

The other two relatively minor amendments in clause 7, regarding artists and permits for occasional licences, could perhaps be considered in the recommittal stage. Those amendments merely clarify the law and facilitate the operation of the court; there is no principle in them. We seem to be seeing the light at the end of the tunnel and I hope the Committee will adopt my suggestion.

Before I do anything else, it will be necessary for me to have some expression of opinion from the Committee. If it is favourable to my proposition, I am reasonably certain the member for Kalgoorlie will withdraw his amendments. We can then vote against the clause and dispose, for some time, of the Liquor Act Amendment Bill.

Mr T. D. EVANS: The amendments I proposed to clause 7 referred to the portion of the clause dealing with the hours in which Sunday trading could take place. My amendments sought to leave the liquor law in Western Australia as it is, without writing artificial zones into it.

I am very pleased to accept the Minister's assurance that the existing law in regard to Sunday trading hours will remain intact. I will have achieved my purpose. I therefore seek leave to withdraw my amendments on the understanding that Sunday trading hours will remain as they are now.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr SKIDMORE: I am unable to co-operate with the Minister because I have had an amendment on the notice paper for some time and I wish to move it to protect the interests I am representing. I hope this will not be taken as some of my time. If the Minister wishes to report progress, I would like to seek leave to continue my remarks at a later date.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think you will have any problem because next time the Bill comes before the Committee you will be entitled to make two more speeches.

Mr SKIDMORE: I am content to leave it at that.

### *Progress*

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

*House adjourned at 5.41 p.m.*

## **Legislative Council**

Tuesday, the 14th September, 1976

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

### **BILLS (12): ASSENT**

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

1. The Confederation of Western Australian Industry (Incorporated) Bill.
2. Alsatian Dog Act Repeal Bill.
3. Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 3).
4. Building Societies Bill.
5. Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).
6. Country Towns Sewerage Act Amendment Bill.
7. Law Reform Commission Act Amendment Bill.
8. Stock Diseases (Regulations) Act Amendment Bill.
9. Cattle Industry Compensation Act Amendment Bill.
10. Main Roads Act Amendment Bill.
11. Industrial and Commercial Employees' Housing Act Amendment Bill.
12. Teachers' Registration Bill.

### **QUESTIONS (7): ON NOTICE**

#### **1. RAILWAYS**

##### *Suburban Services: Electrification*

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Health, representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) On what date was an application made to the Australian Government for financial assistance for the electrification of the suburban railway service?
- (2) (a) Have any subsequent applications been made; and  
(b) if so, on what date/s?
- (3) What reply has been received from the Australian Government?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) Verbal application in August, 1975, by Mr O'Connor to the Commonwealth Minister for Transport, Mr Jones, in Canberra.
- (2) (a) and (b) The matter has been subsequently discussed with Mr Nixon on a number of occasions.
- (3) In a letter dated 7th July, 1976, Mr Nixon said—

My predecessor agreed last August that the Bureau of Transport Economics would review the Wilbur Smith Report. This has now been done and the bureau has reported that investment in the busway system is superior to investment in the urban rail system. The bureau thus supports the findings of the Wilbur Smith Report.

In view of the foregoing it seems to me that the next step should be for you to forward to me a submission which details costs of the urban transport system which your Government proposes to adopt.

If this is done officials could begin to analyse your proposal in relation to possible financial assistance in 1977-78. You will appreciate that I can offer no comment on the proposal until such analysis has been completed. If your option is contrary to the economic solution I would appreciate your advice on the factors which contributed to your decision.

There is a current minute before Cabinet on this matter.

## 2. "POLICY AND PERFORMANCE" PUBLICATION

### *Local Ownership of Airports*

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Health, representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) On what date did the Government intervene to prevent transfer of airports to local ownership as stated on page 219 of the publication "Policy and Performance"?
- (2) What was the form of the intervention?
- (3) What reply has been received from the present Australian Government?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) Two dates are relevant:  
10th June, 1975; and  
8th January, 1976.
- (2) On 10th June, last year, the Premier formally requested the then Prime Minister, the Hon. E. G. Whitlam, to defer extension of the Federal Government's Local Ownership Plan in Western Australia for two years. This request was denied.

On 8th January, 1976, shortly after the election of the Liberal-Country Party Government, the Premier made formal representations to the present Prime Minister, seeking again to have the implementation of the Plan deferred.

- (3) While expressing belief in the general concept of aerodrome local ownership, in his reply to the Premier, Mr Fraser advised that his Government's Transport Policy calls for a review of the Local Ownership Plan with the objective of encouraging shire

councils to improve local aerodromes and associated facilities. He added that this review will have regard to experience of the Plan in operation over recent years and particular regard to the special circumstances existing in remote areas.

## 3. COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTRES

### *Progress and Funds*

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What progress has been made in the provision of Community Health Centres at—
  - (a) Geraldton;
  - (b) South Hedland;
  - (c) Claremont; and
  - (d) Lockridge?
- (2) Has the provision of any of these centres been affected by cuts in funding by the Australian Government?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) (a) Geraldton Regional Health Centre: A building contract has been let and the scheduled completion date is June, 1977. Good progress is being made with the building.
- (b) South Hedland Health Centre: A building contract has been let and the scheduled completion date is June, 1977. Good progress is being made with the building.
- (c) Teaching Health Centre—Claremont: Planning and documentation are approaching completion.
- (d) Lockridge Health Centre: This centre is established and operating.
- (2) No.

## 4.

### BIRDS

#### *Classification of Dealers and Standards*

The Hon. R. T. LEESON, to the Minister for Education, representing the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) Has the current review of classifications of bird dealers and keeping standards been completed?
- (2) If so, when will the decision be made known to those concerned?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) When the consequent amendments to the regulations made under the Wildlife Conservation Act have been gazetted and tabled. The

first drafts of the amendments are now being checked and it is hoped that they will be tabled next month.

## 5. EDUCATION

### *Loan Council Funds*

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Education: 7.

(1) Is it a fact that—

(a) there has been an eight per cent cut, in real money terms, in Loan Council funds made available to the States;

(b) this cut approximates \$116 million; and

(c) these cuts will effectively reduce the amount available for school buildings by about \$23 million?

(2) If so, what is the reduction in funds available to Western Australia?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

(1) and (2) This information will become available when the Budget is announced.

## 6. EDUCATION

### *Standard and Finance*

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Is it a fact that Western Australian primary schools rate second worst in Australia in terms of resources available to them?

(2) Is it a fact that Western Australian secondary schools have dropped to fourth worst in Australia in terms of resources available to them?

(3) Does the Schools Commission Report indicate that this State must direct more of its effort to education if our children are to be given opportunities equal to those available elsewhere?

(4) Is it a fact that only 23.9 per cent of the State's recurrent expenditure budget for 1975-1976 was spent on education compared with 36.6 per cent for Victoria?

(5) Is it a fact that in the same period only 15.9 per cent of the State Budget was spent on building schools compared with 26 per cent for Victoria?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

(1) No.

(2) No.

(3) The Report commends the States for continuing to add in real terms to the resources they devote to schools.

(4) and (5) The Report itself states that statistics commonly used can be misleading and interstate comparisons are not meaningful unless exactly the same components are contained in the statistics being used.

## EDUCATION

### *Class Numbers*

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Is it a fact that Western Australia has the largest percentage of any State of primary school classes above 30?

(2) Is it a fact that classes are occupying more than 400 temporary classrooms?

(3) If so—

(a) is the Government concerned with this unsatisfactory situation; and

(b) what provision is it making to improve these conditions?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

(1) to (3) Marked improvement in class sizes and accommodation in primary education has occurred since this Government came into office. I am optimistic that this trend will be maintained.

## BILLS (2): THIRD READING

1. Taxi-cars (Co-ordination and Control) Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

2. Civil Aviation (Carriers' Liability) Act Amendment Bill.

Bills read a third time, on motions by the Hon. N. E. Baxter (Minister for Health), and passed.

## ACTS AMENDMENT (JURISDICTION OF COURTS) BILL

### *Second Reading*

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Attorney-General) [4.50 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

In essence, this Bill is designed to increase the civil jurisdiction of both the District Court and the Local Courts and to provide for an appeal from a Local Court to a judge of the District Court with a further appeal by leave to the Supreme Court. Its provisions will amend the District Court of Western Australia Act and the Local Courts Act.

A special committee which had operated over recent years was re-convened to examine the distribution of jurisdiction between the Supreme Court, the District Court and the Local Courts of Western Australia. That committee, comprising a

Supreme Court judge and District Court judge, the Solicitor-General and the President of the Law Society, has now reported to the Government and the substantive recommendations of the committee are contained in the Bill before the House. His Honour the Chief Justice has stated that, in general terms, the special committee's report accords with his own views on the various matters referred to.

The report reviewed the statistics showing the volume of work in each of the courts since their last report four years ago and has noted various factors affecting, or likely to affect, the work load of the Supreme Court including—

The Road Traffic Authority Act whereby the majority of trials on indictment in respect of road deaths now proceed in the District Court.

The creation of the Family Court of Western Australia thus hiving off all original matrimonial jurisdiction and most similar proceedings.

Proposed amendments to the Commonwealth Judiciary Act transferring significant areas of jurisdiction from the High Court to the State Supreme Court.

In view of the inflation which has occurred over the years the special committee considered it desirable and recommended to increase the civil jurisdiction of both the District and the Local Courts.

As I mentioned at the beginning the two current Acts affected are the District Court of Western Australia Act and the Local Courts Act.

It is proposed to lift the monetary limit in the civil jurisdiction of the District Court—as set out in section 50 (1) (a) (b) and (c) of the Act—from \$10 000 to \$20 000 and to lift the monetary limit set out in paragraph (d) of the same section which includes actions for recovery of possession of land from \$5 000 to \$10 000.

The Local Courts Act will be amended by increasing the monetary limit in personal actions and actions in relation to a partnership account, a share under an intestacy, or legacy under a will, and also equitable claims from \$1 000 to \$3 000—sections 30, 31 and 32—and by increasing the ceiling rental in relation to actions for the recovery of possession of land from \$1 600 to \$5 000—section 99.

It is further proposed to amend section 107 of the Local Courts Act to provide that there shall be an appeal as of right from a final judgment and by leave from an interlocutory judgment of a Local Court to a judge of the District Court; with an appeal from the District Court to the Full Court of the Supreme Court only by leave of that court; and with a further provision that the Supreme Court or a judge thereof may on summons remove into the Full Court an appeal then pending in the District Court.

Generally speaking, the civil jurisdiction of the District Court is recommended to be doubled in terms of the monetary value of actions and trebled in relation to the Local Court. This is because the Local Court's jurisdiction was last increased some 22 years ago whereas the jurisdiction of the District Court was increased more recently.

There are some other minor consequential amendments, including arrangements in regard to pending proceedings.

I am satisfied that the altered jurisdiction conferred under the Bill will work for the benefit of persons having business in the courts and provide a more sensible distribution of cases under current conditions.

I commend the Bill to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. Grace Vaughan.

### **WESTERN AUSTRALIAN MEAT INDUSTRY AUTHORITY BILL**

#### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice), read a first time.

### **SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**

#### *Second Reading*

Order of the day read for the resumption of the debate from the 9th September. Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee, etc.*

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

#### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Attorney-General), and transmitted to the Assembly.

### **ADOPTION OF CHILDREN ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 9th September.

**THE HON. R. THOMPSON** (South Metropolitan) [5.00 p.m.]: Mr President, I support this legislation. As the Minister said in his second reading speech, the decisions which resulted in this amending Bill were made at the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General and the meetings of the Australian Council of Social Welfare Ministers which met in Darwin. The purpose is to bring our legislation into line with the more socially advanced Acts operative in some other States. The Minister did not say in which States these provisions exist or whether the other States have introduced legislation along these lines. I do not think that that matters very much, but it would be

nice to know whether the whole of Australia is moving towards uniform legislation in this respect. The Minister may be able to tell us that.

The Bill contains six amendments to the Adoption of Children Act. Although they are not major amendments they are advanced or progressive amendments. Of course, when we deal with the Adoption of Children Act we are dealing with a very ticklish subject which is dear to the heart of everyone who has been involved in an adoption or who has a relative who has been involved in an adoption. Everyone can and does set himself up as an expert in this field.

Most people think the Department for Community Welfare is the deciding authority. That is not the case at all. A judge of the Supreme Court is the deciding authority in the granting of adoptions.

The principal change in the Bill is the removal of all references to illegitimacy. The second one is that when one parent marries or remarries only the new spouse rather than the two will have to apply for adoption. There will be provision for an unmarried mother to nominate the father as the person by whom the child is to be adopted, if she so wishes. The change in Christian names not being allowed after the age of 12 years is also good. There is a further new provision to prevent the use of undue influence to induce a person to revoke an adoption.

I should like the Minister, Mr Medcalf, and all members, to have a look at one matter. I think I had better read the final paragraph of the Minister's second reading speech. He said—

Finally, the proposals create two new offences. It is proposed that it be an offence to use undue influence to induce a person to revoke an adoption consent, and also to receive the possession, custody, or control of a child for the purposes of adoption without the consent of the Director of the Department for Community Welfare.

Members of the legal profession have drawn clause 11 of the Bill to my attention. Clause 11 of the Bill reads in part—

- (a) transfers or causes to be transferred the possession, custody or control . . .

Section 23 of the parent Act, which has been repealed and re-enacted, and section 22 use the word "possession". According to the representations which have been made to me it is not possible for any person to possess another human being. I am not a legal practitioner and so I cannot voice my personal opinion. This is why I ask Mr Medcalf to look at the matter because he is a lawyer. I have been requested to move for the deletion of the word "possession" from the Bill. At this stage I say that I support the Bill, but I will

move an amendment if I cannot receive a satisfactory answer with regard to the word "possession".

**THE HON. N. E. BAXTER** (Central—Minister for Community Welfare) (5.07 p.m.): I express my appreciation to the Hon. Mr Thompson for his support of the Bill. He mentioned to me this afternoon before the House met that he would raise this query in regard to the word "possession". Looking at the matter as a layman, I am inclined to think that the word was deliberately put in by the Parliamentary Counsel to make the intention of this amendment very clear.

At this stage I prefer to refer the matter back to Parliamentary Counsel to ascertain the reason for the inclusion of this word. I give Mr Thompson notice now that I shall be prepared to defer the Committee stage until the next sitting of the House so that this matter can be checked.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### **ACTS AMENDMENT (EXPERT EVIDENCE) BILL**

##### *Second Reading*

Order of the day read for the resumption of the debate from the 9th September.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

##### *In Committee, etc.*

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

##### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Attorney-General), and transmitted to the Assembly.

#### **CITY OF PERTH PARKING FACILITIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

##### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 9th September.

**THE HON. D. K. DANS** (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [5.13 p.m.]: We support this Bill. The measure seeks to amend the City of Perth Parking Facilities Act and contains amendments which have been advanced by both the City of Perth and the Government. Whilst this amending Bill will do a lot to facilitate further parking in Perth, it appears to me that the day is not far distant when a great deal more attention will have to be given to this problem and that either the present Government or a future Government will have to deal precisely and honestly with the question of restricting the entry of traffic into the city. I do not think anyone in the House would disagree with that.

As one of those unfortunate people who have to travel into the city by the Kwinana Freeway each day, I do not know how much further we can go in providing parking facilities or increasing parking fees, because saturation point has been just about reached. We support the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

*Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. N. E. Baxter (Minister for Health), and passed.

### **MOTOR VEHICLE DEALERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 9th September.

**THE HON. D. K. DANS** (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [5.17 p.m.]: We agree with this Bill which is a simple piece of legislation to amend a section of the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act.

It would appear to me, however, that the verbiage of the legislation could have been a little more explicit. Its provision now excludes those vehicles that have been sold to a dealer for demonstration purposes.

We think this is a worthy amendment and we support the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

*Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Education), and passed.

### **GOLD BUYERS ACT REPEAL BILL**

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 9th September.

**THE HON. S. J. DELLAR** (Lower North) [5.21 p.m.]: This Bill seeks to do one thing and one thing only, and that is to repeal the Gold Buyers Act, 1921-1975. The Opposition in this Chamber supports the measure.

Members will be aware that under the conditions which apply under the provisions of the present Act it is unlawful for persons to possess gold or gold matter without being the holder of the requisite licence.

In his second reading speech the Minister said that with the decline in the goldmining industry—and this is quite apparent so I will not elaborate on it at this stage—the restriction is a little out of date. In fact, the Bill supplements the provisions that applied by the actions of the Government in Canberra when it repealed part IV of the Commonwealth Banking Act in January, 1976.

The repeal of the legislation will permit certain functions to continue whereby people will be able to have a little fun prospecting and panning for gold in the areas concerned.

We support the legislation and hope it will have a speedy passage through the House.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Thank you, Mr Dellar.

**THE HON. R. H. C. STUBBS** (South-East) [5.23 p.m.]: I wish to say only a few words on this Bill which seeks to repeal the Gold Buyers Act and to say I approve of the repeal.

I noticed that in his second reading speech the Minister mentioned the fact that the goldfields will now have to depend to a large extent on tourism; or words to that effect. I think this will be apparent all over the goldfields because of the closing down of almost all the goldmines in Western Australia. The only mine that has not closed is the mine at Norseman and that manages to survive only because of some very rich ore being mined by a cheaper open-cut method.

While speaking of gold panning I would like to say as a matter of interest that I saw this take place as a tourist attraction in Canada where it was so attractive from the point of view of tourism as to be able to maintain a town with about 20 motels consisting of about 500 units.

In this old mining State the Historical Society of British Columbia had restored the place to the condition it enjoyed during the gold rush days at the time when gold was discovered. This restoration was carried forward even to the extent of wax models being provided of the events and personnel of the day, featuring a barber shop and client; a dentist and patient; and a fully furnished saloon and clients.

The main attraction was gold panning. For this people queued up and paid a dollar for a couple of pounds of wash. It was legitimate wash which was brought up from a mine on the site. The gold from the wash could be taken away or brought back as the people wished. Gold of reasonable size would be stuck on a card and small specks were bottled in water.

What appealed to me was the fact that people were travelling miles to see this. I travelled 430 miles from Vancouver for the purpose. This would be the equivalent of travelling from Perth to Norseman. I

gleaned a lot of good ideas and I thought perhaps I could pass this notion of tourism on to those who may be interested, because I feel that Kalgoorlie, Norseman, and other places have such a wonderful historical background that people could be persuaded to visit these places and spend their tourist dollar. It would need only a little pressure selling to achieve this end. This is made easier by the bituminising of the Eyre Highway. According to the statistics we find that the number of people using the highway now has increased by 30 per cent and in a few months' time the number could be doubled. As I have said, with the right type of direction people could be lured to Kalgoorlie and Norseman and other outback areas to witness and take part in the various skills associated with goldmining.

