

I have raised. I know the Minister is fully aware of the position of my constituents in connection with tourist coach travel. I appreciate that there has been an improvement in the attitude which the commissioner proposed initially, which was a flat refusal. But the protection which is still being given to these two major companies is quite unreasonable. When a Western Australian company demonstrates that it is capable of entering the Tourist Trade business I believe it should be given every opportunity and encouragement.

It is pleasing to note that the Minister for Housing advises that the captured market of insurance companies with regard to the insurance of housing is being looked into by the Trade Practices Tribunal. I hope that this position is corrected.

I hope that the Minister for Traffic sees fit to ensure that the Road Traffic Authority does not carry on the same practice which it so stupidly carried on on the occasion of the last race meeting at Toodyay. I am very pleased to hear that the member for Toodyay claims to have done something about that matter.

I hope that the overcrowding of school buses to the Eastern Hills High School is corrected in the near future.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Sodeman.

#### ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

**SIR CHARLES COURT** (Nedlands—Premier) [10.46 p.m.]: I move—

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

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 10.47 p.m.*

## Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 14th April, 1976

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

#### LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION IN THE ASSEMBLY

*Retirement: Luncheon*

**THE PRESIDENT** (the Hon. A. F. Griffith): Before we proceed with the business of the day I have a short announcement to make. Tomorrow, commencing at about 1.00 p.m., the Joint House Committee will tender a buffet luncheon in order to honour the Hon. John Tonkin, Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly, upon his retirement as Leader of the Labor Party. Members of this Chamber are invited to attend that luncheon in his honour.

#### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

##### *Postponement*

**THE HON. N. McNEILL** (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [2.34 p.m.]: I ask that questions on notice be deferred to a later stage of the sitting.

The **PRESIDENT**: Questions deferred.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by the Hon. V. J. Ferry, leave of absence for six consecutive sittings of the House granted to the Hon. C. R. Abbey (West) on the ground of ill-health.

#### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: NINTH DAY

##### *Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 13th April, on the following motion by the Hon. M. McAleer—

That the following address be presented to His Excellency—

May it please Your Excellency:

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

**THE HON. LYLA ELLIOTT** (North-East Metropolitan) [2.39 p.m.]: I would like to commence my remarks today by paying a tribute to the Hon. Ron Thompson for the very fine leadership he provided for Labor Party members of the Legislative Council during his term of office, and to thank him for the ready assistance he has always given—when it was sought—on any problem that might arise.

I would also like to congratulate the Hon. Des Dans on his elevation to the position of Leader of the Opposition in this House, and the Hon. Roy Cloughton who has been elected as our party's Whip. I am sure both of them will carry out their duties admirably.

I would like to deal in some detail with the Speech delivered by the Governor on behalf of the State Government. First of all, we see under the heading "State Finances"—

Indications are that the Budget introduced in State Parliament in October will achieve a balance in 1975/76—

That is not very surprising. As I said in my speech on the Appropriation Bill in November of last year, the State Government will be able to achieve a balance firstly because of the very generous assistance it received from the former Federal Labor Government. For this current financial year it received an increase in untied grants of 34 per cent over the

previous year. Secondly, if we look at other funds which have come from Federal sources and which were previously not available to other Governments in this State we see a tremendous increase in grants for education, hospitals, dental services, recreational facilities, Aboriginal welfare, pre-school education, child care, sewerage works, and so on. In addition to all that Federal money, I do not have to remind members of this House of the great burden placed on the taxpayers of the State by the Government's increases in sewerage and water rates, electricity, and State Government Insurance Office charges, motor vehicle registration, and so on.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Do all those handouts add up to the \$5 000 million deficit?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: All these increased taxes and charges have contributed to the inflationary spiral, and I might add this State can boast one of the highest inflation rates in Australia. I would like to know what has happened in relation to Sir Charles Court's statements prior to the last election that "Inflation can be beaten to a substantial degree State by State", and "We will review all taxes and charges to see what streamlining is possible to reduce irritation to the public". Those were statements made by Sir Charles Court prior to the last State election and they are among the promises on which he was elected.

Sir Charles Court certainly reviewed State taxes and charges but rather than reduce irritation all he has done is impose a heavy burden on the people of this State. Are these some of the promises Sir Charles Court claims to have implemented, like the promise to conduct an inquiry into concessions for pensioners? The inquiry was held and the report was brought down, but what has happened to it? Will the recommendations of the committee be implemented?

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: After the Federal Minister meets the States.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The Government professes to have a great deal of concern for the unemployed, yet it strongly supports the Federal Government's policies and all its cuts. I have not heard any member of the Liberal and Country Parties in this State condemn the Fraser Government's cuts in pensions, education, health and welfare, and culture or its repudiation of wage indexation; nor have I heard any great complaints about the handouts being given to big business and big farmers.

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

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I said while we have not heard any complaints about the cuts in payment to the little people,

we have also not heard any complaints about the large grants being paid out to big business and big farmers.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Did you not listen to Mr Wordsworth last night?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: We see this in the Governor's Speech—

The State Government will co-operate with the Commonwealth Government in its efforts to abate and control inflation, as the key to re-building investor and consumer confidence—

I would like to know how we will bring about more consumer spending if we take from the people who are the consumers.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I will tell you.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The people who spend money are the consumers. How will we improve the employment situation when we find the Federal Government not only being itself responsible for sacking people but also introducing cuts which mean less employment for quite a few people and the dismissal of others?

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: What particular cuts?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: For example, cuts in capital works. Will they not mean less employment for many people in the building industry?

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: What capital works? What cuts have been introduced up to date? Name them.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I am just about to name them. Not only has this "fabulous" Government in Canberra, which was going to bring about all these miraculous improvements in unemployment—

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: We had the worst unemployment in the history of the nation.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Not only is it creating further unemployment but the miserable, petty cuts it is introducing will affect the quality of life in this country. Let us have a look at some of those cuts. I am happy to be able to quote them to members opposite. A sum of \$9 million has been cut from the childhood services programme. This includes many buildings which were planned and which will not now be built.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is recurrent expenditure. That is not capital funding.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Yes it is.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Tell us the projects that have been cut.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: A sum of \$1.7 million has been cut from the legal aid programme.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is recurrent expenditure, not capital works.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The Federal Government obviously does not care about justice for poor people.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are mixed up.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I happen to know what I am talking about even if members opposite do not. I am talking about money that is involved not only in capital works but also in recurrent expenditure.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You said "capital works".

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I know exactly what I said. I referred to the fact that cuts involved capital works which would mean people employed on those projects would not now be employed. I did not say that was all I would talk about. If I may continue, I have already stated that \$1.7 million has been cut from the legal aid programme, which will be against the best interests of poor people. Pharmaceutical benefits have been cut back by \$7 million which once again will affect many people who can least afford it. A miserable \$132 000 was saved by not publishing very important and valuable research papers, and I would like to quote as follows from a statement about this particular cut which appeared in the Melbourne newspaper *The Herald* on the 5th February, 1976, under the heading "Poverty study hit by 'poverty'" —

Five learned men have just spent three years on a piece of work which would have made Australia a world leader.

"A chance for this country to make a contribution" was how one of them described it all today.

But the penny-pinching that is going on in Canberra at present may well have turned it into a lost chance.

I refer to the carefully considered, much heralded and long-awaited study into poverty led by Melbourne's Prof. Ronald Henderson.

The five main reports will still come out in due course, but 22 important research papers which should have appeared alongside the main work may not see the light of day.

The Social Security Minister, Senator Margaret Guilfoyle, said today that the Government would save \$132 000 by not publishing the papers.

What a disgraceful thing to do! In all 22 important papers will not be published in order to save a miserable \$132 000.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What about the \$4 700 Mr Cooley mentioned the other day?

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I did not say it was badly spent; you ought to read *Hansard* properly.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: An amount of \$1.7 million is to be saved—

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I listened to what you said.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I mentioned the figure, I didn't say anything about it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Why don't you let Miss Elliott get on with her speech; you are making it very difficult for her.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The sum of \$1.7 million will be saved by dropping the \$40 funeral benefit for pensioners. When the Hon. Grace Vaughan mentioned this the other night, if I remember correctly the Minister for Health interjected and said, "Tell us the truth; who is really responsible?" Is that correct?

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Yes.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: We on this side all looked at each other in amazement because as far as we were concerned it was the Fraser Government which dropped the funeral benefit for pensioners. I have checked on this matter. Not only have I read a whole lot of Press reports which confirm what Mrs Vaughan said, but I have spoken to the former Minister for Social Security (Senator Wheeldon) who assures me that it was a policy decision of the Fraser Government to drop the \$40 pensioners' funeral benefit. I think that clears up that point.

Then there was a saving of \$29 million due to a delay in pension increases. Had the increase been paid in the first place it would have put the money into the pockets of people who needed it and would spend it. Is not that a way to boost consumer spending and confidence?

An amount of \$31 million has been cut from the environment, housing, and community development programme at a time when there is a desperate shortage of housing. Of course, we are very much aware of the repudiation of the undertaking to support wage indexation. In the very first case before the Arbitration Commission since its election, the new Federal Government opposed the 6.4 per cent increase.

An amount of \$277 000 was cut from the film and TV school, in respect of which *The Age* said that any major cuts would be signing the death warrant of one of the most promising experiments in the history of arts in Western Australia. There has been a cut of \$7.3 million in Aboriginal affairs. Part of this money would have been spent on promoting employment for Aboriginal people, apart from many other desirable projects that will be dropped or seriously affected. How does this increase employment?

An amount of \$8.4 million has been slashed from the budget of the ABC.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: That wouldn't hurt.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The Federal Liberal Government really wanted to cut the budget of the ABC by \$14.4 million, which would have meant the sacking of about 1 000 employees. Imagine that: 1 000 employees out of the 7 000 employed by the ABC would have been sacked.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: It is peanuts to them.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Probably there are too many there, anyhow.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Do you really think that?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Is that helping employment? However, it was only as a result of the strong opposition of Dr Hackett, who negotiated with the Government in respect of this, that the amount was reduced from \$14.4 million to \$8.4 million which now means the loss of 184 jobs.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Didn't Dr Hackett agree to that figure?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: They probably had him over a barrel and he could not help but agree; but at least he had the cut reduced from \$14.4 million to \$8.4 million.

There was also a cut of \$10 million from the hospitals building programme.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: When; where?

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

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I said \$10 million was cut from the hospitals building programme.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: It is the first I have heard of it. I have had no advice from the Federal Government on that.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I regret I have not the relevant Press cutting with me. However, I can assure members opposite that \$10 million has been cut from the hospitals building programme. I have not mentioned all of the cuts that have occurred.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: All that you have made up.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: They are capable of confirmation.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: It is amazing how, when members opposite do not have any logical answer to what we say, they always try to denigrate the speaker or to draw red herrings across the trail.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I don't see how you can cut the capital works building programme when a building is half completed.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Most of these cuts are mean and petty and—

The Hon. G. E. Masters: And they add up to something like \$110 million.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: —they will not make much difference to the overall deficit. They will not greatly affect inflation; all they will do is affect many small people. This is the sort of policy the present State Government supports. It is very proud to support such policies which will do nothing for inflation or unemployment.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: That is a matter of opinion.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I have already quoted areas in which these cuts will create unemployment. At the same time as the Federal Government takes from the poor it gives to the wealthy—to big business and big farmers.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Don't be ridiculous.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Has the Minister gained any benefit from the superphosphate bounty?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Superphosphate bludgers.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: What about tax concession bludgers?

The Hon. J. Heitman: They didn't tell you they get back \$660 million from the farming community.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I believe some help should be given to the little farmers who are struggling. Some concessions should be available to help people who are in trouble and who need assistance. Obviously many little farmers do need this, but there are many who do not need it, including the present Prime Minister (Mr Fraser) and half of the present Federal Cabinet who will benefit from the reintroduction of the superphosphate bounty.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: They would not put a means test on that.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: We also see that another of the policies of our new Federal Government is to subsidise unemployment with its "marvellous" 40 per cent investment allowance.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You don't think that is a good thing?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I am about to give an instance of how ridiculous it is when it looks as though the Swan Brewery will receive about \$8.5 million of the taxpayers' money for its new plant at Canning Vale, and yet it is going to sack 350 men. How is the Government helping to promote employment when it subsidises automation that will put men out of work?

I would like to know if these are the sorts of policies the Court Government supports—policies that take from the poor and give to the wealthy and create unemployment.

Richard Hall, in the *Bulletin* of the 14th February, 1976, in referring to the new Federal Government policy said that for

the first time in many years we are seeing an attempt to put into operation an authentic nineteenth century conservative philosophy. I agree with him.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What is wrong with that?

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: It is time we had something conservative.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: A good workable economy of the type that made the British Empire famous.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I am glad Mr MacKinnon has finally admitted that he is living in the past. We will have a status quo or do-nothing Government in Canberra just as we have had a do-nothing Government in this State since 1974.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That is why Mr Whitlam still appears on the front page.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You must have been Rip van Winkle during that time.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I should like to know exactly what this State Government has achieved.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It has produced the greatest depression the world has ever seen.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I think you all ought to give Miss Elliott a fair go because she is having great difficulty with you, Mr Dans.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member is making her speech under difficulties contributed to by both sides of the House and I think fewer interjections would enable her to make a more appropriate speech.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Just what has this Government achieved which was not started by the Tonkin Government or was not substantially financed by Federal funds?

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: A lot.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Let us look at some of the headings in the Governor's Speech. This Government is very proud of what it has done for education.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: My word it is!

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: What the Government did not tell us in the Governor's Speech is that in the 1975-76 financial year this State will receive approximately \$130 million from Federal sources for all forms of education. As the last State Budget provided exactly \$230 681 000 for education we will see a significant amount was contributed to education in this State by the Federal Labor Government. Because of all this Federal money, not only has the State Government been able to upgrade disadvantaged schools, substandard schools, but it has also been able to train teachers of handicapped children, build and equip school libraries, hand over teacher training costs,

provide dental clinics and matters of that kind. Hidden in these achievements is an awful lot of Federal money which the people have never heard about and which is certainly not mentioned in the Governor's Speech.

The Government referred very proudly to the opening of the Chidley education centre but it did not tell us that the State Government paid for only half of it. The total cost is approximately \$1.2 million of which the State Government found only \$600 000.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: So what?

The Hon. W. R. Withers: If you had been there at the opening you would have heard the Minister compliment the previous Minister.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: An amount of \$250 000 came from Federal sources and \$350 000 from the Public Educational Endowment Trust so the State Government cannot claim that the total was funded by the State Government.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What gave you the idea that anybody made that claim?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I am saying the Government has not provided the information in the Governor's Speech that money had been contributed from outside sources.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: If you had been at the opening—

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: A very select few people go to the openings of these things.

The Hon. T. Knight: If they are interested they would go.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Do not talk nonsense, Mr Knight. People go to these things only if they are invited.

The Hon. T. Knight: They go because they are interested, because they have an interest in their area.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You do not put all these items in the Governor's Speech.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You put in a lot of criticism about the Federal Government.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: If we had put in all the criticism you would be still talking.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Mr Masters was so critical of this side of the House last night for not dealing in more detail with the Governor's Speech that I am very glad to oblige him. I had already intended to do this before he mentioned it. I notice that he is not interjecting—

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I am delighted you took my advice and studied it more carefully.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: There is not much to study; that is what I am trying to convey. The next heading is

housing. We see that "the State Housing Commission expects to complete its 1975-76 programme of 757 units by the end of the financial year". Last week I took strong exception to the Minister's smart aleck reply to my question when I sought information about the number of units built during the last six or seven years. I thought his answer was unnecessarily discourteous. I can only think he did not wish the information to be made public.

As I said, this financial year the commission expects to build 757 units. If we go back to 1970-71 we find that every year the number has been steadily decreasing. In 1970-71 the housing commission built 3 499 houses and flats. The following year the figure was down by 920 to 2 579. In 1972-73 it was down to 2 207, which was a drop of 372. In 1973-74 it was down again to 1 984—a drop of 223 units. The following year, 1974-75, the number dropped to 1 150 which was a decrease of 834. This year there is another drop of 393 to only 757 units.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You did not say 1970-71. Did you mean to say that?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I did say that. I said that in 1970-71 the figure was 3 499 and it dropped to 2 579 in 1971-72.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: The first figure mentioned was under a Liberal Government.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I know; I am quite aware of that. What I want to know is why the figure has been dropping every year. Is the SHC being starved of funds? What is the State Housing Commission doing when so many people desperately want—

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What about the private sector figure? You did not mention that.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: —low rental or low cost purchase homes. I think people are entitled to an answer on this question. Why has the figure been steadily dropping every year?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Why did you not mention the private sector home building figure?

The Hon. G. E. Masters: It would only embarrass her.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You can mention those figures.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I do not want to.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You are the one most interested in them.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I am not talking about the private sector. The private sector does not build houses for sale or rent to low-income people.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: It certainly builds them for sale.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: There are a lot of people on the waiting list who must be catered for by the housing commission. That is why it came into existence. I do not know why the figure is dropping and I think it is about time we got some reason to show why the figure is 757 after being 3 499 in 1970-71.

With regard to cultural affairs, we are not told the Federal Government gave the State \$800 000 for cultural and leisure activities in this financial year. I should like to know how much the State is spending. With regard to the environment we are told that 4 000 hectares have been set aside for future institutional, recreational, and environmental purposes north of Beechboro, and so on. Here again there is an omission. We are not told that the Federal Labor Government made available to this State for the current year a loan of \$8.2 million for land acquisition and development in urban areas; and the previous year it made not only a loan of \$9.8 million available but also a grant of \$1.8 million.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: The Governor's Speech concerns what the State Government has done, not what the Federal Government has done.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Obviously members opposite do not really understand what I am getting at.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: That is for sure, because the Governor forgot to mention also that the Federal Labor Government carried the State!

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The Governor's Speech is intended to inform the people of Western Australia not only of the proposed legislative programme for the current session but also of the achievements of the Government.

I am saying that not much would have been achieved without substantial help from the previous Federal Labor Government. The present Liberal-Country Party Government has not stopped denigrating the previous Federal Government since it has been in office.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You have not yet said anything about the financing of hospital buildings.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The next heading is "Legal Affairs", and there is mention of the Family Law Act of Australia. Here again, the introduction of that Act was the work of the Federal Labor Government.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: It was Federal Parliament legislation.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: That is right, but it was introduced by a Federal Labor Minister. The people of Australia would still be waiting, probably, if a Liberal-Country Party Government had been in office.

The Hon. N. McNeill: That is pure supposition on your part.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: This State Government certainly cannot claim that it made any contribution towards improving the situation with regard to divorce laws. I do not need to be told that divorce laws are a Federal matter because I am aware of that fact.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Why bring it up?

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Miss Elliott can bring up any matter she wants to discuss.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I have brought it up because it is mentioned in the Governor's Speech. That was a very enlightened piece of legislation which was introduced by a Federal Labor Government.

