

In Committee

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

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2: Amendment to long title—

Mr. O'NEIL: I simply want to indicate that this clause seeks to amend the long title of the principal Act by changing the words "certain insurance business" to "the general business of insurance." I wish to have it clearly recorded that we on this side of the Chamber are totally opposed to the principles of the Bill and therefore are opposed to this clause.

Mr. TAYLOR: For exactly the opposite reason I wish the clause to stand as printed.

Clause put and passed.

Progress

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

House adjourned at 6.07 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 8th August, 1972

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

QUESTIONS (6): ON NOTICE

1. PRIMARY PRODUCTS

Statutory Marketing Authorities

The Hon. N. McNEILL, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) What precise investigations are carried out in country areas to determine the sociological consequences of the creation of statutory authorities for the control and or marketing of agriculture commodities?
- (2) If such investigations are, or have been, carried out, are they reported, and if so, to whom?
- (3) Does the Government consider that consequential effects upon commercial and community activities as a result of the implementation of policies of such authorities, are of importance in the achievement of decentralisation and the continued development of country centres?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) Nil.
- (2) Answered by (1).

- (3) It is not considered that the policies of statutory authorities provide a major stimulus to decentralisation, but indirect benefits can assist the development of country centres.

2.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES PHARMACIES

Fremantle Mayoral Election

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON, to the Leader of the House:

Referring to answers given to my question on Friday, the 2nd June, 1972, relating to the use of Friendly Societies facilities in the Fremantle Mayoral Election—

- (a) have the promised inquiries been made;
- (b) have the aspects referred to in part (3) of the question become known, and considered as promised;
- (c) if the inquiries have been made and the aspects mentioned considered, could the Minister advise the House of the results of the inquiry, and what, if any, action is proposed?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (a) Yes.
- (b) Yes.
- (c) Part of the premises referred to in (1) of the Hon. Member's question on 2nd June, 1972, was used by staff volunteers to promote Mr. McKenzie's campaign for election as Mayor of Fremantle. Several volunteer members used the office area of the premises on election day, having been authorised by the Society at a meeting on 12th May, 1972, as recorded in the Minutes. Mr. McKenzie paid for the expenses involved. No action is proposed.

3.

HAIRDRESSING

Prices

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Does the fixed price of \$1.20 for men's haircuts apply to customers with long hair who request special cuts and who may remain in the barber's chair for more than 20 minutes?
- (2) What are the fixed prices for women's haircuts?
- (3) If the answer to (1) is "Yes", does the Minister for Labour think this is just?

- (4) If the answer to (2) indicates that there are higher charges for women, will he advise the reason for this?
- (5) Has any consideration been given to a range of charges from \$1.20 for short hair to \$2.80 for special hair styles, for all sexes, whether they be male, female or intermediate?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) There are no fixed prices for men's haircuts. There is however, a recommended price of \$1.20 by the Master Gentlemen's Hairdressers Association for an ordinary short haircut. There is no recommended price for special cuts for long hair, this usually being determined by the length of time spent in the chair.
- (2) There are no fixed prices for women's haircuts. The Master Ladies' Hairdressing Association does not recommend prices. Prices appear to vary according to the requirements of the client.
- (3) The Minister's opinion is that if the client wishes additional services requiring extra time, he should be prepared to pay for it.
- (4) Answered by (2).
- (5) Not by the respective Gentlemen's or Ladies' Associations.

4. DRUGS CONVICTIONS

Penalties

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) What penalties are prescribed for persons convicted of peddling hard drugs in Western Australia?
- (2) Are the penalties considered adequate?
- (3) How many convictions have been recorded for this type of offence during the last two years?
- (4) What penalties did the Courts inflict?
- (5) Has there been any increase in the number of convictions compared with the two previous years, and if so what?
- (6) In view of the recently publicised statement of the Federal Minister for Customs, Mr. Chipp, after a recent overseas visit, that only 15% of the drugs being imported into Australia illegally were being intercepted, what action, if any, does the Western Australian Government propose to take?
- (7) Is it intended to increase the penalties for this type of criminal offence?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) Maximum penalty \$4,000 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding 10 years or both.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) 1970-71—5 convictions
1971-72—12 convictions.
- (4) 1970-71—
6 months' imprisonment
12 months' imprisonment
3 months' imprisonment
3 months' imprisonment
4 months' imprisonment.
1971-72—
5 months' imprisonment
3 months' imprisonment
Fined \$200
2 years' imprisonment
2 years' imprisonment
3 years' probation
2½ years' imprisonment
Committed to Child Welfare Department—18 years.
Fined \$500
Fined \$300
12 months' probation
Convicted, awaiting sentence.
- (5) Yes.
1968-69— 5 convictions
1969-70— 1 conviction
1970-71— 5 convictions
1971-72—12 convictions.
- (6) Continued and increased surveillance where necessary.
- (7) No.

