattoo if used.

Of course, anybody who has anything to do with stock knows that the eartag is on one ear, and the earmark is on the other. If all stock owners had been misled by the statements made by Dr. Gardiner some 25,000,000 or 30,000,000 sheep would have been eartagged incorrectly which would have meant that every stock owner would have to change the eartags on his sheep.

I made a protest to the Minister for Agriculture in regard to this published statement by Dr. Gardiner and in the *Journal of Agriculture* of March, 1972, and on the very back page, with no explanatory statement concerning the reasons for the announcement, and with no reference to the previous article, the following appeared:—

Under the new Stock Brands and Movement Act Regulations, to be in force shortly, sheep eartags used as a registered brand must be placed in the ear opposite to the compulsory registered earmark.

When an eartag is chosen as the means of displaying the registered brand, it must be placed in the off or right ear of female sheep and the near or left ear of male sheep.

If a tattoo is used as a registered brand it must also be on the ear opposite to the compulsory earmark. Private reference marks and tags may only be placed on the opposite ear to the earmark.

Of course, this is the same provision that was announced before, but we found in that statement he has stated that the eartag should be on the ear opposite to that which he stated previously which, of course, has been normal practice, and I hope always will be. The Minister, in replying to some remarks that were made during a debate earlier this session, made some comment regarding the stock experts on this side of the House. His remarks were as follows:—

It is only since the proclamation of this legislation that the deficiencies mentioned by the honourable member have become evident. Perhaps it would be uncharitable of me to suggest that the debate, the analysis, and the discussion by stock experts of both Chambers of this Parliament were inadequate, in that they failed to foresee all the circumstances that have arisen since. Deficiencies have become evident, and they are almost multitudinous.

Those comments were recorded on page 3247 of current *Hansard* No. 15. How can we be stock experts when we read the confusing statements that are made by the Registrar of Brands?

This confusion has not only been created among members in this Chamber but also among all members of the farming community. At the moment we have one set of rules applying to the owners of stock, and a relaxed set of rules applying to carriers and those who pick up sheep in the yards for delivery to the market for slaughter.

This organisation is governed by a waybill, a copy of which I have here. It is a small page in a book which can be bought for about 20c if it has 20 leaves and 50c if it has 50 leaves. The waybill contains a small area for a description of the stock being transported. It must be filled in with the number of stock, the description of the stock, and the brands or earmarks involved. I have on the notice paper an amendment to simplify the procedure.

Those who are familiar with the transportation of stock must know that dealers in stock can have numerous earmarks. An earmark is placed on a sheep when it is young; but when that animal reaches maturity, the earmark has taken on an entirely different appearance and there is no apparent relationship with the original earmark. This is because the animal has wandered around in scrub and stubble for two or three years and has been shorn two or three times. I therefore defy any inspector to identify an earmark on an animal in the middle tier of a three-tier truck in the early hours of the morning. In that respect I believe the waybill will serve no useful purpose.

I agree it will have some merit in that we hope it will be filled in and at the end of the trip handed in at the slaughterhouse. It will then be kept as a record and could be useful. I repeat that it would be impossible for an inspector to identify an earmark by the description provided in the small space on the waybill.

For this reason I have on the notice paper an amendment concerning earmarks. The Brands Directory of Western Australia has in its front pages a code designating every type of earmark. The directory also has a code for the position of the earmark. The position will be all that is identifiable after a period of, say, three or four years; and this code should be used.

I question the incidence of stock stealing. The answers to questions asked earlier in the year indicated that the incidence was not as great as it was thought to be. From personal experience I know the difficulty in proving whether or not stock has been stolen because a stock thief does not operate in an area where he can be seen. It

is often some weeks before the loss is discovered, and it is virtually impossible to check them out. Stock may have been stolen or they may only have strayed and wandered into bush country. This contention was expressed in answers to questions in this House and the information was published in the *Farmers' Weekly* on Thursday, the 17th August, as follows:—

The 1971-72 figure for cattle was 35, down 83 on the previous year.

In 1971-72 there were nine prosecutions for sheep and cattle theft—six for sheep and three for cattle.

There were ten prosecutions in 1970-71, five each for sheep and cattle.

The six sheep-stealing charges involved 25 sheep and the three cattle-stealing charges involved three cattle. Obviously the animals were taken from a small yard. However, what happened to the rest of the sheep which were reported stolen?