The next reference in the Governor's Speech is to hospitals and health. A sum of \$78 million was made available to Western Australia this year for recurrent costs in State hospitals, and additional funds were made available for capital development. I do not have the breakdown figures, State by State.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I can assure the honourable member that the State contribution towards hospitals is far greater than the Federal contribution.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: A sum of \$108 million was made available for the whole of Australia for capital works.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Of which we received \$11.5 million.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I would say that was a sum not to be sneezed at.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: We put in \$21 million of State money.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Does the Minister not think that the Federal money was worth worrying about? An additional sum of \$78 million was granted for recurrent costs.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: We have not received that yet.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You probably will not get it now that Fraser is in Government.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: How about getting onto transport?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: There is also reference to community health services. A sum of \$5 million was granted to this State by the Federal Labor Government for community service facilities. We now see all sorts of improved facilities such as community health centres, family planning clinics, and treatment centres for alcohol and drug dependents.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Out of the taxpayers' money.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The State Government has benefited very substantially as a result of grants from the previous Federal Labor Government.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I must agree with that remark; it certainly knew how to spend money.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Unfortunately this State Government will not acknowledge the generosity of the Federal Labor Government which made most of the present achievements possible.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Any Government can be generous and accrue a huge deficit.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: It does not seem to be reducing. Sir Charles Court said he would do it in six months.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: It is a hard job with a deficit of that size.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The next heading in the Governor's Speech is "Transport and Traffic". The Court Government could have saved the taxpayers of this country millions of dollars had the Premier agreed to transfer the railways to the Commonwealth.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Did you say "the taxpayers"?

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Is the honourable member aware that the agreement with the Commonwealth set out that this State should carry all debts?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: All losses were to be faced by Western Australia.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: It now seems that our rail services are to be cut severely. I believe that it is some years since new rolling stock was purchased and many of the railcars are breaking down. It is about time they were replaced.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: A short time ago the honourable member was saying we should get rid of the railcars but now she is saying we should have new ones.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: It is about time we joined with the rest of the world which is beginning to realise the importance of public transport to the survival of cities—

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: That is why we are hanging onto our railways.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: —particularly railways, which have a superior carrying capacity when compared with other forms of transport and are economic in fuel usage. In this State we are cutting back our rail service and discouraging people from using it.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: The Commonwealth Railways have increased their freight charges to this State.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: While speaking on the subject of transport and traffic, I want to refer to the road toll, and a contributing factor to that road toll. I refer particularly to street lighting and sign posts.

Several weeks ago I arranged to visit a friend living in Duncraig. It was the first time I had been to the home of that friend so I very carefully studied the road map of the area so that I would be able to locate my turn-off by observing a couple of street signs before that turn-off. I did not want to hold up traffic while looking for street signs.

I had a good idea of where I had to turn off the main road and when I approached the area I started to look for Warwick Road, which is a major road. I was travelling along Wanneroo Road but when I reached the vicinity of Warwick Road I discovered there were no street lights on the side of the road on which I was travelling.

Wanneroo Road is a dual carriageway with very few lights, and it is absolutely impossible for anyone travelling along Wanneroo Road to see the street signs on either side of the road. I have pretty good eyes and I do not wear glasses.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: We agree that you have pretty good eyes.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Perhaps you do need glasses.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Although I had very carefully studied the map before I commenced my journey I found it impossible to see the street signs in the area where I wanted to turn off the main road.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Is not this a council issue?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: A Legislative Council issue.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Perhaps the honourable member does not have any shire councils in her province.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Because I was not able to read the street signs I was forced to cross a very busy dual carriageway on a Saturday night in order to reach the other side of the road and find a corner where there was a street sign which I could see. I then worked out how many streets I had to go back to reach Warwick Road. I finally reached what I thought was Warwick Road and turned into it but after driving along it I discovered a sign which indicated that I was in Tuart Road. I thought that was incredible because I had studied the map carefully.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I think all this indicates is that you are not a very good navigator.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I travelled a little further and found another street sign which again indicated that I was in Tuart Road. By this time I was rather irritable because I was running a half hour late. However, I turned at the next corner where there was a street light in order to study the road map.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I think I can offer the solution to your problem. You were possibly blinded from the flashes of your beautiful engagement ring!

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I did not have it on at that stage. To my surprise I found that according to the road map the street from which I had just turned was actually Warwick Road.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: That is a local authority problem, surely.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: If we are interested in all aspects of road safety and in reducing the road toll, this is one area that must be looked at. If local authorities will not do it, the Government must step in to do something about it.

The Hon. N. McNeill: You also noticed the tremendous amount of road work going on in that vicinity?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Yes, but my point is that busy roads, which carry a lot of traffic, should be well lighted and signposted so that people who are unfamiliar with an area will know exactly what they are doing and where they are going. At the present time newcomers to this area must duck and dive all over the place, not only because they cannot see the street signs, but also because the signpost sometimes gives one road a different name from that found in the street directory.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What did the local authority say?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I think this matter should be looked at.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Maybe you did not contact it!

The Hon. N. McNeill: It has been like that along Wanneroo Road for a long time, and I think during the time of the Tonkin Government too.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You were going to turn on the lights.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: We have.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: At that time the dual carriageway was just being commenced, and the light on one side of the road would not have been so far away from the other side.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The dual carriageway has been under way for a long time.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: On this occasion it was absolutely impossible to see the street name from the other side of the road.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Let me reassure you that I have experienced the same difficulty along Wanneroo Road.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I was running late this night, I was in a rather ill temper and panicking when I could not find my way. It is quite possible that, in these circumstances, someone could become involved in an accident on such a busy road.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You reckon you want a black tracker out there, do you?



The Hon. Lyla Elliott: The next matter with which I wish to deal I introduced to this Chamber in a speech on the 14th August, 1974. I informed members that I had undertaken a tour of the Swan area with a community health sister when she was on her rounds to look for sick Aboriginal people. I met these people, and many of them were sick, suffering from diseases such as diabetes, ulcers, ear infections, bronchial trouble, poor nutrition, and alcoholism. Some of these Aborigines were middle aged, some were old, but they all needed shelter in some form, nourishment and regular medical treatment. I appealed to the Government to do something about finding shelter for these people.

Subsequently I received a written reply from the Minister and it gave me some encouragement. I thought the matter was being looked into because of a report provided by Sister Frances Northrop who undertook a study of the needs of homeless Aboriginal people. I remind members I made that speech in August, 1974. On the 19th March, 1975, I asked the Minister for Community Welfare the following question—

Further to the request in my Address-in-Reply speech on the 14th August, 1974, concerning the urgent need for a hostel for homeless Aboriginal people in the Swan district, and the written reply from the Minister for Health dated the 28th August, 1974—

- (a) has action been taken to establish such a hostel; and
- (b) if not, when is it anticipated it will be provided?

to which he replied—

- (a) No.
- (b) No action has been taken to establish a hostel as suggested by the Hon. Member in the speech.

On the 13th August, 1975, I asked the Minister another question as follows—

Further to the reply to my question of the 19th March, 1975, concerning the urgent need for hostel accommodation for homeless Aboriginal people in the Swan District—

- (a) has any action yet been taken to establish such a hostel;

The reply to part (a) was "No". Part (b) then asked—

- (b) if not, why not;

The answer to part (b) reads—

- (b) Because action to provide shelters for homeless Aborigines in the metropolitan area is being taken by the New Era Aboriginal Fellowship, officers of the Community Welfare Department and the Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs, and a shelter is now

in operation to meet this need and to test the most effective way of managing this type of facility. The shelter is located in Norbett Street, East Perth, and is being run on a day-to-day basis by Sister Bernadine, a nun of the Sisters of Mercy.

Then part (c) asked—

- (c) will the Minister undertake to have this matter investigated immediately?

To which the Minister replied—

- (c) The matter is under continuing review. It is felt that the present development is adequate at this stage and it is not appropriate to plan a similar facility in the Swan District area.

That was on the 13th August. On the 11th September, 1975, I asked the Minister for Community Welfare the following question—

Further to the reply to my question of the 13th August, 1975, concerning the urgent need for hostel accommodation for homeless Aboriginal people in the Swan district—

- (1) Is it a fact that Commonwealth funds available for Aboriginal hostels were not used in this State during the last financial year?

The reply to part (1) was "No". Part (2) asked "If so, why?" to which the Minister replied—

- (2) During the last financial year no moneys were allocated by the Commonwealth Government to my department for the provision of accommodation for homeless Aboriginal people in the Perth Metropolitan Area. Money was allocated to the New Era Aboriginal Fellowship in order to set up a facility at Norbett Street, East Perth. Officers of my department provided support and advice to the organisation concerned. The facility is now in operation.

I then asked—

- (3) What is the action being taken referred to by the Minister in (b) of his reply of the 13th August?

To which the Minister replied—

- (3) The Commonwealth Government has provided funds for my department to appoint a specialist team of four officers who will work in close conjunction with the Aboriginal Advancement Council seeking solutions to the problems faced by and the needs of the homeless Aborigines in Perth.

Finally part (4) of the question reads—

- (4) As the shelter being provided by St. Norbett's in East Perth cannot be related to the needs of

people living in the Swan district, will the Minister have these needs investigated urgently?

And the Minister's reply to that part was—

- (4) The specialist officers referred to in my reply to the previous question will be looking into that very problem.

Well, Mr President, seven months ago I thought finally we were getting some action on the matter I had raised about 20 months previously. However, on the 1st April, 1976, I asked the Minister—

Further to my question of the 11th September, 1975, concerning hostel accommodation for homeless Aboriginal people and the Minister's reply indicating the appointment of a specialist team of four officers to study the problem and seek a solution, will the Minister advise—

- (1) Whether the team has brought down a report yet;
- (2) If not, when is it anticipated it will do so?

I was absolutely disgusted with the reply I received. It reads—

- (1) No.
- (2) There have been difficulties in proceeding with appointments owing to delays brought about in the clearance of funds and because of political changes. At the present time only two of the team have been appointed. Interviews currently are being conducted and it is anticipated further appointments will be made shortly, thereby enabling the team to commence its task. I expect to review progress reports at six monthly intervals. A final report will be submitted to the Minister at the termination of the project in three years' time.

I finally thought last year that eventually we would have something done about this matter I raised back in August, 1974. However, here we are, seven months later, when I thought a report would have been brought down and some action taken to provide shelter for these people, and we are told that the team has not even been appointed, it has not started work.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Several of these officers have started work.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: That is just not good enough, Mr Minister. These people are desperately in need of shelter and yet the Government is fiddling around talking about appointing teams.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: From where do we get the money?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I would rather see the money spent on providing a shelter than appointing more teams, if it is going to take this long.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The amount spent on the teams would not be a fraction of that necessary for a shelter.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: There is a shelter at Kalgoorlie, and it is run by the Little Sisters of the Poor.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: That is right.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: It is providing shelter for these people. Why cannot it be based on something like that?

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Do you know how much it cost when it was built years ago?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: No, I do not know.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Of course you do not know! It cost \$54 000 to build, some years ago.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: There is a much heavier cost in human illness and suffering because we are not providing these shelters.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You asked the Department of Aboriginal Affairs under your Federal Government to come up with the money, but you just did not get any.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: There is a wonderful Sister working her heart out in an understaffed and totally inadequate home in East Perth; the Minister referred to this person in an answer to a question I asked of him last year. Sister Bernadine is running this home for Aboriginal alcoholics. Originally, the centre was supposed to cater for only 12 people, but she is desperately trying to find more space for other people, because there are so many of them. It would do members of this Chamber some good to go down and talk to Sister Bernadine and see exactly the sort of work she is doing, trying to help these people.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I am attending to that matter at the moment; I am hopeful of obtaining further accommodation in this area.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I have with me some photographs of the type of people who go to Sister Bernadine's centre.

The PRESIDENT: What does the honourable member wish to do with the photographs?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I should like them passed around the Chamber so that members can look at them while I am speaking.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: It would be a good idea if the honourable member tabled the photographs.

*Sitting suspended from 3.32 to 4.11 p.m.*

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Before the afternoon tea suspension I passed around some photographs—which I hope all members have had an opportunity to view—on

the backs of which are the names of the various people in the photographs. They were given to me by Sister Bernardine with a little information about each of the people involved, and I would like to read two or three of the stories. The first one is about Peg. I have marked on the back who she is. The following information Sister Bernardine gave me—

... until 5 years ago she didn't touch a drink. She was working up North and she was a first class cook, I can vouch for that. She came down to Perth, she got lost in the city and took to drink. She is a middle-aged lady as you can see. She is a beautiful person, she has dignity, she is the kind of person who would pay her way. When she stays with us she always pays her money, as soon as her cheque comes she pays it. She is so well known for honesty that a certain shop in the area would always give her credit, because again she pays the moment the cheque comes. But Peg has lots of problems and for two years before our home opened she lived in the East Perth cemetery. The only shelter she had was the tombstones.

Then there is Terry, who also appears in the photographs and, as members can see, he is rather well dressed. The following is the information about Terry—

He was on his way to court. He is an epileptic beside an alcoholic, he is staying at our home, and he is a sick man. He is 60. He is worthy of better I'd say. He is trying to rehabilitate. He dreaded prison where he had already been several times for alcoholism. He dreaded the very thought of being confined and the degradation of prison. He longs to come out. He is a person who likes to do things for others. He would give you a hand around the house. He has just got his suit out of the drycleaners, he had put it there himself. He wanted to express I suppose that he has dignity. He likes a clean suit, and yet if our home hadn't taken him in Terry would be living where he is sitting at the moment as seen in this kitchen picture.

The following information concerns Roger, who also appears in the photographs—

Roger is a young boy of 29. He has done work for the various Councils. He would like to work but then he fell into alcoholism and he is a very ill man, not very likely to live very long. Kidneys, liver infection and had rheumatic fever when he was younger and he has ulcers. He too, came from the cemetery as I mentioned with Peggy. In a fit of the D.T.'s he severely damaged his hand through banging it on a door. It is practically impossible for him to get the use of his hand back because he fell several times. He is a very very

fine boy when he doesn't drink. He hates drinking and he would like to overcome the problem but he needs more help. We need a separate house to put the likes of Roger and Peggy in so that they can be together but near enough to us to give them the support that they temporarily need. He is to my mind very well worth helping. I think he has a lot to contribute to our society, as there have been times at home when he has helped me greatly in soothing down arguments or showing people around he has an innate natural courtesy and it seems a shame it has to end up on this dump.

Josie is another who appears in the picture and, about her, Sister Bernardine says—

Josie hasn't got a home, at one time she did have one. She just has to roam around as best she can. She has a little child about 4-6 years of age... When Josie did have a home, she had a mother with her but her mother had a breakdown and eventually they had to leave the home and her mother roams around too, she has been twice back to Graylands in 1975 but when she comes out that poor woman has nowhere to go so it is not very long before she is back into Graylands, or she should be back in to Graylands.

Sister Bernardine has given me story after story about these people. I was going to read these to the House, but have decided it would be preferable if I sent a copy to the Minister for Community Welfare.

What I am appealing to him to do is to take this question seriously. Not a great deal of money would be involved, I understand that at the moment there is a house available at the back of St. Norbett's for approximately \$20 000. This is not a great deal to ask the Government to pay to increase the facilities available to Sister Bernardine.

Other things can also be done to make more places available for these people who are at present living in the cemetery, under bridges, on the banks of the river, or, as can be seen in this picture, in the paddock, as it is called, outside Sister Bernardine's place because she cannot accommodate them.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I sympathise with your cause, but you are asking for \$20 000 for one particular area. Through the President, I must advise you that we have, in our area, far more Aborigines with an alcohol problem than you have in the city.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: That may be so and that is the honourable member's problem. I sympathise with anyone who is sick or homeless. The State should do something for all of them, wherever they

might be. However, the ones I have seen are those closest to me in the metropolitan area. It seems so wrong to me that in this day and age and in this so-called affluent society these people must wander around with all these sicknesses in all kinds of weather; and the Government merely says to them, "Sorry, but we do not have enough money to provide shelter for you."

Still on the question of Aborigines, I must say I was shocked and disappointed at the action of the Minister for Transport in respect of his decision to demolish the old station master's house at Guildford. This matter has received some publicity in the Press so no doubt members will be aware of it. The brick building was perfectly sound and the Railways Department, or Westrail, decided it had no further use for it and would knock it down. A deputation of reputable people from Guildford including members of the Swansee Noon-gars, an Aboriginal organisation, and other residents in Guildford, waited on the Minister for Transport and begged him not to have the place knocked down.

In the first place it had some historical significance to the area, but, most importantly, it was needed as a community centre for Aboriginal people. There is a fairly large concentration of these people in the Guildford area and up to this time they have had nothing to call their own. This building could have been used as a focal point for them. The centre was to be run by the Swansee Noongars which is a responsible organisation with some funds it was prepared to spend to undertake any necessary renovations.

The Government would not have had to pay out one cent had it agreed to leave the house standing and hand it over to the organisation to be used as a centre. However, unfortunately, the Minister, for reasons best known to himself, decided not to agree to the request and, with what I regard as indecent haste, had the perfectly sound building demolished.

The Swan Shire Council has come to the party and put the Government to shame by indicating that the Swansee Noongars can use the old courthouse for two days a week at this stage. But I was absolutely disgusted with the decision of the Minister and I still cannot understand what motivated him to have the house demolished.

He said it was because of the safety factor, which was a lot of nonsense because there is a bitumen path going right across the railway line in front of where that house stood, which was used by Aboriginal people and non-Aboriginal people alike for many years. It was just an excuse and we find it very hard to understand why he insisted on having the building demolished.

Another problem which is of serious concern to the people of my electorate is the smells which the people of Midland

have had to put up with for so long. For far too long the people in Midland and surrounding districts have been subjected to these revolting smells which cause them and their families distress. It is not a joke or a funny subject; it is a very serious matter because it has made many people ill.

For many years they have been promised action. Each time it has been said steps would be taken to eliminate the problem within a few months. I have in my possession a file which goes back some 10 years and which will confirm what I am saying. Meetings have been held, petitions have been raised, deputations have taken place, and questions have been asked in Parliament; but the problem is still with us.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Which came first, the people or the abattoir?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: With the equipment that has been put in the problem should have been removed, but it has actually become worse in recent years. Although several smaller industries have offended in this regard, the major and most consistent offender has been the Midland Junction Abattoir.

I have a fairly lengthy report which details where the problem has emanated from over the past few years. Each time a report has been made that smells have been evident, someone from the Health Department or the local shire council has gone to the abattoir to try to detect the source of the smells. There has been consistent evidence of breakdowns in the machinery in the dry rendering plant and the effluent disposal plant.

In the *Swan Express* of the 16th January last year we saw assurances by the abattoir board that the abattoir was well on the way to overcoming its major odour problems. We were told changes were being made in respect of the installation of a condenser and afterburner which would eradicate once and for all the odours emanating from the dry rendering operation—that is, the offal cooking process. But what did we find? On the 26th November, 1975, it was reported that the afterburner had not been operating since the 24th November and a large volume of vapour from raw materials had been escaping into the atmosphere. The afterburner was an essential piece of equipment to remove odours from the cooking process. On the 28th November the afterburner was still not operating because the plant was defective and lacking in maintenance. On the 12th December the temperature in the afterburner fell from 760 degrees centigrade to 540 degrees centigrade. On the 17th January the afterburner was adjusted but was still failing to 560 degrees centigrade, and so on. It is a record of breakdowns and inadequate maintenance in the dry rendering process, which is one of the major sources of

the smells emanating from the abattoir, although we were promised by the abattoir board that the smells would be eradicated once and for all.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Do you think we should close down the Midland Junction Abattoir and have the killing done in the country?