I support the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

*Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Education), and passed.

## RACECOURSE DEVELOPMENT BILL

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 9th September.

**THE HON. S. J. DELLAR** (Lower North) [5.27 p.m.]: This Bill contains a new innovation. If I read its title members would perhaps obtain a clearer indication of what it sets out to do. It is a Bill for an Act to establish a racecourse development trust and to make provision for a racecourse development trust fund for the purpose of assisting country racing clubs in improving facilities provided by those clubs, and for incidental and other purposes.

I think the operative phrase is "for the purposes of assisting country racing clubs". As members will be aware, the racing fraternity in the country generally—that is, those associated with the gallops and the trots—have in recent years attempted to lift their standards to provide for their patrons facilities which, though not comparable with those which exist in the metropolitan area, are the best they can provide to accommodate the large numbers of people who attend their racing and trotting meetings.

The purpose of the Bill is to establish a fund based on a contribution by the Government which amount will be matched by the Western Australian Turf Club and the Western Australian Trotting Association. The Bill further provides for a four-man trust which will administer the fund and decide which clubs in the country areas are to receive assistance.

I think I might be generous enough to say that I commend the Government for its actions in this regard.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Thank you very much.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: It is not often that I commend the Government.

The Hon. N. McNeill: You have good cause to do it more often.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: That is debatable. At the moment, however, we are not debating the merits of the Government; I am merely commending the Government on one small action it has taken.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: For which I thanked you.

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: And for which I am receiving a great deal of assistance from Mr Lewis. I believe that not all of the public in Western Australia is interested in the future of the country racing and trotting clubs.

A tremendous amount of investment is involved in racing, not only by those people who own the horses and participate in the sport, but also by those who assist in running the country programmes and those who support racing by way of patronage.

Members who attend country race meetings will be aware that the facilities are bleak, to say the least, in some areas. In those areas where there is a fairly large population the facilities are somewhat better.

I well recall—as will Mr George Berry—the facilities which existed at Marrilla Station where the Winning Pool Racing Club recently held a meeting. It holds one meeting each year, and the club is to be commended for the facilities it does provide.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Was not there a meeting held there only recently?

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR: As a matter of fact, a meeting was held there only three weeks ago. I could tell the Minister a story about a certain horse, but perhaps it will keep until later. The Winning Pool Race Club attempted to cut down on attendance numbers because it was unable to provide adequate facilities to cater for an influx of something like 1 500 people who have to be fed, housed, and showered during the weekend of the race meeting.

Other racing clubs in the Murchison have improved their facilities in many cases. In particular, the Exmouth Racing Club obtained a loan through the local governing body in order to provide what I consider to be one of the most modern and up-to-date racecourses in the north-west of Western Australia. Of course, we are all aware of the cost involved in repaying a loan raised through a shire council. It is possible, by means of the provisions in the Bill now before us, that

the club will be able to convert its loan and borrow directly from the fund.

I do not think I need to say much more. I am sure that once the fund is established it will increase substantially and more money will be made available to country racing clubs, although, as the Minister has indicated, during the initial stages of the setting up of the fund the amount of money available will not be great.

With those supporting remarks, I commend the Bill.

**THE HON. T. KNIGHT** (South) [5.32 p.m.]: The Bill before us, to establish a racecourse development trust, will indeed be welcomed by country racing and trotting clubs.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: That is what I have already said.

The Hon. T. KNIGHT: The money made available to the fund will be used to assist country racing and trotting clubs, and it will be welcomed by many people.

Many racing clubs are located in my province, at Albany, Esperance, Mt. Barker, Pingrup, and Nyabing. There is also a trotting club at Albany. I understand a site has been set aside at Gibson Soak, near Esperance, for the establishment of a trotting club. All of the clubs I have mentioned are in need of financial assistance to help them provide the facilities required by the public and the competitors who patronise racing.

The Hicks Park Trotting Club was established a couple of miles out of Albany, along Lancaster Road, two years ago. The officials and members of the club have done a fantastic job in providing facilities, but lack of finance has slowed down development considerably. The slowing down in development as possibly cut back the attendance of patrons.

In order to sponsor and promote racing clubs in country areas it is necessary to provide financial assistance such as that envisaged in the measure now before us. I am sure the smaller country clubs will be able to increase their patronage by providing modern club facilities.

We also saw the opening of the Spencer Park Racecourse last year. It is on the south coast, near Albany, and it was named after Mr Percy Spencer who was the president of the club for many years, and an official for a great number of years. That club had a very successful first season. In spite of the lack of funds, the track is considered to be one of the best and one of the fastest in Western Australia. It is a pity this measure did not come forward 12 months previously because next year Albany will celebrate its sesquicentennial year as the first settlement in Western Australia. The town will hold many celebrations and, in particular, the

racing club intends to hold meetings and offer large prizes in the hope of attracting additional patrons. A weekend race meeting will place emphasis on the Albany Sesquicentenary Cup. I understand the first prize will be in the vicinity of \$10 000 or \$15 000. The club lacks a grandstand and public shelters, although it does have a good standard in clubrooms.

The establishment of the racecourse development trust will assist the Albany Racing Club to provide additional facilities, and it will also assist the other racing clubs throughout my electorate to provide facilities. We will be able to look forward to a better standard of racing and more public interest. Perth, because of its population, already has very good facilities. I believe that within the next few years the standards of the country racing and trotting clubs will be lifted way beyond what they are at present. The passing of this measure will augur well for the establishment of improved facilities for the sport of racing throughout Western Australia. I support the Bill.

**THE HON. H. W. GAYFER** (Central) [5.37 p.m.]: I feel I must have something to say in respect of this Bill. Previous speakers have stated that it is possibly some 12 months behind the times, and it has also been said that the measure should have been introduced a long time ago.

The measure will involve unclaimed dividends and I know that during the years I have been in this Parliament many measures have been introduced in an attempt to get some control over unclaimed dividends. I well remember while I was in another place a certain gentleman who later became the Premier of this State argued that unclaimed dividends should be used for the purpose of constructing homes for aged people. I remember another occasion when the Opposition of the day argued that the unclaimed dividends should be used for another purpose.

Because of the embarrassments which occurred on the previous occasions when there has been some move to spend unclaimed dividends, I am very pleased that it has now been decided to do something with them. I believe they are to be spent in the right direction, and in the right and proper place. Unclaimed dividends, from racing and trotting meetings, should be reinvested to improve racing and trotting tracks and the facilities which are available for the public at those tracks.

This has been a moot point over the years and I am very pleased to see that the Government has decided to allow money to be diverted in this manner from Consolidated Revenue. I was rather surprised when this measure came forward because I know it is not easy to have money diverted from Consolidated Revenue, even though one might consider it should be



rightfully diverted. This Bill will be the means of returning to the people what I consider to be rightfully theirs.

There are many racing and trotting clubs in my province, and I am closely associated with them. Many racing clubs have attempted to bring the standard of their facilities up to those which exist at the city clubs, but it has proved to be very costly. A grandstand costs in the vicinity of \$150 000 or \$160 000. It is also very costly to grass a race track and bring it to the standard desired by those who ride and train the horses.

Country race meetings attract a considerable number of tourists to country towns. I know that in the towns of York, Beverley, and Narrogin race meetings attract a considerable number of people. Therefore, the Government will indirectly assist tourism with the introduction of this racecourse development trust.

I know that it was argued in another place that the committee should comprise six members. A great deal of representation has been made to me on this very matter. The committee will comprise one member nominated by the Treasurer, one member nominated by the Western Australian Turf Club, one member nominated by the Western Australian Trotting Association, and one member nominated by the Totalisator Agency Board. It is considered that the representatives of those various bodies will be able to recommend the allocation of funds where they are most needed.

Representations made to me suggested that the committee should be increased from four to eight members so that added impetus could be given to the direction in which it is considered the money should be spent. However, I see difficulties in a committee of that number. We do not know which way the representatives of the different organisations would tend to lean.

I believe the measure should be tried out in the spirit set down by the Minister. The four committee members will be responsible for the disbursement of funds, and the particular racing or trotting club concerned should make representation to their representative on the committee.

I suggest to the Minister there should be some provision for members of a club, which is being considered for a loan, to be asked to attend relative meetings purely and simply in an advisory capacity. I believe the advice of the clubs concerned is absolutely necessary so that the members of the committee will be aware of the plans of the racing club.

I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill. I agree with previous speakers that it is long overdue. As I said previously, the measure will provide that unclaimed dividends will be returned to the section of the community to which they belong.

**THE HON. N. E. BAXTER** (Central—Minister for Health) [5.44 p.m.]: I would like to express my appreciation to those members who have supported this measure; and Mr Dellar in particular for his support and his commendation of the Government for introducing the Bill.

I thank Mr Knight for his remarks in regard to the racing clubs in his particular province, and I express my appreciation to Mr Gayfer for his dissertation and his suggestion.

It will be recalled that when I introduced the measure I said the Minister responsible for it had agreed to an amendment to provide for advice to be given to the committee along the lines suggested by Mr Gayfer.

The effect of the amendment will be that when an application is made by a club for an allocation of money for a specific project, somebody from the local racing region or zone will be invited to deliberate with the trust on that application. I intend to delay the Committee debate on this Bill until tomorrow when the foreshadowed amendment will appear on the notice paper. This will allow members an opportunity to consider the amendment before it is moved.

I have had a very long association with racing and I have seen the ups and downs of some of the country clubs of Western Australia. As a matter of fact, prior to the war I was Secretary of the Balingup Racing Club and during and after the war I was Secretary of the Balingup-Greenbushes Racing Club. We ran a number of meetings in that area, and in 1946 we ran a meeting for the club at Bunbury when the Bunbury Racing Club was good enough to let us use its course. This was the first seven-race meeting held at Bunbury. My association with the racing industry has included also owning and racing horses.

A few months ago I met the Secretary of the Bunbury Racing Club and he told me that he was writing a history of that club. He mentioned my association with racing in the south-west and he told me that my name would appear in this history so that there will be on record my association with racing over the years.

There is need for money to improve facilities in racing clubs. Many of the tracks at country racecourses do need improving. As a racehorse owner I am aware of the risk factor to horses—which are worth many thousands of dollars—when a track is not up to scratch. There is also a need for improvement in the facilities provided for the public who give their support to both trotting and galloping events. I believe over the years this measure will go a long way to help provide

the facilities that are needed in country centres. With those remarks I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

## **WESTERN AUSTRALIAN MEAT INDUSTRY AUTHORITY BILL**

### *Second Reading*

**THE HON. N. McNEILL** (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [5.49 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to establish a meat industry authority, to provide for a system of approval of abattoirs, and to repeal the Meat Industry (Treatment Works) Licensing Act, 1937.

Members are possibly aware that a Meat Industry Advisory Committee was formed following the release of the Towns and Austen report on abattoirs in Western Australia. That report recommended the establishment of a meat industry authority to determine the need and capacity of new abattoirs, and the location of such works.

The committee has since carried out those functions and has provided a mechanism for resolving problems within the industry, but has no statutory authority.

A major involvement of the committee, especially during its first two years of existence, was its assessment of proposals submitted to the Government for the construction of export-standard abattoirs. These proposals were invariably on the basis of State guarantees.

The emphasis on export-standard abattoirs reflects the marked growth of the State's livestock industries and the consequent increased dependence on export markets. In recent years, Western Australia has exported approximately one-half of its beef production, and approximately two-thirds of its mutton production, and with the development of markets in the Middle East, exports of lamb have increased substantially, accounting for 50 per cent of production in 1975-76.

The value of the State's meat exports was \$74 million in 1973-74, \$56 million in 1974-75—which was a year of low export prices—and \$59 million for the first nine months of 1975-76. Exports of all meats increased from 71 000 tonnes in 1973-74 to 108 000 tonnes in 1975-76.

Feasibility studies on the basis of State financial assistance were received and assessed by the committee for sites at Pinjarra, Wanneroo, Boyup Brook, Geraldton, Northam, Carnarvon, and Esperance. Requests concerning abattoir construction not backed by detailed feasibility studies were also received for sites at Collie, Toodyay, Gingin, and Port Hedland.

The committee supported the construction of an export abattoir at Esperance by 1976, and in this decision gave due regard to the isolation of Esperance from existing export facilities.

In assessing general abattoir needs, the committee has stressed that the site at Baldvis reserved by the Government for a future meat industry complex be given due consideration when additional capacity is required.

The committee is considered to have fully justified its role during this period by its critical assessment of these projects. One submission, for example, sought guarantees to the extent of \$23 million for three works and associated cold store facilities at ports. In retrospect, the committee's judgment has been shown to have been very sound.

The increase in export abattoir capacity has coincided with increasingly stringent standards of construction and procedures imposed by importing countries. The construction of an export abattoir demands large capital outlay and careful planning to achieve an efficient level of operation. Under-utilisation of installed capacity results in high operating costs and dislocation of the work force. A rational approach to overall planning is therefore required if full benefit to the industry and the community is to be achieved.

Nonexport abattoirs have provided increased competition for export establishments since the latter were required to undertake substantial upgrading to comply with the specifications of major importing countries. Because of lower capitalisation and lower operation costs, stock can be processed at nonexport abattoirs for the domestic market at a lower cost than at export establishments, and some nonexport abattoirs have increased their scale of operations significantly because of this differential.

At present, there are no controls over the establishment of abattoirs outside the metropolitan area, provided that the site has been approved by the shire concerned and, in the case of export establishments, by the Commonwealth Department of Agriculture.

Since the prosperity of the meat industry in Western Australia now depends significantly on export markets, the long term viability of export abattoirs is of prime concern to the Government.

It is now considered desirable to formally establish a meat industry authority with appropriate statutory recognition and powers to ensure the orderly development of further killing facilities throughout the State, and to advise the Minister generally on abattoir and meat industry matters.

The Bill provides that the authority will have a composition similar to that of the present committee, and it will be noted

that one member shall be a representative of the interests of persons directly employed in the processing of meat at abattoirs.

The functions of the authority are clearly defined in the Bill, as well as its role in regulating the construction and operation of abattoirs.

Legislation of a similar nature has been provided in other States by the Meat Industry Authority Act (New South Wales), the Meat Industry Act (Queensland), and the Abattoir and Meat Inspection Act (Victoria).

Finally, the Bill provides for the repeal of the Meat Industry (Treatment Works) Licensing Act. This Act requires the licensing of all abattoirs where meat is processed for export, but has no relevance at this time, since the same matters are legislated for in the Commonwealth Export (Meat) Regulations. The Act has therefore no legal effect in practice.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. R. T. Leeson.

## AUSTRALIAN CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

### *Appointment of Delegates—Request for Council's Participation: Assembly's Message*

Message from the Assembly received and read as follows—

The Legislative Assembly having this day agreed to certain resolutions concerning the Parliament of this State continuing to participate in the Australian Constitutional Convention, transmits a copy of the Resolutions for the information of the Legislative Council.

The Legislative Assembly requests that the Legislative Council will consider its continued participation in the Convention and appoint Members in accordance with the Resolutions to act with the seven Members of this House who have been so appointed.

## THE SCHEDULE.

WHEREAS it is desirable that the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia should by resolution declare its will in regard to the continued participation of the Parliament in the Australian Constitutional Convention and make such decisions consequent thereupon as may seem appropriate; NOW, THEREFORE, the Legislative Assembly resolves to continue to participate in the Australian Constitutional Convention and further resolves:

1. That for the purposes of the Convention—

- (a) the delegation from the Parliament of Western Australia should consist of twelve members of whom seven should be appointed by the Legislative Assembly and five by the Legislative Council;
- (b) the seven members appointed by the Legislative Assembly shall comprise two members from the Liberal Party, four members from the Australian Labor Party and one member from the National Country Party; and
- (c) the five members appointed by the Legislative Council shall comprise three members from the Liberal Party and two members from the Australian Labor Party.

2. That each appointed member of the delegation shall continue as an appointed member while a member of the Parliament of Western Australia unless—

- (a) the House of Parliament by which he has been appointed terminates his appointment; or
- (b) he resigns as a member of the delegation by writing addressed to the President of the Legislative Council or the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, as the case requires.

3. That the seven members appointed by the Legislative Assembly shall be—

The Hon. Sir Charles Court.  
The Hon. D. H. O'Neil.  
Mr W. R. McPharlin.  
The Hon. C. J. Jamieson.  
The Hon. H. D. Evans.  
The Hon. A. D. Taylor.  
Mr R. E. Bertram.

4. That the Hon. Sir Charles Court or his nominee be Leader of the delegation, and the Hon. C. J. Jamieson or his nominee be Deputy Leader.

5. That where, because of illness or other cause, a member of the delegation is unable to attend a meeting of the Convention, or of a committee of the Convention or of a sub-committee or working party of such a committee, the leader or senior available member of the party from which that member is drawn may appoint an

alternate member, and the member so appointed shall be a member of the delegation for that meeting.

6. That the Leader from time to time, make a report to the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly respectively of such information and matters arising out of the Convention as he thinks fit, and such report shall be laid on the Table of each House of Parliament.

7. That the Leader and Deputy Leader of the delegation, or their respective nominees, be appointed to represent the delegation on the Convention's Executive Committee.

8. That the Honourable the Attorney General be asked to provide such assistance to the delegation as it may require.

9. That the Legislative Council be informed of this resolution and invited to continue its participation in the Convention on the basis outlined herein.

## UNEMPLOYMENT AND INFLATION

### *Commonwealth Government Action: Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 8th September, on the following motion by the Hon. D. W. Cooley—

- (1) This House notes with concern—
  - (a) the high level of unemployment in Australia generally and Western Australia in particular;
  - (b) that unemployment has worsened to a substantial degree since the advent of the Fraser Government;
  - (c) that the latest figures provided by the Government Statistician are the highest since the Great Depression of the 1930's and appear to be heading towards the half million mark before the end of this year.
- (2) We consider that the Australian Government's strategy to reduce Government spending in order to direct more finance into the private sector has contributed to this unfavourable employment situation and at the same time has effected a deterioration in the quality of life for workers and their families on incomes which are lower than the average weekly earning, pensioners and Aborigines; by—
  - (a) the abolition of taxation concessions for dependant children;

- (b) the introduction of a Medi-bank levy and the restoration of rights for Private Health Funds to provide full medical and hospital benefit to the people of Australia which will reduce the take-home pay of some wage and salary earners by as much as \$10 per week;

- (c) a policy which has reduced real wages for lower income earners through a successful advocacy in the Australian Industrial Commission to allow a very small percentage of increases in the Consumer Price Index to be reflected in incomes;

- (d) a change from the previous Government's policy of relating Social Security and Repatriation Pensions as a percentage of average weekly earnings to movements in the Consumer Price Index;

- (e) a large reduction in the grants for Aboriginal welfare.