Mr. T. D. Evans: It may well be that the figures you quote are not accurate and are misleading in so far as often the police in such a case will charge a person with both stealing and receiving—two separate charges involving the same animals.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: This could be right, which would mean that the 25 sheep involved only three charges which does not help the figures very much.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I am not suggesting you are misleading us, but that the figures might be.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: I do not have the figures to hand, but something like 4,800 sheep were reported stolen. If three charges involved only 25 animals, a great many sheep were not accounted for. I am at a loss to understand how a waybill will help. Actually, as I have indicated, possibly many of the sheep have not been stolen, but have merely strayed.

Recently a local policeman told me that 500 sheep had been reported stolen. A hunt was carried out everywhere for them and they were found in a neighbour's crop. This was an instance where 500 sheep had been reported stolen, but they had not been stolen. Someone had left the gate open and the animals had wandered three or four miles away to a neighbour's crop. So, although we quote statistics, I do not believe that the incidence of sheep stealing is as great as we are led to believe it is.

I have now found the figures for which I was searching a few moments ago. In answer to a question by the member for Blackwood as to how many sheep had been stolen, the Minister for Housing replied—

Year ended 30th June:

	Sheep	Cattle
1967	Not available.	
1968	1,922	10
1969	1,664	17
1970	2,186	29
1971	4,728	118

Mr. T. D. Evans: Were they actually proved to be stolen or only reported as stolen?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: Reported. There is no proof that they were, in fact, stolen. I fail to understand how the filling in of a waybill will help in tracing these sheep in transit. I do agree that the waybill will be of some use in recording the number of animals transported. If sheep stealing occurs in one particular area the carriers involved can be isolated and a watch kept on them. But the waybill will be useless in helping an inspector to identify the stock. Most of the stock is transported at night and the inspector must stop the truck and board it in an effort to identify an earmark to coincide with a fancy drawing on the waybill.

In the back of a truck a farmer may have cattle with half a dozen earmarks and also sheep with several earmarks. All the information must be written on the waybill. Earmarks might be placed in different positions, and so a farmer must write a story on his waybill. The inspector must then match the earmark on the animals with the description on the waybill which, of course, would be impossible.

I now wish to refer to a few of the other provisions in the Bill. Section 31 (2) reads in part—

- ... every proprietor of sheep shall—
- (a) ... brand each of his sheep with his registered brand—
 - (i) forthwith after the sheep is shorn for the first time; or
 - (ii) before the sheep is removed from the run, whichever first occurs.

The question arises: What does one do after one shears a sheep for the first time? Must it be branded later or is it classed as a cleanskin?

Section 37 (3) states that an inspector or police officer may seize and destroy any branding iron or other instrument for branding or earmarking stock other than one authorised by the Act. My interpretation of that provision is that a person is permitted to have only one instrument for branding. Many farmers have two properties. I have, and I have two brands, one on each property. This obviates the necessity to cart the one brand backwards and forwards. The Act should provide for the brand registered by a farmer and not the one brand only as stated in the Bill.

Section 49 (1) contains a terrific amount of verbiage. It reads—

A proprietor of stock who desires to move any of his stock repeatedly to and from neighbouring runs for the purpose of feeding, watering, dipping or spraying the stock or for other purposes incidental to animal husbandry.....

In my opinion most of that wording could be omitted, reference being made only to purposes incidental to animal husbandry, because that is what is involved when one is feeding, watering, dipping, and so on.

I do not intend to say much more now, but I will have a lot more to say in Committee. However, I have one other point to make now. Some three or four years ago, or perhaps more, it was decided to adopt a system of coloured eartags to denote the age of the animals. The Registrar of Brands mentioned this in an article in the *Gnowangerup Star* on the 3rd August.

He mentions that compulsory colour tags to indicate age have been abandoned and farmers can use tags of any colour to suit their own convenience. In another article he states where the coloured eartags must be used to denote the age of the sheep. In the November, 1971, journal he states—

Ear tags used as a registered brand must be a type approved by the Registrar, and the colours must denote year of birth as follows: 1971 red, 1972 orange, 1973 brown, 1974 blue, 1975 yellow, 1976 black, 1977 white, and 1978 green. The sequence is then repeated.

Nevertheless we find that on the 3rd August of this year all compulsory colour tags to indicate age have been abandoned and, instead, it is suggested that we revert to age-notching of sheep. This is a system of cutting a notch in the front of the ear one year and at the back of the ear the following year. When we consider the items I have listed, such as scrub, stubble, and shearers, certainly there are many notches in the ear.