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: I am not an expert. I can only look at reports that have come in about the defective machinery in the dry rendering process and the effluent disposal plant which is not coping. Whether it is due to inadequate machinery, poor maintenance, or overloading, I am not sure. I intended to raise this question later on. However, I will deal with it now.

Back in 1970 the Brand Government commissioned a report from two experts named Towns and Austen to advise on abattoir facilities. Those two gentlemen came to this State and made a definite recommendation to the Brand Government that it should not increase the daily sheep and lamb capacity at the Midland Junction Abattoir beyond 8 000. That was a firm recommendation by Towns and Austen. But after seeking the advice of the experts the Government of the day completely rejected the recommendation and entered into contracts, which were binding on the incoming Labor Government, to increase the daily sheep and lamb capacity to 12 000—an increase of 50 per cent.

I do not know whether or not the Midland Junction Abattoir is being overloaded because of this. Some of the reports from the health inspectors seem to indicate it is being overloaded because there are references to excessive kills and over-kills, the fact that offal is being held over and putrefying, and so on. The advice of the experts and the fact that the equipment is continually breaking down seem to indicate the abattoir is being overloaded. If that is so, it is about time the Government started considering what to do about it.

The Tonkin Government set aside land at Baldvils for another abattoir and I would like to know whether the present Government has plans to build another facility there, perhaps to reduce the load at the Midland Junction Abattoir.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Your Deputy Premier at that time said there was no need for increased killing capacity.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Certainly not at Midland.

The Hon. N. McNeill: He meant generally.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: We were bound by the contracts that had been let to go ahead with the Midland Junction Abattoir but at the same time land at Baldvils was set aside by the Labor Government for future abattoir facilities. I think it is time the present Government

started looking at this question because there is a very distinct possibility that the Midland Junction Abattoir is being overloaded and that this is the reason for much of the trouble.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I think the site at Baldvils was selected by the Brand Government.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: I am assured by the previous Minister for Agriculture it was acquired by the Labor Government.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: It was done when Sir Crawford Nalder was Minister.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: I am surprised to hear that because my information is it was acquired by the Tonkin Government. The current panacea for all the problems at Midland is the appointment of an expert to supervise the effluent disposal plant. I hope it is successful and that this gentleman will be able to overcome the problems in that part of the abattoir; but I am not aware that any reference has been made to the dry rendering process which is also causing a problem. I do not know whether this is just another bit of patching up, whether we are tackling the basic problem, or whether overloading has taken place, but it is about time something was done to relieve the people in the area of this disgusting, unhealthy air pollution.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: It has been going on for a long time, but I do not think it has killed anyone yet.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: That is no justification for it to continue.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Did it continue during the three years of the Labor Government?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It has been going on for 10 years.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: I have already indicated that the hands of the Labor Government were tied because contracts had already been let. All it could do was to try to install machinery on the advice of people at the abattoir in an endeavour to overcome the problem in the effluent disposal and the afterburner processes. However, when a Government has been committed by a previous Government it is in a difficult position.

I would like to move on to the question of the employment of middle-aged women. A 55-year-old lady visited me recently. She had been retrained under the NEAT scheme. Her husband was a pensioner and she was forced to become the family breadwinner. However, after being trained as a bookkeeper she found it very difficult to find employment. First of all the employment agencies were not interested in any person over 40 years of age; and, secondly, she found that Government policy is that when a senior retires everyone else moves up and a 15-year old is employed at the bottom. I think that is roughly the policy of the Government.

Many women become family bread-winners while they are in their 40s and 50s, either because of their husbands' ill-health or because they are widowed or separated. They should be given the opportunity to work, and their opportunities should not be limited by the age factor. I appeal to the Government to look at this question and to relax any restrictions that might exist in respect of the employing of mature-age women.

Another matter which has come to my notice recently is the lack of emergency shelter for women and children in distress. I believe there are about four shelters which are run by private, voluntary organisations. Several weekends ago I received a phone call about a woman with three small children who had been thrown out of her family home by a drunken husband. She had nowhere to go, had no furniture, no money, and no food.

She could not afford to go to a hotel and could not afford a flat because she had no furniture and no money for food. All I could do was to try to get her into an emergency shelter for women and children. However, I had a terrible job because every one of them seemed to be packed to capacity. It occurred to me that possibly this woman was one of many people who could find themselves in the same position but whom we may never get to hear about. I do not know what on earth happens to them if they have no family or friends to take them in. In that case there is a danger that the children could be taken from the mother by community welfare officers and put into homes.

Therefore, another matter the Government should be looking at is the question of more night shelters for women and children in distress.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: If such people approach community welfare, they will do their best to help them find accommodation and will also give them an advance for food.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: This occurred during a weekend and we rang the Community Welfare Department emergency number. I know there was not much help offering. Eventually towards the end of the day by sheer luck we were able to get her into a night shelter because someone else moved out at the last minute. As I said, the Community Welfare Department was phoned and although I do not recall the details of the suggestions made, the people concerned certainly did not have any effective answers to the problem. I think they suggested that the children could go to Bridgewater or somewhere like that.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: That would relieve the situation for the children in the meantime.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The mother would not want that to happen.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: It is not a place of detention.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I know, but no mother wants to be separated from her children, and they should not be placed in this position.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I could not agree more.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: There is one final matter I wish to deal with before I conclude. It is a matter I have already raised in this Chamber and concerns the mental health patients who are accommodated in privately-run hostels.

First of all I would like to say I am very glad that, from information received from the Minister and the department, action is being taken to clean up sub-standard hostels which do not care adequately for the residents in them. However, I was disappointed that in his reply to my question the Minister did not give an undertaking that he would introduce the proposed legislation without delay. This could go on for months, and I think it is vital that it be introduced immediately.

Secondly, I still believe an inquiry should be held to which patients, relatives of patients and others who have a grievance against a hostel may air their grievances.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: It would not tell us any more than we already know and it would be wasting money.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: It could tell the Minister a great deal; I am sure many things would come out.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Didn't someone tell you that one hostel said it had never been visited, but in fact it was visited five times in a week?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: That was stated on a television programme. However, there is no question that things are going on which are to the detriment of the residents, and these should be stopped. If there has been constant supervision and surveillance of the hostels, why has it been left until recent times to correct these matters?

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Why wasn't legislation introduced in your Government's term?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I think it was being drawn up by our Government.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: It was mooted before your Government came to office, but nothing was done during those three years.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I thought Mr Davies, the Minister for Health in our Government, was attending to this matter. However, let us not go back to the past; I am concerned that something be done for these people as quickly as possible and that the whole matter is not just be left until legislation is passed. It is just not possible for social workers and other

officials during infrequent visits to hostels to be able to see everything that is going on.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Legislation will not cure all the ills.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: That is my next point. First of all, I think it is essential that legislation be introduced immediately to lay down standards for these places.

The other thing we must do is establish some form of visitors' board. I discussed this with the Minister last night. In addition to the departmental or official visitors, I think other people from outside should visit regularly and talk with the people concerned. It could be a group of voluntary visitors who would call on the residents of these homes, most of whom are poor, forgotten souls with no family or friends and no-one to whom to tell their troubles. If they have someone they can regard as a friend and to whom they can tell their complaints we might get to hear a lot more than we have in the past. I feel many people are scared to talk to official visitors from the department because they think in some way they may be victimised.

Since I first raised this issue in Parliament I have had many people telephone me and tell me the most dreadful things that have occurred. I cannot talk about one particular instance because it is *sub judice* at the moment. Had this matter been attended to a long time ago a person who is dead might be alive today, and she might not have received the terrible treatment she received over a long period. I do not want to go into that particular case; all I can say is that it is not sufficient merely to have departmental officials visiting the hostels, there must be some organisation of voluntary visitors set up. I envisage these visitors would be looked upon as friends by the residents of these hostels. They would gain the confidence of these people and would immediately report to the department anything that is wrong.

For example—and this is the sort of thing that may not be picked up by a departmental visitor—in one of the hostels Public Trustee cheques sent to these people were being stolen. The people meant to receive the cheques were not getting them; they were being fooled into signing the cheques over to someone else. The amounts involved were not very large; they ranged from \$7 to \$10. However, they were meant to enable the persons concerned to buy cigarettes and other personal needs. Instead of their receiving this money to spend on things to make life a little more pleasant and bearable, we have this miserable and mean situation of the money being stolen from them.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Once we get legislation, that is something we can check on.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I hope so. It should be very carefully investigated to ensure this type of thing does not happen again. I am not sure whether this would be observed by a person from the department. There are many mean little actions that make life miserable for these people.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: They would not know who is getting a cheque of that nature.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I think it could be checked through the Public Trustee. That office would know to whom the cheques are sent. That is only one example of the many ways in which these poor people have been exploited, and this has got to be stopped. This matter needs to be investigated so that the people concerned are cared for and have someone they can regard as a friend to tell their problems to and whom they can tell if something mean is being done to them, or if they are being underfed.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: That is what we are attempting to do.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I hope the Minister will agree to these suggestions and that legislation will be introduced without further delay. I support the motion.

**THE HON. T. O. PERRY** (Lower Central) [4.43 p.m.]: I rise to support the motion moved by the Hon. Margaret McAleer. I was interested in many of the matters she referred to, particularly in respect of local government. However, before I continue I would like to support a comment made by the Hon. Lyla Elliott in respect of the old age pension.

Somewhere in my file of newspaper cuttings there is an article which appeared at election time in which a promise is made that old age pensions would be reviewed regularly and that adjustments would be instant and automatic. That promise was made by the present Federal Government during the last election. I think it is contemptible that a section of our community who are disadvantaged and are not able to look after themselves as well as the rest of us can, were chosen to be the means of a saving of \$29 million by the deferment of the increase in the old age pension.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: They even refused the Consumer Price Index. I think it brought it from 6.4 to 6.2 per cent.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: Mr Cooley has studied that, but I am not aware of it.

Much has been said in this Chamber about the superphosphate bounty. I think one point has been missed, but to emphasise the misleading statements that are made I should like to read a few newspaper reports. In the 26th March, 1976, an article appeared in *The West Australian* headed "Whitlam in attack on bounty". It goes on to say that the superphosphate subsidy

was paid to wealthy farmers and graziers. That is a lot of rot; it is not paid to farmers and it is not paid to graziers. In *The Sunday Times* of the 15th February, 1976, in the Cassandra column appeared the following, under the heading "Super bounty irks some"—

Do not be surprised if you hear some farmers moaning that the reintroduction of the superphosphate bounty will not help them much.

In many cases it will not.

Take the example of a small dairy farmer who uses 10 tonnes of superphosphate on his grazing country to boost his milk yield.

On today's costs he probably parts with about \$600 to buy super and have it spread. He gets just over \$1 000 back from the Government.

What rot! Who checks these items before they are published in a newspaper?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: No-one.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: A farmer spending \$600 gets \$1 000 back from the superphosphate—

The Hon. R. Thompson: You would not believe anything that *The Sunday Times* ever printed.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: A friend of mine called on *The Sunday Times* and saw a Mr Dunn. He pointed out that the article was incorrect.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It is the worst newspaper in Australia.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: A small correction appeared the following week in the Cassandra column. It read—

... last week a figure of \$1 000—given as the approximate bounty on superphosphate for which a dairy farmer paid \$600—was printed instead of \$100.

That is getting nearer the mark. The newspaper did not go on to correct other parts of the statement that were pointed out as being totally incorrect. When Mr Dunn of *The Sunday Times* was asked why this type of article was published in the newspaper his reply was that it was to stir up feelings between city and rural people. What an ambition! Surely to God we can get the truth over and explain why the subsidy is paid.

I should like to go back a little in history; before the Farmers' Union was formed in Western Australia. Mr Heitman knows about the old primary producers' association. My father was chosen to investigate the price of superphosphate in England. He got a quote for superphosphate landed in Australia which was cheaper than we could manufacture it in Australia. He wrote and asked for a quote for 22 per cent superphosphate and the reply he received—I have the old letter

at home—was that they did not manufacture 22 per cent superphosphate in England; they manufactured 28 per cent superphosphate, a much higher grade.

When superphosphate could be manufactured and landed here in Australia cheaper than we could produce it, what did the Government of the day do? It put on a tariff against the imported superphosphate and gave a subsidy to the manufacturers of superphosphate—not to the farmer. It was never paid to the farmer.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Why did they storm Forrest Place?

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: The bounty goes to the manufacturer of superphosphate. The manufacturer used this money to help pay union wage demands which enables manufacturers to employ labour in the industry. If it were not for the bounty there would be no superphosphate industry in Australia.

We talk a lot about handouts to the farmer, but there is another side to this matter. I shall quote now from the *Western Farmer and Grazier* of the 25th March, 1976. The article reads—

Tariff protection of Australian industries stung farmers \$4 000 a head in a single financial year.

That is a total of \$543 million in a year. I think the superphosphate subsidy this financial year—Mr Wordsworth was quoting figures last night—will amount to a paltry \$30 million. But the farmer is disadvantaged; tariff protection is costing him \$543 million in a financial year. Yet Mr Dunn of *The Sunday Times* has the audacity to admit that *The Sunday Times* prints this type of article to stir up feelings between our rural and city dwellers.

Mr President, farming is darn hard work. Those people who were engaged in the industry prior to the Second World War, such as Mr Heitman and Mr Gayfer, when we were not as mechanised as we are today and most of the work was done manually, will tell members how hard the work was.

I am concerned that some farm advisers—one lives not very far from where I live—are suggesting from time to time that if only farmers were to plan and organise they could sit on the verandah and tend their farms. I should like to quote from a letter in the *Western Farmer and Grazier* of the 25th March, 1976. It reads—

I wish to comment on the supposedly "stunted" sheep as grown by followers of Bob Hall.

Bob Hall is the farmers' adviser. To continue—

In actual fact it was Brian Carlan, who in the early 1960s told my husband that if he upped his stocking rate "he could sit on the verandah and watch his money grow".



That is wonderful in theory. To continue—

My husband took his advice, as did many others in the district, and stunted sheep notwithstanding has remained in business ever since.

I do not know whether having stunted sheep on one's farm is anything to be proud of. The lease of the farm which the man who was given this advice had been farming for a number of years recently expired; and either he had to sell the sheep on the farm or send them somewhere else. He knew that he could not send them to market because nobody would buy them. So he begged the person whose property he had been leasing to buy the sheep. That person did not want them so he had turn them into the bush. He was offered 20c a head for them. A farming adviser is paid \$300 or \$400 a year to tell one how to farm and yet his advice is that sheep at this time are worth 20c a head. My son has 500 wethers and recently he was told, "Take the wool off them and we will give you \$10 a head." This happened in the same district with the same rainfall.

Bob Hall had been talking of a farmer in the district who was boasting of being off the farm for eight weeks and yet the farm went on with no problems. He did not say that the farmer's old father looked after the sheep regularly and milked the cow and that there was always somebody there to do the work. Time and time again this farming adviser is saying that farmers can be absent from the farm for six months in the year and can spend the other six months on the farm. Mr Hall takes *Hansard* so he will read what I am saying. I am not using parliamentary privilege because he will be reading it in good time.

I think I have told this story once before, but I must repeat it. I was talked into joining the farming advisory group. My young brother was a member of the pasture improvement group which first formed the farming advisory group. When I was approached to join I said, "No, I have farmed a certain way all my life. I might not be a very efficient farmer but I get a lot of satisfaction out of doing things my way." The group could not get enough members so eventually I joined. As I was not very enthusiastic the farm adviser left me until last to visit. This was Mr Hall's predecessor.

The day he called I was working in the paddock. He drove to the house and my wife directed him to where I was working. He drove through a mob of sheep. When he arrived the first words he said to me were, "I do not think you will get a very good lambing percentage out of that mob of sheep." I said, "How do you arrive at that decision?" He said, "They are much too fat." I run an all-wether flock and I was not expecting a very good lambing percentage! Those were

the first words the farm adviser said to me. I agreed with him completely; I could not contradict him. From the time I was a small boy and my father took me into his confidence and told me about the birds and the bees and the difference between males and females, somehow or other I got a hazy impression that one did not breed from wethers; but that was the first thing the farm adviser ever said to me. It was the first time we had ever agreed; and I agreed completely with what he said.

The sort of advice now given is, "Do not conserve hay, do not conserve grain; it is not necessary, you can run your sheep without it." Five or six years ago when wool prices were very low Mr Hall said, "Wool will be grown in the district at 10 pence a pound or less." That was in the days before decimal currency. In the depression days I think we got about 10 pence a pound but there were not very many prosperous farmers.

At that time, when farmers were trying to economise, the advice to farmers was "Do not crutch or drench your sheep because it is too expensive." Now there is a new theory—"Do not dress fly-blown sheep because that is nature's way of killing off those sheep which are susceptible to fly strike. Do not help any ewes which have trouble lambing because that is nature's way of killing off those ewes." Of course the answer is to get off one's backside and look after the sheep. One would be much better off.

The letter from which I quoted goes on to deal with chain shearing and compassion. It refers to a method of hanging sheep by their legs and trying to get the wool off. I was not very impressed. The letter talks about cruelty to sheep and yet the farm advisory service tells them not to dress fly-blown sheep. We all know what happens if we do not: the crows come along and pick out the eyes and foxes eat holes in the sheep while they are alive. Yet the letter talks about compassion.

In the early days the Englishmen came out here and introduced the rabbit because they wanted a bit of rabbit shooting. We know what a curse that was. They brought out foxes because they wanted fox hunting and we learnt what a curse that was. Of course, the biggest curse that ever came to this country is the farm adviser. I wish to God they would be sent back to where they came from because they have nothing to offer. I used to defend them. I once said that if the average farmer was very careful with budgeting, the farm adviser had a part to play. Then the next-door-farmer told me the farm adviser was \$30 000 out in his budget. He runs 18 000 or 20 000 sheep and his farm adviser was \$30 000 out in his budget! I do not think they are of any advantage to any farmer.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It appears to me they have been successful only in breeding stunted sheep for the short leg market.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: I am concerned because I do not think that sort of talk does the farmers any good. I would not blame the wharf labourers, the Collie miners, or the timber workers who listen to those talks for believing that the farmers sit on their verandahs while they run their farms. If people believe the farmers run their farms in that manner they cannot be blamed for being concerned about the super bounty.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: They would not be listening to the talks, they would be out on the job.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: Yes, they would be far better off.

I would like to spend a few minutes talking about the dairying industry. Recently 75 quotas were granted to dairy farmers in this State, each quota being for 52 gallons of milk. Those quotas will be the salvation of many farmers engaged in dairying. I believe that shortly there will be another allocation of 52-gallon quotas to 75 farmers. A survey by the Department of Agriculture revealed that about 105 viable farmers will be eligible for the ballot for the 75 quotas. That means approximately 30 dairy farmers will miss out and will not receive a quota. I am rather disappointed because the Dairy Industry Authority recently granted to 440 existing quota holders an extra 5 gallons each. I understand that consideration is now being given to the granting of an additional 5 gallons to another 330 dairy farmers. That is a total of 3 850 gallons of milk.