5.

GRAIN

Moisture Level

The Hon. J. HEITMAN, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Has the Department of Agriculture conducted tests on the present method of determining the moisture level in grain received at country sidings?
- (2) If so, what were the results of the test?
- (3) What action may be taken to ensure producers are not penalised by inconsistent moisture readings?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Under the conditions in which the tests were conducted the present method of determining moisture content of grain was found suitable. Further tests will be carried out under field conditions next summer.
- (3) Producers may send samples to the Department of Agriculture for arbitration if they feel they are being penalised.

6.

FRUIT FLY

Baiting Scheme Subsidy

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) How many separate Fruit Fly Baiting Schemes have operated in Western Australia during each of the years 1967-68, 1968-69, 1969-70, 1970-71 and 1971-72?
- (2) In which areas did each of these schemes operate?
- (3) What was the total subsidy provided in each of the above years?
- (4) What amount of subsidy was paid to each separate scheme in each of these years?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

(1)—

Year	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72
No. of schemes	48	48	17	47	40

- (2) Information in Appendix A is submitted for Tabling.
- (3) and (4) Information in Appendix B is submitted for Tabling.

The papers were tabled.

(See Paper No. 221.)

SUPPLY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 3rd August.

THE HON. L. D. ELLIOTT (North-East Metropolitan) [4.47 p.m.]: Mr. President, I wish to support the Bill. To hear the members of the Opposition speaking, both here and in another place, one would imagine that unemployment was a problem only in this State and that the election of a Labor Government last year was responsible for it. Let us have a closer look at the position.

Firstly, I would like to remind members that unemployment was already well established a full year before Labor took office. Between December, 1969, and January, 1971, the number of Western Australians registered as unemployed rose by over 2,000. If the current unemployment situation in Western Australia is attributable to the Labor Government, why is it that measures introduced by the Commonwealth Government to relieve unemployment were not directed to Western Australia alone? Unemployment relief given by the Commonwealth Government is being spread throughout every State, and I think this is proof that it is a serious problem right throughout the country and not just in Western Australia.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What were the figures for unemployment in the months you mentioned, between December, 1969, and January, 1971?

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: Between December, 1969, and January, 1971, unemployment rose by 2,000.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What were the figures for unemployment?

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: I do not have them with me, but that is a fact.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They would all be school leavers, of course, in those months.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: It was not a Labor Premier who first raised the problem of increasing unemployment. It was the Liberal Premier of New South Wales (Sir Robert Askin) who, last year, first spoke of the necessity for a special Premiers' Conference to discuss with officials of the Commonwealth the danger signs that were appearing in the economy. The truth is that it was the Federal Liberal Government which was responsible for contributing substantially to unemployment, not only in this State but also all over Australia.

Nobody who values his reputation for honesty would seriously suggest that the Federal Government, when it introduced its Budget last year, did not know the Budget would create unemployment. The Federal Government knew exactly what would be the effects on employment of its 1971 Budget. It received warnings from many of the country's economists, including those in the ranks of the Federal Parliamentary Labor Party. *The Australian Economic Review* of the 23rd July, 1971, the month before the Budget was presented, warned—

Unless the appropriate stimulus is given to the economy to induce a greater real through-put of goods and services, the level of unemployment will continue to drift upward and by the June quarter 1972 could easily exceed 80,000.

It went on to say—

If traditional measures of severe monetary and budgetary policies are used in an attempt to contain inflation there will be very substantial costs in losses of real output and substantial unemployment.