Mr. Lewis: Or no ears at all.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: As the member for Moore says, there could easily be no ears at all. I consider there should be some organised form of marking stock so that they are readily identified by that mark—or perhaps by a tag.

I suggest to the Minister that he should give consideration to reverting to the coloured eartag scheme. I think he would find that 75 per cent. of the sheep in Western Australia are already marked in this manner and have been for some years. The firms from which the farmers buy the colour tags have developed a sequence. A farmer orders the tags and he is given the right colour for the right year. At saleyards it is easy to identify the age of a sheep marked with a colour tag. Everyone knows what the tags stand for.

If we revert to the notches in the ear we find that after six years a sheep would have three notches in the front and three in the back. If the shearers have also "had a go" there may be no ear left at all.

There is still a great deal of tidying up to be done with this measure. We have been a long time getting to it. I know the measure has taken up a good deal of the Minister's time and we have been on his back about it.

At the moment people in the country do not have any ideas as to what they should do. I still receive queries as to whether waybills are in force. The Minister made a Press statement on this subject, but this did not alleviate the problem for many. Some thought they were affected and some thought they were not. The police and stock inspectors are not certain as to what they should be doing. In fact, I do not think they are doing anything.

I am pleased the measure has come up for discussion. I hope we can sort it out and perhaps some of the amendments which appear on the notice paper under my name may have this effect. I hope the end result will make the handling of stock clearer and easier all round. This is the prime consideration; namely, to get the stock from the farm to the market as speedily and easily as possible, and with the least possible chance of theft occurring.

I hope we can arrive at a satisfactory solution so far as the waybill system is concerned. Perhaps some other system may be suggested later on. I would be only too pleased to support anything which will gain the objectives of making the movement and branding of stock so much easier.

I indicate my support of the measure, although I will be moving some amendments in the Committee stage.

MR. REID (Blackwood) [9.50 p.m.]: I wish to speak to the Bill and, in fact, a number of amendments under my name appear on the notice paper. These will be dealt with in the Committee stage.

I would like to direct my comments to the provision of waybills with which my proposed amendments are concerned. Before doing so, I would like to make one other comment. I am sure all members are aware of the need to reduce the incidence of stock stealing. I believe all of us appreciate the moves that are being initiated to bring this about. However, I ask whether it is good practice to bring into force something which it is not possible to maintain, police, or even adhere to. This is my basic objection to clause 7 which relates to section 46; namely, the provision of a waybill.

The member for Roe has already mentioned some figures in connection with stock stealing. I asked a question on this subject in the House on the 9th August. One can only surmise that the reason for proposed re-enacted section 46, which is concerned with waybills, is an effort to try to reduce stock stealing. In fact, the Minister stated this when he introduced the Bill. I very much question whether,

in fact, this provision will make any contribution whatsoever towards reducing the number of stock stolen. In fact, I challenge the Minister to prove that it will bring about a reduction in the numbers stolen. Unless there is reasonable proof to indicate that this reduction would come about or that more people would be apprehended, why is it included in the measure?

Mr. H. D. Evans: Do you not think you would have to try it before passing judgment? In its present form I do not say that the system will work.

Mr. REID: Why try something which has already been proclaimed and is not working?

Mr. H. D. Evans: True, in its present form. This is why the amendments are before the House.

Mr. REID: The present amendments are totally inadequate to deal with the situation. I say the basic problem lies in the fact that it is not possible accurately to identify stock. This is where it begins and ends. If it were possible, I would be 100 per cent. behind this move, but because it is not I say it is frivolous, a waste of time, and additional costs will be incurred in an effort to identify stock which it is not possible to identify.

We know that for centuries stock have been notoriously difficult to identify. There is no really effective method of identifying by brands or earmarks. Perhaps the only effective way is the firebrand, but after a number of years this becomes callous and is impossible to read in many cases with cattle and, particularly, with horses. Sheep have nothing but wool covering their bodies. It is possible to put a brand on the wool, but when the system is concerned with the ears—and there are only two ears to work on—it breaks down.

My contention is that it is not a responsible action for us to introduce legislation which would involve people in a mountain of paper work which, in fact, we know will not be practicable in the field.