If the quantity of milk involved in those extra quotas were granted to the existing producers an additional 70 dairy farmers would be granted a 52-gallon quota. As I said earlier, only about 30 dairy farmers will miss out on a quota when the final allocation is made. I consider that the surplus should not have been granted to the present quota holders.

A very long growing season is experienced in the Warren-Manjimup-Pemberton-Northcliffe area. The green season lasts for about 10 months of the year and I believe that area will be responsible for producing most of the whole milk of this State. I believe milk will be produced more cheaply there than in the irrigation areas on the west coast. Land is very costly on the west coast, and irrigation is very costly. I do not think that area will be able to produce milk as cheaply as the lower part of this State.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Have you taken into consideration the transport costs?

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: Yes, even taking those transport costs into consideration I think that will be so.

The Hon. N. McNeill: It did not apply with potatoes.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: I believe that in 20 or 30 years we will consider it to have been a mistake not to look after those farmers who are already in the industry.

The Hon. N. McNeill: That comment applied to the potato farmers also.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: Yes, that is so. I want to dwell for a minute or two on the grasshopper plague in Western Australia. I do not know that many people realise how prevalent grasshoppers are in the Kojonup-Katanning district. The grasshoppers are there in plague proportions and I have never seen them so bad. I think the attention of the Department of Agriculture should be drawn to the problem so that some action can be taken.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: I think the department forecast that there would be a plague.

The Hon. T. O. PERRY: Well, the forecast appears to be correct.

I now wish to voice a personal grievance. On the 25th May, 1975, a surveyor made application on my behalf to subdivide my farm and leave me with an area of 800 acres. Prior to any subdivision town planning approval must be obtained. Towards the end of 1975 the surveyor was notified that approval would not be granted because I wished to retain 800 acres for myself. It was considered that 800 acres was not a viable farming proposition.

I do not know who, in the Town Planning Department, decides whether or not an area of 800 acres is a viable proposition. Those responsible do not know that I will not establish a racing stable, for which purpose 800 acres would be more than enough. Those responsible do not know that I will not establish an orchard, or grow vegetables, or set up a piggery with 50 sows. I would be able to grow sufficient feed on that area of land for a piggery and I imagine that my income would be in excess of the Premier's present salary.

It seems that someone in the department decided that it would not be a viable proposition with only 800 acres. However, I know of men who have never farmed more than 100 acres and one man in particular has been able to bring up two sons and he has been to England. I have never had to apply for a farm development loan, or for a reconstruction loan, but I was considered to be not viable on an area of 800 acres.

I appealed to the Minister and as late as February, of this year, the decision was reversed.

What annoys me is that I come from a family the members of which live to 80 or 90 years of age. We have had a group of people plaguing us at Darkan every Sunday morning and if I believed them it seems the world is to end very soon and I will live to see the second coming of Christ. However, it seems I

will never live to see the day when some people in Government departments get off their backsides and do something.

The application for my subdivision was made on the 25th May, 1975, and a decision was not made until February, 1976. The surveyor concerned is no longer doing the job and is employed elsewhere. I think it is time somebody stirred up some of the people in Government departments so that decisions could be made much more quickly. I am now in two minds because my next door neighbour has offered me \$94 500 for my farm, which is not supposed to be viable. I ask who in the department concerned is qualified to make such a decision. Some of those people would not know a bee from a bull's foot but they try to tell me I am not a good farmer and I would not be viable on 800 acres of land. Do those people think I would want to keep 800 acres and not have a viable proposition? I have been farming all my life and I do not need a farm adviser. Time is moving on so with those few words I support the motion.

**THE HON. CLIVE GRIFFITHS** (South-East Metropolitan) [5.09 p.m.]: I want to make a few comments on the motion now before us. Firstly, I congratulate the Hon. Margaret McAleer on her very fine speech when she moved the Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech. She made an excellent speech and I am sure it did a great deal for the prestige of this Chamber in the eyes of those who were fortunate enough to witness the opening of Parliament on that occasion. Miss McAleer deserves to be congratulated for the competent manner in which she proposed the adoption of the motion.

I also congratulate the Hon. Ron Thompson for the very effective manner in which he carried out his responsibilities whilst Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber. I have always had a great personal regard for his capacity as a member of Parliament, although as he is aware we certainly have very great differences of opinion from time to time. However, I do respect the way in which he has carried out his responsibility as a representative of the people and, in particular, in his position as Leader of the Opposition.

I add my congratulations to those of other members to the Hon. Des Dans on his elevation to the position of Leader of the Opposition in this House. Since he has been in Parliament he has proved to be a competent debater and I believe he will make a very good Leader of the Opposition. I trust he holds that position for a long time! I also congratulate the Hon. Roy Cloughton who is now Opposition Whip.

I was somewhat astounded, during the course of this debate, to hear a member, while making his contribution, refer to the length of a speech which was made by another member. I refer to the Hon.

Ron Leeson when he said that a Federal member, in his maiden speech, spoke for a period of only 13 minutes; the implication being that that was not a very good contribution.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: The point he was making was that the member did not speak about the problems of the mining industry.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: He mentioned the time taken for the speech. I do not believe the length of a person's speech necessarily conveys the worthiness of that speech, or otherwise. Indeed, I sometimes think that the shorter a speech the better it is. I have often been told that is the case and some people have suggested I ought to take some notice of what has been said.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: I take it you will not speak for very long this evening.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I thought it was a strange comment to come from the Hon. Ron Leeson because he is not known for making long speeches.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: He makes good speeches.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: To make sure that I was not misjudging him, I did some checking and I find that he became a member in 1971. During that year he made only one speech which lasted for 17 minutes. Whilst that was four minutes longer than the speech about which he complained it did not seem to me to be significantly longer. The significance of my comment, of course, is that it was his only speech.

In 1972 Mr Leeson spoke for a total of 18 minutes during three speeches. I am not saying that what he said did not make a great contribution to the debates concerned. I am merely suggesting that the length of a speech certainly should not be one of the measures of its sincerity.

In 1973 the honourable member spoke on many occasions: on the first occasion for 14 minutes; on the second occasion for 11 minutes; on the third occasion for six minutes, on another occasion for six minutes, and on still another occasion for seven minutes. That made a total of 76 minutes in three years. I repeat: I am not saying that the length of those speeches indicates that the honourable member has not made some worth-while contribution in that time.

However, this indicates that he does not believe long speeches have any great merit. In fact, I could perhaps ask members whether or not the old proverb that a person living in a glass house should not throw stones is applicable in this case. The honourable member's record shows that he is not known for making long speeches. I venture to say I am sure that the Federal member for Kalgoorlie will go on for the rest of this particular session

of Parliament to make speeches of far greater length than those Mr Leeson has made on behalf of the people he represents.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Well, I hope he talks about the Kalgoorlie people when he does.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: He will not make many speeches in Kalgoorlie, you can be sure of that!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am led to believe that that particular member is very popular and knowledgeable—

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Popular with *The Australian* in any case—it reported the whole of his speech.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: —and he thrashed the sitting member as a result of his popularity in Kalgoorlie and other places. However, the proof of the pudding will be in the eating and I am certainly not one to forecast for how long Mr Cotter will remain a member. I am commenting merely that it is unfair for an honourable member with a track record such as that of Mr Leeson for his first three years to comment that the Federal member for Kalgoorlie's speech lasted for only 13 minutes.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: What was left out of it?

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Imagine Mr Cotter not wanting to mention Kalgoorlie.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: In my opinion Mr Cotter is a good member of Parliament, and he will continue to represent that area for a long time.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You say he is a good member of Parliament, but he has been a member for only 100 days, and he has spent less than that time in Parliament.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: How long does a member have to be in Parliament to be proven good or otherwise?

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I have been here for two years, and I would not like to be judged yet.

The Hon. N. McNeill: He has been a very good representative of the area for a long time.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: That is not the point I was making. I am simply stating in defence of Mr Cotter that because his maiden speech lasted for 13 minutes only, it is no indication he is not a good member for Kalgoorlie.

I wish to speak tonight about the Education Department. Already this year I have had some run-ins with certain members of the Education Department, and particularly at the opening of the school year when some of the children who had previously attended the Kinlock Primary School—and attended it for the whole of their school lives—were precluded from

attending it this year. As a result of my representations, the Minister indicated he was prepared to reconsider the decision, and a solution was arrived at quickly, and everyone was happy. At the time I was critical of the fact that departmental officers were not prepared to take notice of the representations made and it was only through my speaking to the Minister and his consequent intervention that action was taken. I am grateful to the Minister for his assistance.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are a very persistent worker for your area.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am grateful for what the Minister has done for the people in my electorate. Always the Minister has indicated to me his desire to make himself familiar with any problems I bring to his notice.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You have gone far enough—we have got the message.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: For example, the Minister has been prepared to visit my area in regard to any problems, and he will report quickly about whether or not he is able to help. Not always has he done what I wanted him to do, but nevertheless he has put himself out to investigate any problems. While the Education Department is in his hands, it is in good hands.

I was pleased indeed to see the recent announcement that a \$1.5 million integrated education facility was proposed, to cater for physically handicapped children south of the Swan River, and that this facility will be built by the State Government at Willetton, with a proposed opening in the second half of 1977.

This education complex will be planned by the Education Department and it will contain educational and medical facilities as well as physiotherapy and occupational therapy services.

This centre was recommended by the Council for Special Education so that handicapped children, including spastic children, could be educated as near as possible to their homes. The Willetton project will not supersede the Sir James Mitchell Spastic Centre, but it will help alleviate the cramped conditions at the Mt. Lawley centre by relieving the pressure on its accommodation. The complex at Willetton will include the Burrendah primary school and pre-primary centre which are now under construction, as well as a high school which is planned for the site. The primary and secondary schools will be built to cater for physically handicapped children so that they can be integrated into the schools' programmes. This is not merely an educational centre catering for children of all ages; it is also, as I said earlier, a centre to provide a community service on a continuous basis. It

will incorporate physiotherapy, occupational therapy, psychological services, social worker services, speech therapy, and medical services. Each of these sectors will have space provided and specialised equipment. I am sure this particular type of facility will serve as a model for the future development of special education—

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: The department has the South Australian development as a model to follow.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: As I said, this facility will serve as a model for the future development of special education in Western Australia. I want to congratulate the Minister for his move in this direction.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Thank you.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am very happy to report also that the Minister was instrumental in setting up a working party to advise him about the community use of schools. In my opinion too little use has been made of our schools for many years. The facilities provided could be made available to the community for use after school hours and at weekends. So much of the taxpayers' money is tied to these facilities, I feel they ought to have access to them.

The Minister recently called a meeting to gather together various groups of people including representatives of local authorities, the Community Recreation Council, the Council for State School Organisations, the Local Government Association, the State School Teachers' Union, and several other bodies. It was proposed that a working plan be formulated to enable the facilities to be made available to the community, other than during school hours, much more readily than hitherto has been the case.

Another matter upon which I would like to commend the Government—and again I say this action would have been initiated by the Minister for Education—is the fact that the Treasurer has made available to the department an advance allocation of loan funds to the extent of some \$10 million in order to permit the early commencement of projects for the next school year. Of course, this action has several great advantages, not the least of which is a tendency to beat inflation because the work is spread over a greater period of time and the department does not find it is competing against itself for the available services from builders in this field.

While I am discussing the Minister for Education, I might say I was pleased to see the comment he made—quite hastily to scotch a rumour—that it was not this Government's intention to reintroduce fees for tertiary admission examinations. The Minister said quite categorically that it was not the intention of the Government to impose fees for these examinations. Possibly this rumour was started by the

same people who recently spread the mischievous rumour that the Federal Government intended to reintroduce fees for tertiary institutions.

I am sorry to see that the State Government was able to prevail upon the Commonwealth Government not to proceed with the inquiry into the extension of the Kwinana Freeway. I was disappointed about this. I have said before and I repeat: I am quite certain the extension of the freeway, as proposed, will not solve the problems currently existing. Time will show that we have made an irreparable mistake in regard to this extension. I was very grateful to the Federal Minister who came to Western Australia. He spoke to the Premier and other Ministers, and I was pleased that he was prepared to allow me some time to make my comments to him to ensure that he heard both sides of the story.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Which Minister was that?

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Mr Berinson?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: No, the current Minister.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Mr Jones of the Labor Government?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: No, they are ex-Ministers, and some are ex-members of Parliament.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Mr Jones wanted an inquiry.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I wish the interjector had not asked me that question!

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Mr Nixon—the Minister for Transport?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: It was not he. It was the Minister for the Environment and Conservation.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That is Greenwood.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: It does not really matter, but the fact is he was prepared to see me and to let me put my side of the story to him. He was here on a very short visit, and he was gracious enough to see me at his hotel one evening. When he returned to Canberra, he wrote to explain the situation. Although he was unable to indicate the final outcome at that stage, I was grateful that he was prepared to see me at such short notice and permit me sufficient time to put forward a submission on behalf of the people who felt the State Government is doing the wrong thing.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Senator Greenwood is the Minister for the Environment.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Yes, it was Senator Greenwood.

Another matter to which I wish to refer concerns consumer protection. I believe there is a limit to which Parliaments can

go in making laws to protect people from themselves. However, I equally believe there is a great responsibility on the part of the business community not to exploit people and certainly not just to trade only within the confines of the laws which control their activities.

I should like to recount to the House an incident involving a used car dealer. Before I proceed, I point out that this would not apply to all dealers; indeed, I believe it would occur in only a small minority of cases. As members know, the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act provides amongst other things that if a dealer sells a motorcar for a price in excess of \$500, he must provide some sort of warranty; however, if the car is priced at under \$500, he is not obliged to do so. We debated this provision when the Bill was before the Parliament, and everybody understood what it meant; indeed, it was quite clear to me.

However, the trader who does what I am about to recount gets no marks in my book for being a decent businessman; namely, to assume that because a motorcar is priced at under \$500, and does not require a warranty, the dealer has no obligation whatsoever to the purchaser. Whether a person purchases a motorcar for \$100 or \$495, he is entitled to expect that motorcar to go and to do at least some of the things a motorcar is supposed to do.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Not necessarily.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am suggesting that it is necessary. Of course, this would not apply if a person went along to another person who was wrecking a motorcar and said he wanted to buy a particular part. But if a person purchases a motorcar for \$495, to drive backwards and forwards to work I do not believe it would be unreasonable to expect that the motorcar should give some sort of indication that it would take him backwards and forwards to work.

Members might say, "How could somebody buy a motorcar under these circumstances?" It can happen, as the following case shows. The case in itself is not important, but the principle is very important. A person whose son worked in the north of Western Australia wished to purchase a cheap motorcar for his son to drive when he came down to Perth during his annual leave. The family had only one car, and the father decided to buy his son a vehicle for around \$450 to use during the three or four weeks of his stay in Perth and, when he returned to the north, the car could be sold for a couple of hundred dollars. That was not an unreasonable suggestion; indeed, it was quite a charitable thought on the part of the father.

This person went around and saw several people and told them precisely what he wanted, why he wanted it, the length of time he wanted it for, and what he proposed to do with it at the end of the time.

One day, a used car dealer brought a motorcar to his house, and the father took it for a drive, returned to his house and parked the car on his lawn. The car was then in working order.

The dealer went into the father's kitchen and negotiated with him as to the purchase of the car, and the deal was completed. Apparently this was an illegal act on the part of the dealer because the Act states that the purchaser must be taken back to the business premises to conclude any purchase. However, that in itself does not matter; I am not complaining about that aspect because perhaps it was the easiest and most desirable way to conclude the business.

The next morning, the boy's father had to travel to his place of employment in Fremantle, and he thought he had better shift the car from the lawn where it had been parked the day before. But from that day to this, the car has never worked; it has never started again from the minute it stopped.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Did it have a battery in it?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Yes; in fact, it flattened its own battery and the neighbour's battery and almost flattened the equipment it was hooked onto at the local garage!

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Did it have any petrol in it?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: They even put petrol in it, but the motorcar did not function. I do not know how the dealer got it to this person's house in the first place, but he did and the father even drove it.

Having spent his money in buying a car for his son to use, the father returned to the dealer to try to sort something out. His son was in town, and had no car. However, he was told, "There is no guarantee because the Act says it is not necessary. You have purchased the motorcar, and that is the end of the line." So, the fellow come to see me. It is still not the end of the line; in fact, the dealer does not know how far away from the end of the line it is!

I recommended that this person approach the Consumer Protection Bureau and apprise it of the case, which he did. The bureau approached the motor dealer and asked him to do something to resolve the situation, but of course the dealer just thumbed his nose because the law states that unless a vehicle is priced at over \$500, it does not require a warranty.

I am concerned with the justice of the matter. As far as I am concerned there is still a moral obligation on the part of a dealer—whether or not the law says he should provide a warranty—to sell to a person a product that will at least go half of the way to doing what the person wishes it to do. This man did not ask to buy a

motorcar that did not go. If it had worked for only two days, at least it would have functioned for part of the time. But it has never started once. I am building up to a point, and I will return to it in a moment.

I should like to refer to another matter relating to consumer protection. Members have all read the Ombudsman column in the *Daily News*. How many times have we read of the case of a person who has moved from Halls Creek, Alice Springs or somewhere else on the other side of Australia to Perth, and who has hired a carrier to transport his furniture and effects to Perth only to find that when the goods arrive, a leg is off a table, the refrigerator does not work and the television screen is broken? How many times have we read answers to the effect that because a person did not take out comprehensive insurance, he can go and jump in the lake?

It seems to me that these people who profess to be professional in their occupation totally disregard their obligations. They are saying, "We will cart the stuff, but you make your own arrangements about insurance so that when the goods arrive in whatever condition we decide to bring them, you can have somebody else to complain to and make a claim on."

The cost of shifting furniture is greater than it need be; the actual charge made by the carrier represents only a part of the total cost, because a person has to take out comprehensive insurance to cover himself against damage and loss, and it becomes a built-in part of the cost of shifting furniture.

The point is that it is the responsibility of the person moving to take out insurance. The contract signed at the carrier's establishment contains in the finest of fine print which one would need the most powerful microscope invented to read, a passage which states that under no circumstances will the carrier accept responsibility for loss or damage. Therefore, it is important that a person takes out adequate insurance.

Recently, a constituent approached me and informed me that some very valuable furniture had been damaged in transit. It transpired the company she actually engaged to carry the furniture got somebody else to carry it. She approached carrier A, who accepted the job and promptly engaged carrier B to do the work. This person was under the impression she was dealing only with carrier A, and that some sort of insurance was involved.

The insurance company with which the lady had not dealt but with which the carriers had dealt was reluctant to enter into negotiations; its office was based in Adelaide, and this lady was expected to carry out all the negotiations with the insurance company which was refusing to assist her in having her claim resolved.

I spoke to the carrying company concerned. I said, "I do not think this is a very fair deal, and I believe you have an obligation to do something about it because this lady engaged you to get her furniture shifted from one point to another." The chap virtually told me to go and jump in the lake; but I did not do that.

The two instances which I have related brings me to my point. Members of Parliament are very responsible people. In my years in Parliament, I do not know of one member of Parliament who has acted irresponsibly in the discharge of his duties and in speaking in Parliament.