(3) The House also notes with concern the continued attacks by the Australian Government on the trade union movement by its assertions that wage increases are the sole cause of the high inflation rate.

(4) The House considers that the Australian Government should concern itself more with the interest of all people in the community instead of an affluent few within the private sector.

**THE HON. G. E. MASTERS (West)** [5.57 p.m.]: I would like to make a few remarks on this motion. I listened with some interest to the speeches of Opposition members, and, although Mr Dans is not here at the moment, I must say that he treated us to probably one of the most depressing speeches this House has heard for some time—certainly it was the most depressing speech I have heard here. I am sure the honourable member missed his vocation—he should have been an undertaker. We can imagine Mr Dans walking across the floor of this House as the undertaker with his eight pallbearers flanking him, and we know who those eight would be.

The Hon. N. McNeill: His vocation is to be depressing.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: That is it. One can almost hear him crying, "The end is nigh" and his fellow members would say the same.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Did you hear the bells?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We could almost hear the bells of doom ringing when he made his speech the other night. How depressing it was! We need something to boost confidence.

One can imagine the intense frustration of Opposition members which has been brought about by the re-emergence of the private sector. We see the private sector gradually gaining strength and confidence. This is a great worry to the Labor Party as it means its demise in the next election if the private sector starts moving forward. I will quote some figures to prove the point.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Hurry up.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I will not hurry up.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I was not asking you to hurry up—I was asking the private sector.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: It is amazing to me, and it must be amazing to the Opposition that the private sector can re-emerge after the battering and near destruction it suffered at the hands of the Labor Party over the past years, and I mean at the hands of the Whitlam Government. When we look at the motion one can imagine—

Several members interjected.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The choir is still singing.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: That is the extent of the devastation.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I would like to refer specifically to the last six words in the motion moved by Mr Cooley. Paragraph (4) commences—

The House considers that the Australian Government—

I am sure Mr Cooley means the Commonwealth Government. To continue—

—should concern itself more with the interest of all people in the community instead of—

And these are the words to which I wish to draw attention—

—an affluent few within the private sector.

This demonstrates the bitterness and intense hatred of the private sector felt by the Labor Party, and it demonstrates the clear difference between the philosophy of the Liberal Party and the National Country Party and that of the socialist party.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Just as well there is a difference!

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: It certainly is, as far as the private sector is concerned. As the coalition Government, we stand for freedom, personal endeavour,

those things worth fighting for and reward for work done. But this is something the Labor Party cannot understand; the Labor Party is dedicated to the destruction of the private sector, to the stifling of personal initiative and, of course, to the emergence of a welfare State in which everybody—man, woman, and child—depends upon a socialist Government.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: What rot!

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: A welfare State is what members of the Opposition dream of. If we read through the motion, we find it is full of hypocrisy. Part (1) (b) states—

That unemployment has worsened to a substantial degree since the advent of the Fraser Government;

The House is asked to note the situation with concern. However, when we look at the figures, we find "substantial" is the wrong word. Of course, Western Australia has fared better than most States. I believe I am entitled to ask why the Labor Party did not move this motion in July of 1975. Of course we are concerned about unemployment; of course we agree the situation is not a good one. But let us look at the figures over the past few years.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: What figures—seasonally adjusted?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I have both sets, and if Mr Cooley insists I will have them photocopied and distributed to members; he will find the results are still the same. To begin with, I will use the accepted figures.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: What are "the accepted figures"?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I refer to the figures distributed by the Commonwealth Employment Service where, in table 1 of "Australian Original Data" for July, 1973—at which time, of course, the Whitlam Government was in power—it reveals that 76 359 people, or 1.34 per cent of the work force were unemployed.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: What was the situation in West Germany, Britain, and other European countries?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am making this speech; Miss Elliott has made her contribution to the debate. In July, 1974, 93 585 people, representing 1.61 per cent of the work force, were unemployed, a gain of .27 per cent on the previous year. However, in July, 1975, 251 622 people or 4.24 per cent of the work force, were unemployed, representing an increase on the previous year's figures of 2.63 per cent. In July, this year, 270 286 people, or 4.44 per cent of the work force were unemployed, an increase of .2 per cent in the 12-month period.

Therefore, one would imagine the Labor Party would have been more concerned about unemployment last year than this

year. Whitlam managed to increase the number of unemployed by 2.63 per cent in one year, while the Fraser Government has managed to hold it to an increase of only .2 per cent. We are far from happy with the situation. However, it makes one wonder about the silence of the Labor Party last year, when the pressure was really on and when the Whitlam Government was destroying the economy of Australia.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Have you read tonight's newspaper?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Every member in this House should be concerned about unemployment, but motions such as this certainly will not improve the situation. I believe the coalition parties are much more concerned about unemployment than is the Labor Party. We realise it represents a great threat to our way of life. We know unemployment is the breeding ground for—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: But you said you could fix it up on a State by State basis.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I believe this to be an important point, and worthy of repetition. We realise unemployment is the breeding ground for unhappiness, family problems, suffering and misery; but this is the background on which socialism breeds.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: If we are socialists, I am entitled to call your people fascists.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Is the Leader of the Opposition upset at being called a socialist?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: No, not at all. The socialists did not do too well, and we now have a fascist Government. Let us see how well the fascists go.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am sure members opposite do not mind being called socialists, just as I do not mind being called a conservative.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I am just letting you know the situation.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I should like to listen to the Hon. G. E. Masters, for the same reason that at times I listen to the Hon. Grace Vaughan.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I repeat that we, as a coalition Government believe in freedom and the rights of the individual, and we recognise the great dangers of unemployment.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You have had 2½ years, and you have not fixed it.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We realise the situation has worsened, and we are concerned. However, the three years of Whitlam Government could be likened to a very heavily loaded train running backwards down a hill. In the latter period of the Whitlam administration, the load went faster and faster backwards. Since

the advent of the Fraser Government, the train has slowed, as the figures I read to the House clearly indicate. Of course, this backward slide eventually will stop, and we will commence moving forward once again. I regard the slowing of this dash backwards in a period of only eight months as a very good effort on the part of the Fraser Government.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Choo-choo!

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Members opposite may give their imitations of steam trains if they wish, but these are the facts relating to unemployment.

Part 1 (c) of the motion states that the House should note with concern the following point—

that the latest figures provided by the Government Statistician are the highest since the Great Depression of the 1930's and appear to be heading towards the half million mark before the end of this year.

I cannot see how the Labor Party can be serious about this suggestion, unless it is designed simply to strike fear into the hearts of the public. The Labor Party seems almost to relish the idea.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I hope you remember this next year.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: It will be in *Hansard*. Of course, we expect members opposite to put on a show in this House because of the great difficulties confronting the Labor Party in the electorate. If the private sector recovers—as it will—Labor will be in serious trouble electorally.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Earlier in your speech you said the private sector "was recovering".

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: It will recover, but if it recovers to the extent we hope, Labor will be in trouble at the election. However, we now see a brand new confidence emerging in Western Australia. The mover of the motion could not have read the newspapers over the last three weeks; if he had, he would not have moved his motion.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Have you read tonight's newspaper?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: No, I have not; I intend to read it during the tea suspension. The big news in the few days prior to the moving of this motion was contained in *The Australian Financial Review* of the 1st September where, under the heading, "Iron Ore Scramble—Marandoo seeks huge Japan loan" the following statement appears—

The Marandoo iron ore partners, Texas Gulf Sulphur and Hancock and Wright, are seeking a staggering \$1,000 million in loan funds from the Japanese steel mills to develop their Pilbara iron ore deposit.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I will believe that when I see it.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Under the subheading, "Pilbara expects export rise" the following statement appears—

However, the companies have noted a steady improvement in demand from Japanese and European steel mills in the past six months.

Again, this reflects a little more confidence in the market. The article continues—

As recently as March Hamersley expected to sell only the same tonnage as in 1975, but improvements in both Europe and Japan have lifted its likely sales by about 9 per cent.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I thought it was confined only to Australia.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Of course it is not. Another newspaper article is headlined, "N-W Shelf looks good", reflecting the rising confidence in the market. A recent issue of *The Sunday Times* carried the headline, "Jobs for 5 000 in gas-field project", under which the following statement appeared—

The State Government will announce agreement on the \$2 billion development within a few weeks.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: When?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The announcement is to be made within a few weeks—the Leader of the Opposition does not read the newspapers. The article continued—

Exports of Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) and the huge inflow of overseas capital for the project will have to be approved by the Federal Government.

It will now, because we have the right Government. Heaven help us if the Whitlam Government were in power at this time! The article continued—

But this approval is expected to follow automatically on the State Government's announcement.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: In other words, we can expect to see 5 000 jobs made available within a few weeks?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: That is not what he said.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The article continued—

Apart from the gasfield development the Karratha-Dampier area is also to be one of the main centres for a new \$100 million, 27-well oil exploration programme on the North West Shelf.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Here is the cargo cult mentality again.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: It is not a cargo cult mentality; this is happening.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: We have been hearing about this for 2½ years.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We have seen it diminishing over the last 2½ years.

*Sitting suspended from 6.10 to 7.30 p.m.*

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Before the tea suspension I demonstrated amply that there has been an improvement in employment prospects and, indeed, in growth in industry. In this connection I refer to a recent news review of BHP. Certain adverse comments were made by the mover of the motion, Mr Cooley, about this company, and I would draw his attention to some facts revealed in that news review. In it the following appears—

At a press conference held to coincide with the 1976 preliminary profit announcement BHP Managing Director, Mr McNeill told newsmen he expected the mineral industry to benefit from a world wide pickup though it might be a slow pickup in the steel industry.

The author of that report thought there were better prospects for improvement. The report continues—

Mr McNeill forecast a rise in our own domestic steel orders.

Again that is a good sign.

It is quite wrong to malign this great Australian company which has been responsible for much of the growth in Australia, and for a great deal of prosperity enjoyed by the work force. Mr Cooley made a comment by way of interjection that BHP had made a profit of \$2 million per week. That is not correct.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I mentioned \$100 million a year.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Again that is incorrect. This is typical of some of the rather loose comments that have been made by members of the Opposition. In fact, the profit for last year was \$65.6 million, representing a reduction of 44.8 per cent. Mr Cooley has suggested a profit of \$104 million for the year, but the official figure is \$65.6 million, so Mr Cooley was \$38.4 million out. I suppose he regards that as chicken feed, but I am sure the Premier would welcome that sort of money to the coffers of the State.

Another comment was made by Mr Cooley relating to the profit and loss on steel production. This year BHP lost \$50 million on steel production. It should be borne in mind that this company is prepared to spend huge sums of money in the certainty that the economy will improve. Despite that set-back the company continued to retain its staff, and it has kept the industry going for the benefit of Australia. That was another typical misquote made by the Opposition in this debate.

We can see greater and improved prospects for Australia, despite the fact that Mr Keating, a Federal Labor shadow Minister, made some comments which I believe

were designed to frighten away many of the prospects of development. Over the past three years the Australian Labor Party has driven nearly every prospective development and exploration company out of Australia. This cannot be regarded as a wonderful achievement; it is something about which the Labor Party should be ashamed.

The ALP has pointed out quite happily that there will be 500 000 unemployed. I suppose that is just what it wants. It has no understanding of the investment involved in a company, or the return on capital.

Even with the smaller firms we see bright prospects of some improvement. In this connection I refer to "Quarterly Statistical Abstract" No. 439 of June, 1976. Relating to new companies registered it states—

Period	Local companies registered
1970-71	2 162
1971-72	1 712
1972-73	1 780
1973-74	1 448
1974-75	1 317

Then for the September-December and January-March quarters of the current year, it shows a total of 1 196 new registrations of which 618 registrations are in the March quarter. That indicates the people are at least prepared to invest their money in Australia which now has a sensible Government that gives encouragement to private enterprise. So, we see a real awakening.

In paragraph (2) of the motion this Government is accused of adopting the strategy to reduce Government spending in order to direct more finance into the private sector, thus contributing to the unfavourable unemployment situation. That is quite an incredible comment. Of course this Government is devoting money to the private sector. Does the Labor Party not realise that the private sector employs three out of four persons in the work force? If we take the unemployment figure, we will see that the greatest number of unemployed come from the private sector, and not the Government departments. So, the unemployment figures for the private sector would be considerably higher than those for the Government sector. It is a problem which the private sector faces. We should realise that this group is responsible for paying taxes and financing Government departments.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That is the group which is asking the Government to undertake public works, so that it can engage in carrying out those works.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We are quite proud of the efforts of the private sector.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: At the expense of the Government sector?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Not at the expense of the Government sector. The private sector pays taxes and finances the social welfare programmes. It is quite obvious that social welfare and similar programmes cannot be financed without a prosperous private sector. The tactics of the Labor Party are to introduce such programmes and pay for them later. I can describe it as a "never never party". It could not pay for the programmes it introduced in its term of office.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: It won a war for you, when your lot abdicated.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Despite all that we hear the Opposition making such comments. In fact, the private sector is responsible for paying the salaries of members opposite. Often they denigrate this House, but they accept gladly their salaries financed by the private sector.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: We are fully aware of the market economic situation of this country.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: From the comments that have been made by Mr Dans we know that without private enterprise the economy of this country will fail. The way in which the Labor Government operates leads to other conclusions.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You should get past the propaganda and back to the facts.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We heard some discussion from members opposite on taxation concessions, and according to them the wicked way in which the Fraser Government has abolished certain tax concessions, such as the child allowance. I believe the figures they quoted were misleading. I have the taxation scales before me, in case there is argument from members opposite.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You will now give the true misleading figures?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I shall now give the true figures. In January, 1976, a man with a wife and two children, earning \$100 per week paid 25c per week in tax. He was entitled to a rebate of \$7.60 per week, but he did not get it because he paid only 25c per week. So, he got all of the \$100 he earned per week. He had a child allowance of \$1.50 per week, and that gave him \$101.50 per week. I am now referring to the low income earners, about whom we are very concerned.

Under the new scheme the person earning \$100 per week would get \$104.80. If we take the case of a man with a wife and four children, earning \$100 per week, he would receive under the old scheme \$105.75 per week, but under the new scheme he would receive \$116.80 per week.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You had better send him out to spend that money as the Commonwealth Government has advocated!



The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The present Government has been accused of neglecting the low wage earners, but it is doing everything to assist them. On a wage of \$150 per week the scales are just about even. In January, 1976, a man with a wife and two children on \$150 per week would have received \$141.10 under the old scheme, and \$137.55 under the new scheme, or a little less.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: These are the true misleading figures!

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: They are the correct figures. In January, 1976, a man with a wife and four children earning \$150 per week would have received \$145.35 under the old scheme, and \$149.55 under the new scheme, or a little more.

When we get to a man earning \$180 per week we find there is a loss. What the present Government has done is to take more from those who are earning more, and give it to those who are earning less; yet members opposite have criticised the Government for so doing. A man with a wife and two children earning \$180 per week, would receive \$160.40 per week.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Have you allowed for the amount you cheated from the workers through the Arbitration Commission not applying full indexation?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am talking about the taxation figures that have been quoted in this House. They show quite clearly that the people earning high incomes would pay more tax, and those on lower incomes would pay less.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: They are receiving less per week through the nonapplication of the full indexation scheme.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: In January, 1976, a man with a wife and two children, earning \$180 per week, would receive \$160.40 under the old scheme, and \$156.90 under the new scheme.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You have allowed for Medibank?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We are taking more from the high income earners, and less from the low income earners.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: A wage of \$180 per week is not a high income.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We have not robbed anyone in the community. We have simply readjusted the scales, and enabled those who are deserving to receive more per week. It is significant that under the Fraser Government the child endowment allowances are paid directly to the mother. This must be of great benefit to her.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Tremendous!

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The honourable member might not think so, but he has not lived if he has not realised the problems which some mothers face.

Another improvement is that we have increased the spouse or daughter-housekeeper deduction from \$400 to \$500 per year, or an increase of \$100 per year representing nearly \$2 a week. Members opposite might say that is chicken feed, but nevertheless this is more than what their Government did.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Did you include the Medibank adjustment in that?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I have not included that. In regard to the allowance for students, we are making allowance for a deduction in respect of students up to 25 years of age. Previously it was up to 21 years of age.

I am not suggesting there has been any great improvement. What I am suggesting is that there has been no drop. In fact we have improved slightly. So the comments of the Labor Party and those in the motion are not quite true. They are misleading.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: In the extreme.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I think you are very kind to them.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I must be. I feel sorry for them when they make statements which are not correct.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I have heard some remarkable speeches on this motion. I will have them framed.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Is one yours and one Mr Cooley's?

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Let me comment on Medibank. The scheme was impractical. The Minister for Education who has widely travelled throughout the world and has seen these schemes in operation made very fair comment as always. We know that Medibank has increased the costs of medical care enormously and frighteningly. At the same time it threatens to lower the standards to an intolerable degree. This has occurred in other countries and would have occurred here. So we had a choice of either a levy or increased taxes. Mr Cooley said the Labor Party promised the Medibank levy would cost only about 1.5 per cent. That is rubbish. How could it when we are talking about figures for this year?

The Hon. R. Thompson: What did the Opposition do when the original Bill was going through.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am not talking about that subject. I am talking about the motion before us.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They are getting worried and are trying to sidetrack you.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I said 1.35 per cent.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I stand corrected, but no doubt the cost would have been 2.5 per cent or more, and I will quote some figures. Last year Medibank cost \$1 637 million which was the amount quoted in a speech by Mr Lynch, the Treasurer. The estimate for this year is \$2 000 million.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: That sounds reasonable.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Chicken feed they say. We are throwing millions away and who is paying for it? The public is, so why worry! The ALP created a monster and it knows it. It destroyed a very good scheme by creating a monster of immense proportions.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Opposition is agitated. Obviously I am touching a nerve and members of the Opposition do not like the truth. However, I suggest they should listen.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Medibank must be faced because we must pay the bill somehow and a levy is the only way apart from a tax increase which is the same thing. There is no difference at all. Under (2) (c) of the motion the mover is suggesting that the Consumer Price Index was not reflected in incomes. We realise this. The public generally indicated their feelings clearly on the 13th December. They indicated that they realised the wage spiral could not continue. It would not work and did not work. I stated in this House that indexation was the answer. But I was wrong. I did not do my sums.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: So you agree with the double-cross?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Not at all. I am suggesting there seems to be only one way and that is tax indexation.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You promised full indexation and full tax indexation.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Fraser Government has been in office only eight months. I am giving the figures to indicate there is a big increase. The tax indexation is the only way. It means that Government spending must be decreased and this is being done now. However, it is difficult after the policies of the Labor Government over three years.