Since the introduction of the measure I have sold stock on a number of occasions. The carrier or agent who loaded stock for me on all occasions wrote onto my waybill "various earmarks." All the cattle I sold on that day had the same earmark, but he could not identify the mark for the purposes of the waybill, the form of which the member for Roe has already displayed to the House. Although the stock which went to sale had one uniform earmark it was not possible to identify that.

If members do not think this is credible, I can give a further illustration; this happened a couple of months earlier. A neighbour, who has a registered earmark for his cattle, found his cattle mixed up with mine. We all know that under the Brands Act, an earmark or brand would not be issued to a person if it was similar to that issued to his neighbour.

In this case, there was no close similarity between my neighbour's earmark and my own. The cattle were running in a paddock and we had to segregate them. I have a fair idea of my own stock, but it was not possible to sort them out until we got them into a yard and, one by one, we clipped the ears and the hair to examine the mark. This took 1½ hours and 10 animals were involved.

Why should we insist on a mountain of paper work unless it will, in fact, enable stock to be positively identified? As it is, the provision has been included purely on the basis that it may achieve something in the direction of identifying stock, reducing the number stolen, or perhaps enabling those responsible to be apprehended.

I do not wish to weary the House but I would like to mention that on the 9th August I asked a question of the Minister representing the Minister for Police. I asked how many sheep and cattle had been reported stolen in the year ended the 30th June, 1972, in particular—because it is the latest—and in the previous five years. In the year ended the 30th June, 1972, 1,960 sheep and 35 cattle were reported stolen. The actual prosecutions were for six sheep and three cattle. The figures for the preceding five years run down to as low as two sheep and no cattle stolen.

However, much higher numbers of sheep and cattle are reported stolen. The member for Roe made it quite clear that generally the first thing a farmer does when he finds that sheep and cattle are missing is to say that they have been stolen. In many instances it is found that there is a hole in the fence or somebody has left a gate open. In the weeks that follow the sheep and cattle often turn up. With some embarrassment, the owner puts them back into his paddock and says nothing.

The actual incidence of stock stealing is almost minimal. Often it is a case of a person having a set on his next door neighbour. If a nice steer wanders onto his property, he will open the gate and whizz it in. If a person does not like his neighbour, this could be an opportunity to take him down. In many cases it probably amounts to personal disagreements, misunderstanding, and conflict between two people instead of stock stealing.

In the Committee stage I intend to try to remove the entire provision. I believe for a number of reasons, which I will outline, that the amendments proposed by the Minister will not overcome these difficulties. In his second reading speech, the Minister said—

There is no waybill problem in the transport of stock from farmers' properties either for sale or slaughter, where the farmer retains ownership of the animals up to the point of loading onto the transport.

This is simply not the position, because it is not possible accurately to identify runs of sheep with a multiplicity of cuts and slices in their ears. With age, the earmark becomes distorted. I have said it is not possible to identify them, but I suppose it would be possible, but only if tremendous costs were incurred in the exercise. The multitude of entries on a waybill would turn it into a farcical operation. The carrier who has filled in, or received, the waybill is then required to keep it for six months. The waybill contains the signatures of the owner and of the carrier. One can well imagine what will happen with many truck drivers in the business because of their methods of keeping accounts. We will not be able to fight our way into the average trucker's cabin because of the waybills; they will be flowing out of the windows. Signatures of every farmer in the State will be scattered all over the State. This is an aspect which should not be overlooked and concerns me greatly. Trucks pull into bays and if we go into the bush near those bays I am sure we will find the waybills containing the two signatures. Obviously, they will be used as toilet paper. We will find waybills, containing signatures of property owners, scattered throughout the bush near every truck bay.

I have not the quotation or the date, but in *The West Australian* recently there was an item about a man who forged a signature. If this provision is passed, signatures will be scattered all over the State. Let us be practical in this matter. The Minister has agreed to an exception being made in the case of stock dealers who buy out of the yards. If we make an exception, a confused situation will arise.

In this case, it was apparently decided that because of the multitude of earmarks the pen number would suffice in identifying the stock. It comes back to why we are doing this. We are doing it purely in an endeavour to reduce the incidence of stock stealing. If a dealer puts only a pen number on the waybill for the stock he buys, what will happen after he disposes of the stock or they are agisted? All over the State there will be stock, some of which are supposed to be made out with waybills, while the others are not.