The Federal Government, of course, went ahead and applied traditional measures, knowing full well that those measures would worsen the already developing unemployment problem.

More recently, Alec Mairs, the finance editor of *The West Australian*, in an article published on Monday, the 24th July, had this to say—

The 1971 Budget was framed to meet a set of circumstances that never happened. Its underlying proposition was that by holding down demand and allowing unemployment to rise, inflationary forces that were being fuelled by excessive wage rises would be weakened.

In the same report the finance editor went on to say—

The growth rate of the Australian economy in the past year was rather miserable. The Treasury estimates that the gross national product (the total value of goods and services produced by the community), at constant prices, rose by only 3 per cent, or a little more.

I would like also to quote the following extract from the same report:—

In essence the Treasury is saying that unless a Government is prepared to carry out a low-growth high-unemployment policy for some time, it has little chance of significantly reducing the present inflation in this way.

I am not an economist, but as I understand the implications of it, the last Federal Budget was based on the false premise—as was pointed out by Mr. Mairs in his article—that by holding down demand and allowing unemployment to rise inflation would be slowed down.

The Federal Treasurer (Mr. Snedden) in his Budget Speech had this to say—

Although cost increases and the price increases which follow them may be due, in the first instance, to increases in wages and other cost elements, they are without doubt stimulated and made possible by conditions of strong demand for resources. Hence, if resistance to such cost increases is to be stiffened, as it must be, there has to be a sufficient degree of restraint on potential demand for resources, particularly in those sectors where it is obviously running too high.

The chief instruments available to the Government and its related authorities are the annual Budget, the effects of which are spread over the ensuing year, and monetary measures taken by the Reserve Bank in collaboration with the Government.

Shortly after Mr. Snedden made that speech in introducing the Federal Budget, the Reserve Bank of Australia issued its "1970-71 Report & Financial Statements." I think it was released about a week after the Budget. In the report the Directors of the Reserve Bank of Australia refute the basic premise of the Budget that demand factors were responsible for inflation in this country. They had this to say in the section entitled "The Problem of Inflation"—

Such indicators as labour market statistics and imports suggest that, with the possible exception of a period towards the end of 1969 and in early 1970, aggregate demand in Australia in recent years has been broadly within the capacity to produce. Hence, it is harder to attribute the recent acceleration of inflation in this country to excess demand pressures.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What page is that on?

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: It appears on page 36. The point I am making is that the basic ills of the economy as a whole can be attributed in a major way to the Budget strategy of the Liberal Federal Government. One may ask why unemployment is higher in this State than in others.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It is a funny thing, but that was going through my mind.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: I do not think Mr. Griffith would say that *The West Australian* newspaper is a staunch supporter of the Labor Party.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is giving that impression lately, I must admit.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: Mr. MacKinnon's impressions differ from mine. However, on the 22nd June of this year *The West Australian* had this to say—

W.A. has a strong case for seeking additional loan-fund assistance, apart from help with its budgeting problems. Its May unemployment figure is the highest percentage of any State. External factors—particularly the fall in the international demand for metals—are largely to blame for W.A.'s position, which will not be remedied by Canberra's grants for rural unemployment relief.

There are ample precedents for Federal assistance to a State in special circumstances.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is funny how you people accept *The West Australian* as an authority one day and then refute it the next day.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: I am saying that that newspaper is not a supporter of the Labor Party. However, it was stating facts which members opposite will find hard to refute.

In the same newspaper on the 22nd July the following editorial appears:—

Clearly, the State's problems differ considerably from those of the rest of Australia.

It is because of these differences that W.A. has a justifiable case for further Commonwealth help. In view of the national benefits reaped during the mineral boom, the Federal Treasury has an obligation to help the State at a time when a down-turn in international mineral markets has had serious effects on mining and other industries.

Other States have industrial diversification that enables them to ride the bumps better than W.A., where expansion and stability depend so much on mining. Canberra's rural help programme is the wrong medicine for this

State, where more than 80 per cent. of the registered unemployed are in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I think somebody in the Federal Government must have read that article because the State Government certainly received a lot of help.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: I will come to that, Mr. Griffith. During the mineral boom the building, mining, and engineering industries attracted a great deal of labour to this State. In the five years to the 30th June, 1971, the annual population growth of this State was 3.9 per cent., compared with the Commonwealth figure of 1.9 per cent.