Let me give a little sum to indicate the problems of wage indexation. If a wage earner on \$150 or \$180 a week were to receive a \$10 increase, if he were lucky he would get 70 per cent of that in his wage packet; no more. In this case the employer would be paying out \$10 and would have to raise his costs to pay for

the increase of which the employee would be receiving something like \$7. Therefore the employee would be behind the eight ball. How can he, when he receives only \$7, cope with the extra costs charged by the employer?

The Government gains. It happily takes 30 per cent at all times which is why the Labor Party, through the Whitlam Government, continued to encourage the wage spiral. The Government was getting 30 per cent to 60 per cent of it in the coffers and thereby paying for its mad schemes.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: The public doesn't care.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The public does care as they indicated pretty clearly on the 13th December.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: The public are learning.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What about the next quarterly adjustment?

Several members interjected.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: If we look at the motion further we see it contains a suggestion that the Government has indicated that wage increases are the sole cause of our high inflation. I do not think this has ever been suggested by the Liberal or Country Parties. It is true we have said wage increases are responsible to a certain degree, but there is no way in the world we would say it is the sole reason. It would be stupid for us to say so. Many factors are involved one of which is the colossal wage spiral and the lack of production. In three years the gross domestic production was increased by one per cent whereas cash wages increased by 70 per cent. Federal spending increased by 140 per cent. This was sheer madness, and who pays? The public is still trying to pay for it. On the same point paragraph (3) of the motion states that the House notes with concern the continued attacks by the Australian Government on the trade union movement. For a start it is the Commonwealth Government. I imagine the Opposition believes in a Commonwealth, one way or another.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Don't you know that the terms are the same—Commonwealth, Federal, and Australian?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I suggest that this is a deliberate way of raising other issues. I suggest the Opposition does not care about the Commonwealth at all. It believes there should be one Government in Canberra and no others.

We are accused of attacking the trade union movement. The attacks have been against only those irresponsible trade unions. On the 11th September Mr Lynch is reported in *The West Australian* as follows—

Fifth column in unions—Lynch

And he is right. The article reads—

"It is intent on destroying economic recovery and putting thousands of Australian workers on the dole," he told a meeting of business men.

He said that there was a small group of left-wing leaders planning to ban trade with New Zealand. They are bringing political issues into the trade union movement. The article further states—

"I believe that the community is becoming increasingly hostile to the disruptive activities of militant left-wing trade unionists who are intent on using industrial blackmail to frustrate the Government's economic strategy," he said.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: He is out of step with Senator Cotton.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: He is not. We realise there is a fifth column and a left-wing group dedicated to the destruction of our economy. Luckily the Medibank strike was a failure and men who had been ordered not to work went to work because they wished to work.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: They have to work to pay the levy.

A member: What would they be called?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: What would the honourable member call them? Mr Cooley would call them scabs.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I would.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: At a meeting, the members of the TWU decided they would not go on strike. I imagine that was a majority decision of the union, and those who went on strike would be called scabs because they opposed the union majority decision. But no. Mr Cowles and Mr Higham said that if workers went on strike as a matter of conscience they would be protected. Who are the scabs and who are not? I thought that the trade union movement abided by majority decisions.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Do you believe Mr Cowles and Mr Higham were wrong?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The workers were told if they went against the union majority decision they would be protected by Trades Hall.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Is that good or bad?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: That is very bad as far as I am concerned.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He understands. He knows what you are talking about.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We listened to lengthy discussions. He does fully understand.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Sorry. It is a difficult position for me as I am sitting in the enemy camp.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: There are no sides here. It is a House of Review.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The militant unionists are hell-bent on using the trade union movement as a political tool and the decision to ban New Zealand trade is frightening because again it will possibly put thousands of people out of work. The work force will suffer considerably, so what will happen? The Labor Party says there is nothing wrong with that.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Who said there was nothing wrong with that?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Does the honourable member think it is wrong?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I stated that you must have frightened Mr Muldoon.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am amazed. I thought Mr Dans would have commented.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I will be reserving my comments for next week.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: It appears the Opposition is not prepared to commit itself because it cannot. It is under orders from Trades Hall. What else can it do? All the same, as a result unemployment will be encouraged and increased.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You talk about things which have no relation to Western Australia.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: They do have. The New Zealand trade is as good here as it is anywhere else, and we will suffer. The honourable member would not know anything about it, but Mr Dans would.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We have an affinity with New Zealand.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The other problem which concerns me is the fact that left-wing militant union groups use civil disorders and disobedience and support them whenever possible. We see a small group of unwashed hairy goats—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I notice you do not refer to Pommy shop stewards.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Leader of the Opposition could be right. However, I am not arguing about that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What is it with Mr Dans? He has a thing about communist unions and Pommy shop stewards. He is the one who raises these matters.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I am trying to help.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I will ignore that remark because obviously it must be a touchy subject for Mr Dans.

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

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: What I am suggesting is the left-wing section of the trade union movement encourages civil disobedience and actively supports it whenever it can.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Again we see them on their hobbyhorse of the environment which unfortunately, they are using with some success.

There are a number of people who are vitally concerned with the environment issue, including many in this House. However, there is a left-wing group infiltrating the environmental groups and using the issue for its own ends. It is using it very effectively, and we should realise this.

Those of us on this side of the House are amazed at the situation in the Labor Party's environmental circus. We notice the actions of the spokesman in another place who is generally regarded as the clown of the environmental circus of the Labor Party.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Who is that? Do not keep it a secret.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: There is no question about it. We also see acrobats because in the recent wood chip issue they turned amazing somersaults. So the word "circus" would be fair comment.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You don't think it was done to save a seat?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: It is certainly not a matter of principle by the ALP. If we consider the effects of some of the union problems we see—

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: —just what it costs the public and the nation. There is a comment in *The Australian Financial Review* of the 3rd September, 1976. It reads—

Japan suspends \$42 million in coal project.

Why? Because of the union unrest and the doubts in the minds of Japanese businessmen whether they will in fact be able to recoup anything from their investments.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: They seem to have done very well.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am suggesting the left-wingers of the trade union movement are still trying to frighten off developers and people who are prepared to put money into Australia. We see reports of a threat of industrial action by metal tradesmen in the Canning Vale brewery project. The huge Telfer project in the north was brought to a halt through union action. There is massive unemployment and members opposite are complaining about the possibility of there being 500 000 unemployed, yet they are supporting this kind of action.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Who is supporting it?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Is the Leader of the Opposition against it?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I think there is a great need for a properly conducted investigation of the attitude of the companies in the Pilbara.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Let us consider the effect of industrial action in the Pilbara. Last year the four Pilbara producers mined and sold about 80 million tonnes of ore but another 10 million or 11 million tonnes were lost through strikes. The losses were as high as 20 per cent at Mt. Newman, nearly as much at Robe River, and 2½ per cent at Hamersley. The Labor Party should be concerned about unemployment. It is a terrible thing for members of the Labor Party to condone this type of action while they are moaning about the possibility of 500 000 people being unemployed in Australia.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Are you concerned about the unemployment rate?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Of course I am.

The Hon. R. Thompson: What is your policy? You are the party in government. What are you doing about it?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The honourable member who asked that question obviously did not listen to what I said prior to the tea suspension. I will hand him copies of newspaper cuttings of the 1st, the 3rd, and the 5th September which clearly indicate the Government has done everything it can to try to encourage employment in Australia.

Perhaps the worst point in this motion is the final one, which reads—

- (4) The House considers that the Australian Government should concern itself more with the interest of all people in the community instead of an affluent few within the private sector.

I have mentioned this matter previously. I am disturbed about this point in the motion because it indicates the attitude of some Labor Party members in this House—certainly that of the mover of the motion and one or two others. It speaks of the "affluent few within the private sector", who employ three out of four people in the work force in Australia. They are the people who have done so much for this State. They are the small factory owners, shopkeepers, vigneron, and farmers, all of whom have worked and produced in this State. They are the true workers. By the sweat of their own brows they have built this State into what it is today. They employ most of the people in the work force and they pay high taxes. I am amazed that this kind of comment could be made in a motion.

Perhaps there is justification for one or two small points in the motion, and unemployment is one of them. We are also concerned. But to attack the small man in the private sector is a disgraceful thing to do. I think the Labor Party should be well and truly ashamed of itself for supporting this motion. The Opposition should throw it out. Members of the Opposition should join hands with us, cross the floor, and vote against this disgraceful motion.

I have much pleasure in opposing the motion because I think it is irresponsible. It is designed to cause concern to members of the public, to draw their attention to things which are not exactly accurate, and to attack in particular the private sector.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Before you sit down, tell us what you are going to do about unemployment.

**THE HON. GRACE VAUGHAN:** (South-East Metropolitan) [8.05 p.m.]: I have great pleasure in supporting the motion put forward by the Hon. Don Cooley, and in doing so I exhort the House to show real concern for the people of Western Australia and to think objectively about constructive ways to do something about the ailing capitalist system. It is in one hell of a mess and we must start thinking of people, not just of material goods.

The reason the capitalist system is faulty is that it is based on crass selfishness—the kind of attitude Ayn Rand is advocating these days, that it is a crime against society to think about social welfare, that every individual should be motivated by greed and selfishness in order to do what is best for himself so that the whole of society will miraculously succeed.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is another inaccurate statement. She must have said that years ago.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: It is an accurate statement about Ayn Rand.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: She is not saying it these days.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: She is saying it these days. That is the kind of attitude the Liberal Federal leader is advocating, and when we hear sneering remarks about socialist philosophy, that is the kind of philosophy the Liberal Party is advocating through its actions.

The Hon. Don Cooley has brought this motion before the House as a result of the type of approach to the social and economic needs of the people which I have described. It is typical that when these matters are brought before the House the conservatives react to defend what they are doing. Far be it from their minds to care about what happens to people. We have heard plenty of examples of this attitude from the Hon. Gordon Masters,

who cried great crocodile tears about the poor people; but when the unemployment situation was almost as bad as it is now, there was then one job available and 10 people seeking it, whereas now there are 12 people seeking every available job. He spoke *ad nauseam* about the dole bludgers.

Today we have Senator Cotton advocating that retailers get boots and all into the great consumer \$1 000 million which has been saved and is sitting in banks. Of course it is sitting in banks. People are so unsure about this capitalist system, which is not being propped up the way it should be by those who want to support it. Instead, they are letting the Ayn Rand principle apply and hoping that society will survive. It will not survive because people are afraid that if they do not hang onto that bit of money they have in the bank perhaps next week they will be unemployed, labelled as dole bludgers, and not receive any money. The Hon. Gordon Masters would not turn a hair at the misery of people who have to suffer the indignity of being without a job because that is the way they have been conditioned.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Why do you make such a wicked statement?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: People are conditioned to think it is wrong to take money by way of unemployment benefits. The Hon. Gordon Masters has made statements which indicate very clearly that he does not care. He has spoken tonight about the people up north restricting output. Material goods and output are all that matter. The fact is that people are attempting to improve their working conditions. That is what the great Labor movement is all about, and he is antagonistic towards it although he has to admit some people come into society disadvantaged and underprivileged and their experience in life makes them worse. Of course, they are the first people to be unemployed and they have the least initiative and fewer resources to enable them to survive a bleak period in our economy. These are the people whom we should be helping and to whom we should be giving money. By spending in the public sector we can feed money to the poorest section of the community. They are the people who spend money very readily—often not on the kinds of things which would lead to their betterment in the future.

I am appalled at the lack of concern we see in this House for the people who are unemployed. I am appalled at the clinical attitude which is taken towards the suffering of people.

Day after day I receive complaints from people who have in fact been denied unemployment benefits because of some technicality. It came to my notice only today that a person in my constituency had been away in the country looking for a job and had therefore not been able to return a form he was supposed to fill in. Consequently he did not get a cheque. He has

been into the department and filled in a form three times but he has still not received any money. Had he received that money he could have removed himself to the job in the country.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I will take it up for him.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The Hon. Gordon Masters will take this person up to the country. I will give him the address of the person tomorrow so that he can pick him up and take him to the country. Perhaps his generosity will extend to giving him a few bob to ensure he will not go hungry when he gets there.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You will not help him out; you will leave it to Mr Masters.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Yes, I will. If I were to help all who came to me and take them up to the country I would have to hire a helicopter. These are the kinds of things which are occurring and which we should be correcting. I stress the point I am making—that it is easy to be facetious, and it is easy to show no concern. We are here to be concerned about the people. The facts which have been put forward in the motion by the Hon. Don Cooley are irrefutable and the only way they can be countered is by this gabbling noise of protest about how unkind anyone is to say he does not care. I suggest there is evidence here of little concern for the people who are the victims of the failing capitalist system. Senator Cotton's remarks are contained in an article entitled "Spend or sink—Government". The attitude is "Get out there and spend your money. Do not save it in a bank in case you are on the dole next week and you will need it to feed your children or to keep up payments on the things which represent an ordinary, middle-of-the-road type of existence, or even survival".

May I say that in speaking about those who are underprivileged Mr Cooley is referring to somewhere in the vicinity of 70 per cent of adult males who are receiving less than the average weekly earnings. Figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics show that in fact among the working people of Australia 70 per cent of adult males receive less than the average weekly earnings. We can imagine how hard it is for people who are trying to get along on \$170 a week.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Sure we get an average, but if we have a greater sharing and a better distribution of income we will get more people receiving above that average weekly income.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Name a more egalitarian country than Australia.

The Hon. N. McNeill: When your average goes up you get more people below the average.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Some people have the peculiar idea that to be patriotic is to run down what other people have. I believe that to be jingoism and chauvinism. I believe to be patriotic is to love one's country and to want to improve it; and that is what we should be advocating here. We should be showing concern and trying to remedy the situation. We should be looking at the sorts of things Mr Cooley has brought to our notice instead of immediately playing party politics and showing a typical conservative reaction.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Look who is talking. You have done nothing but that since you have been in this place.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Sheep-like noises from the Government!

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: That is the sort of conservative reaction we expect from conservative people.

Mr Deputy President, this spending drive that Senator Cotton is advocating is indicative of the sort of capitalism which is not controlled, remains unchanged, and is not conditioned. That sort of capitalism is unbridled and is full of greed to grab what it can from the consumers—

The Hon. N. McNeill: I think that is your official Labor Party policy in Australia.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I think you had better talk to Hayden.

The Hon. N. McNeill: A consumer spending drive is what they advocated.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Mr Deputy President, while the Ministers opposite are having a conversation, I am trying to tell you my views on this motion. We see also that as well as exhorting people to spend, the Prices Justification Tribunal's effectiveness is about to be reduced. Obviously that tribunal will be phased out. It has already been changed and has been emasculated to the extent that it is almost unrecognisable compared with what was introduced by the Whitlam Government.

I turn now to some of the other things mentioned by Mr Cooley. One paragraph of the motion states that the House notes with concern the continued attacks by the Australian Government on the trade union movement; and we hear plenty of that in this House. We are also aware of a great deal of inability to recognise that in a capitalist system there needs to be an organisation to protect working people in the same way as there need to be organisations to protect people who are farmers or people who are manufacturers, or any group of people who need to band together in order to protect their interests. The sort of union bashing that is indulged in by the Australian Government and by members of this House is a shame to the capitalist system because it does not support that system and does not ensure it

is propped up. Consideration is never given to costs other than wages. Of course, indexation has not been carried out to the extent the workers were led to believe it would be carried out, but rather this plateau concept has been introduced. We are led to think—we are not led to think by the Australian Government; we are told—that the people demanding wage increases are ruining everything. No thought is given to managerial expertise or to greed and the spending that goes on in order to reduce company taxation and that sort of thing.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: What about productivity?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: It is ridiculous to close our eyes to the facts that are being produced in the community.

Certainly wages are part of the cost spiral, but only a part. Inexpert management can cause vastly more problems than the spiralling of wages, which are only chasing goods that are being incompetently marketed. Surely if we have a competent marketing system prices will be reduced and, therefore, workers will not demand more wages.

Another of the meagre attempts made to ameliorate the unemployment situation has been this business of removal costs. This smacks very much of the 19th century when the industrial revolution was in full swing and men were regarded simply as an economic factor and not in their real role as people, and people could be moved *en masse* from one place to another depending on where the manufacturer decided to extract coal to produce steel, or whatever. This present move smacks very much to me of the 19th century. It is to be applauded that at least some attempt is being made to remove people and to pay their costs, but this is only a drop in the ocean when we consider the inordinate number of people applying for each vacant job.

Are we now going to have a regulation that says if people refuse to be moved they will be cut off like those whose cases are coming forward to me day after day? Will unemployment relief be cut off to them when they refuse to go to a job because it means packing up all their belongings and taking their children away from their schools and their friends?

The Hon. N. McNeill: I can recall some of your Labor Ministers advocating that sort of thing without recompense.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: That, again, is typical of our reactionary conservatives opposite who are always looking at the past and quoting somebody else, instead of looking at what is happening here and now. If members opposite showed some concern, as Mr Cooley's motion exhorts us to do, surely we would at least take one step forward because we would admit that there is something to be concerned about.

I want to draw the attention of the House to one of the major reasons for misery in our country, and that is the reduction in the allocation of money to Aborigines. Heaven knows, the amount of direct help given to Aborigines was a trifling enough amount in the first place, considering the tremendous burden placed upon these people by history and by experience.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Poor Mr Bryant!

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: If we look objectively at the way in which we have handled this situation, we must allocate the blame everywhere for the failure to improve the lot of Aborigines. I see in 1976-77 an amount of \$153 million will be spent in direct help to Aborigines, and this is a reduction of \$33 million over the amount spent in 1975-76. That is an 18 per cent cut in the amount; and in real terms, taking inflation into account, it amounts to a cut of 30 per cent. That is a tremendous blow to the Aboriginal people who have been uplifted just by the fact that interest has been shown in them. If money has been spent in ways that were considered to be unwise then, of course, mistakes have been made, just as they were made in respect of the great input of money into education. But it is a human failing to make mistakes, and this is something from which we should gain experience.