It is already happening in Western Australia that the stock agents are filling in waybills by using the description, various earmarks, and brands rather than trying to fill in the individual earmarks. It has already been pointed out that under the same system the pen numbers under which the stock are being sold could be filled in many times, so pen No. 10, for instance, could be filled several times in a matter of days or perhaps on one day. What do we do then? How do we effectively control the identification of the stock? We have not a hope of doing so. That is the whole point. We are incurring another expense in an area which cannot be controlled or identified.

These are the basic areas of concern in which I feel no worth-while argument has been put forward for the introduction of waybills. Until positive individual identification can be established across the board, waybills should not be introduced. The industry already regards this as a farcical provision.

How can we expect the Police Force to enforce the provision? Do we ask a police officer to pull up a three-decker truck loaded with 300 sheep, and crawl inside it with a fistful of waybills when there may be 100 different earmarks among the sheep and some of them may be without ears? I cut the ears off 20 sheep the other day because they had ear cancer. The Act says it is an offence to have any sheep with cropped or mutilated ears on one's property, and the penalty is a fine of \$20, irreducible under mitigation. That law has been in existence for a long time, but admittedly there have been no prosecutions under it. It is a question whether or not the ears have been wilfully cropped.

I think there is a need to update the Stock (Brands and Movement) Act. Let us do it in a constructive way. The Bill will not bring that about. If the waybill is introduced, it will be the biggest bit of red-tape nonsense and the most ineffective piece of legislation in existence. It will have no practical effect whatsoever.

The member for Roe also raised the matter of the description of the earmark. Bearing in mind that the ears become distorted after the earmarks are placed on them, and that it is not possible to identify the marks, how will the farmers and producers write all these things on a waybill? A crop of cartoonists will be produced throughout Western Australia because it will be impossible to give anything other than a diagram of the earmarks. It will become the greatest joke in the stock industry in Western Australia unless we can by some means positively identify stock and then relate them to a waybill. If it were possible to do that, I would support it wholeheartedly. Otherwise, how can we ask police officers to vouch for what is included in a truckload? It is not possible for them to do so, and I know any police officer would be loth to pull up anybody and sign his name to a document stating that a man had on his truck old wild bulls, steers, or wethers with missing or slit ears and that they carried the earmarks enumerated on the waybill.

In the Committee stage I shall speak to the amendments I have on the notice paper. I feel that, because of the costs that would be involved for producers, I have made out a case as regards waybills. It has been said by some that the provision of the waybill will act as a deterrent against the stealing of stock. I will give an example of what could happen. A man is driving down the road in his truck, which contains some stock he has stolen. The stock are

listed in the waybill. A policeman pulls him up. Has he pulled him up for stealing stock? In the past, the police have not pulled up many people for stealing stock. When questioned, the man would say, "I am Joe Blow. I am off to Bullsbrook and I am selling my sheep to the butcher at Bullsbrook." The waybill book cost 20c. It contains a signature. Because of the multiplicity of numbers, there are various earmarks on the bill. How can the policeman check up on them? Will that reduce the incidence of stock stealing?

It comes back to the word of the police officer, who will not be inclined to enforce a provision which he knows is hopelessly out of touch with the situation. I strongly urge the Minister to look again at proposed new section 46, dealing with waybills, with a view to introducing a means by which positive identification of stock can be achieved. I would be quite happy to support such a system.

MR. I. W. MANNING (Wellington) [10.08 p.m.]: I think the two previous speakers have presented the facts of the situation that exists at the present time. I want to devote myself mainly to proposed new section 46—the waybills provision.

I am reluctant to oppose completely the principle of a waybill of some description, but I know only too well that what the member for Blackwood has said is correct. It is very difficult for the stock owner, the transporter, the stock agent, the inspector, and the police satisfactorily to identify the stock with the description on the waybill. Recently I took the opportunity of a grievance debate to raise one or two other aspects of this problem.

THE SPEAKER: There is too much audible conversation.

MR. I. W. MANNING: I raised the matter of the transporting to and from calf markets of baby calves, and the requirements under the Act to have them branded and earmarked or eartagged.

I would like to go further and say there is a very real need to alter the requirements in respect of the sale of calves less than seven days old. During the grievance debate I suggested that instead of the earmark, brand, or eartag, the tailtag be used as is used for grown cattle taken to cattle markets.