Then came the international downturn in the mineral markets, and because the United States imposed a 10 per cent. surcharge on imports and revalued its currency, Japan—our biggest customer—was seriously affected and was forced to cut down on its importation of our minerals. Obviously the industries geared to mining boom conditions—engineering, construction, fabrication, etc.—will be the hardest hit. It is in those industries that the highest percentage of unemployment is to be found.

Is it reasonable, therefore, to blame the State Labor Government for a recession which was created partly by international factors, and worsened by the Budget strategy of the Liberal Federal Government? I imagine members of the Opposition go home every night and thank their lucky stars that they lost the last State election and so do not have to contend with all the problems facing the State Government at the present time.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: You must be joking.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: What steps has this Government taken to alleviate the situation? Has it been merely sitting back and doing nothing?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No, it has been waiting for the Federal Government to give it money and ideas.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: Firstly, Government Ministers have been overseas for the purpose of attracting industry to the State. The Premier and the Minister for Mines went to Japan to hold talks with the top Government officials and business people there, in an effort to get them to reverse their decision to cut down on imports from Western Australia and the Minister for Development has also been extremely active.

Secondly, the Government has taken positive steps to encourage decentralisation for the purpose of attracting industries to country areas.

Another move was made by the Premier when on the 12th May last he wrote to the Prime Minister seeking a submission to the

Loan Council to allow Western Australia to borrow \$3,000,000 to create employment in the metropolitan area. This request was not even acknowledged by the Prime Minister. We should bear in mind that it was a request to borrow money; it was not a request for a grant to be made.

However, it was not until a month later, when the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Anthony) was in Perth on the 7th June, that a promise was made by him to look into the matter. It was only then that anything was done about the matter. Not only did the Commonwealth Government refuse to support the request of the State to borrow \$3,000,000—

The Hon. N. McNeill: That was an additional \$3,000,000.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: —but it would not even submit the request to the Loan Council for its consideration. However, with further pressure at the Premiers' Conference later in June, the Premier of Western Australia got the \$3,000,000 loan. He also persuaded the Commonwealth to lift the borrowing limits of small local authorities from \$300,000 to \$400,000.

Yet another step was taken by the State Government. On the 14th June it allocated \$14,000,000 for a crash programme of public works to be undertaken in order to relieve unemployment, particularly in the building industry. The President of the Master Builders' Association (Mr. Mitchell) congratulated the Government for, and I quote his words, "taking the initiative and for moving so quickly."

The Hon. N. McNeill: That was committing next year's finances of the State.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: The Government wasted no time in getting rural relief projects under way. The \$42,000,000 Co-operative Bulk Handling project for a new grain terminal at Kwinana will soon be under way; and this will provide employment for hundreds of men.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I hope you are not taking any credit for that project. If you do it would be an insult to the farmers who organised this project over the past three years.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: This project will be started, thanks to assistance from the Government. This assistance involves the guarantee of a loan of \$30,000,000 from the R. & I. Bank.

During June, money was released to building societies, both in the metropolitan area and the north-west, to stimulate home building.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The \$500,000 for the metropolitan area represents about three-quarters of an hour's trading.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: On the 26th June the State Government agreed to guarantee a loan of \$420,000 to enable extensions and improvements to be made to the Manjimup cannery. The upgraded

cannery will provide direct employment for 70 people, and indirect employment for many more district residents in the fruit-growing and allied industries.

On the question of whether there has been a loss of confidence in the State so far as businesses and private industry are concerned, I was rather interested in some figures released by the Department of Labour and National Service. They deal with the movement in employment in the larger factories for the month of June. I would like to quote these. In New South Wales the figure fell by 0.5 per cent.; in Victoria it fell by 0.6 per cent.; in South Australia it fell by 0.2 per cent.; in Tasmania it fell by 0.5 per cent.; in Queensland it rose by 0.6 per cent.; and in Western Australia it rose by 0.1 per cent. Queensland and Western Australia were the only States where the figure rose. The rise of 0.1 per cent. in Western Australia in June, 1972, compares favourably with a fall of 1 per cent. in June, 1970 when the present Labor Government was not in office. There was an overall average fall throughout Australia of 0.3 per cent. in the month of June, but in Western Australia the figure actually rose by 0.1 per cent.