Members of Parliament enjoy a privilege conferred by the law, and they are permitted to speak freely without fear. Therefore, I say unequivocally that, in future, I will have absolutely no hesitation in naming and exposing dealers and traders who have no regard for their clients.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Surely you are not referring to carriers. What you are suggesting would increase the costs.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The honourable member has missed the point I am making. I do not know what would be the value to the client of a heap of smashed furniture.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: It would add to the cartage cost of the client, because he would have to pay the insurance charge.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am not saying that the client does not have to pay the insurance charge. I am saying that unless the client takes out an insurance policy there is no way in the world in which he will have any furniture at the end of the trip. A professional carrier should be competent to carry the furniture without its being smashed at the other end. Virtually the carrier is saying, "You must expect the furniture to be damaged at the other end, so you should take out an insurance policy." I suggest in many instances it would be better for the client to sell the furniture on the second-hand market, and to buy new furniture at the other end.

Some people value particular pieces of furniture and personal effects. It might be a piece of antique furniture, or even a Coolgardie cooler. If a person wants to keep such pieces of furniture, and employs a professional carrier to do the carting, he ought to be able to expect that carrier to be capable of carting the furniture without damage.

I am getting dangerously close to the stage when I will have no hesitation whatever in using my position in this Parliament to name such organisations publicly. I would be very reluctant to take such a step, but actions of unscrupulous traders will force me to take it. I give due warning to such people that if any

constituent of mine suffers from their actions and they refuse to enter into reasonable discussions to overcome the problem, I shall make public their actions in this Parliament. The traders concerned may or may not suffer from such action on my part.

I now want to deal with an extraordinary question relating to third party insurance. I suggest to the Minister that it should be looked into. A constituent of mine was sitting in a bus shelter on one occasion waiting for a bus. This constituent was a woman. A vehicle passed by, and an empty drink can thrown out of the vehicle by one of its occupants hit her in the eye. She had to go to hospital for treatment. The injury near her eye was stitched, and now she has a scar on her face.

This constituent picked up the can and took it to the police station. It was tested for fingerprints, in the hope that the person who had thrown it could be traced. However, that did not prove to be successful, and so the culprit could not be identified.

The point is that there is no insurance cover for this constituent of mine who was injured. All she was doing was waiting for a bus to take her home after work. She contacted me and the Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust, but it was found that there was no coverage for her injury. Had she been hit by the utility she would have been covered; but she was merely hit by a can thrown out of the vehicle.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Would that not be covered by the compensation Bill which the Labor Government wanted to bring in?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I would like to read the fine print of the insurance policy provided under such legislation. Here was an innocent person sitting at a bus shelter, a vehicle passes by, she is hit by an empty can, but there is no compensation for her.

I bring this matter to the attention of the Minister in the hope that he will do what he can to assist such injured persons. I hope the Minister will let me know what transpires.

There is nothing else I wish to add in this debate. I reiterate that it was a great pleasure and privilege to hear the way in which the Hon. Margaret McAleer moved the adoption of the Address-in-Reply on the opening day of Parliament. I support the motion.

**THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON** (North Metropolitan) [5.52 p.m.]: I support the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech. First of all, I want to congratulate Mr Dans on his appointment as Leader of the Opposition in the Council. I also express my appreciation for the manner in which Mr Ron Thompson carried out his duties as

Leader of the Opposition; he felt the time had arrived for him to step down, and he has done so. Mr Ron Thompson has set a very high standard for Mr Dans to follow, but I believe that Mr Dans will be equal to the example that has been set. I am sure he will lead the Opposition in its usual effective role.

I also congratulate the Hon. Margaret McAleer for the way in which she moved the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply. She did that job very well under what could be very trying circumstances on opening day.

I wish to comment on one remark made by Mr Clive Griffiths in his contribution to the debate; that is, greater use of school facilities. This is a matter which has been investigated by the Government. I would point out to him that in my maiden speech in this House in 1968 I dwelt at some length on this subject.

The response of the Minister at that time was that he believed schools were being used to a great extent, and there was no need to make further use of the facilities. That proved to be a misguided opinion. It is now universally recognised that schools can play a wider role in the community by making the facilities available to the public and by making the centres the focal points of the community. I would support whatever moves this Government is making towards that end. I should point out that this has been the policy of the Labor Government for a considerable time.

I was rather startled by a remark made by Mr Perry about the editor of the *Sunday Times*. He pointed out that the editor (Mr Dunn) said the items which Mr Perry had mentioned were printed for the purpose of creating dissension between rural dwellers and city dwellers. I am surprised that Mr Perry has taken exception only at this stage. I suggest to him that his colleagues have been guilty of creating among the rural population a hatred for city dwellers.

On a previous occasion I said in this House that the Liberal Party and the National Country Party had a great deal for which to answer in respect of such action on their part. I think this is a feeling being created deliberately for political ends. Unfortunately, such action has proved to be an effective political move, and that makes it more distasteful. It will take a great deal of undoing. I hope that members of the Liberal Party and the National Country Party have some twinges of conscience on this matter; unfortunately up to date they have not displayed any twinges of conscience.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Does that imply the Labor Party has no conscience?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Labor Party has not indulged in such action.



The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Do you condone some of the speeches that have been made by Mr Cooley in this Chamber?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: In reference to the Governor's Speech all I can say is that it is a recitation of history. It is a badge which indicates the bankruptcy of ideas on the part of this Government, and it leaves very little to which the people of the State can look forward.

As I proceed I will refer to one or two matters mentioned in the Governor's Speech. One can only judge this Government as being a failure. In the past the main thesis of the Liberal Party was the development of the State. In attempting to achieve that in this Parliament it has been manifestly unsuccessful. That was because of the negative attitude adopted by the Ministry.

Members of the Government made great claims to being the defenders of State rights in the period when there was a Federal Labor Government; however, that claim seems to have evaporated since the change of Government in Canberra. In the last few weeks I asked several questions as to whether this Government would protest at the actions of the Australian Government, but there was great reluctance by the Minister to indicate in the answers the State Government would do that.

One of the questions I asked concerned the new policy on Australian ownership in the uranium industry. I asked the Minister whether the State Government agreed with the policy announced by the Australian Government and, if not, whether the Government intended to make a protest to the Australian Government. The answer was rather wordy and stated—

- (1) and (2) The State Government welcomes a declaration by the Commonwealth Government of its policies in respect of overseas investment in Australia.

I assume even potential overseas buyers would welcome a clarification of the guidelines. The answer continues—

We have, at all times, made our own policy clear, namely, that we seek to have the maximum Australian equity and Australian management that is practicable in each case, but we do not believe that hard and fast lines can, or should be drawn in respect of the proportion of Australian and overseas participation in any particular project.

To me that indicates there is a clear division of opinion between the two Governments and that the State Government is, in fact, revealing that it does not agree with the policy laid down by the Australian Government. The answer concludes—

In view of the foregoing, there is no protest contemplated, as there are no grounds for one.

We will let that pass. The answer, in fact, contains conflicting information, but indicates that since the defeat of the ALP in the Federal sphere, the State Government has suddenly found it is no longer politic for it to protest about the Australian Government's actions in the way it used to protest against those of the Whitlam Government.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Even Mr Dunstan is happy with the present Federal Government.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: We will leave Mr Dunstan to answer for himself. He is much more capable of doing so than I am. I would agree that the South Australian Government is a good one and has the most popular leader of any Government in Australia.

On the 1st April I asked the following question regarding the uranium deposits—

- (1) Does the Government support the views of the Australian Minister for National Resources, Mr. Anthony, as reported in *The West Australian* on the 30th March, 1976, in which he asserts that other nations will be provoked if Australia's uranium resources are not made available to them?
- (2) Is the Government concerned that an unfavourable reaction to Australia within Japan could result, so damaging trade relations between the two countries particularly in respect of trade with this State?

I also asked whether the Government intended to protest to the Australian Government about the matter. Again the reply indicated that no protest would be made and it expressed the pious unfounded opinion that no unfavourable reaction in Japan was expected. Of course there was an unfavourable reaction and we have heard more of it since then.

*Sitting suspended from 6.05 to 7.30 p.m.*

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Prior to the tea suspension I was instancing the evaporation of this Government's defence of the State's rights. The Government is no longer moved to protest about actions and decisions of the Australian Government since the change of Government in Canberra. From one of the replies I have received, I am not sure but that it simply indicates ignorance of what is going on.

In the question I asked on the 1st April, which I quoted previously, I also asked—

- (3) Does the Government agree with the important comment that the views of Sir Philip Baxter reflected views of 30 years ago?

The Minister replied—

- (3) The question is not understood as we are unaware of the reported comments on Professor Baxter's views, to which the Hon. member refers.

Those comments are contained on the same page of *The West Australian* as the other statements of Mr Anthony. I quote from the article under the headline "Force talk attacked"—

The Australian Conservation Foundation yesterday attacked Sir Philip Baxter, the former chairman of the Australian Atomic Energy Commission, over his statements on uranium.

Sir Philip had said that Japan would take Australian uranium by force if Australia refused to sell it.

The senior project officer of the ACF, Mr Douglas Hill, said that this displayed the mentality of the 1930s when politicians thought they could avoid war by giving Hitler what he asked for.

Quite obviously the Ministers in the Government do not read the Press, or if a question is asked they do not read the items very carefully. That reference was not very difficult to find on the page to which I referred.

Again, when I asked questions about reported statements by the Associated Chamber of Manufactures, which was concerned that the Australian Government was no longer going to issue final reports but only draft reports of the Industries Assistance Commission for public comment, in reply to the question whether in the interests of manufacturers in this State the Western Australian Government would make a protest, the answer was "No", and it concluded by saying—

Action by the Government will be considered at the appropriate time.

The words "the appropriate time" can have whatever interpretation one cares to put on them. The phrase does not indicate there is any great intention on the part of the Government to care specifically for the interests of this State.

A survey conducted by the Associated Chamber of Manufactures was also the subject of a question I asked of the Government, and I will come to that later on. It is interesting to note that in the article in *The West Australian* to which I referred, the Australian Minister for Overseas Trade and National Resources (Mr Anthony) is reported to have said he "re-affirmed the high priority that the Government placed on a resurgence of the mining industry to help Australia out of its economic difficulties". Like many of the actions of the current Australian Government and the Government of this State, that is more like an expression of hope than anything positive. Those Governments seem to be so little aware of what is happening about them that I doubt their ability to make positive plans for the State at all.

I quoted one example where the Government of this State displayed ignorance of what was going on, and I will quote a further example. On the 31st March I

asked questions in relation to negotiations between Japanese buyers and Western Australian producers. I asked the question—

- (1) Has the Government received official notification from Japanese buyers of Western Australian iron ore that—
  - (a) negotiations with the producers for new pricing have been suspended; and
  - (b) pricing terms will be for two years?

The Minister replied—

- (1) (a) No.
- (b) We are aware from discussions with both senior representatives of the Japanese steel mills and the producers that negotiations are proceeding on the basis of a two-year pricing formula.

That statement is not supported by a report in *The West Australian* of Saturday, the 27th March, under the heading "Iron ore—pricing talks suspended", which says—

Negotiations for new pricing of Australian iron ore to Japan have been temporarily suspended.

That is quite an unequivocal statement and it does not take any great ability or intelligence to gather its meaning. I would have thought that because of the importance the Government attaches to these industries it would be aware of what was happening; but here we see it has quite obviously been abysmally unaware of it. I went on to ask—

- (4) Will he advise what are the guidelines laid down by the State Government that are to be observed by the producers in these negotiations?

The reply was—

- (4) The producers as well as the purchasing steel mills in Japan are well aware of the objectives of the State, which are to make the best use of our resources, to maintain viable producing industries capable of expansion and of adherence to their contractual obligations.

That is just so much "waffle". I would claim that in fact the Government does require guidelines which are more specific. In the past it has made much of the requirements of companies to construct what is called the infrastructure; that is, the facilities needed to service the work force and perhaps the construction of a railway line, associated port facilities, and so on. I assume the infrastructure would come within the category of "guidelines"—what is required of a company if it intends to open up new mines in this country. But, given the opportunity, all this Government

can do is make "waffling" statements such as the one contained in that particular answer.

I also suggest a good deal of conflict exists between the Government of this State and the new Australian Government, and I think some hint of that is given in this evening's Press where it is reported there are moves to depose the Minister for National Resources (Mr Anthony). We do not know whether or not that report is true. It is only rumour at this stage. But we have seen in the answers given to me that there are quite serious differences in the policy stated by the Australian Minister and what is obviously in the mind of the Government of this State.

I believe Mr Anthony has in fact been quite outspoken on relationships with Japan, which is a very important trading customer of ours. He has indicated there are problems in dealing with the Japanese interests, and in a speech given to the Japan Relations Symposium on the 18th March, after a recent visit to Japan, he says of that visit—

During my stay there I found doubts and anxieties on the part of those with whom I spoke, particularly with regard to the direction of the policies the Australian Government might take.

He also made reference to contracts with Japan, and in a speech to the National Rural Press Club given at the Lakeside Hotel at Canberra on the 25th March he made reference to problems arising with long-term contracts. I quote from page 3 of the copy of his speech which has been circulated by his department, where he said—

Of course, I do not mean to imply that long-term contracts are the answer to all our trading problems. If you look at some of the things that have happened to some of these contracts and others like them you start to get an idea of the problems you can run into. For example, economic conditions can change. They can change world wide. Japan felt the effects of the economic downturn very severely last year. When recession hit Japan she was forced to look pretty hard at her long-term contracts with Australia and other suppliers.

She didn't want to take, or take so soon, all the sugar she had agreed to buy from us. She didn't want to take, so soon, as much iron ore as she had thought she would need. There were also problems on coal.

What do you do when you run into these problems? Do you insist on the letter of a contract being honoured, and perhaps place the future of such arrangements at risk? Do you look for some compromise that will allow

both sides to get through a sticky period? Is it worth winning the battle, only to lose the war?

On the other hand, what's the use of having a long-term contract if it hasn't got some teeth, some bite, some real guarantee of security for the producer?

I would suggest quite obviously there are difficulties in the trading relationships between Australia and Japan at this time, as is indicated in those remarks. Of course, there would be problems for this State because we are one of the principal suppliers of raw material to that nation. The people of this State would be most concerned if this Government has no clear thoughts on what it will require in these agreements or in the conduct of negotiations, or if its voice is not able to be heard. And yet when given the opportunity to speak, we hear nothing from the Government about this.

Another matter that arises from that statement is that of the economic position in general. As I said earlier, I asked questions of the Government relating to a survey conducted by the Australian Associated Chamber of Manufactures. I will not read out the question, but it indicated a fair number of problems arising in the economy which show an upturn has not been achieved since the change of Government but that, in fact, the reverse is the case. All the Government could produce in an answer was a reference to the replies of the manufacturers that they expect some improvement in the next quarter. In part, the Minister said—

(2) As the Hon. Member is no doubt aware, the general prosperity of the economy is largely dependent upon the Federal Government's economic policy.

It is clear that the election of the new Commonwealth Government at the end of 1975 has already begun to have an impact on the business community.

I am not denying that; in fact it has had a very marked impact, but not to its benefit. I would like to refer to some other aspects of this as I proceed. The report to which I referred in that question made reference to the shortage of new orders, lower rates of output and employment, and unexpected price rises in the present quarter because of higher average unit costs and selling prices in the March quarter.

In dealing with this I would like first of all to indicate to members what had been happening prior to that period by quoting reports that have appeared in the Press. First of all, in *The West Australian* of the 8th April a headline appears which states that Myers' profit was up by 40 per cent in the six months to the 31st December, 1975, and that it was a record \$24.3 million. That sort of headline is found

on many occasions. Then we have another headline "Clyde lifts earnings by 25.7 per cent" in the same period; and another "McIlwraith has record \$50m. sales".

The Hon. W. R. Withers: That could mean a decrease in productivity.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I will not proceed through all of these reports, Mr President, but I want to assure the honourable member that that is not so in respect of the companies concerned. It may apply to one or two companies, but in respect of the reports I am quoting I believe an increase in productivity or else an increase in the price of the goods being sold is indicated. In fact, one would assume that to be an inflationary factor. We hear little criticism of this aspect of the economy. We hear plenty of criticism of the effect of increases in wages, but we hear almost no criticism at all of the profits these companies have been making.

As I said, the newspaper states that the firm of McIlwraith had record sale of \$50 million in the six months to the 31st December, and the firm's profit improved by 21 per cent. That is not a bad slice for that company.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: According to the Liberal philosophy that does not increase prices.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Of course they increased prices to achieve that result. I have here a newspaper report which states that the decision of grain-growers to plant bigger areas to take advantage of bigger grain orders has resulted in big orders for Massey Ferguson machinery. That indicates greater productivity because more machines will be sold, and more men will be employed to build them.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I was referring to the companies you mentioned previously.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The honourable member can check this afterwards; I will not take up the time of the House to do that now. He will have to accept my assurance that in the cases to which I am referring the cause is either increased productivity or increased prices. We can assume that increased productivity is good, but increased prices are bad. So what do we say about these companies? Is it wrong for them to achieve these results?

The Hon. W. R. Withers: It depends on your outlook.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Here is another newspaper headline which says that Kemtron, a Melbourne-based electrical group, lifted its net profit by 2.1 per cent to \$1.237 million in the six months to the 31st December, 1975, and that was after a decline in the first half of the year. The point I am making is that in

that period the economy had been making a remarkable recovery. However, after that period it is a different story.

Another headline states that Michaelis Bailey Ltd., the leather and plastic goods firm, lifted net profit to \$980 000 in the half year ending the 31st December. In that case sales were up by 12.5 per cent, and one would assume that means higher productivity. Another newspaper article states that Ford has bounced back for the second highest profit since beginning operation in Australia.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: That doesn't mean anything in a high inflation period. You must quote the percentage return on capital. So far the only one you have quoted is 2.1 per cent in the second half of the year.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: They are very important figures because it is claimed that businesses were in a very bad state; but these figures show a very different picture. After all, to double profit is not a bad effort.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: It does not mean a thing in a period of high inflation.

The PRESIDENT: Order! When you two gentlemen have finished this conversation I would like to hear the Hon. R. F. Cloughton.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Thank you, Sir. Another newspaper article states that Petersville Australia Ltd. achieved a record result. It states that this large ice cream, dairy and food company had a record half year and that it projects improvement in earnings in 1975-76. The article states that profit rose by 39.6 per cent, and sales by 14.9 per cent. This result was achieved after tight control over costs in all areas, an increase in overall levels of efficiency, and a return to profit in the ice cream division.

Another article states that Tomlinson Steel improved its results with an increased operating profit of 22.7 per cent in the half year to the 31st December, 1975.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Still no percentage return on capital. You have quoted only one.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Mr Withers can get up and present his argument later. These figures are quite clear. All these companies have returned to a position of profitability in the six months to the 31st December, last. No matter what argument the honourable member may care to put forward, they were not making a loss at that time; they were not in bad shape; in fact, they were showing optimism. Increased sales of 13.9 per cent is an extraordinarily good result and one which most firms would like to achieve not in a half year but in a full year.