Tailtags have proved to be a very satisfactory means of identifying stock for the purpose of controlling disease. If cattle with tailtags are taken to the abattoir and found to have a disease, by means of the serial number on the tailtag they can be traced back to the producer who sold them and steps can be taken to deal with the disease on the property. Tailtagging is therefore successful, and in my view it would be a successful, easy, and ready means of identification to meet the requirements of the waybill provisions in this legislation.

It has been suggested that tags need not necessarily be placed on the tail of the animal. They could be placed in a strip along the back of the animal where they would be more readily seen by anyone looking down onto them in a truck or from the rail in the stockyard. I think that suggestion should be explored. It makes common sense to me.

I said earlier that the waybill requirements are very irksome. At the stock market on a wet day I have seen a load of cattle come in and the truckie trying to get his waybill handed in and signed. It was raining, there were bellowing cattle and people running hither and thither, and it seemed to me to be an almost impossible situation. However, I do not want to knock the idea if it is felt a docket can be used to authorise a carrier to cart the stock, and that thereby the transporter who is stopped on the road can show in writing that he has X number of cattle on board and that he picked up the cattle at a certain person's property and was transporting them to a particular destination.

If cattle are being taken to a fat cattle market, they will all be carrying tailtags, the number of which could be recorded on the waybill. The stock owner could make some arrangements to ensure that the tailtag number is recorded on the waybill. That is my suggestion. I think it would be impossible to ask anyone to indicate on a waybill the firebrand or a description of the earmark. As a result of the wealth of experience I have had in respect of the problem I endorse fully the comments made earlier.

I do not wish to make a lengthy speech on this Bill because I took the opportunity during a previous debate to highlight the problem. It is a ridiculous requirement to ask that two-day-old calves—which are taken to the market in hundreds every week—be earmarked or firebranded, because the person who is selling them has them for only two or three days and the person who buys them may hold them for years. The buyer wishes the ear to be intact so that he may apply his own earmark; then he will firebrand later.

The calves should be identified by some means other than an earmark or firebrand. They should have a ready mark of identification which may be removed later so that the new owner may apply his own registered earmark. I think that is a tremendously important aspect, and I hope it is not overlooked.

For the moment I have no objection to the amendments proposed by the Minister. I really do not think they achieve a great deal, when compared with the original Act; but, of course, much will depend upon what regulations are prescribed. The success or failure of the system will depend largely on how sensibly it is implemented. For the moment I support the Bill.

MR. H. D. EVANS (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [10.17 p.m.]: I thank the three members on the other side of the House who contributed to the debate. They have revealed an intimate knowledge of the stock industry and the problems created by the Act we propose to amend. It is interesting to note that they all placed their finger upon what is probably the most difficult part of the whole exercise; that is, identification for waybill purposes. I think the member for Wellington foreshadowed a solution in the suggestion he tentatively put forward.

The Act was introduced in 1970 and considerable debate ensued upon it. The then Minister for Agriculture pointed out that he appreciated there were many problems. He suggested the legislation should be given a trial and if there were difficulties the Act could be reviewed and amended. Probably we will have to approach the legislation on that basis.

Now that the member for Blackwood has returned to the Chamber I would point out that the legislation was brought down in 1970 in the spirit that if it did not work attempts would be made to find a solution to specific problems. Probably the matter will now be better covered by the amendments contained in the Bill itself and those on the notice paper submitted by the members for Roe and Blackwood.

However, I point out two aspects. All speakers appreciate the difficulty surrounding stock stealing. It is quite obvious that as the price of cattle increases and as the value of sheep increases the tendency to steal stock becomes a proportionately greater source of concern. As the position stands—and, whether or not he intended to, the member for Blackwood demonstrated the position clearly—the police are confronted with tremendous difficulties in apprehending and convicting stock stealers. It is well nigh impossible to do that in the existing situation unless one actually follows the person concerned to his destination. However, no speaker advanced any solution which could be substituted for the contents of the Bill, with the exception of the member for Wellington, whose suggestion I will pursue in a minute.

Members placed no emphasis upon the necessity for identification of animals so that disease may be traced back as quickly as possible. This is, as most members will agree, most important, particularly if there were an outbreak of exotic diseases. In those circumstances the measure before us would be of great assistance and I am sure it warrants consideration on those grounds alone.

Mr. Reid: Wouldn't you say that unless it was possible to identify stock individually—

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I am sorry; the honourable member was not here when I made my opening remark that the whole

crux of the matter of identification is for waybill purposes. That is the nitty-gritty of the exercise.