The Fraser Government and the conservatives are saying they will help the Aborigines by being more judicious in the way they spend money on direct help to them, and that is all very well; but why should the amount be reduced? Why not say, "We will spend the money in a better fashion and therefore, there will more benefit given to Aborigines"? We are only putting a drop in the bucket in respect of remedying the situation of Aborigines, when compared with the effort of other countries which have minorities to worry about. Compared with New Zealand, we are not even making a start. The percentage of our income that is spent on our native people is absolutely parlous and miserly, compared with what the people of New Zealand spend.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You don't know what we spent on Aborigines in this State this year.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: "Parsimonious" is the word.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Yes, that is a very good word.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Do you know how many Aborigines there are in Western Australia and Australia?

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: That is a pretty good question.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Yes, it is a good question. The answer is that there are somewhere in the region of 70 000 Aborigines in Australia.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You are out to billy-o.

The Hon. N. McNeill: You are so incredibly wrong that you have completely destroyed your credibility.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Well, the Minister has a good memory for figures, but he has not a good memory in respect of what happens to people. Probably he will be able to inform the House of the correct number because he is very good at numbers, but he is not very good in respect of what happens to people.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Don't you think one follows the other?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I wish to lend my support to this motion. It is a demeaning thing for one to have to stand up in front of this House and ask members to be concerned about something that one would think their very condition of humanity would cause them to be concerned about. Having to stand up and coax members opposite to be concerned is an indictment of this House. I exhort members opposite to think again and to support the motion.

**THE HON. CLIVE GRIFFITHS** (South-East Metropolitan) [8.26 p.m.]: I would like to make one or two comments in regard to this motion, and I was prompted to do so by several misleading statements made by Opposition speakers. Mr Cooley devoted his entire speech to some simple forms of mathematics, and all three exercises he carried out proved that he had just not done his homework. He endeavoured to indicate that the family allowances benefit paid by the present Federal Government would disadvantage people, but in each of the three examples he used it was clear that the people concerned would in fact receive more take-home pay.

However, I believe the significant social reforms in the coalition Government's first Budget highlighted its concern for the needy in the community. The Budget reaffirmed that the Government's determination to reduce the rate of inflation remained the top priority, but it has not maintained this at the cost of further relief to those in need. The Treasurer (Mr Lynch) has included in the 1976-77 Budget a number of significant social reforms which will benefit a wide sector of those most in need of help; and yet it is suggested by members of the Opposition that we on the Government side have no sympathy for people in need. That is a completely misleading assumption on their part and cannot be sustained by the facts.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: I suppose you will give us the true misleading figures now?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The social security and welfare section of the Budget is directed towards those less fortunate people of the community, and in that section I think the facts speak for themselves. It does not need me to run through the figures, but obviously the members of the Opposition either have not bothered to check or they have some other motive for moving such a motion. It seems to me that their new-found concern for the unemployed people of Australia is a little belated because Mr Cooley spent his entire period while speaking in endeavouring to decide whether the unemployed people ought to be the actual unemployed people or whether they ought to be the seasonally adjusted unemployed people. The people who are unemployed in Australia do not care what system we use or what we call them; they are concerned that they are unemployed.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley. You ought to be concerned with the figures.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Of course we are concerned at the figures.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Apparently you are not.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: We are concerned at the figures, but the point I am trying to make is that Mr Cooley criticised the title of the category in which the people were being placed. Frankly, I am not concerned whether we use this system, that system, or some other system. Too many people in Australia today are unemployed, but that situation did not occur as a result of any action of the present Federal Government. The people of Australia indicated clearly on the 13th December last year where they believe the fault lies for the unemployment figures.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: They wrongly believed that by changing political leaders they could alter the economic system. That is just not possible.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am sure that the proof of the pudding will be in the eating and that the policies of the present Federal Government will certainly do a lot more to relieve the unemployment situation than the policies adopted by the previous Government which proved, re-proved, and proved again to be the cause of unemployment in this nation. I certainly do not want to go into that, but I want to refute the implication that the present Government is not concerned about the needy people in the community.

I come back to what I said earlier—that the social security and welfare provisions in the Lynch Budget clearly demonstrate the extent to which the present Federal Government feels for these people.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: What did it do for them?



The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I shall give the Chamber an example.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Let us hear it.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I have already said that Mr Cooley gave us three simple exercises in arithmetic, every single one of which proved that he had not done his homework.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not think that is correct.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I can read it out of *Hansard*. That will prove conclusively that his arithmetic was done without any homework whatsoever. Therefore, he was endeavouring to mislead members of this Chamber into believing that a state of affairs exists when it in fact does not exist. This desire to mislead members was further assisted by other speakers. Indeed, the honourable Lyla Elliott—

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: She spoke very well.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: She probably spoke very well but she spoke very misleadingly.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Very truthfully.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am not saying that she deliberately misled, but she certainly misled members of this Chamber with some of her comments. Just for the record I shall indicate what they are. It came to my mind when the Honourable Graham MacKinnon was speaking when he made reference—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What did he make reference to?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: He made reference to some figures which Miss Elliott had referred to during her speech.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Was that the percentage of the expenditure?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Of the expenditure, yes, in the various countries, Mr MacKinnon said—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I recollect the exercise.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Mr Dans said that it was public expenditure.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Who is robbing this coach?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Fair enough.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Mr MacKinnon said—

For instance, I have not been to Canada for a long time but I have been there long enough to know that their social welfare payments are very little different from our own and certainly are not higher, as that paper indicates. There must be a variation in the way in which their statistics are collected.

In his usual helpful manner the Hon. Mr Dans interjected and said—

Those figures do not relate to social welfare payments. They said they were spent in the public sector.

Mr MacKinnon then said—

Miss Elliott was talking about social welfare.

Miss Elliott said—

I was talking about the public sector.

Mr MacKinnon apologised and said that he thought she was talking about social welfare. Frankly, so did everybody else, because if one turns back to what Miss Elliott actually said one sees that she said this—

... it is about time the Federal Government—

She probably got into trouble for using that term.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: She cannot be blamed for how it is transposed in the speech.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: If Mr Cloughton is going to interject, would he please do it so that we can hear him?

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: We all have cause to adjust the records. Miss Elliott may very well have said "Australian".

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: This is a corrected copy of her speech. I make reference to that only in passing. Miss Elliott said—

... it is about time the Federal Government had a look at other parts of the world and realised what a small proportion of public funds is spent on welfare in Australia.

Again I refer to *The OECD Observer*.

Mr MacKinnon asked her to tell us what the figures were and she said—

I am about to do so. Current Government expenditure and revenue ... The figure given for Australia for 1973-74—

She then went through the whole gamut of these figures. She said the figure for the Netherlands was 46.4 per cent. Mr MacKinnon interjected and said, "Crazy!"

Miss Elliott then said—

Obviously Mr MacKinnon does not believe in humane social welfare policies.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I was right!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Exactly. Everybody was quite right to assume from those comments that Miss Elliott was speaking about social welfare.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not think any country would spend 46 per cent—

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I know Mr Dans said that subsequently but the point I am making is that a completely misleading set of figures was given by Miss Elliott.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I think you might have misunderstood her.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: She did not say during the course of her speech that those figures did not apply to social welfare.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I corrected it.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I know.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: She was talking about money spent in the public sector.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: She did not say that until after Mr MacKinnon—

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Do you not believe the Government spends money on pension schemes—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am endeavouring to convey to you, Mr President, that Miss Elliott did not enlighten the House that she was speaking about funds spent in the public sector until, by way of interjection during Mr MacKinnon's speech, Mr Dans pointed it out. That is how the House discovered that Miss Elliott's figures did not relate to social welfare at all, notwithstanding that every time she mentioned figures she mentioned social welfare.

The accusations are that the present Federal Government is not concerned with and is not doing enough for the needy people in the community.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Tell us what it has done.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I shall tell honourable members.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: More importantly, tell me what it is going to do.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: It is going to give assistance to the aged in the community to the tune of \$2 499 million, an increase of \$369.6 million over the previous 12 months. It is going to give assistance to homecare services to the tune of \$14.3 million, an increase of \$2.2 million over the previous 12 months.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What are you quoting from?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am quoting from Mr Lynch's Budget Speech.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Would you tell us the percentage increase compared with the Whitlam Government?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I shall tell members all that in due time. The total increase for aged people is \$344.4

million. With regard to assistance to ex-servicemen and their dependants, war pensions and allowances and service pensions there is an increase of \$82.5 million over the previous year.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Your figures are no good unless you relate them to percentages.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: For assistance to handicapped people, invalid pensioners' allowances, sheltered employment allowances, handicapped children's benefits and allowances, handicapped persons' facilities and rehabilitation services there is an increase of \$99.4 million over the last Budget. For assistance to widows and supporting mothers, for widows' pensions and allowances and for supporting mothers' benefits and allowances, there is an additional \$80.5 million over the last Budget. Mr President, these are the actions of a Government which is alleged to be totally unconcerned with the welfare of needy people in the community.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is a marvellous record, is it not?

The Hon. N. McNeill: I think they might be sorry that they asked you what the Government was going to do.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: For family allowances there is an additional \$755.3 million.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: All to the lower income earners.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: These are the actions of a Government which is alleged to be totally unconcerned with the well-being of the needy people in the community. That is a very hollow statement by members of the Opposition.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: The \$755.3 million goes to parents whether they are poor or wealthy.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: For assistance to homeless men and women, who I think would be the sort of people the community would expect to be looked after, there is an additional \$1.3 million. In the whole area of welfare programmes in that bracket there is an extra \$4.4 million.

Mr Cooley has been talking about the total. The total direct outlay on social security and welfare is estimated to increase from \$5 012 million in 1975-76 to \$6 187 million in 1976-77, an increase of 23.5 per cent over the previous 12 months. That makes it equivalent to 25.4 per cent of the estimated total Budget outlays.

Can we tolerate the suggestion that a Government which is prepared to increase its social welfare payment by 23.5 per cent in a year is a Government that is unconcerned with the plight of the needy people of the community? Can we say such a

Government is unconcerned when it is prepared to devote 25.4 per cent of its total Budget outlay towards social welfare and security? Is that the action of a Government that is unconcerned about the plight of the needy people in the community?

It is absurd for Mr Cooley to move such a motion. It is nothing more than a cheap political endeavour on his part to gain some advantage from the plight of those people in the nation who are presently unemployed and in need.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Well said.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I reiterate it is purely and simply a sheer political attempt to gain some advantage out of the plight of these unemployed people.

A new scheme is to be introduced which will help home buyers who are buying their first home to bridge the deposit gap. This is the action of the present Federal Government which is designed to help the people who need the help most. I do not think we should tolerate a motion such as this.

There is also to be an increase in funds for legal aid; aid provided for the needy people in the community; people who are dependent upon society to provide them with the wherewithal to obtain proper legal representation and advice. There is to be an increase of over 25 per cent over the previous year which will mean an extra \$3.7 million. In the face of this Mr Cooley would have us believe that this is the action of a Government which is totally unconcerned with the plight of the needy people in the community.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: It is too.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I could instance example after example, but the crux of the matter is that the present Federal Government has clearly demonstrated in its first Budget that far from being a Government that is only concerned with the affluent section of the community, that it is indeed a Government whose main concern is for those who comprise the needy people in the community.

If all else fails to convince the honourable member, I would refer him to a plan that was announced a couple of days ago under which the Commonwealth proposes to pay the removal expenses and re-establishment costs of people who move to an area where they have the guarantee of a job or where they can train under the national training scheme which will apply from the 1st October. The Federal Government will pay out \$1900 to a four-member family which wishes to move from its place of living in an endeavour to obtain permanent work.

Is this the action of a Government which should be criticised as one that is not interested in the well-being of the

needy people in the community? Of course it is not.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: It is a desperate last-minute move to try to salvage and correct some of the damage it has done up to the present time.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: What a pathetic attempt that is on Mr Claughton's part to try to salvage something from the wreckage of the argument put forward by the Opposition.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Mr Cooley is remarkably silent.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: He has the right of reply.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: The motion before us contains some comment about the Government's attitude to the trade union movement. Mr Cooley and members of the Opposition of course would like to believe that we on this side of the House are opposed to the trade union movement. They would like to think this is so. Fortunately the trade union movement is comprised of a fairly alert group of people, because without its support the overwhelming defeat of the Labor Government could not have been achieved on the 13th December, 1975. This was brought about by the opposition of the main stream of the trade union movement in Australia.

The trade union movement comprises people of sound common sense; it realises its responsibility and seeks to provide a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. It is on this basis that the Australian nation has been founded and brought to the state of greatness it has now reached.

The section of the trade union movement with which we are particularly concerned is that section which comprises irresponsible militant leaders who use their positions in the unions to sabotage this nation.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: They are the ones who do not agree with you.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: That is a terrible thing to say about your country.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: They are the people with whom we take issue. We do not take issue with the trade union movement as such; we support it; it is a great movement.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: You could have fooled us.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: What have you ever done for the trade union movement?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Those members of the trade union movement who—

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Do as they are told.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: —made their views heard on the 13th December, 1975, and those members of the trade union movement who know what a free

enterprise Government has to offer appreciate the position thoroughly and demonstrate their ability to work.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: There were 4.5 million people who voted against you.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: When the bells are rung and the vote is taken on this motion I will be surprised if Mr Cooley has anybody on his side of the House to support him.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: You had better hold onto your hat.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He might have a couple through sheer friendship.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: From the concern you have expressed I should have thought you would be voting with us. I really thought you were a man of conscience, Mr Griffiths.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: We know that you have been bludgeoned into gear.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: When the division bells are rung the record will show where those in this Chamber who are most concerned will be sitting.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: It certainly will.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: It will certainly not be on the side on which Mr Cooley and his friends will be sitting because from the figures I have given I have demonstrated positively that a Government which is prepared to increase its social welfare payments by 23.5 per cent is certainly not a Government which is unconcerned about the plight of the needy people of the community.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Do you know that figure is very misleading?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Every figure that does not suit Mr Cloughton is misleading. If we use the actual unemployment figure and it does not suit Mr Cloughton we are told that we should be using the seasonally adjusted figure; on the other hand if we use the seasonally adjusted figure and it does not suit Mr Cloughton, we are told that we should use the actual figure relating to unemployment.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: You have juggled all the other figures. What about the Aboriginal vote?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: A statement has been made on the Aboriginal question and I will tell the honourable member what it is if she wishes me to.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: We have listened to all the others; we might just as well have that, too.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Mr Lynch has already explained that a sub-committee is examining the expenditure in this area.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: I do not believe all that Mr Lynch says.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: He has added the Government will be reassessing the Aboriginal welfare programmes when the report of the committee is received. The point made by Mr Lynch was that the Federal Government believed that the spending of funds on Aborigines could be done in a much more efficient manner than that adopted by the Whitlam Government. But I do not want to go into that.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: It is much more efficient to let them all die out.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: If I could get a word in edgeways—and I know you are interested in what I have to say, Mr President—I must stress that the programme adopted by the Whitlam Government in this matter was a terribly inefficient programme. Its method of funding and assistance to Aborigines is well known to everybody.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Except the Aborigines.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I do not believe it is necessary to reiterate the inefficient methods of funding that were adopted during the Whitlam regime. As I have said, Mr Lynch has indicated that when the report is received a reassessment of the situation will be made.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: It will probably be dropped by another \$33 million.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: If the Government's social welfare programme is any indication of the interest it has for the needy people of the community, we may rest assured that when the reassessment is made it will be undertaken with the same sentiment that has been demonstrated in the other social welfare programmes that I have already outlined. I emphatically advise you, Mr President, that it is my intention to oppose this motion.

**THE HON. J. C. TOZER** (North) [8.58 p.m.]: I also believe the motion deserves to be defeated; indeed, I feel it should be condemned as being highly inaccurate and quite frivolous.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: You will tell us what parts are inaccurate as you go along.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Do not interrupt him; he is reading his speech again.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: My colleagues have already spoken on this matter and, no doubt, other members will follow to cover the entire subject.

It is my intention to discuss the question of the Federal Budget allocation to Aborigines. This should not be surprising; after all, 40 per cent of the Aborigines in Western Australia come from the North Province—almost 10 per cent of the total Australian Aboriginal population.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: What about Noonkanbah.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: For the information of members there are 106 000 Aborigines in Australia and we have 22 000 of them in the Western Australia. It might have been assumed that Mr Withers and myself would be concerned about this apparent reduction in the Budget allocation. However, we praise the Federal Government for introducing a degree of sanity in the use of funds—these are your funds, Mr President, and mine; they are the funds of everybody in Australia.

Let us see what Mr Cooley said in his motion.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Does Mr Withers go along with the statement you have made?

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I go along with any sensible statement Mr Tozer makes about the North Province.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: In part Mr Cooley's motion states—

We consider that the Australian Government's strategy to reduce Government spending in order to direct more finance into the private sector has contributed to this unfavourable employment situation and at the same time has effected a deterioration in the quality of life for workers and their families on incomes which are lower than the average weekly earning, pensioners and Aborigines; by—

(e) a large reduction in the grants for Aboriginal welfare.

The manner in which Opposition members have discussed this particular question has revealed a distinct lack of enthusiasm for this part of the motion. Both Mr Cooley and Miss Elliott skipped over it, in a few words. Mrs Vaughan had a little more to say, but what she said was just as inaccurate as what was said by the other speakers.

I would like to go a little further than the Hon. Clive Griffiths in quoting what Mr Lynch had to say about this matter. I do not intend to read the whole of his statement, but simply an extract from that part in which he makes general comments. Mr Lynch, when talking about Aboriginal affairs, stated—

The Government is mindful of its election undertakings and is committed to promoting the welfare and well-being of Aborigines.

Unlike our predecessors, however, we do not see the achievement of that objective as being simply a matter of injecting ever-increasing amounts of money into an ever-increasing complexity of insufficiently considered programs.

An increasing body of evidence has demonstrated the need to re-assess the efficacy of some of the approaches of the past.

In this re-assessment the Government will have the benefit of the recent Hay Report on the programs involved.

Meanwhile, and pending its consideration of that Report, the Government is providing in this Budget no less than \$153m for programs of direct assistance to Aborigines.

Although this is \$33m less than expenditure in 1975-76, spending on many programs is being maintained at about the same levels as last year.

In the case of some programs—such as grants to Aboriginal Housing Associations—the provisions in the Budget are to cover outstanding firm commitments, pending further reviews of the objectives, priorities and past administration of those programs.

In the light of those reviews additional funds will be provided.

The Treasurer is quite clear with regard to what has been provided as far as housing is concerned, and it is quite contrary to what Miss Elliott told us. The Treasurer said the Government would cover existing commitments. He said that when surveys, which have been instituted long since, are completed the matter will be reappraised and in the light of this information additional funds will be provided.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Where does he say that; that additional funds will be provided?

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: For the information of the honourable member, it appears at page 17 of the Budget Speech, delivered by the Treasurer on the 17th August, 1976.