I do not think it can be said that the Government in Western Australia either has been responsible for creating unemployment, or is doing nothing to relieve the unemployment situation. I refer to a report which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 13th June which states—

Canberra should match Mr. Tonkin's determination to reduce unemployment in W.A. with a more realistic appraisal of this State's special difficulties.

The present Government has been in office for 18 months only, and during this time it has been confronted with tremendous problems that are not of its own making. I think all fair-minded Western Australians will agree that the Government should be given a fair go. I support the Bill.

THE HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [5.07 p.m.]: I rise to support the Bill. It seeks to authorise certain moneys to be allocated for the running of the State, and the total to be allocated when the Bill becomes law is \$235,000,000.

We realise that this is a very responsible Bill and it has been introduced by what should be a responsible Government. I consider that all Governments should be responsible; and that we as members of Parliament should view such Bills in a responsible way.

In the course of my contribution to the debate I would like to raise one aspect of the role of responsibility. I believe this Government is administering the affairs of the State on double values; but I do not necessarily mean that in the monetary sense. It has adopted double values in

respect of a number of questions, but perhaps I can refer firstly to its double values in respect of the enforcement of laws as they are, and its double values in respect of its treatment of people.

In this regard I refer to the performance by the Government in respect of the road maintenance tax. The abolition of the road maintenance tax was an election promise announced by the then Leader of the Opposition on behalf of the Australian Labor Party; and indeed since assuming office as Premier he has tried to implement that promise. However, at the election he did not say to the people that he was intending to introduce a substitute tax, by increasing heavily the license fees on commercial vehicles. The proposal to introduce this tax sent a wave of consternation throughout the community, so much so that we know the result.

Subsequently the Premier endeavoured to bring in as a substitute another form of tax to take the place of the road maintenance tax. In fact, he made it his business to raise this matter at a Premiers' Conference. That was his intention, and from what I am told no suitable opportunity presented itself at the Premiers' Conference; but I understand the matter was actually raised at a conference of the Australian Transport Advisory Council.

It is rather interesting to note from the Press reports dealing with this particular move that Western Australia was the only State that raised the issue and it received no support from any of the other States; that is, the proposal for the replacement of the road maintenance tax with another form of tax. The reports in the newspapers indicated that if all the other States failed to support the move by Western Australia to abolish the road maintenance tax, it meant that South Australia approved of the road maintenance tax. Obviously South Australia realised the value of the funds to be derived from this source.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Have you asked South Australia whether it approves of that form of tax?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: Obviously South Australia accepts that form of tax and still supports it because South Australia has not made any move to introduce another tax as a substitute.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You are making an assumption.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I think the Minister for Transport will confirm what I have said. It seems rather odd that the Premier and his Government should continue to attempt to honour an election promise which was completely ill-founded; and it was ill-founded to the point of creating confusion among transport operators who were required to submit returns and pay the prescribed scale of fees. The action of the Government has placed these people in two different camps.

Firstly, there are the transport operators who continue to furnish their returns and pay the road maintenance tax; and secondly, there are those who have been encouraged by the Premier and his Government not to pay the tax or to worry about it. However, the Government has still been collecting the tax from most of these operators; and to their credit most of the operators saw reason for continuing to pay the tax as required under the law.

However, a number of transport operators have been encouraged not to furnish returns, and to ignore the payment of the tax. This has placed them at a great disadvantage, because the situation now is that people who have failed to furnish returns in recent times and to pay the road maintenance tax are required to submit confidential financial statements setting out their assets and liabilities. Few conforming operators will continue to submit returns as has been their required custom.

I refer to a report which appeared in the *Daily News* of the 26th July, 1972—

Government move on road tax.

The Premier, Mr. Tonkin, has called on road transport operators owing road maintenance tax to submit returns saying whether they could pay.

He said that the information was needed to assess the ability of operators to pay and to decide whether warrants should be issued for non-payment of the tax.

Where it was established that payment was out of the question, the amount would be written off.

In other cases, the money could be paid in a lump sum or in instalments, depending on the judgment of the committee set up to examine all default cases.