Mr. Reid: Surely if it is not possible to do that the whole Bill is negated.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I cannot see us ever accurately identifying every animal. If that is what the honourable member wants, I do not think it would work. I will refer again to the suggestion of the member for Wellington when I consider some of the proposed amendments.

In the debate no reference was made to the work of the committee which considered the matter at great length for some 18 months before the draft legislation was presented. The committee comprised members of all agricultural organisations, the Police Force, and the Department of Agriculture. It considered the matter very thoroughly. When it was found after the proclamation of the Act that its provisions were not suitable, and the confusion which members opposite mentioned became evident, the legislation was referred back to the committee for further examination. The Bill is the result of the committee's further deliberations.

I reiterate: no alternatives to the amendments in the Bill have been proposed; the only alternative is to carry on with the almost impossible situation with which we are now faced, which offers no protection from disease and very little protection from stealing. I think the figures quoted by members are almost negligible.

I notice that the member for Roe has four amendments on the notice paper. Three of those appear to be acceptable, and will assist in fulfilling the purpose of the Bill. His proposed amendment to clause 7 is desirable, but I think his purpose could be achieved in a more streamlined and neater manner. The honourable member will probably agree with me when I explain in Committee.

The member for Blackwood has eight amendments on the notice paper, two of which are of importance. His amendment to clause 7 is to delete the essential words containing the requirement for waybills. If the words are deleted the purpose of the Act will be emasculated. His proposed amendment would also destroy the intention of the committee and its hope of introducing a system which would assist in the apprehension of stock stealers. Amendments Nos. 3, 4, 8, 9, and 10 proposed by the member for Blackwood are consequential upon acceptance of his proposed amendment to clause 7. So the main proposition is whether the Committee accepts or rejects his amendment to clause 7. I notice that the honourable member proposes to insert a new clause 11 to repeal section 50 of the principal Act. He also proposes a new clause 12, which I feel should be rejected.

Mr. Reid: Why?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: I will give my reasons in the course of the Committee stage. I feel we should take the amendments *seriatim* in the Committee stage to see which are useful amendments to the parent Act.

The member for Wellington has foreshadowed suggested alternatives for the present waybill. I would agree with those who have spoken that the present system is unworkable. I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

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

That the House at its rising adjourn until 2.15 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).
Question put and passed.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Closing Time

THE SPEAKER (Mr. Norton): I wish to advise members that questions for Thursday will be received up till 3.45 p.m. tomorrow.

House adjourned at 10.26 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 18th October, 1972

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (5): ON NOTICE

1. *This question was postponed until Tuesday, 24th October.*

2. **WATER SUPPLIES**

Rates: Assessments

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) What is the method used by the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board to calculate "annual value" for the purposes of assessing water rates in the metropolitan area?
- (2) What basis is used for rating in country areas?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) The calculation of "annual value" for the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board, as provided under section 74 of its Act, is made by the Valuation Section of the State Commissioner of Taxation.

(2) Section 48 of the Country Areas Water Supply Act provides for the estimated net annual value to be calculated on the following basis:—

- (a) the current net annual value adopted by the Local Authority in the district of which the land is situated; or
- (b) a sum equal to the estimated full fair, average amount of rent at which the land may reasonably be expected to let from year to year, on the assumption (if necessary to be made) that the letting is allowed by law, less a deduction of forty per centum for all outgoings; or
- (c) an amount not exceeding six per centum of the capital value of the land.

3. BUSSELTON HOSPITAL

Alterations and New Structure

The Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) (a) Are any structural alterations and improvements being planned for the Busselton Hospital; and
- (b) if so, what is the nature of the proposed work?
- (2) At what stage are negotiations for the purchase of all the land required for the establishment of a new hospital on a site known as "Lilly's Mill" at Busselton?
- (3) (a) At what stage is planning for the new hospital; and
- (b) what facilities will be incorporated in the new hospital, such as number of beds, accommodation for permanent care patients, community health facilities, and other features?
- (4) As the matter of providing Busselton with a modern and more suitable hospital has been under consideration for a considerable time, is the Government now in a position to give an assurance that ground work on the new site will commence at a certain date and that the new hospital will, in fact, be completed within a certain period of time thereafter?
- (5) Has consideration been given as to the future use of the land and buildings comprising the present hospital?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) The provision of a transportable building to house new X-ray equipment required to replace worn out items, is being investigated. Consequential minor