Another newspaper article states that Peters boosted its profit by 144 per cent; and another says that Elders lifted its earnings to \$2.65 million and increased profit by 6.5 per cent to the 31st December. Another headline states that Parry's profit was up by 51.8 per cent.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: What was the previous percentage return on capital in that case?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Obviously, despite Mr Withers' concern, it was not a figure that was deemed to be important because it is not included in any of these reports. Had it been a significant business factor one would think the reports would state it, but they have not done that.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: How do you know?

The PRESIDENT: Order! My records show that Mr Withers made his speech on the Address-in-Reply on the 30th March. I would now like to hear the Hon. R. F. Claughton.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I think I have quoted sufficient of these to indicate a considerable change occurred in the business climate in the six months to the 31st December, although Mr Withers does not seem to be prepared to admit it. However, knowing his philosophies and policies, that is to be accepted.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: He knows more than you about business practice.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It would not be a bad idea if some of the members on the other side made themselves more familiar with business practice. As most members would admit, if not publicly at least privately, the situation is that since 1969 there has been a very serious downturn in trade. A very big and responsible company, the CRA company, did not blame the previous Australian Government. The relevant headline in *The West Australian* of the 20th February this year reads, "CRA profits hit by world recession". The article continues—

The world recession severely affected Conzinc Riotinto of Australia Ltd's earnings in 1975 and the giant mining house has slashed its final dividend.

The company reported that the position had been improved by Hamersley iron ore operations. The article continues—

But Hamersley's increased earnings reflected the higher average selling price for iron ore together with a more favourable exchange rate.

Of course, we know that the iron ore companies profited by the higher price for iron ore which was negotiated with the Japanese by the former Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr Connor). I am sure all the companies appreciated that fact because without it they would have been in a much more serious position than they are today.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: They had to because of American devaluation and our Government's revaluation.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: This company also reported that it profited from this development. With regard to industrial and resource development, the Governor's Speech did not say a great deal. It referred vaguely to several projects, but there is nothing definite at all. The Speech reads in part—

The year ahead presents great challenges and opportunities for our industrial growth and resources development.

Priority is thus accorded to negotiating development of North-West Shelf natural gas. It will serve existing and proposed industry in the Pilbara, and the increasing demand in the metropolitan and other areas of the south of the State.

Much complex negotiation remains both within Australia and abroad. The Government is looking for decisions on developing the North-West Shelf this year, but to begin physical development will certainly take longer.

It is quite obvious from that part of the Speech that there will be very little action in relation to the pipeline that is to be built.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: It does not need to be built. It is quite uneconomical to do so. You must face up to that fact.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I assume that the member would see the export of that gas from the north-west shelf.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Yes; and the use locally for industry.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The former Australian Government was not against the concept to the extent that it meant an initial cash flow to enable the development of those resources. I do not think the present Australian Government—

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Connor never made that statement.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Perhaps Mr Withers reads too selectively and misses important things that he did say.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I suggest you look at the *National Miner* of the 12th April in the political notes.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I would not regard the *National Miner* as an unbiased source of information. I suggest that the member reads more widely than that.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Naturally I do.

The PRESIDENT: Order! This is not a conversation between two members.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The previous Australian Government agreed with the Tonkin Government that there should be a development of the pipeline from

Perth to the north-west shelf. I have no hesitation in saying that that would have been under way at this stage if there had not been a change of Government in this State, because this new Government in Western Australia—

The Hon. N. McNeill: Tell me what the Whitlam Government did about exploration on the north-west shelf in the three years it was in Government.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: This Government was very much ideologically opposed to the idea of the Labor Government. It was not opposed on financial grounds but because it was being proposed by the Labor Government the idea had to be opposed regardless of what it meant to the people of this State. The position is that the Commonwealth Government has gone to private enterprise to try to obtain development funds. As far as we can gather from Press reports, it is having problems in marshalling those funds. So we are left at this stage without the development of that project.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You are looking at \$1 700 million even without the pipeline.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: That is a large sum of money and the previous Australian Government made some efforts to get considerable funds into this country.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Dubious efforts.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It is interesting that there are voices of objection from across the Chamber concerning overseas money coming into this country for the development of our resources. We hear a lot from members opposite about their support of the concept that overseas money should come to Australia for development purposes. There has been no period in which the need has been greater than in the last few years. But instead of attempting to co-operate with and assist the former Australian Government to obtain those funds, this Government did everything in its power to stop it. Members opposite certainly cannot deny that. It was made into the greatest scandal in this country.

The Hon. N. McNeill: How do you defend \$4 000 million for temporary purposes?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Even Sir Charles Court suggested not so long ago that a couple of thousand million dollars of overseas money would be very useful in this State.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Negotiated through the Loan Council.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Is the Minister suggesting that if the money had been secured it would not have gone through the proper process?

The Hon. N. McNeill: Indeed I am.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: After the nasty things Mr Masters said about the Arabs last night, you will get nothing.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: When other members have finished their speeches I will carry on.

The PRESIDENT: I think the honourable member is doing his best to encourage interjections.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I suppose that indicates some interest in what I am saying. That is one proposal which is hinted at in the Governor's Speech. It is wishful thinking on the part of the Government which is scratching around trying to find something to justify its existence but with nothing substantial to put before the people to suggest that it deserves their support any longer. The Governor's Speech continues—

During his brief visit to Japan in April, to discuss policy affecting Western Australian development, the Premier conferred with the Prime Minister of Japan, senior Japanese Ministers and industry leaders.

But there is nothing to indicate that any solid benefits were obtained from the time and money spent on that visit. One would expect on an important occasion such as the opening of Parliament, when it is the normal practice for the Government to indicate its programme for the coming session, that it would have sought to inform the public about such things.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: If you had been informed of what was in the *Japanese Times* of 1975 you would realise why.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Speech continues—

Visits by the Premier to Britain and the United States in July related to the Government's decision to seek immediate negotiations direct with the companies for development of North-West Shelf gas and thus circumvent the then Commonwealth Government's reluctance to co-operate.

I suggest that co-operation is a two-way process. One can co-operate only with somebody who is willing to co-operate. The Speech continues—

Despite the current international recession in minerals and metals, the State Government is proceeding with negotiations for several other large-scale resource developments.

We were given no indication of what those developments may be. For example, they may be the nodules that are lying offshore. They could be on the seabed, a potentially important source of minerals for the State.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You could not expect him to disclose company names or mineral areas while negotiations are taking place.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Of course not. The Government just has nothing in the pipeline to disclose.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: That is a typical piece of your logic.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: If it had something at a stage of finality, one could not stop this Government from running out with Press releases in their hot little hands to let the media and the public know. The smell of an oil rag is what we will be left with. I am not sure whose oil it will be or where the smell will come from.

I shall give a couple of examples of what this Government has come up with recently in its feverish scratching around to find some project which will give an impression of activity. The matter I refer to appeared in an article in *The Sunday Times* of the 4th April. On the 7th April I asked questions relating to marine services in this State, the intention being that they would be able to co-ordinate their activities to put in a bid for shipbuilding or related work. I think it is worth while as a long-term project, but when we look at the current situation I suggest that the Government and the industries have very little to hope for. In volume 4, No. 1, of the *Industry News* of the 27th February, which is a publication of the Associated Chambers of Manufactures of Australia, there appears the following headline: "Shipbuilding Industry Crisis—Government Moves". The article reads—

The state of the Australian shipbuilding industry is now so critical that unless immediate Government action is taken there will be serious disruptions including retrenchments.

Further on it is stated—

"The situation is now so critical, especially for the two largest yards, that the alternatives are few indeed. To avoid serious disruptions both yards must receive orders for vessels which are already beyond the preliminary design stage immediately.

The article later states—

"It is evident that the very lowest overseas tenders now being received in this country can be disregarded as dumped prices, injurious to our home industry".

This Government is proposing that a shipbuilding industry should be promoted, in spite of that claim. I would like to again draw the attention of members to an article in *The Australian* of the 3rd of this month under the heading "Massive ship debt worries bankers". The article indicates a debt in the oil tanker industry of \$40 000 million. Part of the article reads—

MAJOR international banks are sitting on a time-bomb of shipping debts which are about to burst, causing chaos and damage like that brought about by the collapse of the British and U.S. property markets.

That is extremely lurid and descriptive and the type of language we would expect to find in a State financial report. I think that is done deliberately to highlight the

very serious situation which obtains in this particular industry. The article continues—

This was the warning given by bankers at an international conference in London on Wednesday, when it was stated that banks and government banking agencies are owed \$27 950 million on tankers alone.

On top of that, a further \$11 980 million is owed to other creditors by the tanker owners.

But the assets secured are worth only \$20 000 million.

Those are fantastic and colossal sums of money. There is a debt of some \$20 000 million without any sort of backing.

The Hon. N. McNeill: You are using that as an argument for not promoting any shipbuilding in this country?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Do not be impatient.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: A conference under the chairmanship of Mr Nixon broke down in Sydney last week. It was on shipbuilding.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I was asking the question.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I ask the Minister to be patient. Again quoting from the article—

There are debts on 90 per cent of the world tanker fleet. Soon 20 per cent of the ships will be idle, carrying a debt of \$5 590 million which cannot be serviced.

So the ships are lying idle and nothing can be done to raise money to cover the debt on them. The article goes on to express the concern of the industry and points out the pitfalls which Governments should attempt to avoid. The article later reads—

It would also be a year of reckoning for shipyards. Political efforts to aid shipbuilders might make the shipping crisis much worse by producing unwanted tonnage, Mr Norland said.

I would suggest to the Leader of the House that is a warning for this Government, as much as it is for any other Government throughout the world. If there is any thought of developing a shipbuilding industry in this State it is likely that the industry will end up finding itself in financial trouble.

The Hon. N. McNeill: You are really saying that we should not do anything.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Returning to the beginning of my remarks, I said that in the long term it would be a worthwhile exercise. It would be sensible to do it. However, if the Government is looking at the establishment of, or the encouragement of, a shipbuilding industry at this time, surely there are very serious economic problems in the industry. Obviously cheap

shipping will be available around the world in the next couple of years because of the bankruptcy which will occur.

The Hon. N. McNeill: That is no secret; we are aware of it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Leader of the House will agree with me then that the Government is scratching around trying to find something to bolster its courage. In fact, it has done nothing to encourage the industry.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I do not agree with that at all.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: If the Government is coming out with statements about a shipbuilding industry, when that industry is in such a serious position, that does not say much for the rest of the economy of the State which has been in the charge of this particular Government.

The Hon. N. McNeill: If you reflect on what you have just said you will find there is little logic in it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I would expect that remark from the Leader of the House because he would not want to believe the evidence, or admit the substance of the evidence.

The Government has also been in the Ord irrigation area encouraging the farmers to take an interest in sugar production. It seems to me that could be a very disastrous project.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: That is not correct.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I would be happy if I were proved to be wrong; I would be delighted.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: The plan is for a pilot plant up there.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Let us examine what has been said. I intend to quote from a speech made by Mr Sinclair to the Australian Sugar Producers' Association on the 22nd March, 1976. At page 9 of his remarks he said—

I have been reported recently as criticising economic assessment as the only relevant criterion in the evaluation of agricultural activities. I stand firm in my view that social implications are too important to be neglected or to be relegated to a minor role. It is this philosophy which makes me tread fairly cautiously in creating productive capacity in new areas, as too often today's developments are tomorrow's social problems.

I think that is a very clear warning to this Government. Mr Sinclair continued—

In this regard, I was pleased to see the sugar industry deciding not to introduce new growers on its recent expansion of productive capacity but rather use the opportunity to redress some of the problems of the past. I am also pleased to see that the Western

Australians are proceeding cautiously in the possible establishment of a sugar industry in the Ord River region.

I hope that is a true statement of the position; that their caution is most extreme.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: It will take six or eight years to develop. That is why there is only a pilot plant there now.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Mr Sinclair's speech goes on and refers to the development of a substitute for sugar.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You were talking about social problems. Yet, you do not consider the social-economic solution of providing a building industry from sugar cane bagasse.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I would expect Mr Withers to be more concerned with what is happening on the Ord River.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I certainly am.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Then I take it he will listen. I hope he has read Mr Sinclair's speech.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I have.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: In that case he will be aware of these remarks. At page 7 of the speech Mr Sinclair states—

I cannot leave the world scene without making some mention of one of the serious problems which could face the sugar industry in the next few years—the manufacture of high fructose corn syrups. The technology exists now for providing a large proportion of our sweetening needs from a non-sucrose rich crop such as sorghum, maize, wheat and the like.

That does not seem to me to indicate an opportunity for development of new sugar cane growing areas when there exists a large capacity for increased production in the established areas. We have already seen what happened to the cotton growing industry and we would not like to see the same thing happen to an industry such as sugar growing if it were encouraged on the Ord.

The Hon. N. McNeill: If the shipping trade were in the same situation as the sugar trade, should we promote shipbuilding in Western Australia?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: That is an answer which the Leader of the House can supply.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I thought you would be able to supply it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The trend of my remarks was quite plain. An examination of the figures in the Australian Agricultural Council meeting notes on the overall situation, and commodity notes, dated the 30th January, 1976, shows there is reference to the sugar industry. I hope that the people on the Ord are giving serious consideration to entering this scheme as a result of those figures.



The Hon. W. R. Withers: They will decide only after the pilot plant is finished.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Any rational person can look at these things now and I would expect those people to consider very seriously any proposal that they should go into the sugar industry.

If the entry into the industry is to take six to eight years there could well be a different picture. In fact, a substitute will take a larger share of the market than what appears at present. There has already been a degree of substitution in the brewing industry as a result of the increased price of sugar. The cost of the product has to be considered. There is a capacity around the world to increase sugar production from other crops.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: You are aware that Queensland is embarking on a great expansion programme?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: An expansion project has been embarked upon. The figures are given in the speech made by Mr Sinclair.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: It will be a 220 000 tonne crop only.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am glad to see that members are so interested in my remarks. I hope they will continue to be.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: They know a lot more about it than you do.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: They have not disclosed that up to date.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I was making the point that the Government has come up with nothing. If it has anything in the pipeline it is holding its cards very close to its chest—a most uncharacteristic attitude for the State Government to take in regard to development projects.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Mr Tonkin made stacks of announcements when he was in Government, and nothing happened.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: There was of course a change of Government in this State—a change for the worse. We have seen that in the period up to the 31st December, there was a marked recovery in the business climate of the country, which was reflected in this State. The policies of the previous Australian Government obviously were taking effect.

The Hon. N. McNeill: That stretches the imagination!

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Very little has happened in Western Australia since the present Government took office in 1974. If we look at the figures in regard to business activities, we find a worsening position. I have figures here, but I will not burden the House with them. However, the headline that appeared in *The West Australian* on Thursday, the 8th April, reflects the state of the economy. It said, "Survey:

Consumer optimism slumps". There had been a marked improvement in consumer spending up to the end of last year, but that faded away. Authoritative comment supports the view that economic recovery in the country depends on the resurgence of consumer spending. The result of that particular report indicates that consumer optimism is faint and there is likely to be a drop in consumer spending.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: The *de facto* honeymoon is over!

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: That is right. In *The Australian* of the 20th March we saw an article headed, "World recovery now in trouble". If we believe the evidence contained in this article, we see that the world situation is worsening rather than improving.

The Hon. J. Heitman: What do you suggest should be done to overcome that?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Governments in this country are adopting irresponsible attitudes. Our own State Government is doing its best to wreck the principle of indexation, a system which had been hard won by the former Australian Government as a way to control the increases in wages and salaries, and which was dampening the wage spiral. That principle is being visibly wrecked by the State Government in association with the Australian Government. A great deal of difference exists between the expressed views of the parties in Government and what actually takes place.

To conclude my contribution, Mr President, I would like to quote from a speech delivered by the Federal Treasurer (the Hon. P. Lynch), as it illustrates my argument. I am reading from page 9 of a Press release of a speech made by the Federal Treasurer to the House of Representatives on the 4th March, 1976 in which he said—

We are working towards an Australia with maximum freedom for individuals to pursue their own goals in ways of their own choosing.

The Government will restore the private sector and encourage enterprise.

It will consult with those in the community who are affected by its decisions or who can contribute to better informed government.

This Government will demonstrate that individual choice is not only compatible with a deep concern by Government for the needs of the disadvantaged, but an essential ingredient of it.

The dignity and capacity for self-help of those in need is preserved by Government helping them in ways that least impinge on their independence.

Compassion for the less affluent in the community will be shown, not by the rhetoric of our predecessors, but by deeds.

I do not think I need remind members of the many promises the Fraser Government has broken. We have seen the institution of a means test for the NEAT scheme and this action certainly limits the people's freedom of choice and their ability to select the jobs they would like. What has happened to tertiary allowances, unemployment benefits—unemployed people must now wait for a longer period before any benefits become available—and pensioner funeral benefits? Pensioners are considerably disadvantaged since the Fraser Government came to office. What has happened in regard to child care? We have also noticed a downturn in capital projects. It is items such as these that mark the great difference between public statements and assertions about what will be done and what actually takes place. There is very little correlation between these two things. The State Government is as guilty of this policy as is the present Government in Canberra.

**THE HON. J. HEITMAN** (Upper West) [8.37 p.m.]: I would like to congratulate the Hon. M. McAleer on the speech she made when moving the Address-in-Reply. Her speech was one out of the bag. She did not encourage interjections, and this is a great attribute from any member.

I would like to congratulate our new Governor. Anyone who has met him knows he is a tremendous chap to have representing the Queen in this State. Over the years as he carries out his duties he will become more and more popular; we will get to know him and discover what a genuine person he is. Like all Australians, his heart and soul is in the advancement of our country. Many of his remarks in his Speech interested me. On page 4 I see a matter that affects my electorate. He said—

There has been another good grain harvest and Western Australia will probably see another record planting. This is quite correct. We have had some very good seasons as well as some very good sales overseas. So the wheat grower is one primary producer who is doing better than some other primary producers. However, with the increased cost of production, the profit has not been what one would imagine. The price of tractors and farm machinery is increasing at a phenomenal rate—I would like to know how many farmers are able to purchase this machinery and still remain viable. The only ones really doing well out of the cost of such machinery are the people who sell it. A country agent receives 10 per cent on the sale of a \$60 000 tractor—not a bad return even if he sells only one a year.

If one wishes to make a profit out of wheat, it appears to me one should purchase a big plant and then do most of the work oneself in order to ensure the best results. We have had the remark thrown

at us many times in this House that the farming community is rich. People do not realise that farmers work three times as hard as the average man on a wage.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Turn that up—that is not true.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: Farmers are entitled to any money they make. I would like to quote from a Press release issued by the Minister for Agriculture (Mr Old), which reads—

Western Australia's wheat quota records will be maintained on the same basis as last season, the Minister for Agriculture, Mr Old, said today.

He said the formula used in Western Australia had proved satisfactory, and the Wheat Quota Committee would continue to apply it for the 1976-1977 season.

This formula was intended to retain base quota structures, in the event that production restrictions might be needed again in the future.

This is like a red rag to a bull as far as I am concerned. We should never have had wheat quotas in 1968 because we had a semi-drought in 1969. From then on there has been no need for wheat quotas whatsoever. Those wheatgrowers in some areas who had been through the very wet years of 1963-1965 did not take the headers out of their sheds. When wheat quotas were issued, farmers in these wet areas found their quotas were for very small amounts. In actual fact, the quota was no good to them because they could not produce enough wheat to keep body and soul together. The Minister for Agriculture continued—

Twenty per cent of each quota-holder's deliveries each season is added to 80 per cent of his property's base quota, to give a new base quota for the following seasons.