Operators who did not provide the required details of their financial circumstances would be prosecuted.

He said: "Defaulters cannot expect sympathy from the State Government unless they comply immediately with its requirements."

If that report is correct, it certainly seems to be a peculiar statement. For almost two years the Premier has been encouraging people to default on the payment of this tax, but according to this Press report he has said categorically that those people cannot expect any sympathy from the State Government unless they comply immediately with the requirements.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Can you substantiate your statement that the Government has been encouraging them for many years not to pay the tax?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I will leave the honourable member to do that. No-one can deny the fact that these people have been encouraged to default on the payment of the tax, and as a result they are placed in the situation in which they now find themselves. Now they are confronted with the requirement to submit financial statements to indicate whether they can or cannot pay the tax.

This is most embarrassing to the people concerned. Furthermore I believe that it constitutes an administration of the law by a means test and I do not think justice should be meted out by a means test. It should, of course, be fair and reasonable, and I have no argument about that; justice should be administered in this way, but we must bear in mind that if that were the case those who were able to pay certainly would be required to pay and those who did not conform and did not possess the finance would be allowed to get off scot free.

This seems peculiar to me. I have the fullest sympathy for the people who are unable to pay. They have been placed in this extremely embarrassing situation and I feel the Government is aggravating that situation by now being obliged to carry out some form of correction. So there is undoubtedly a double standard on the points I have raised.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Would you rather the Government ignored the law?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I hope we will hear Mr. Cloughton's contribution to the debate shortly. We will be most interested to hear what he has to say.

The question of responsibility which is associated with the Supply Bill is a very real one, particularly when we are asked for supply to the tune of \$235,000,000. In this case I refer to the need for responsibility and the need to enforce the law whether it be done in one way or another.

Here again I say the present Government is manipulating the emotions of the people for political gain. The Government appears to be openly encouraging some sectional interests to ignore the law, while the majority of responsible and community-conscious people have to carry the burden.

I refer to the present time to the unfortunate situations and circumstances of having what has come to be regarded as a camp in the grounds of Parliament House. It is all very interesting. I have with me a large file of newspaper cuttings which tell the story and the sequence of events which led up to the establishment of the tent in the grounds of Parliament House and the events which followed to the present time.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: What would you have them do with the tent?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I do not propose to read all the Press reports, but I would like to refer to some of them to show the sequence of events and to prove to the House that the actions of the Government are slanted towards political manipulation. This has been acknowledged in words uttered by the Premier himself and, incidentally, the Leader of the House was good enough to confirm that fact in an answer to a question I asked of him.

According to the Press reports I have in my possession, apparently it was the intention of the Aborigines to set up a tent in King's Park. At least this is so if we are to believe a heading in the *Daily News* of the 10th June, 1972. I would like to quote the spokesman of the group who said—

We want to bring pressure on the Federal Government to get their help. This can be done by getting public opinion even stronger behind us in our quest for housing.

At King's Park we will set up our tents in full public view.

The Director of King's Park said that the park by-laws would stand in the way of the camp consulate being established in King's Park. He said—

Kings Park Board Director, Dr. Paul Wycherley, said today that park by-laws would stand in the way of the proposed consulate.

He said: "To camp overnight in Kings Park is an infringement of park by-laws.

"If the Aborigines move in we'll have to serve an infringement notice on them and ask them to leave. The action we would take after that would depend on them," he said.

So the intention in the first place was undoubtedly to go to King's Park.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: How do you know they were going to King's Park?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I am indicating from the Press reports I have with me that this was the intention.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: *The West Australian* is not very reliable.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: A minute ago it was apparently 100 per cent. reliable.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not know about that. I will touch on this aspect later.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: This happens to be the *Daily News*. In *The West Australian* of the 12th June, 1972, we find the following:—

The Premier, Mr. Tonkin, is surprised at the decision to set up an "aboriginal consulate" in protest at inadequate moves by the Federal State governments on Aboriginal housing.

So Mr Tonkin was surprised at that. The editorial in *The West Australian* of the 14th June later said in part—

Such a step would do more harm than good to the council's cause,

He is speaking of the Aboriginal Advancement Council. To continue—

which is to seek more money from the State and Federal Governments for Aboriginal housing. The council would succeed only in drawing unfavourable attention to itself. The magnitude of the Aboriginal housing problem is well known in Canberra and in Perth.