There is no doubt at all that anyone who has an understanding of the Aboriginal problems in this State, and throughout Australia, will see that they were created by the nature of the expenditure over recent years and it is long overdue for review. So, we welcome the review and we will be satisfied when we see the money being spent with better effect.

Certainly, one of the things for which the Whitlam Government can justly be criticised was the huge increase it made in spending on Aboriginal affairs without any proper examination of the output which that spending was meant to produce.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: That is not correct. Some planning had been done.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It was minimal.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: Spending on Aboriginal affairs rose from \$31 million in 1971-72 to \$186 million during 1975-76.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: We set up advisory councils.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: That is an increase of 600 per cent in five years. At no time did the Whitlam Government pause to look at what the community was getting for its money, whether the money could have been better spent, and above all, was it being spent appropriately. The simpleminded expansionist philosophy pervaded the thinking of the Whitlam Government and any matter related to the advancement of the unfortunate Aboriginal people.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Tell us about some of the efforts in the Kimberley.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The member opposite is aware of the story in every town where there were Aborigines.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. John Tozer will address the Chair and disregard interjections.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: In due course I will attempt to answer the question asked by Mr Thompson. Last week, the Minister for Education (the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon) spoke on this subject and he quoted from a current copy of *The Bulletin*. He quoted Alan Reid, the same person I intend to quote. The remarks of Alan Reid, at page 3 of his article, are relevant to the subject under discussion. For some reason Mr Reid decided to give advice to the Australian Labor Party, and I will read his advice in this instance. In referring to the Australian Labor Party he states—

Somehow or other it has electorally to re-establish the credibility of its Parliamentary wing as potential, alternative managers of the Australian economy, apart altogether from the credibility of Whitlam, its main spokesman. And this is going to be difficult for, at the moment, it would appear that the left wing and an element which holds extreme views on the environment and social questions generally together are very powerful, probably dominant, in the ALP machine.

The ALP policy on this very difficult question of welfare unfortunately is cast by obtuse academics and starry-eyed social scientists.

Whilst speaking on the subject of Aborigines quite recently, during an adjournment debate, I believe I was described as speaking with mealy-mouthed sentimentality. I wonder whether that same description would not be applied to one of the speakers who preceded me tonight. We do not want these starry-eyed academics at all; we want pragmatists—practical men who at the same time have a social conscience. I trust Mr Viner will be a man to lead us in the right direction and get some sanity into the manner in which we believe our funds should be spent in this difficult area.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: People have trouble getting to talk to him.

The Hon. N. McNeill: That is not so; he has been to all sorts of meetings—even bush meetings.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I still want to know what mistakes were made in the Kimberley.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Why does the member opposite not speak to the motion?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have asked for order. Will members please maintain order. The Hon. John Tozer.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: I will again quote from the article by Alan Reid, as follows—

The Fraser Liberal-CP government, with a record majority in the House of Representatives and control of the Senate, was undoubtedly sucked into the economic and administrative vacuum created by Whitlam and his ALP administration.

And this administrative vacuum has been as damaging in the area of Aboriginal advancement as anywhere else. To continue—

Some of the projects into which he poured big money, for example education, Aboriginal advancement and growth areas, were praiseworthy in themselves. But his weakness was that he was more concerned with the impressiveness of the amounts than with how these were to be spent.

That is what Alan Reid had to say about the question. No-one in Canberra, or in this Parliament, wants to see a reduction in the amount of money spent on welfare and education. Perhaps more importantly, no-one wants to see a reduction in the amount of money spent on vocational guidance and training, and employment opportunities. We do not want to see a reduction in the vital area of housing. However, we do want to see that the money which is made available is spent sensibly. That applies particularly to the question of Aboriginal enterprises and housing.

It is interesting to note the comments by Mr Viner. I will refer to his detailed post-Budget statement so that I can explain the programme for the benefit of Mr Thompson. There is encouragement for Aboriginal communities to provide an element of self help. It is interesting to note where money is being directed.

I wonder whether Opposition members, who have spoken to this motion, have taken the trouble to read the statement by Mr Viner. It is so important that we see things in their proper perspective, in this Chamber, and I think I should read a good deal of this document. The document is in the form of a letter sent out by the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. It was directed to all the leaders

of Aboriginal communities, all departmental personnel, and all persons concerned with the question of Aboriginal advancement in Australia. I will read the relevant parts of the letter, as follows—

Because there has been a great deal of ill-informed speculation about recent Government decisions on Government spending as far as they affect Aboriginal Affairs, I have had prepared a statement setting out clearly what has actually been decided. I would be very pleased if you would ensure that this statement is distributed as widely as possible.

You will see that the Government is very concerned to see that the money it provides gets out to the Aboriginal people. Many Aborigines have complained to me about waste of money in some areas like housing.

I am determined Aboriginal Affairs money is wisely spent. That is why reviews are being made into housing money going to State Housing Commissions and Housing Associations as well as Aboriginal enterprises and communities.

I wish I had time to go through the whole statement because it is important and relevant. It is headed "Statement on Implications of Government's Decision on Expenditure in 1976/77" and, in part, reads—

The Government has now laid down guidelines for the formulation of the 1976/77 Budget. The effects of this on Aboriginal affairs expenditure is that most of the programs will receive about the same amount as was spent during the financial year 1975/76. Next year will be one of consolidation and re-assessment to prepare to move forward the following year as the economy recovers.

The Government has asked that the effectiveness of a number of programs be reviewed and that it be reassured that assistance is going to areas of greatest need and that money is being spent wisely. In those areas under review, funds will be limited to what is necessary to meet commitments.

Details of expenditure proposals are as follows:

**Health**—health programs through Aboriginal organisations and State Departments will be maintained at the same level (about \$17m).

**Education**—will be funded at the same level (about \$9.5m), so that existing programs should be maintained.

**Employment**—will be funded at a slightly increased level (about \$6.5m). Existing employment support schemes will be re-oriented to give more emphasis to training and permanent employment. A review is to be undertaken of Aboriginal employment opportunities.

These are practical applications of money we are making available for this important part of our operation in this country, and particularly the North Province. Miss Elliott referred to the RED Scheme, but clearly that scheme has nothing to do with Aboriginal welfare. It was a temporary palliative to improve the employment situation for a time, and if Aborigines were employed under the scheme it was purely coincidental. The statement continues—

**Legal Aid**—will be funded at the same level (about \$3.7m) and continue as an autonomous operation. This will require some rationalisation of services and more efficient use of funds in some areas if services are to be maintained at current levels.

**Welfare**—there will be an increase of \$200 000 and overall programmes will be maintained. Emphasis will be given to proven successful programmes including ones where Aborigines themselves are making a contribution.

**Support of Missions and Settlements**—will be funded at about the same level (\$10 m). To enable continuation of essential services, capital expenditure on some new facilities will be deferred.

That is \$14.5 million. To continue—

**Enterprises**—A review of the operation of existing enterprises and of the role and objectives of the Aboriginal Land Fund Commission has been ordered. The Land Fund Commission will have \$1 m available from this year for purchase of land and properties in 1976/77—

Mr Viner is referring to a carryover of \$1 million from the last year's operation. Of course, tonight we see in the Press that Noonkanbah has been purchased, clearly from this fund. A figure of \$500 000 is quoted, but that is not the figure I had heard elsewhere. To continue—

—the Aboriginal Enterprise Fund will be limited to its current funds of about \$0.5 m—

Again this is a carryover from last year. It goes on—

—for making loans for Aboriginal business enterprises and funds for support of Aboriginal community enterprises will be reduced to \$2 m pending the review.

On this question of Aboriginal enterprises, I would like to refer to the period after the election in 1972. Eleven station properties have been purchased in my province area, and the ones that come to mind are Oombulgurri, Pantajin, Pandanus Park, Strelley, Pippingarra, Yanbeyarra, Mount Welcome, Woodbrook, Peedamulla, Mount Minnie, and now Noonkanbah.

These stations have supported one, two, or perhaps three families since time immemorial, and some of them have done so unsuccessfully. We must have some reassessment on these pastoral stations. We are making a grave mistake by just letting a whole community of Aborigines loose on them. There is no way in the world that the stations will be viable until we can devise a system where there is some other useful employment for all the people who are available for employment.

I would like to illustrate what has been happening on some of these stations. The reason they are not succeeding is quite clear; there has been no accountability. Members will recall that I asked questions on this matter in the House, but unfortunately the Minister was not able to answer them because this matter is in the province of the Commonwealth Government.

Since the communities have been on the stations, on at least two of them, all the stock has been eaten. I can recall that when I visited one of the community associations—

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: It does not sound as though Mr Viner is doing a very good job of their management.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: —the chairman of the association, a very likeable fellow, wanted to come to get me on an aeroplane. I thought this was not reasonable so I waited until I could go over on a barge. But this same man took approximately \$50 to \$75 worth of artifacts on a chartered aeroplane to Derby at a cost of many hundreds of dollars on the same day. There is just no understanding this. Our social and welfare workers insist that these people have the right to make up their own minds. Until we can devise a better system where we can give them the helping hand they need to make up their minds in a sensible manner, we are going to fail. This is why the Minister has demanded that reassessments be made.

By way of interjection today someone mentioned the "cargo cult". What we have seen happen over the last few years has introduced this cargo cult to the Kimberley and the result is quite unbelievable. I was in Fitzroy Crossing one day and a chap came up to me and said, "I want a truck." I said, "I am sorry, but I cannot help you to get a truck." He said, "Oh, the Government is giving it to me." I said, "I am sorry, the Government does not give trucks to anybody." He then

said that the Government had given a truck to another chap. The fact of the matter is that this fellow really thought someone would give him a truck, and this is typical of the profligate manner in which Commonwealth funds have been spent.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Were they being spent that way?

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: I am afraid so, in many instances.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Did you check on that?

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: I have lived with it for many long years.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You have not even checked whether it was correct.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: The Labor Party was in power for only three years.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: A week or so ago I called on the chairman of a community association because I wanted to ask his permission to visit a village that is being established for his people. I asked him also to escort me there, and he did this very kindly. He then told me about the inadequacy of the present Budget and how the Government paid for the fuel at the power-generating station and how it paid an interim figure for the wages of a mechanic and a bookkeeper, but he told me that he had no money to pay the wages of the men.

I said to him, "How many cattle have you got in the place?" He said, "I do not know—perhaps a couple of thousand." I said, "What the hell are you doing about them?"

The cattle were there but he had to be persuaded to work out that he would not get money for his cattle until he had mustered them and taken them to the meat-works where they could be slaughtered. In this particular case the meat-works was a very short distance from the property.

We must think out these problems better than we have done in the past because we are getting in a great mess. Strangely enough, this fellow reacted very quickly. Before I left the area I found that the men were out mustering and that the cattle would be delivered to the meat-works in the next few days. Thus the chairman of the association learned that he would obtain money for the cattle on delivery to the meatworks, and the money for the wages that he felt he could not pay as someone in Canberra had not sent it to him would thus be available to keep the men working around the place. There has to be accountability. We do not want to thrust European standards on these people at all, but somehow or another we must provide this helping hand—if I may describe it this way—for them.



On the question of housing Mr Viner's comment is as follows—

A complete re-assessment of Aboriginal housing programs has been instituted to investigate allegation of waste and extravagance and establish the most efficient ways of providing housing to Aborigines in urban, rural and remote situations. This re-assessment will apply to Aboriginal-directed and State Government-directed programs. Funds for Aboriginal Housing Associations will be limited, pending current reviews, to about \$7m to cover legal commitments only, while State grants also will be limited to \$7m pending review to see that housing is going to areas and people in greatest need.

The committed ventures are in fact going ahead, but it is very interesting to see this housing development. I am not complaining about it, but I would like to point out that the only places in the Kimberley with sewerage installation are at Looma, One Arm Point, the new village at Fitzroy Crossing, and the new village at Mowanjumb. We do not find deep sewerage installations at Derby, Wyndham, Kununurra, and Broome, but we find it in the places I have mentioned.

The Hon. R. Thompson: All installed by the State Labor Government too.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: In Port Hedland and Karratha—and I point out that these fast-growing towns are on the cyclone-prone coastline—northern members have tried to impress upon the Government that we need underground electrical reticulation throughout the residential areas. We have not achieved this in the towns I have just mentioned, but we do have it in Looma, One Arm Point, the new village at Fitzroy Crossing, and the new village at Mowanjumb. This is good—I am not complaining about it specifically. However, it is fairly significant that the work is performed expensively in these places and yet cheaply in the standard-type urban-development in Derby, Wyndham, etc.

Mr Viner and Mr Lynch have stated that the whole expenditure programme is being reassessed. It was interesting for me to note that men from the Commonwealth Department of Works and Housing, who looked to be very effective officers, several weeks ago went through the area to survey the housing development programme. I was pleased they were on the job so quickly, even before the Budget was introduced. These officers undertook a survey and the report may now be in the Minister's hands, or it will be coming forward forthwith. Perhaps then we will see some changes or at least we will see the reassessed programmes being followed. Mr Viner made one last comment on housing, and it is fairly significant. He said—

There will be a \$3m increase (to a total of \$10m) in funds provided to the Aboriginal Loans Commission for housing loans.

Now quite frankly this is typical, and it illustrates the Liberal-National Country Party thinking on this matter. Where a man is prepared to help himself he will get the assistance he needs as illustrated by the spectacular increase in this particular area. The strange thing about it, of course—and members have heard me bleating in this House in recent weeks by asking questions and other methods—is that we cannot get additional housing funds for our temporary building societies to build houses for Europeans. One of our greatest disabilities is the lack of privately-owned homes. I am not complaining about the availability of funds for Aborigines to build homes. I want to see them in homes, and ideally, in their own homes.

The next item in this statement by Mr Viner is in regard to cultural, sporting, and recreational activities. Quite frankly, I felt this was one area where there was room for attack, and particularly by someone like Miss Elliott. She seems to have avoided this area entirely. Mr Viner said—

Funds will be reduced to \$400 000 next year. This will require a greater contribution by Aboriginal participants if programs are to continue at existing levels.

Again this is typical of Liberal Party philosophy; that the people who will help themselves will be the winners. Not so much in my area, but in places such as the City of Perth I feel we have probably failed under this particular heading. I will certainly take the opportunity of explaining my thoughts on this matter to Mr Viner. The next item mentioned by Mr Viner reads—

Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies—will be funded at the same level (\$1.8 m).

We have to accept this requirement. The last comment refers to a matter raised earlier in the debate. Mr Viner said—

Aboriginals will appreciate the initiatives which have been taken by the Government and which will be of direct benefit to them. For instance, the Government's decision to introduce a new system of family allowances paid to wives will provide a substantial increase in income for many Aboriginal families and will consequently reduce the demands on some programs.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: What was that quote from?

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: I do not know whether Mr Claughton was in his seat when I commenced.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: *Hansard* will want to know.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: *Hansard* does know, because I told them before we started. The whole criticism of the Budget by the mover and by the other Opposition speakers is based on the reduction in dollars. The critics of the Budget ignore all other factors, and I believe on this question of Aboriginal advancement, these factors cannot be ignored.

It is absolutely essential that we take stock of what we are really trying to do, and where we are going in this area. We have to formulate our plans, guided by sound, practical common sense, taking into account the feelings and opinions of the people concerned.

I look forward to continuing beneficial programmes, and I have no doubt we can anticipate better value for the dollar spent. I reject the Opposition's criticism, and oppose the motion.

**THE HON. I. G. PRATT** (Lower West) [9.30 p.m.]: Well, Mr President, what a dismal and pathetic performance we have had from the Opposition on this motion. One has only to look across the Chamber and see the dejected looks on their faces to realise what a frustrating experience this debate has been for members opposite. Well, it should be, because that is exactly what they deserve for bringing a motion such as this before the House.

The motion on which members opposite have based this attack centres around unemployment and inflation. The Opposition has the absolute cheek and gall to try to nail this on the current Federal Government. Do they not listen to their own Federal politicians? Did they not listen to the then Opposition, headed by Mr Gough Whitlam, when he tried to gain power in 1972? Did they not listen to him when he told them what he was going to do? Did they not listen to him when he gained power? Did they not listen to a succession of Treasurers, as they said what they were going to do with the Australian economy? Did they not hear these sorts of quotations: "Our policy will be aimed at diverting people from the private sector to the public sector" and "We are enlarging the public sector to absorb those displaced from the private sector"?

This was what the Federal Labor Government set out to do, and well it accomplished its objectives. We read of what happened to the clothing and footwear industries, and of the hundreds of people thrown out of employment by deliberate policy decisions of the Whitlam Government. The reason for all this was that this man and those in cahoots with him thought they could act God with the Australian nation.

What a disastrous failure this Whitlam experiment in socialism was to this country, and members opposite who support such policies with a ridiculous motion such as this well deserve the frustration that comes with it.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: In that case, your party must be enjoying it because it is continuing the same policies.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I should like the gentleman opposite—one day, when he has time to put together words in a coherent fashion—to support in depth what he has just said. Unfortunately, by the time we gain some information from him we will probably be asleep.

Passing from that comment as to where the real blame and accountability for unemployment lies, I should like to comment on other points contained in the motion, and speeches to the motion by members opposite. We have had the usual two-pronged hymn of hate from Mr Cooley and the Hon. Grace Vaughan. It is my intention to take them to task on some of the things they have said.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Get out your cane!

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: Mr Deputy President, that inane interjection is just what one would expect; it was fitting and in keeping with the method adopted by members opposite in this debate. They have attacked Government members at every opportunity. They show their hatred of anyone who is not a socialist, particularly anyone who happens to have anything to do with the farming industry.

Mr Cooley attacked what he regards as wealthy farmers and graziers, showing his dislike and hate for this section of the community. But that was not all; he was not prepared to stop at this point, because he went on to refer disparagingly to the rest as "dirt farmers". I wonder exactly what he meant by that. I wonder if he was referring to the hundreds of people in our community who work long hours—far more than his unionists would ever work—usually for very low rewards. These are people who are proud of their contribution to this nation.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Careful—you will be union bashing next.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I am not a union basher. As Mr Claughton well knows, I was an active member of a union.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Mr Lewis will tell you what a dirt farmer is. My remarks were not at all disparaging.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: If Mr Cooley wants to put some more dirt on his gravy, he can continue in that vein. He referred to these people several times as "dirt farmers". Perhaps he did not mean to be disparaging, but was only trying to be kind. If that is Mr Cooley's attempt at kindness, I would hate to find him in a nasty mood! These people are not dirt farmers; they are Australian citizens who are doing a worthwhile job in our community and who are providing the food the community eats. I wonder what would happen if members of our farming community decided to act in the same way as

many of our trade unionists, and tried to work as few hours and do as little work as they possibly could.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Do you believe all unionists act in this way?