The base quota figure in each case is shown on the registration certificate issued to each grower who has applied. (This year's certificates will be issued in October).

Farmers do not apply for a wheat quota until the end of May, but they are not told what the quota will be until October. That is just when the crop is almost ready to harvest. If quotas were in force for the coming year, farmers would not know until the last moment whether their grain quotas would be cut down or increased. The Minister should have been more explicit in the Press release so the farmers would know that there will be no quotas imposed this year and that this release contained a formula to endeavour to keep a record of what every farmer produces. Then if quotas come into being again, the records will be available.

I hope this will be the last occasion on which I will speak about wheat quotas in this place. We should never have had

a system of quotas in Western Australia. What we must do is to ensure a good marketing organisation to sell the wheat we produce from year to year. The wheat-growers are doing a wonderful job for the whole of Western Australia by subsidising cheap wheat for stock and home consumption. As long as this continues, wheat farmers will not grow. However, what they grow must be sold overseas. I hope the Minister will release another Press statement to explain his first one.

In his Speech to the House the Governor went on to say—

The wool market appears to be strengthening and the wool stockpile is being reduced. In fact, it is proving valuable as an assured supply for Australia's customers.

The Hon. N. McNeill: That is a bit out of date, is it not?

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: Yes, and it is not very long ago that the Governor made his speech. I will read to members shortly just what is happening in regard to wool. The people who handle wool have gone on strike because they want higher wages and they also want the maximum weight of a bale of wool reduced from 204 kg to 180 kg.

This has been on and off for many years, for as long as I can remember. At one time, the unions refused to handle bales in excess of 320 lb. This gradually increased to its present level. The unionists do not really handle these bales very much because they are pulled onto trolleys and wheeled around. When they are sold they are put on a dump bale.

At one time, they used to put three bales into a steel press, tie steel bands around them, and load them onto the ships with cranes. So, there is very little actual handling done today, as it is mostly done by trolleys and other mechanical means.

Surely, if the farmer can load the bales onto his truck, load them onto a railway truck and consign them to Perth, the union members should be able to handle the wool from there with all the mechanical means at their disposal. I understand that the Farmers' Union is contemplating suing the Storemen and Packers' Union as the following newspaper article indicates—

The Farmers' Union may sue the Storemen and Packers' Union in WA for interest losses incurred by wool-growers from the present dispute in the wool industry.

The Farmers' Union will see its legal advisers on the issue this morning.

Producers have not been able to get payment for wool sold at auction at Fremantle and Albany last month.

The Farmers' Union has not yet calculated how much interest is involved but it could be more than \$100 000.

I take it that the \$100 000 would be on a daily basis. The article continues—

Discussions will also be held today with wool brokers on the amount and the number of growers involved.

The union's wool-section president, Mr J. D. S. O'Connell, said yesterday that talks had already been held with the Employers' Federation on the possibility of such action.

"They have told us that similar action has previously been taken by various organisations in WA and the Eastern States", he said.

The proposed action represents a hardening of attitude by WA wool producers.

The Farmers' Union said last week that it would not support direct action by farmers to load ships with their wool because it would only widen the dispute.

"Wool producers are feeling upset and frustrated about the deteriorating situation," Mr O'Connell said.

"They have been putting a lot of pressure on me and the wool-section executive to do something on their behalf.

"We spent two days in meetings before deciding the present course of action.

"We do not want to inflame the situation, but why should our members take such losses?"

Mr O'Connell said that the Farmers' Union had decided to seek interest losses because these could be documented fairly easily.

The assistant general secretary of the Federated Storemen and Packers' Union, Mr S. Crean, speaking from Melbourne, said that if the Farmers' Union was really serious it would sue brokers who, he claimed, were responsible for the situation.

"None of our members is on strike," he said. "They have either been stood down or sacked."

Mr President, if a man will not work, is he on strike? What is the situation?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: They have actually been sacked.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: I was asking Mr President. Another part of the same article is headed, "Ministers urge return to work" and states—

CANBERRA: The Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Mr Street, and the Minister for Primary Industry, Mr Sinclair, entered the wool dispute last night by calling on striking unionists to return to work.

In a joint statement, Mr Street and Mr Sinclair said that members of the Storemen and Packers' Union involved in the dispute should return to work as soon as possible.

They said they had made the recommendation after Monday's talks before the Arbitration Commission.

If the storemen and packers returned to work, it would allow talks to proceed aimed at settling the dispute.

A return to work was necessary to maintain the viability of the Australian wool industry, which was of vital concern to all Australians.

All sections of the wool industry were being hurt by the strike, including growers, brokers and the unionists, who were losing wages.

"Wool buyers throughout Australia are facing problems through their extended lines of credit on sold wool", they said.

"The buyers have bought wool but have seen it held up in wool stores.

"In Japan, by the end of this month many mills will have run out of wool to process and a similar situation is rapidly developing in Europe.

"We are both of the opinion that work should be resumed so that the dispute can be settled by the normal processes of arbitration."

The situation could have been worse overseas except that wool handling authorities had stockpiled a considerable amount of wool overseas in case something like this happened. However, that stockpile now has been liquidated and sold to the various mills; they are getting close to the situation where they will have no wool to process. Once that happens they must go elsewhere where workers are quite prepared to load wool onto the ships and Australia will lose its overseas markets.

Another letter contained in *The West Australian* is from a Mr Monks, of Mt. Barker, who says—

As a member of the public who is heartily tired of irresponsible and selfish actions taken by trade unions I wish to draw attention to the cost of these actions.

The wool industry has been brought to a standstill and \$86 million worth of wool—much needed overseas capital—is held in Australia by union action.

The cost to the Wool Commission and therefore the farmers in interest alone is \$2.2 million a week.

He has been able to work it out quicker than the Farmers' Union. He continues—

If unions genuinely cared for the welfare of Australians surely the Arbitration Commission is the body to judge the justice of their claims and rule accordingly without strike action being taken.

Their action is all the more damaging when one considers the warning from Japan that it may get its wool

from other sources or turn to synthetics. The long-term effects would be a reduction in wool sales and unemployment for union members.

The unrealistic demands by shearers in their log of claims is an instance of the unions ignoring the ability of an industry to pay.

The refusal to handle wheat to Chile cost the wheat grower \$10 million.

Considering these examples of union action it is obvious that the aim of the unions is the disruption and breakdown of not only primary industry but the economy of Australia.

That is the feeling in the country today. The farming community feels that everything it tries to do is hampered one way or another by union action. These costly disputes and strikes do not help anybody. I believe it is about time the Australian farmer woke up to the fact that he holds the country in the palm of his hand. If he cared to stop sending his wheat, his stock, and his wool to the metropolitan area for distribution, he could make a terrific mess of Australia.

However, they are people with common-sense and I do not believe that will happen. When we get one irresponsible section of the community which keeps these strikes going, in the long run there is only one way of stopping them.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: And how is that?

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: Members know how I feel about the wool dispute. We cannot have wool sales because we are not able to get our wool out of the country or be paid for it. Yet wool futures have never been higher. This means that the price of wool is on the increase: but this price will be destroyed by irresponsible people. I quote now from the Governor's Speech in relation to mining—

Value of mineral production for the calendar year 1975 is expected to exceed \$1 000 million. This is despite the difficulty experienced by the mineral industry in faltering world markets and restrictive regulations on development of fuel and energy resources.

Here again, we must add to this the excessive number of strikes which the mining industry has had to put up with throughout the year. The Liberal Government in previous years developed the mining industry in the north to a stage where it is now earning \$1 000 million each year for this country. This is something of which we can be mighty proud, even if there are those who cannot see it. The Governor went on to say—

Representations by the State Government for Commonwealth financial assistance for the goldmining industry were unsuccessful. The Government regrets that such assistance is not forthcoming.

The State Government made generous contributions to try and keep both KLV's Fimiston and Hill 50's Mt. Magnet mine development programmes going. It is still ready and willing to participate further if the companies can arrange the required matching funds.

We heard quite a bit about this the other night arising from a question I asked Mr Leeson when he was speaking. *Hansard* records the following—

The Hon. J. Heltman: How much did the State Government put in?

The Hon. R. T. LEESON: The State Government provided assistance of about \$1.5 million.

The Hon. J. Heltman: That is a fair bit more than the \$250 000 the Federal Labor Government promised. It shows that the State Government has pride in Kalgoorlie.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Most of that money was in the form of loans.

The Hon. R. T. LEESON: It was also a darn sight more than the present Federal Government offered to the industry.

Since this interchange, we have had a news release from the Premier, which states as follows—

State Government aid which had kept Kalgoorlie's Fimiston gold mine open from November to February was not made in the form of loans—

So, Mr Dellar was not quite right. The news release continues—

—nor had the amount given been as much as \$1.5 million.

Mr Leeson was not quite right, either. I am sorry about that because I believe Mr Leeson has a very easy voice to listen to, and it is a pity he does not learn his subject before he stands and makes such statements in this place. The Premier's news release continues—

The Premier, Sir Charles Court, said this today when replying to a Labor M.L.C. for South-East Province, Mr R. T. Leeson, who claimed yesterday that opponents of the Whitlam Government had bought the Federal seat of Kalgoorlie with a 'crook cheque'.

The Premier said that Mr Leeson was giving a false impression in stating that the State Government's aid to the Kalgoorlie gold-mining industry had been \$1.5 million, including loans that would have to be repaid.

"Mr Leeson's remarks show that he is out of touch with the situation in Kalgoorlie and the people there," the Premier said.

"The very strong impression I got during my visit to the Goldfields last weekend was that people across the political spectrum appreciated what

we had done to alleviate the troubles of the gold-mining industry and did not see our motives as being in any way sinister.

"Mr Leeson will have few supporters in Kalgoorlie/Boulder for his carping criticism.

"The Government advanced Kalgoorlie-Lake View sufficient funds in November, December and January to keep about 150 men who would otherwise have been retrenched in November working on development of the Fimiston mines until a decision was made by the Federal Government whether or not to participate with us in a joint loan of \$6 million to KLV," Sir Charles said.

"We had suggested the joint loan in November as a means of keeping the Fimiston mines open. The money would have been used to pay for two years' development work to allow the mines to be worked profitably again.

"The State Government's contribution to the joint loan was originally to have been \$1.5 million. The money advanced to KLV prior to a Commonwealth decision was to be regarded as part of that loan if the joint loan went ahead," the Premier said.

"However, it was made clear that if the joint loan did not eventuate the money we advanced to keep the Fimiston mines open, up to a maximum of \$500 000, would be written off."

Sir Charles said that the total spent by Kalgoorlie-Lake View under the scheme had been about \$440 000.

A scheme which had delayed the closure of Hill 50's gold mine at Mt. Magnet was expected to cost the State Government about \$250 000. This, too, was not regarded as a loan and would have to be written off.

I believe this Government has been very fair and reasonable in its assistance to the goldmining industries of Kalgoorlie and Mt. Magnet, especially after the Federal Government had examined the situation and found that even if \$6 million were spent, there would be no guarantee that the companies would make sufficient profit to keep the mines operating for more than a few years.

It does not matter who finds the money; they must have some stability in the venture to be able to repay the money invested in it. I believe the same thing has happened with the Hill 50 company at Mt. Magnet. I can remember living not far from Mt. Magnet, in the Morawa district. We used to hear reports of the wonderful amounts of gold being taken from the Hill 50 mine. It appears that the company intended to work the mine until it got all the gold out of it, without prospecting in the area to establish other mines.

Evidently the shareholders have taken more out of that mine than they should have done, and the mine has been left standing in its present state. It is all very well for some people to blame the State Government for these things, but we should be fair and admit that the Government has done everything humanly possible, with the small amount of finance it is allocated from year to year.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: The rural community is very jealous of the amount that has been spent there.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: If that amount had been spent on the rural industries, especially the beef industry, the position of those industries would be much more viable. I am sure if that amount of money had been spent on the rural industries more people would be employed than are being retained in employment at Kalgoorlie and Mt. Magnet.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: The Fraser Government has not been very kind to Kalgoorlie.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: No.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: We have heard the Prime Minister say that no responsible Government would spend that amount of money on the goldmining industry.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: From time to time we have heard what some people have said about this House. In this regard I shall not read out all the newspaper cuttings I have, but I am sure we can all profit from the headlines that have appeared. The first is a report in the *Daily News* of the 28th August, 1975, under the heading of "Scrap Upper House, says Woman M.L.C." The report states—

A woman Labor MLC has called for action that would put her out of office—she wants the WA Legislative Council abolished.

The next is a report which appeared in the *Daily News* of the 2nd October, 1975, under the heading of "MLC's 'dead wood' is Council". This states—

The "dead wood of politics" which should be scrapped is the Legislative Council, says Mr Ron Thompson, MLC.

The next is a report in *The Sunday Times* of the 14th September, 1975, under the heading of "Only one house is needed". I could go on quoting other reports. The whole theme is that the Labor Party is not happy with the set-up of this House. It has been said that the Labor Party can never get control of the Upper House or have a full vote.

In her contribution to this debate Mrs Vaughan told us that on working out the percentages on her calculating machine she found she would have had to contact a great number of electors each day to cover all the electors in her province. In this regard I have before me some figures from

the "Quarterly Statistical Abstract" of March, 1976. From those figures I worked out that the average Liberal member represented 34 554 electors; the Labor Party member represented 51 438 electors; and the National Country Party members represented 22 547 electors. The difference is not that great when we take into account the fact that most seats held by Labor are located in the metropolitan area. The only exceptions are Lower North Province with 6 019 electors and South-East Province with 22 109 electors.

When I was first elected to this Chamber the Liberal Party did not hold one seat north of Geraldton, and all the northern seats were held by Labor members. At the time three Labor members represented the North Province; they were Mr Strickland, Mr Wise, and Mr Willesee. They were tremendous persons, and I am sure everyone in this House at the time appreciated their contributions to the debates.

At that time the Lower North Province was also represented by three Labor members. The one I knew best was Mr Heenan who sat next to me in this Chamber for some time. I also found him to be a tremendous person. He did not cry his heart out and uphold what the unions did. Every time he spoke we listened to his contribution with interest.

The South-East Province was also represented by three Labor members at the time. They were Mr Stubbs, Mr Garrigan, and Mr Bennetts. There again we had three tremendous Labor members. Although Mr Garrigan was not a great debater, the other two participated well and we listened with interest to their contributions. There were no cries and lamentations from them about the unions.

These are the types of members which the country people are prepared to elect. If the Labor Party wants to win seats in the country these are the types of candidates it should encourage to stand. The country people are sick and tired of the actions of some trade unions and the way they treat the people of Australia in holding them up to ransom. It almost amounts to blackmail. They prefer to satisfy their claims not through the Arbitration Court but by other means. The people in the country are sick and tired of this state of affairs.

I have nothing against the Labor members of Parliament. I think there is a need for the three parties in this Parliament. Let us turn our attention to the Labor members of the past. They did not cry their hearts out about the union affairs and what should be done to get more wages for the worker when industry could not bear the added cost.

Let us turn to the annual losses of the State Shipping Service. It is required to employ two crews, so that each crew can have 26 weeks of paid holidays each year. A report which appeared in *The West*

*Australian* of the 14th April under the heading of "Loss by State ships a record" reads as follows—

The State Shipping Service made a record loss of \$6,961,573 last year, \$2,308,990 more than in 1974, according to the service's annual report, tabled in Parliament yesterday.

In January, the Premier, Sir Charles Court, said that the estimated loss in the 1975-76 financial year had risen from \$5.8 million to \$8 million.

The Minister for Transport, Mr O'Connor, told the Legislative Assembly yesterday that the service's future was not clear.

The pattern of transport in the North-West and Kimberley was changing and the region was in a depressed state of activity.

However, the present vessels were operating efficiently in view of the low tonnages, the type of cargo being carried and the facilities and working times at various ports.

The chairman of the service, Mr F. N. Jones, said in the report that the loss was caused by crippling inflationary cost increases, high rises in wages and salaries, unprecedented increases in stevedoring industry levies and a severe downturn in cargo traffic. The drop in cargo of 40,000 tonnes had nullified the freight increase imposed in July 1974.

#### CYCLONE TRACY

The report shows that two of the main reasons for the drop in cargo were cyclone Tracy and the downturn in the oil exploration industry.

Broome, the main oil exploration port, had a fall in cargo of 10,479 tonnes. It was the biggest fall in the total drop of 27,449 tonnes on the northern run.

The drop in cargo carried to Darwin was 6,422 tonnes. Food cargo fell by about 10,000 tonnes because of the depleted population caused by cyclone Tracy, though building materials increased by 5,500 tonnes.

During the last six months of 1975, 31,000 tonnes of cargo was carried to Darwin. The increase was a continuing trend and augured well for the future.

The sealing of North-West Coastal Highway had a considerable impact on tonnages shipped to Pilbara ports.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton interjected.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: I was very silent when Mr Cloughton made his contribution, and I hope he shows me the same courtesy when I am making mine. The State Shipping Service has to engage two crews on full wages. For that reason

it is much cheaper now to send most commodities to Port Hedland by road, as it is almost completely bituminised.

Although it is a sad story, it is one which we have to take into account in considering these matters. We find that in Western Australia, more or less through the impact of the strikes and the actions of the unions, the people are being held to ransom. The unions are forcing the employers to pay higher wages when industry cannot afford it.

I support the motion, and I hope the Labor Party will take some notice of the advice I have given tonight.

**THE HON. I. G. PRATT** (Lower West) [9.09 p.m.]: I am happy to join with other members in congratulating the Hon. Margaret McAleer for the way in which she moved the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply. She is a member who combines the presence of a lady with the responsibilities and duties of a member of the Legislative Council. She is a member of whom we can be justly proud, and I particularly congratulate her for the way she has conducted herself in the Chamber, and the manner in which she moved the motion.

I would also like to extend my congratulations to Mr Dans, who is a formidable opponent. I am quite sure he will do justice to the position of Leader of the Opposition, and carry out his duties in a responsible manner. He has a difficult role to fill, having taking over from Mr Ron Thompson. I would also extend my congratulations to Mr Cloughton on his election as Whip of his party.

One of the first matters mentioned in the Governor's Speech dealt with the electoral boundaries. In speaking on this topic I do not wish to enter into any controversy, because I had my say in the debate on the amendment to the motion.

However, I wish to point out that I am somewhat saddened by the proposed boundary changes. If the boundaries are put into effect as proposed, I will lose some areas of my province with which I have been in close and friendly contact. I refer to the districts of West Armadale, South Kelmscott, the main townsite of Kelmscott, and Roleystone. I had the pleasure of serving all these areas as a councillor of the Armadale-Kelmscott Shire.

The other evening I made a comment to the effect that the areas of West Armadale and South Kelmscott would be in the good hands of Mr Clive Griffiths, into whose province they will be placed. The other areas of my electorate to be excised were not mentioned in the debate the other evening; I refer to the townsite of Kelmscott and Roleystone. These areas will be in the safe hands of Mr Gordon Masters. I should mention that they will receive the excellent representation to which they are entitled.