The council and its supporters should be able to find within the law more effective ways of urging Government action than pitching a few tents in a park.

A further report in *The West Australian* of the 20th June, 1972, under the heading, "Government undecided on consulate" stated—

Parliament House grounds—Reserve A1162, Perth Town Lot H55—are under the jurisdiction of the Minister for Lands, Mr H. D. Evans, who was not available to comment yesterday.

The article continues under the sub-heading, "Tonkin critical" as follows:—

The Premier, Mr. Tonkin, last night strongly criticised the Aborigines' action.

"They are achieving nothing as far as we are concerned," he said.

Mr Tonkin said he had not yet had a chance to closely examine the situation and the matter would be examined.

He thought that Aborigines had been campaigning for equality with the same advantages as white people.

However, white people would not be allowed to camp at Parliament House.

If Aborigines wanted the same advantages and privileges as white people they would have to accept the same obligations.

Those were the words quoted in this article by Mr. Tonkin. In the *Daily News* of the 17th June, 1972, Mr. Davis, speaking on behalf of the Aboriginal Advancement Council, said—

Mr Davis said the group, which had earlier planned to set up an Aboriginal embassy in Kings Park tonight had moved early to take authorities by surprise.

"The land we are camped on is, legally speaking, 'owned' by the Minister for Lands, Mr H. D. Evans, and it can be only through him that we are forced off," said Mr Davis.

Under the heading, "Tonkin: We have power" *The West Australian* of the 21st June, 1972 stated—

The Premier, Mr Tonkin, considers that the State Government has power to remove the Aboriginal consulate from the grounds of Parliament House.

However, he declined yesterday to say what the power was or whether the Government would use it.

"There are more ways of killing a pig than choking it with butter," he said.

That is a most unfortunate suggestion—

Mr Tonkin said the Aborigines had decided not to pitch their tent in Kings Park because they realised that power existed to have them removed.

A further editorial in *The West Australian* of the 21st June, 1972, said under the heading, "Native Rights"—

To a big extent the Aborigines camped at Parliament House are preaching to the converted.

The Federal and State Governments and most thinking people in the community have already recognised the need to move more quickly towards integration.

Yet the protest being made by the Aboriginal "consulate" is legitimate. It is not enough to legislate for equality. To be an equal member of a community a man needs a job and a permanent address for what in bureaucratic terms is called the service of notices. And for the most part Aborigines have neither.

There is a big gulf between what the community thinks it is doing for Aborigines and what it is actually achieving. The main reason for this is that people tend to think of Aboriginal welfare as a single problem in which good intentions have led to disappointment. This is where the "consulate" is doing its people a disservice—by nailing its protest to housing goals that simply cannot be reached in the short term. The world does not owe Aborigines a living. What they are entitled to, in a country that spends many millions of dollars on migrants, is a better deal than they have had so far.

But that means stepped-up job training as well as houses and it means a decision by individual Aborigines to accept equal responsibility as well as equal rights.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: The Press seems to have made capital out of it.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: There are reams of these cuttings.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I hope you do not read them all.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: In *The West Australian* of the 6th July, 1972—that is of recent date—there is a heading "Unions to help Aborigines" and the article states—

The Building Workers' Industrial Union has decided to help Aborigines get the 1,500 homes for which they have been campaigning.

Further on the 7th July we have an article in *The West Australian* by D. B. Smith headed, "Consulate shows up loophole" which states—

The Premier, Mr. Tonkin, has tipped off Perth motorists about one of the choicest free parking areas in the city—the grounds of Parliament House.

Now we proceed to *The West Australian* of the 15th July, 1972, in which is contained another article by D. B. Smith in which under the heading, "Board to Prepare By-laws" he says—

The days of the Aboriginal "consulate" on the lawns of Parliament House appear to be numbered.

Parliament's ten-man joint house committee, which yesterday formally became a board controlling the parliamentary reserve, plans to move quickly to frame by-laws.

The by-laws are expected to provide penalties up to \$150 for breaches such as unauthorised occupation of the grounds.