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: The Hon. Grace Vaughan deliberately misinterprets what I said. I said, "some unionists"; if she had been listening, she would have heard what I said. Unfortunately, Mrs Vaughan shows she is not really interested in listening. She much prefers to place her own interpretation on something and attack the speaker on her interpretation. However, that just does not work. If the members of our farming community adopted this attitude, I am sure many people in our community would go hungry.

The reason we produce our rural goods, and the reason they are such wonderful export earners for this country is that these people are prepared to work hard for long hours and at times for very little return.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: All Australians do.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I could give the Hon. Grace Vaughan some very pertinent examples relating to the amount of hard work done by workers in some of our industries; in fact, the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon gave similar examples in his contribution to this debate. One has merely to consider the pipeline used for the Bass Strait oil to get some idea of the extent of productivity in Australia. However, I am sure members would not want me to go into that now.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Quote the figures. Put it on the record.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: For the sake of Mr Claughton, I will. In fact, it was cheaper for the Japanese to buy the ore in Australia, ship it to Japan, manufacture the pipeline, ship it back to Australia and pay the import duty, than it was for our own workers to manufacture the pipeline in Australia. That was why Japanese pipe was used.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Do you mean they are more efficient managers of their businesses in Japan?

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: If Mr Claughton chooses to live in his fairyland, let him; he is welcome to it.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You are implying that the workmen are at fault; but could not the business managers be at fault?

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: The honourable member professes to be an expert in economics but apparently does not understand the basic facts of economics.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I certainly would not call him an expert in economics; he knows nothing at all about the subject.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: Many of our industries in fact have gone bankrupt due to bad management. Those which survive in spite of the labour situation are those which have good management.

When one hears the Hon. Grace Vaughan in this place, one gets the feeling members of the ALP have a mortgage on feeling and concern for the people. Mrs Vaughan certainly shows this is her mistaken idea whenever she speaks in this place. Tonight, for example, we heard a most disgusting attack upon the Hon. Gordon Masters, one which made the stomach turn.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I agree; it was disgraceful!

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: Members opposite appear to believe that because we are Liberals we must be millionaires, and do not give a darn for anybody else. How little they know about people. They do not care and, what is even worse, they do not bother to find out the true situation.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You support the philosophy of such people.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: That is typical of the thinking of members opposite. Mr Cooley claims I support millionaires, but I doubt if I know one.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You know Mr Cooley.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I was voted here by ordinary working people. In fact, I have lived all my life as an ordinary working man, and I am proud of that and of my friends and supporters. It is utter rot to attack members on this side as though we do not care. Like Mrs Vaughan, most of my work is done with people who need assistance. No doubt she cares about these people.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: She did not give a very good indication of that in her speech.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: No, she did not. I take very great offence to any suggestion that I do not care about people in unfortunate circumstances, because it is not true.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: One good thing came out of it: Mr Masters has a job to do tomorrow.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I thank the Hon. Grace Vaughan for her interjection because it gives a very good indication of the lack of sincerity of her attack on Mr Masters; now she is telling us Mr Masters will do something about it.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I will take up the case for her.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: It appears also that we have some sort of division in the Opposition ranks. When the Hon. Gordon Masters was talking about those people for whom we are really concerned and who are battling—he mentioned those people

earning around the \$100 a week—Mr Cooley interjected and, in effect, said, "You are interested only in those people on the poverty line".

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You were not listening.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: *Hansard* will show just how close I am to the actual words used by Mr Cooley.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You are only stabbing in the dark.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I think that Mr Pratt is very close.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: Then we had the Hon. Grace Vaughan accusing Mr Masters of not being interested in this same group of people. How can we give any credibility to two people sitting side by side in this Chamber when they come forward with such differing points of view?

I should like to mention two other points, one of which relates to Aborigines. I do not intend to dwell on this matter at great length, but it was mentioned in the motion and by previous speakers. All I should like to do is direct the attention of members opposite to the Federal Government *Hansard* for today, because there was discussed in the House of Representatives a matter of public importance, and several Opposition balloons were effectively punctured. I suggest this would make excellent reading for members opposite, and would enable them to learn the facts about the situation.

The final point I wish to make relates to the continual interjections on Mr Masters that he should read today's *Daily News*, on the front page of which appears the heading, "Spend or sink", which is purported to be the attitude of the Federal Government.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Mr Cooley said that a year ago.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: Let us have a look at what it really says in that newspaper. I agree that the headline states, "Spend or sink" and it appears in quotation marks. The source of the quote is named as "Government". But when we read the article we find the report of the senator's speech has nothing to do with the headline; it is merely the reporter's assessment of the situation.

That was the reporter's interpretation. When we read the substance of what was said we find it was an inaccurate interpretation. Let us look at what the Federal Minister did say.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Do you not agree with that? I agree wholeheartedly with what Senator Cotton said.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I do not care what the Leader of the Opposition agrees with.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You should care, or you will upset him!

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I am upset having to listen to this diatribe.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I am afraid the Leader of the Opposition will have to control himself. The headline of the report seems to indicate that Senator Cotton had said that to the people.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: He gave them some good advice.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I know he did. In the report Senator Cotton said—

Your decisions will have a major influence on the extent economic consumer demand can contribute to a sustained recovery in economic activity and employment in this county.

I shall not read the whole of what Senator Cotton had to say. He also was reported as having said—

Are you going to sit back and hope the consumer comes to you or are you going to set out to entice the consumer to buy?

In other words he is telling the people to do something about getting a recovery going. The report states further—

Senator Cotton said there were quite clear signs of economic recovery being generated. But it was quite clearly a finely balanced situation and there were no grounds for complacency.

He is also reported to have said—

It will be clear to you all that if the Government stands aside from its own demands and the resources thus made available to the private sector are not used by it, then we are all in trouble and our strategy and position would have to be reassessed.

The message he is putting across to the industry is to spend so as to provide the facilities for the community to spend. He is saying there is a definite indication of economic recovery, just as Mr Masters said in his contribution to the debate. Why members of the Opposition should interject on him heaven only knows; I am sure members opposite do not know why they did that. The report I have just quoted from says exactly what Mr Masters has said, but the Opposition kept on interjecting while he spoke.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Particularly as Mr Masters did not say anything which encouraged interjections.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: Their behaviour was completely inexcusable. I am afraid I have talked long enough.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Will you sit down shortly?

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: It is obvious from the discomfit of members opposite that I have been talking too long, so I will let them off the hook and conclude by repeating that the embarrassment and discomfit they have experienced during this

whole debate have been well deserved; and they get no sympathy from me for their action.

I oppose the motion.

**THE HON. A. A. LEWIS** (Lower Central) [9.48 p.m.]: I shall not speak for very long.

**The Hon. Grace Vaughan**: I hope it is a promise!

**The Hon. A. A. LEWIS**: The honourable member can rest assured it is a promise. Let me deal with the hypocritical nature of the contributions by members of the Opposition, by quoting from some of the speeches they made in the past. Firstly I refer to page 2437 of the 1974 *Hansard* where the then Leader of the Opposition was recorded as having said "A peculiar motion, one without foundation". That comment might be attributed to the motion before us.

Next I refer to page 2340 of the 1975 *Hansard* in which the then Leader of the Opposition is recorded as having said—

I said the motion last year was an exercise in futility, and the present motion is exactly the same. What bearing a resolution of this House would have on the Australian Government, I do not know. Can any member tell me?

**The Hon. D. K. Dans**: Who said that?

**The Hon. A. A. LEWIS**: The then Leader of the Opposition, Mr Thompson.

**The Hon. D. K. Dans**: I thought I said that.

**The Hon. A. A. LEWIS**: I can tell the honourable member what he said, and that was a classic. Let me first deal with what the then Leader of the Opposition said in the debate in 1975. Also on page 2340 the following is recorded—

**The Hon. R. THOMPSON**: The Budget debate is still in progress in Canberra. If the Liberal-National Country Party coalition is not satisfied with the Budget, let it have the guts to block it in the Senate. Let us have a double dissolution and go to the people.

**The Hon. G. E. Masters**: You would not want to risk that now, would you?

**The Hon. D. W. Cooley**: You would not have the guts to do it.

Then followed an interlude in discussing whether the word "guts" was a parliamentary expression.

Those were some of the things we heard from members opposite. Their comments make very good reading when applied to the motion before us, and should remind them of their shortcomings.

**The Hon. D. K. Dans**: That was last year. I have changed my opinion this year.

**The Hon. A. A. LEWIS**: The Leader of the Opposition is dead right. He is like the Labor Party. It cannot keep an opinion in this place from one year to another. I explained to the Opposition last week about its attitude to the wood chipping industry. The Opposition had a different opinion last year. What is the reason for the difference of opinion this year?

**The Hon. D. K. Dans**: You have a bovine mind and a bull-like roar.

**The Hon. A. A. LEWIS**: The Leader of the Opposition does not like to be reminded of these matters. I would draw his attention to some of the statements he has made. I now refer to the contribution of Mr Cooley to the motion moved in this House in 1975.

**The Hon. D. K. Dans**: When will you get to me?

**The Hon. A. A. LEWIS**: If the Leader of the Opposition is jealous because I am dealing with other members of the Opposition first, I am prepared to deal with him now and put him out of his misery. However, having turned to the comments of Mr Cooley I shall deal with them first. I will deal with the Leader of the Opposition later, because he might change his mind when I get around to him.

**The Hon. D. K. Dans**: I move with the times.

**The Hon. A. A. LEWIS**: I refer to the remarks of Mr Cooley as recorded at page 2354 of the 1975 *Hansard*. He said—

I was hopeful that, before this motion came to this place, the Acting Leader of the House would admonish Mr Wordsworth for even suggesting he should introduce such a motion, because if it does nothing else it brings discredit to this House and to the parliamentary process. It does nothing constructive at all. This type of motion is turning into an annual muck-rake against the Australian Government; it contains so much hog wash that it is hardly worth even discussing.

That was what the mover of the motion before us said in 1975, just a little over a year ago. Today what does he do? He moves a motion, because he thinks it is not a bad idea to do so.

Let me quote from the honourable member's comments recorded at page 2355 of the 1975 *Hansard*—

I put to members opposite that, as a House of Review, we should be reviewing legislation. I think the people in the gallery, few as they are, would be forgiven if they thought this was a House of Review of legislation enacted 6000 miles away by the Federal Government.

As Mr Clive Griffiths has pointed out, the word "Federal" crept in when Mr Cooley referred to the Government at Canberra. He might have been rebuked for using that word.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Members opposite might have been allowed to use it.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: To continue with what the honourable member said—

What will be the final result in respect of this motion that no doubt will be passed by the cruel majority enjoyed by members opposite?

On the same page Mr Cooley was recorded as saying—

How can members of this House assess at this early time the effects of the Budget? The motion claims that the Budget, "will have an increased inflationary action" and, "cannot hope to reduce unemployment". How can we say at this early time that it cannot hope to reduce unemployment?

I have been quoting the comments of Mr Cooley.

I shall now turn to the prince of clowns, the Leader of the Opposition, who in the 1975 debate was recorded at page 2358 of *Hansard* of that year as having said—

Whom are we going to convince?

Who will take any notice of what we do here? We are simply wasting time in a Chamber which we are continually told is a House of Review.

I agree completely with what the Leader of the Opposition said last year before he changed his mind. I guess next year he will change his mind again because there will be another conference of the ALP and he will be told to change his mind, or else the unions will tell him to change his mind.

To turn to one or two constructive remarks relating to what the present Federal Government has done—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Will you do that with action?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Leader of the Opposition can have action if he wishes.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You fascinate me.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I did not think he was that interested in being fascinated. If Mrs Vaughan had said the same thing it would be a totally different matter!

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I like you, but you do not fascinate me.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The compliments are flying thick and fast, and I am overwhelmed.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You should sit down.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I wish to deal with what the Federal Government has done, because members opposite have alleged that it has done nothing. Earlier today Mr Claughton referred to the apple canning industry at Manjimup. In *The*

*West Australian* of the 5th January, 1974, there appeared a report headed, "Apple Aid Sought by Growers". It is as follows—

WA apple growers are considering refusing to export fruit to Europe this season if they do not get government financial help.

At that time we had Labor Governments in both the State and the Federal spheres. On the 5th January, 1974, the apple growers did not know what they would receive from the Government by way of assistance.

On the 2nd April, 1974, the Government's attitude in this respect was likely to be changed, with a certain amount of pressure brought to bear on the Federal Government. The State managed to get some money from the Federal Government to help the apple export industry. That was under a Federal Labor Government.

I would ask members to bear in mind the time when apples are picked. They will see how late that decision was for any grower. In 1975, despite the continual pressure by the apple industry, it was not until late January that the people in the industry found out whether they would receive any support; and in the present year it was a little earlier that they knew, because of the change of Government. For 1977 they know now that a decision has been made by a constructive Government. Of course, Mr Cooley would not think that the apple growers and the employees in the cannery mattered very much.

I was worried about the import of New Zealand apples into America; that to my mind represented the dumping of apples. Australia certainly cannot compete with that type of competition. I am sure that by the end of this month we will find the Federal Government has done something about the matter. We have a free trade agreement with New Zealand, and I believe we should honour it as much as possible. Having just visited New Zealand, I know the feeling the people there have towards us because we did not take the butter which we arranged to take.

I believe the apple canning factory at Manjimup should be supported; and there are many ways of doing that. However, I shall not deal with that aspect this evening.

I turn finally to the speaker on the other side of the House who astounds me most; that is, the Hon. Grace Vaughan. It is very sad when a member of Parliament gets up and castigates other members of Parliament for not having concern for people.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: It is sad to have to do it.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is hypocritical in the extreme when she is quite prepared to give away a job to another member of Parliament.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: I have so many to do and he offered.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is even worse still.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: He has not done it yet.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is the type of remark I would expect. How does the Hon. Grace Vaughan know she has more jobs to do than the Hon. Gordon Masters or I have? One member would not know what another member's work load was, in exactly the same way as one would not know what another person's concern for people was. But this pious, sermonising attitude of the Hon. Grace Vaughan—

The Hon. G. E. Masters: A school ma'am.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: No. She has never been able to get the lesson over, so she would not make a very good school ma'am. It may be sentimentality. I prefer to call it pseudo-intellectual superiority which has never shown through in this House because her speeches on dogma contain the same old tripe time after time, whatever the subject may be.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: You will be losing your fascination in a moment.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I think I have shown the hypocrisy of the members of the Opposition. They have mouthed these words in 1974 and 1975, and they are now prepared to bring before the House a motion such as this, which in my opinion—and, I am sure, in the opinion of that brutal majority in this place—will be killed. I believe the motion should be defeated overwhelmingly.

**THE HON. D. W. COOLEY** (North-East Metropolitan) [10.02 p.m.]: I am very pleased I made a unanimous decision on Wednesday last and allowed this debate to continue. Not one member on the other side has had the courtesy to extend any appreciation of it. I am pleased I made the decision because the debate which has followed has given an indication how bereft of ideas members on the Government side are when it comes to solving the very great problems facing this country at the moment.

To take the last two speeches as examples of the thinking of the Government in respect of the matter before it at the present time, gives one an appreciation of the reasons we are in such a mess. I think those speeches should be disposed of very quickly. The last one was a speech of quotes which made no reference to the motion or anything contained in it.

I must refer to Mr Pratt's contribution. He indicated it was a frustrating experience for him, and it must have been frustrating because he could not put forward a single argument. He embarked on an exercise of denigration of the members on this side of the House who spoke to the

motion—personal denigration which I do not think befits a member in this place. He said on three occasions I had a hatred of farmers. That is far from the truth. I have said previously, and I say now, I do not hate anybody at all. I have a great appreciation of the work farmers do.

Mr Pratt took me to task for referring to them as "dirt farmers". That was a term of endearment more than anything else. There are two types of farmers, and the people I was hitting are the Pitt Street and St. George's Terrace farmers—those who never go out and get their hands dirty. Mr Pratt may sometimes refer to a man who collects rubbish as a "garbo". People in maintenance gangs are referred to as "black gangs". Farmers are referred to as "cockies"; it does not mean they sit on perches. School teachers are not referred to as "chalkies" in any disparaging way. This indicates the very narrow thinking of people on the other side of the House in regard to the broad subject which is bedevilling this country at the present time.

It is significant that a number of matters mentioned in the motion were not touched on at all by members opposite. They did not mention deterioration in the quality of life of the people of this nation. There has been a deterioration because concessions are being taken away which should not be taken away. No-one referred to the abolition of the taxation concession for dependent children, although Mr Masters referred to a small error I made. Everyone makes errors. It is human to err. That is the only time the matter was referred to. Members opposite did not refer to the millions of dollars which are being taken out of the pockets of the small people of this country—the small people with children going to school. They did not make any reference at all to the fact that in order to obtain decent health benefits some people in this country will have to pay \$10 a week to a private health fund.

The Hon. G. E. Baxter: Which fund is charging \$10 a week?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Friendly Societies health fund and the Hospital Benefit Fund are charging \$10 a week. One can pay up to \$10 a week.

Members opposite did not speak about their policy which sets out to reduce the real income of workers in this country by breaking down the wage indexation principles and giving to the workers only a fraction of the movements in the Consumer Price Index; nor did they talk about the change the Government has perpetrated on pensioners, returned soldiers, invalid pensioners, and widows through relating increases in their benefits to the Consumer Price Index instead of average weekly earnings, as established by the Whitlam Government, thus causing a substantial reduction in those benefits.

Six or seven speakers have had an opportunity to study these matters since last Wednesday night and not one has referred to them, which indicates the quality of the thinking of those members in respect of a serious subject such as this.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You are making wild accusations.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am not. Members opposite were given the opportunity by my sitting down and allowing them to go away over the weekend and come back to present an argument tonight. What have we heard? We have heard a lot of personal denigration from Mr Lewis and Mr Pratt. We have had a kind of school-teacher exercise from Mr Masters who picked me up for making a small error. I was not misleading the House; it was an error and mistakes can be made by anybody.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: But not consistently. Yours was a matter of millions of dollars.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Minister suggested it was unforgivable to make a mistake in such a matter. That is not so. It is unforgivable to make a mistake and keep on making it, not admitting one has made it. In the same way, members of the Government parties made a mistake when they sent troops to Vietnam, knowing they would be killed and maimed. They knew a mistake had been made but they kept on supporting that horrible war. That exemplifies the fact that mistakes can be made; but if they are rectified in the proper way there is no harm in them. I confess some mistakes are made and I made one, but it did not alter the fact that the take-home pay of workers in this country is less under the present Federal Government than it was under the previous Federal Government.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is not, you know.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Their take-home pay is less in every respect.