Turning to the other end of my province, I am sure the Leader of the House and I will be sorry to lose the district of Waroona which contains the hard-working, sincere and honest people whom any member of Parliament would be privileged to represent. I am sure it will be a sad loss to both of us to lose our representation of those people.

Education is a matter which has been debated fairly lengthily, and at times even heatedly over the last few years. There are some comments which I would like to make on education. At times we have been told that we do not keep our promises, and the arguments go forwards and backwards. I want to highlight some promises that have been kept, to the satisfaction of the electors in my province.

In the Mandurah area two much-needed educational facilities are nearing completion; that is, the Dudley Park Primary School and pre-primary centre. These were promised by the then Leader of the Opposition before the last State election. We took him to the area and he agreed they were needed. He gave the commitment that if we were elected they would be provided; and they have been. We hope they will be in service early in the second term of this year. I would also like to thank the Minister for Education for the part he played in the provision of these facilities and others I will mention.

It will be necessary in the fairly near future for Mandurah itself to be provided with a high school of its own, rather than as at present having large numbers of children being bussed to Pinjarra. I am happy to say that a site has been chosen for a high school in Mandurah, and so we are progressing one more step towards the provision of satisfactory educational facilities in the area.

We look a little further in the electorate and find that of recent weeks there has been some controversy over the primary school at Baldi which is a rather old school comprising two old wooden-type buildings. It is a typical small country school set in a rural atmosphere and enjoys a privilege which our modern schools do not enjoy; that is, the privilege of being in a rural setting and in a family-type atmosphere.

However, the people of the area are seeking a new school. They see the beautiful new cluster schools in Rockingham itself and feel that in a way they are being underprivileged. The population of the area is increasing and, in fact, it will be necessary in the not-too-distant future to provide a new school.

Earlier in the life of this Parliament, the Minister for Education toured the area and gave a commitment that he would not have the school closed. There had been some conjecture as to whether

it should be closed and the children transported into Rockingham. He said that as long as the school maintained itself as a viable entity it would remain open and, if the numbers increased to such an extent that the present school could not cater for the demand, a new school would be provided. A problem exists in the area because many parents take their children into Rockingham to the other schools there and so the numbers at the Baldi school do not grow to the extent they should. It has been pointed out to the people in this area that if they want their school to expand they will have to send their children to it because there is no way in the world by which any responsible Minister would agree to the building of a new school if the children are being sent to other schools. The responsibility rests on the people in the area and if they produce the numbers to warrant an extension to the school the extension will be provided. They will need to do their part.

One of the other problems involved in the extension to this school or the possible erection of a new school is continuity of enrolments. As it is a small rural community on the edge of a rapidly developing urban area it has some problem in providing the continuity of new pupils. It is necessary for there to be some development and this will require more rural subdivision and more development of the type becoming so popular now. In greater numbers people desire to go back to the land and have a couple of acres around them on which to grow vegetables and keep a horse and perhaps a cow, thus enabling them to lead a more relaxed form of life.

This is one area where this can be done and where this type of subdivision and way of life should be encouraged while at the same time ensuring that the school at Baldi will grow to the size the people desire. With a subdivision and subsequent development a natural increase in numbers will occur.

Rockingham itself is an area in which there has been some controversy. One of the more recent forms of controversy has centred around pre-school education or, as we are now calling it, pre-primary education. Last year the Minister concentrated quite a considerable amount of—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Worry.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I know it involved a great deal of worry and the Minister went out of his way to help the people of the community. He agreed to place a pre-primary centre within the area and, in return, he asked, as an act of goodwill by the kindergartens in the area, that they, too, take part in this community activity by coming under the departmental scheme. He pointed out they would have everything to gain and nothing to lose because if they co-operated the parents of the children attending the



kindergarten would not have to pay any fees. In actual fact, at the time, they agreed to do this, but unfortunately, due to misleading allegations made by some Opposition members of Parliament, one of the kindergartens became so worried and confused that it withdrew from the scheme. I regard this as being most unfortunate because the allegations made were quite untrue and unfounded. The parents of the children who attend the centre are now having to pay out money because the kindergarten was misled by the Opposition. That is a very sad state of affairs.

However, I am glad to say that the Minister—and I congratulate him for this—continued with the commitment he had made, even though one of the pre-school centres had been persuaded to withdraw from the co-operative arrangement.

In Rockingham the present building rate is rapid. In actual fact, 20 houses a week are being completed in the shire. Consequently in the near future a second high school will probably have to be established, and I hope this is something the Minister will keep in mind in order that plans may be made for this facility.

A movement has been made in the Rockingham community towards the provision of a community college. The adult education officer at the high school (Mr Draper) has been investigating this matter for some time and he has obtained the support of the shire council which in principle has agreed to the free use of the community halls for a community college. The institute has shown considerable interest as, too, have local businessmen. I wish Mr Draper well and I hope that in the near future we will see this project coming to a satisfactory and rewarding culmination.

The Minister for Education is coming in for many congratulations from me tonight.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Very nice.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I now wish to congratulate him for the provision of a pre-primary centre at Jarrahdale. In a previous speech I mentioned that Jarrahdale, which is a small community, should be encouraged to take a community interest. The provision of a pre-primary centre has been a tremendous boost to the morale of those in the small community and I think that quite apart from the educational value to children it has been of tremendous value to the community itself.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Very good.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: One point about which I cannot congratulate the Minister for Education concerns the PCA which has done a tremendous amount of work to provide sporting facilities and an oval. The department has been good enough to provide some of the reticulation, but we are still waiting on electricity. Perhaps the Minister could urge in that direction.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The PWD does that, not the Education Department.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: Perhaps we could have pressure by one Minister on another.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I must not spoil my record tonight.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: Moving on to the environment, which is something of concern to all of us today, the Governor's Speech contained mention of proposed legislation for national parks. As within my electorate a considerable area of land is designated as national park, and some of it is causing concern to local authorities, I look forward to this legislation being passed so that perhaps some of the problems which exist and are faced by the shires within the Murray section of the electorate might be alleviated.

Also concerning the environment, I am glad the discussions are progressing relating to the control of estuaries. Peel Inlet is my main concern, but I am also involved with the Canning and Swan Rivers conservation. I look forward to these projects reaching a satisfactory culmination.

I mentioned the need for rural subdivision when I spoke about the Baldy school. However, there is a far wider and more general need for this type of subdivision. The Minister for Local Government, and Urban Development and Town Planning in his policy of allowing special rural zones has helped to overcome some of the problem. One of the special rural zones within the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott has been a tremendous success. However, a great need exists for many more rural blocks to be placed on the market.

Recently I disposed of my own 10-acre property in the outer suburban area, which I had held for some 20 years. After I advertised I was besieged by people who wanted to know whether the land could be split into 2-acre blocks. The 10 acres was too big for them to handle and too expensive for them to buy. The fact that they could not obtain a suitable sized block precluded them from this type of living, a type which is really part of the tradition of our Australian way of life. A little self-sufficiency and country atmosphere goes a long way towards making the kind of citizen we need in this country today. So I look forward to even more relaxation on the part of the department in its attitude to rural subdivisions.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Hear, hear!

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I feel that perhaps there is a case for rural-type subdivisions within the urban corridors. This is something which at present is not allowed by the Town Planning Board. There is a case for overall planning for

these areas with certain sections being taken out and held in trust for the later provision of the main services.

For instance, an area of 100 acres could be divided into 5-acre lots and out of each 5-acre lot which would conform to a set road pattern would be taken enough land to cover the later cost of the provision of main services. If this could be done, a great deal of the land at present unproductive and just being held—involving a nuisance to shire councils and a nuisance because of a fire risk—could be put to some suitable and serviceable use in perhaps 10 years.

While talking about subdivisions I would like to mention a subdivision in Mundijong which has come to a standstill because the water mains are unable to cope with any further subdivisions within the area. This matter has been placed before the Minister for Water Supplies who I hope will give some consideration to upgrading these services so that the town can continue to flourish. It is an area in which there is at present a considerable demand for lots.

While listening to question time in Federal Parliament recently I heard a question asked in regard to the Commonwealth-State housing agreement, relating to the possible purchase of rental houses provided under the previous very strict agreement. From the Armadale section of my electorate I have had queries from people who are in houses provided for rental under the agreement. They have done considerable work on the properties and have invested money in them. They now wish to buy them, but they have been told that as the homes were provided with these particular funds there is no way by which they can be allowed to purchase them.

When the Minister answering the question in Federal Parliament said he would place this matter under review, I was extremely pleased because I consider that those people who have moved into these SHC homes and spent considerable amounts of money on gardens, patios, garages, cement paths, and wallpapering should be given an opportunity to purchase them.

I hope the result of the Minister's consideration will be that the people concerned can purchase the houses and make them into assets of which they and the community can be proud.

I am concerned about the incidence in our community of the destruction of property, vandalism, in general, and physical violence. I think we must look, as a people, at the type of penalty that is being meted out to those who are guilty of these offences.

Recently I had occasion to view with a particular gentleman his house which has three times been smashed by vandals. The last episode cost him \$2500, from

memory. The house, which he uses at weekends, was completely smashed—windows were broken, cupboards overturned, the ceiling dragged down, and fittings and furniture smashed. On one of those three occasions he was able to catch the offenders, who were dealt with in the Children's Court. The law provides that he can sue to be recompensed for the damage done. However, the law also provides that he cannot be told who the offenders are and what happens to them. So he has the ability to sue but he does not know who he has sued. He does not know the names of those young offenders.

We should look at this matter very seriously. I am coming to the way of thinking that perhaps these young people must take responsibility for some of their actions. We see all kinds of destruction and vandalism in the community. When the offenders are caught, the penalties are very often light and, as in the case I have stated, nothing can be done about it.

Turning to physical violence, we often see in the newspapers reports of acts of physical violence, and we think, "That is not right." We look at the penalty and say, "That is a very light penalty." But until an act of physical violence happens to someone close to us, it does not really come home to us just how serious it is.

I had the unfortunate experience some two months ago of having my 16-year-old daughter and her friend bashed and robbed in Perth one night by a gang of three girls and two young men. My daughter and her girl friend were beaten up very badly: they were bruised and scratched. Their jewellery was ripped off them and their money was taken; then the gang methodically proceeded to work them over. This was the result of going into Perth to dancing classes.

As a result of this incident, I took particular notice of the penalties that were dished out by the courts to people involved in this kind of crime, and only two days later I noted a case where a similar thing had happened at the Claremont showground. The young people involved—late teenagers—were put on probation. I also noted that one of them had been involved in a similar incident five weeks previously. So she had been involved in one mass bashing five weeks previously and had been involved in another one; and obviously she would continue to be involved in mass bashing because that was the kind of life she had chosen.

As with vandalism, I think it is about time we started making the offenders face up to their responsibilities. When this kind of thing goes on in our community and it is not safe for girls to walk down the street without being bashed and robbed, something very serious should happen to the people who commit these offences. This situation leads to very low

morale in our Police Force. When policemen see these things happening, they arrest the people involved, who are taken to court where virtually nothing happens to them. It reaches the stage when the offenders say to our police officers, "Ha, ha! There is nothing you can do to me." This was told to me by the officers involved in the personal case I mentioned. They told me that as a member of Parliament I should be raising this issue, so I do raise it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: There is no family responsibility now. How do you breed this back into the family? That is where it starts.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I take note of the interjection, and it leads me to another unfortunate fact of our present way of life; that is, everyone is being encouraged to "do his own thing". It does not matter what the law says; it does not matter what society or tradition say; if one does not want to obey the law one just breaks the law. Over the last few years this type of philosophy has been preached to the public and to the young people in quarters which should show much more responsibility. People have been told, "If you do not like the law, disobey it." I will not go into great detail about where this kind of advice has come from; we all know from which quarters it has come, and it is an utter disgrace.

Another matter I want to mention briefly is the fact that much of this behaviour has been brought about by the "do-gooder" element in society which has brought us to the stage where at present we care more about the poor offender than we do about the person on whom the offence has been committed. This attitude has been building up for many years now—the poor criminal, and to blazes with the person who has been robbed, bashed, raped, or whatever it may be. I think it is about time we took stock and started to change our direction in these matters.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: We are destroying our souls by our own internal corruption.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I want to congratulate the Government—I refer to the Cabinet—on the proposals it put forward last year, and is now putting into action, for the facility to provide care and treatment for rape victims. I believe this matter comes under the responsibility of three Ministers collectively. It is a step in the right direction—a very well intentioned and much needed step. At last we are showing that we do care something about the people who are the victims of crimes and that we do not save all our care and attention for those "poor" individuals who choose to break the law and commit offences against society and individual people.

I do not intend to say any more. There were other points on which I wished to comment, but I have already lingered longer than I intended. I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. V. J. Ferry.

## QUESTIONS (5): ON NOTICE

### 1.

#### MINING

##### *Price of Gold*

The Hon. R. Thompson, for the Hon. R. T. LEESON, to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Mines:

- (1) What is the sale price per ounce of refined gold ex Perth Mint in—
  - (a) the metropolitan area; and
  - (b) the Kalgoorlie area?
- (2) If there is a differential in price, will the Government give consideration to the implementation of a uniform price to private gold buyers throughout the State to stimulate the sale of gold?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) The Perth Mint does not fix a price for refined gold for Perth or anywhere else. The price is controlled by overseas markets, particularly that in London, and it varies from day to day.
- (2) Answered by (1).

### 2.

#### NATIONAL HIGHWAY

##### *North-west*

The Hon. J. C. TOZER, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Transport:

Referring to the Report on Roads in Australia prepared by the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads and presented to the Commonwealth Minister for Transport on the 5th December, 1975—

- (1) Has the State Government drawn attention to the omission of any reference to the Port Hedland-Broome section of the National Highway in the five year programme, even though the Meekatharra-Port Hedland and the Broome-Katherine sections are specifically referred to?
- (2) Does the Bureau of Roads programme for the Meekatharra-Port Hedland section of the National Highway, which envisages an expenditure of \$9 million per annum, and a target completion date in 1989, match the State's planning predictions?

- (3) Is the State Government happy with the recommendation that the Bureau of Roads should undertake strategic planning of National Highways, thus apparently preempting the State Road Authority's power to make major highway re-location decisions and determine priority of work?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) Omission of priority for the Broome-Port Hedland section from the Bureau's report will be taken up with the Federal Minister during the Australian Transport Advisory Council meeting on April 21. The importance of constructing this section has previously been stressed repeatedly to the Federal Government.

- (2) The State's planning has placed the main emphasis of the National Highway Programme on construction of the section between Meekatharra and Newman. Planning studies are being undertaken for the Newman-Port Hedland section.

Given the present level of inflation and grants for National Highways, it is considered that the Bureau's target of 1989 is optimistic.

- (3) No. However, the State Government considers that by co-operation with the Federal Government in strategic planning State objectives will be met. The State Government does not agree that the Federal Government should have the responsibility for major relocation decisions and establishment of priorities.

3.

### TRADE UNIONS

#### *Ballots: Complaints*

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY, to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) How many complaints has the Minister received from trade unionists concerning the present system of conducting trade union ballots?
- (2) How many complaints have been submitted to the Minister in writing?
- (3) Will the Minister table the written complaints, if any?
- (4) If the answer to (3) is "No" will the Minister advise of the substance of each complaint?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) to (3) I wish to reiterate statements made by me to the media and union officials that in the interests of the persons concerned I am not prepared to agree to release names and details of information supplied to me on a confidential basis.
- (4) I will justify the necessity for the legislation when it is introduced into Parliament.

4.

### BEEF ROADS

#### *Expenditure*

The Hon. J. C. TOZER, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is there any explanation why the beef roads programme is to continue in Queensland but has been eliminated in Western Australia?
- (2) Does the elimination of special beef road allocations preclude important beef industry roads such as the Duncan Highway—which is not part of the National Highway—from ever receiving major expenditure supported by Commonwealth funds?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) The Commonwealth Bureau of Roads has recommended in its "Report on Roads in Australia 1975" on page 197, that the Current Provision for Beef Roads in Queensland be discontinued and any future requirement included in the Category of Developmental Roads. Funds for Developmental Roads would be included within allocations for Rural Arterial Roads. The same provision applies to Western Australia.
- (2) No. The only two Beef Roads in Western Australia not included in the National Highway system are part of Duncan Highway and the Derby-Gibb River Road. Both these roads are Rural Arterial Roads on which Commonwealth Rural Arterial Road funds may be spent.

5.

### BUREAU OF ROADS

#### *Recommendations*

The Hon. J. C. TOZER, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Does the Main Roads Department, as the State's road authority, endorse the recommendations of the Bureau of Roads in the 1975 Report on Roads in Australia?

- (2) Is it anticipated that Commonwealth legislation, to be introduced in the next few months, will embrace the recommendations?
- (3) Can a reasonable explanation be given for the apparent anomaly revealed by the fact that the Western Australian allocation of Commonwealth Grant funds when expressed as a percentage of the Queensland total, seems to progressively decrease from 69 per cent in 1974-1975 to 48 per cent in 1980-1981, while the population and vehicle number predictions indicate a rate of increase in Western Australia considerably greater than that for Queensland during the same period?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) It endorses some of the recommendations.
- (2) When the Report was released last February, the Federal Minister for Transport stated that no decisions on the acceptability or otherwise of the Bureau's recommendations had been made. However, previous Commonwealth legislation has tended to follow the Bureau's recommendations.
- (3) It appears to be the Bureau's strategy to bring the Federal allocation for roads to Western Australia, as a percentage of our total roads programme, more into line with the percentages of the other States. The report points out that in 1974-75, Federal funds accounted for 51.8 per cent of our total roads expenditure programme and if the Bureau's recommendations are adopted, this will be reduced to 47 per cent over the next five year period but it will still represent the highest percentage of the Australian States.

#### ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [9.43 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 4th May.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 9.44 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 14th April, 1976

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

### QUESTIONS (50): ON NOTICE

#### 1. GOVERNMENT PREMISES

*No. 11 Ventnor Avenue: Ownership*

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Referring to question 21 of the 8th April, 1976, regarding 11 Ventnor Avenue, West Perth, from whom are the premises leased?
- (2) Who are the owners of the premises?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) and (2) The Prudential Assurance Company Ltd. of 95 St. George's Terrace, Perth, is the registered proprietor of the premises. There is agreement in writing between the company and the Public Works Department to lease the accommodation, although at this stage a formal document has not been executed.

#### 2. WATER SUPPLIES

*Greenhead*

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

As water has now been piped and reticulated by his department to the Leeman residential area, will he advise when it can be expected the same urgent commodity will be provided at Greenhead?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

The provisional works programme of the Public Works Department, which is still subject to adjustment, provides priority for the completion of Leeman reticulation in 1976-77 and Greenhead in 1977-78.

#### 3. GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

*Public Statements: Restrictions*

Mr DAVIES, to the Premier:

- (1) What restrictions does the Government place on employees—
  - (a) writing to the Press;
  - (b) making public statements to the media;
  - (c) contacting Members of Parliament including members of Cabinet?
- (2) Have any written instructions been issued in this regard?
- (3) If so, will he please table a copy?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) (a) to (c) Apart from persons employed under the provisions of the Public Service Act, the Police Act, and, in some instrumentalities and authorities who follow