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

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is true. In the exercise we were doing, the take-home pay of a man on \$180 a week is less by some \$7 under this Government than it would have been had the Whitlam Government been allowed to continue its three-year term of office.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What about the three examples you quoted when you moved the motion?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I sympathise with the Minister because he was caught on the hop the other night and the poor argument he put up in opposition to the motion was understandable. He had only 24 hours to look at it but his colleagues

have had almost a week to look at it and they have come up with weaker arguments than those of the Minister.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You have been working on it for months and your argument was poor.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We have to be fair. He is giving the same speech he always gives on every subject.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Minister indicated in his speech that everything must be all right because a Morgan poll indicated 49 per cent of the population would vote for the Liberal-National Country Party if there were an election tomorrow and 43 per cent would vote for the ALP. But come the 1st October this year those figures will alter dramatically. It was indicated there was some justification for it because the Labor Party was defeated at the last election, but I say if by some action one man were able to deprive Fraser's Government of office after the 1st October this year when people are hit with Medibank—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No one man can do it. It takes the entire electorate of Australia.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The people would realise the taxation concession for children is being abolished, and if there were an election at that time the present Federal Government would lose office as the Whitlam Government lost office.

If by some magic means there had been an election at the time of the Tresillian issue, this State Government would have been kicked out of office. Any Government at all would be kicked out of office when its term was only half-way or two-thirds through.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I must draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that in replying to the debate he is departing from his motion. He is talking about elections and there is no mention of elections in the motion before me.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes, Mr President. The Hon. Clive Griffiths was quite right in saying the man in the street does not worry how the unemployment figures are compiled—whether they are seasonally adjusted or original figures. That is not the point. The people who are responsible for creating employment for those people should be concerned about the figures, and this motion is designed to express some concern about the state of unemployment in this country. I have no connections with the Liberal Party but the very day this motion was introduced the back-benchers in Canberra were expressing the same concern about the unemployment figures as we on this side of the House have expressed in this motion. Was it coincidental?



The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We all expressed concern here.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Every one of us.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Members opposite do not wish to do anything about it. We find here a combination of attacks on the trade union movement and employment at the present time.

The Minister referred to the productivity of Japanese workers in the motorcar industry, compared with workers of Australia in the same industry, and he said the efforts of Japanese workers are seven times greater than the efforts of Australian workers. That is not an attack on the trade union movement; it is an attack on the quality of Australian workers as a whole. The Minister in that statement has maligned every factory worker in Australia, and he is backing up the philosophy of the Fraser Government in respect of the shipbuilding industry. We have seen orders for four ships go out of this country, and in doing that the Fraser Government is destroying a thriving industry, and almost destroying a town. It is putting thousands of people out of work.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: What utter rubbish!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is the philosophy of the Liberal Government. It says ships can be built in Japan four times cheaper than they can be built in Australia, so orders will be sent to Japan to the detriment of the Australian people. Of course, people in other countries may have greater productivity than there is in Australia, and perhaps that is why the people of Kalgoorlie are suffering unemployment at the moment; because black people in South Africa working under inhuman conditions can mine gold at a rate much cheaper than it can be mined in Australia.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: That is typical of the inaccurate remarks you have made throughout your speech.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I know the truth hurts sometimes.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: How can you talk about things you have not even seen?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I heard Mr Masters say this is not the policy of the Liberal Government at all, but I have here a Press release dated the 19th August of an address by Mr Philip Lynch, in which he says—

"It does employees generally no good to get higher and higher money incomes if the results are just higher prices, a severe squeeze on profits, a slump in new investment and a contraction of job opportunities."

We have been told tonight that the Government does not want to restrain wages or to keep down the work force. The Press release continues—

Finally, this audience would need no reminding that wage costs are continuing to hamper business expansion.

Everything wrong with this country is blamed on wage increases given to workers—the people earning \$120 and \$140 a week are blamed. He went on to say—

The fact that the average wage in Australia is now higher than it is in the United States—the most advanced industrial country in the world—speaks for itself.

According to Mr Lynch it is a terrible thing for the workers of this country to have a better standard of living than the people of America. This gets back to the statement of the Minister who said that the Japanese are better workers than Australian people. That is a blot on the whole of the work force. Mr Lynch went on to say—

What this country requires is a sense of responsibility from the trade union movement.

Yet members opposite say there is not an attack on the trade union movement.

Mr Lynch was speaking to the Bradfield Conference of the Liberal Party and Liberal Forum at the Sydney Opera House on the 19th August, and the topic was "The Budget and the Business Sector". A further comment he made was as follows—

These industrial anarchists are selling their mates down the river because their purpose is to destroy the free enterprise system.

That is the attitude of Liberal Governments; and there Mr Lynch was talking about trade unionists. We have been getting similar comments from members opposite, and then they have the effrontery to say there is something wrong with this motion because it is suggested they are making an attack on the trade union movement. Of course they are; they have done nothing but that.

I sincerely hope members opposite will support the motion, but from their interjections it appears they will not. I hoped the debate would be above the type of thinking the Minister projected last Wednesday evening. I would hate to think there are members on the other side who regard Japanese workers as better than ours, because we have the finest work force in the world, and I think that was indicated by the war effort of this nation.

We had a lesson from the Minister in respect of the introduction of Medibank, and there was some dispute about whether the number of people involved was one million, or one million less ten thousand.

or something like that. However, the fact of the matter about Medibank is that for the first time in the history of Australia every Australian has adequate health insurance. No-one can dispute that. In 1975 when the Whitlam Government went out of office Medibank was on the crest of a wave. People were beginning to accept it. Doctors were also beginning to accept it, and statistics showed that the majority of doctors were accepting bulk billing. But what happened? Look at the situation in 1975 in respect of Medibank, and then look at the hopeless muddle we are in at the present time. We have hundreds of people attending the new Medibank centre each day to make inquiries because they do not know what to do in respect of health insurance.

That is a disgraceful situation when in December, 1975, the position was well in hand and everyone had a fair deal at a reasonable cost. We all knew it had to be paid for, but there was no double dealing in respect of the Labor Party attitude. The Opposition in Canberra at that time did not want the people to receive a fair deal. They blocked the proposed levy in the Senate, and subsequently introduced a levy which is almost double that proposed by the Labor Party. Yet Mr Lewis spoke about gymnastics and double dealings, and the changed policies of the ALP! The present Federal Government has an awful lot to answer for.

Our motion will not set the world on fire, but at least we should share the concern of the colleagues of members opposite in the Eastern States regarding this horrible unemployment situation. The Liberal Government is ripping money off the people as fast as it can, and is putting it into the private sector; and the private sector is not responding. Unemployment is increasing, and job opportunities are falling.

The Federal Treasurer made a prediction that there would be an increase of something like 2 per cent in unemployment before the end of the financial year, and that is proof that the situation is not improving.

We should not leave this debate without touching on the remarks of Mr Clive Griffiths.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That was a good speech.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We are all here to try to do our best. Mr Clive Griffiths rambled on quite a bit, but did not produce any solutions in respect of the current situation. He produced nothing at all that was constructive or would indicate that his Government had something in mind to get us out of this mess. He said the present Federal Government is providing benefit to low income earners, but he did not mention anything about the abolition of child concessions.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: There is no abolition, and you know it!

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: There is.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You are the people who make fictitious statements.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Clive Griffiths did not say that since the Fraser Government has been in office unemployment and sickness benefit payments have been reduced by \$34 million, and some genuinely unemployed people have been affected. He did not say that the payment of pharmaceutical benefits to people, and in some cases pensioners, has been reduced and that for the very first time in the history of Australian social welfare pensioners are required to pay for their medicine. He did not say that pharmaceutical benefit allowances were decreased by \$33 million.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What did I say?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: There was very little substance in what Mr Clive Griffiths said. It was a speech as such, but it had very little substance. He did not say that a cutback of \$33 million has been made in Aboriginal welfare. He left it to Mr Tozer to say that. Nor did he say that the funds for industrial research and development have been reduced by \$4 million, or that export incentive grants are down from \$62.8 million to \$7.5 million. These things were not said.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I spoke about social welfare.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Mr Griffiths was painting the lily in respect of social welfare. He truly expounded the great benefits in social welfare which were introduced by the former Federal Government.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I was talking about the 23.4 per cent increase in social welfare benefits.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: That is a misleading figure because it doesn't take into account all the things that were lost.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I intended to refer to the matter about which Mr Masters spoke, but his figures were so ambiguous I do not think they rate a reply.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: They are right.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Despite the fact that the member has had six days in which to investigate the matter, his figures were not right.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Well, the Taxation Department did a bad job, then.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Perhaps we may be able to talk about that at a later time. Mr Tozer, like Mr Lewis, made a speech composed of quotes. He spoke about a reduction of \$33 million in Aboriginal welfare spending, and justified it by what Mr Lynch said in his Budget

speech; but what he said was pie in the sky; he merely said something could be done with the money. The Whitlam Government provided positive benefits to Aboriginal people who had been neglected for 23 long years while the Liberals were in office. Consider the Aboriginal grants made in 1972 before the Labor Government came to office, and then look at the amount granted in the year the Whitlam Government went out of office. This reduction of \$33 million is eroding the great benefits given to Aborigines by the Whitlam Government.

The Hon. N. McNeill: We were the first Government to appoint a Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and he had only one year or so to implement this.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That could be so, but he did not do much.

I feel the House has nothing to fear from this motion.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: I agree.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I think we should completely disregard what has been said by members opposite because they have obviously neither considered the true import of the motion nor been able to provide a positive solution to the problems of the nation. Surely we should forward something to Canberra, even if it is only an expression of concern of what is going on in the nation at the moment.

This is not a motion that will bring members opposite into disfavour with Mr Fraser because, after all, if they have his interests at heart they should tell him where he is going wrong.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: That is what you did with Mr Whitlam?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes, on many occasions we had to tell Mr Whitlam there was something wrong.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: We didn't hear much of it in this House; no doubt you wanted to keep it quiet.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: As I have said, we have nothing to fear in this motion; it simply expresses concern at the employment situation, and the fact that the strategy of the Federal Government is contrary to the interests of a large number of people who have not the financial capacity to meet their commitments.

The motion expresses concern at the lowering wage standard, which is evident if people take the time to look at the figures. It expresses an opinion that the labour movement as a whole is being blamed by the Government for the present disastrous economic situation. The last part indicates that an imbalance is being created by favouring a privileged section of the community at the expense of the masses. I do not think there have been very many convincing arguments against the motion and I think the House should support it.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

#### Ayes—6

Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs	Hon. R. F. Claughton (Teller)

#### Noes—18

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. G. E. Masters
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. N. McNeill
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. I. G. Medcalf
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. Clive Griffiths	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. J. Heltman	Hon. R. J. L. Williams
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. V. J. Ferry (Teller)

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

### CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

#### Returned

Bill returned from the Assembly without amendment.

### PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice), read a first time.

### ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

**THE HON. N. McNEILL** (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [10.34 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

#### Mao Tsetung: Obituary

**THE HON. GRACE VAUGHAN** (South-East Metropolitan) [10.35 p.m.]: I do not consider that the House should adjourn until the few words I have to say have been said. During the last week we have learnt of the passing of a very great man. As I and Mr Withers are the only two people in this House who have been to China, I feel I should say a few words concerning the event. One does not feel great sorrow at the passing of a man who has lived for almost 83 years and who has in the last few years been beset by a serious illness. However, the passing of this man should be noted because of its historical significance. I think it would be remiss of this House if we did not note with regret the passing of Chairman Mao Tsetung which marks the end of a great era not only in Chinese history but also in world history.

Those of us who have some knowledge of history and an understanding of decision making and the ways in which societies are formed, develop and go through traumatic experiences will realise that he was a man of very great magnitude. He was present at the first signs of the revolutionary struggle at the beginning

of this century in China when, along with Dr Sun Yat-sen and others, he was instrumental in overthrowing the ruling dynasty. It was a great many years before the revolution was successful and the liberation of 1949 was achieved.

The stories of Mao Tsetung are legion. They include his great exploits as a leader, as a person who came to have the whole nation loving and revering him and a person who has made a name for himself as a philosopher in his own time and who is quoted almost as extensively as the Bible is quoted and certainly as extensively as many of our great philosophers put together.

In Australia at the moment people from all political walks of life have been praising Mao Tsetung and the work he achieved for the Chinese people. Whatever our political beliefs we look at China and say, "This is a country which has developed in terms of material comfort and unity from a disunited, beleaguered and persecuted country into a united country which is just beginning to develop to the extent that it can give its people a reasonable standard of living."

I should like the House to listen to me for a little longer because I wish to make a couple of quotations from the famous little book. The first one I wish to read to the House concerns death. It is a cheerful quotation and shows that Mao Tsetung has come to the end that he would have preferred in the interests of the people. It reads—

Wherever there is a struggle there is sacrifice, and death is a common occurrence. But we have the interests of the people and the sufferings of the great majority at heart, and when we die for the people it is a worthy death.

China has faced many trials and tribulations during the past century. The Chinese referred to those who were exploiting China to the nth degree as the foreign devils. There was disunity. The foreign devils were taking what they could get, the warlords and landlords were persecuting the people, and there was very little hope for a good life for the majority of people.

Dr Sun Yat-sen is still revered in China as the father of the revolution and is still respected. I have seen the monuments to him in China. But the philosophies and the methods have changed considerably from the days of the uprising in 1911. From the beginning of the republic in 1912 to the liberation in 1949 many terrible things happened to the Chinese people. Throughout all this the people were cheered by the fatherly figure of Chairman Mao and by his sayings and the things he did for them. It is common knowledge among political scientists that the liberation could never have been

achieved if it had not been for Mao's ability to gain the people's sympathy because of the great things he did for them in controlling his armies as they went through China to ensure that they did more constructive things than destructive things. That is probably the great difference between his army and that of Chiang Kai-shek. Mao led the people in the famous long march after there had been a falling out between him and Chiang Kai-shek over the revolution. After Dr Sun Yat-sen died in 1927 it was considered that Chiang had betrayed the revolution. These are matters of political history. I am not going into them except to say this is the reason the long march was started. This was the famous long march in which the red army travelled throughout China and did much good by helping the peasants with their harvests and preserving what one might term a very good public relations project.

Following the devastation of the peasant's land and families by the warlords, there came the great invasion by the Japanese people of the Chinese mainland and the terrible struggles that followed during which Mao and Chiang Kai-shek combined to attempt to throw out their common enemy. At the last minute there was great help from the Allies and the Japanese were finally thrown out. Between 1945 and 1949 there was a great struggle for the communist regime to assume power.

Whatever one's political philosophy may be, one must say that there certainly has been a great success for the Communist Party in the development of China. Those of us who have been there have sensed the great excitement of the people and their pleasure and happiness at the development of their country. I wish to quote one other little saying from the thoughts of Chairman Mao. I think this reflects the sort of attitude I sensed when I was in China. I spoke to many people in many walks of life. I was mainly concerned with the social system in China and not so much with its political system, but it is difficult to divide the two. In 1956, in commemoration of Dr Sun Yat-sen, Chairman Mao said in one of his essays—

Things develop ceaselessly. It is only forty-five years since the Revolution of 1911, but the face of China has completely changed. In another forty-five years, that is, in the year 2001, or the beginning of the 21st century, China will have undergone an even greater change. She will have become a powerful socialist industrial country. And that is as it should be. China is a land with an area of 9 600 000 square kilometres and a population of 600 million people, and she ought to have made a greater contribution to humanity.

This is the sort of humility which came through in Mao's writing. To continue—

Her contribution over a long period has been far too small. For this we are regretful.

But we must be modest—not only now, but forty-five years hence as well. We should always be modest. In our international relations, we Chinese people should get rid of great-power chauvinism resolutely, thoroughly, wholly and completely.

He also thought there would be hard work ahead for the people, and he said—

New things always have to experience difficulties and setbacks as they grow. It is sheer fantasy to imagine that the cause of socialism is all plain sailing and easy success, without difficulties and setbacks or the exertion of tremendous efforts.

Something of his poetry is found in the following little extract—

In approaching a problem a Marxist should see the whole as well as the parts. A frog in a well says, "The sky is no bigger than the mouth of the well." That is untrue, for the sky is not just the size of the mouth of the well. If it said, "A part of the sky is the size of the mouth of a well", that would be true, for it tallies with the facts.

This reveals Mao's great understanding of the fact that China, with its vast population, was only a part of the whole, and he saw it in that context.

I thank the House for listening to me while I paid what I hope was a tribute to Chairman Mao.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 10.47 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 14th September, 1976

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

### NOTICE PAPER

#### *Bills: Introductory Date*

**THE SPEAKER** (Mr Hutchinson): For the information of members I would like to inform them that, commencing with today's issue of the notice paper, information showing the date of the introductory speech of a Bill will appear in the heading immediately after the title of the Bill.

### BILLS (12): ASSENT

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

1. The Confederation of Western Australian Industry (Incorporated) Bill.

2. Alsatian Dog Act Repeal Bill.
3. Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 3).
4. Building Societies Bill.
5. Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).
6. Country Towns Sewerage Act Amendment Bill.
7. Law Reform Commission Act Amendment Bill.
8. Stock Diseases (Regulations) Act Amendment Bill.
9. Cattle Industry Compensation Act Amendment Bill.
10. Main Roads Act Amendment Bill.
11. Industrial and Commercial Employees' Housing Act Amendment Bill.
12. Teachers' Registration Bill.

### CITY OF SOUTH PERTH

#### *Land for Public Open Space: Petition*

**MR GRAYDEN** (South Perth—Minister for Labour and Industry) [4.34 p.m.]: I present a petition from 4103 residents of the City of South Perth. The petition reads as follows—

To the Honourable the Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled:

We, the undersigned residents of the City of South Perth in the State of Western Australia, petition that the House preserve as public open space for all time, all council land not already built on in the area bounded by Mill Point Road, the Swan River, Mends Street, and Ellam Road, South Perth by declaring such area an "A"-class reserve.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House will give this matter earnest consideration and your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

The petition conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly, and I have certified accordingly.

**The SPEAKER:** I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

*The petition was tabled (see paper No. 391).*

### QUESTIONS (15): ON NOTICE

1. SOUTH WESTERN HIGHWAY

#### *Armada-Pinjarra: Upgrading*

**Mr SHALDERS**, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Would he outline details of future planning in respect of renewal and upgrading work to be carried out on the southwest highway between Armadale and Pinjarra?