It will probably be another week or more before the by-laws take effect and the committee can assert its control over the reserve.

The formal procedure of vesting control of the reserve in the joint house committee was set in motion when the Government found that it had no power to evict the Aboriginal squatters who erected a marquee outside Parliament House on June 17.

The Government has denied that it is "passing the buck," but the solution is a convenient one.

In *The West Australian* of the 22nd July, 1972, under the heading, "Natives seek union help" we find the following:—

The W.A. Trades and Labor Council will consider asking unionists to help Aborigines to resist any attempt to remove the Aboriginal "consulate".

The council will also discuss whether to call a 24-hour strike if the authorities pull down the "consulate" tent.

So now we find the group seeking union assistance to prevent their tent being removed. Under the heading, "Aborigines say T.L.C. backs us" the *Daily News* of the 25th July, 1972, states—

Aboriginal Advancement president Jack Davis and secretary Ken Winder said this after they had met the executive of the T.L.C. today.

Mr. Davis said: "The executive said they would support us and maintain us with the tent up at Parliament House through possible industrial action until after the Federal Budget is brought down.

"They have also agreed to give us physical support in the case of a confrontation with authorities trying to shift us off the Parliament House lawns before the Budget," he said.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Under what Statute law do they call it a consulate?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: This is referred to in inverted commas.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It is certainly not a consulate; it is a tent.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: In *The West Australian* of the 28th July, 1972, under the heading, "Consulate illegal from today," we find the following:—

Bylaws giving the Parliamentary Reserves Board power to evict the Aborigines camped on the lawns of Parliament House are expected to come into effect today.

A little later, on the 29th July, an article appeared in *The West Australian* under the heading "Parliament takes power to clear tent" It reads in part—

The Parliamentary Reserves Board yesterday received power to stop people camping in the grounds of Parliament House, but no decision has been made on whether it will be used to evict the Aborigines now camped there.

Further down it says—

Bylaws published yesterday in the Government Gazette make it illegal for any person to camp on the reserve or to erect any shelter without the prior consent of the board.

The board is given power to remove "anything that is on, or is placed, erected, used or maintained on the reserve."

Under a subheading "Penalty," the article reads—

The penalty for breaches of the by-laws is \$150.

The bylaws, which are similar to those of other boards controlling reserves, ban the sale or distribution of goods in the grounds of Parliament without the board's agreement.

They make it an offence to collect money for any purpose and to take part in any public meeting on the reserve without the board's written approval.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Those penalties are not very high. A person can be fined \$400 for stealing a push bike.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: It is a cheap holiday. I come now to *The West Australian* of the 2nd August, 1972. An article headed "Consulate" to stay till August 15th," reads in part—

The Aboriginal "consulate" on the lawns of Parliament House seems likely to remain there till August 15.

The Parliamentary Reserves Board, which controls the grounds of Parliament House, met to discuss the consulate last night.

Later on, it says—

Shortly after the meeting the board's secretary, Mr. H. W. Burton, went to the "consulate" and handed a copy of the by-laws to the president of the Aboriginal Advancement Council, Mr. Jack Davis.

Mr. Davis made no comment except to reaffirm that it was the council's intention to remove the tent on August 15—the day the Federal Budget is to be brought down.

This is what *The West Australian* had to say on the same day in an editorial headed "The 'consulate'."—

The president of the Aboriginal Advancement Council, Mr. Davis, is to be commended for his sensible suggestion to remove the Aboriginal "consulate" from the grounds of Parliament House on Federal Budget Day, August 15.

This would be a happy compromise in an awkward situation for both the protesters and the House authorities. It would avoid any possibility of an ugly confrontation such as occurred when 60 policemen were marshalled to demolish the Aboriginal tent "embassy" in Canberra.

Any move now to force out the Aborigines from the "consulate" would leave a sour taste and offset the goodwill officialdom has built up by its tolerance and understanding. Another 14 days is of little consequence.

Mr. Davis is right when he says that he has gained full political mileage out of the "consulate," but he would be wise not to expect too much from Mr. Snedden's Budget. It would be astonishing if Canberra suddenly found \$10 million in one year for Aboriginal housing in W.A.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I wonder what *The West Australian* would say if a group of people were to camp in St. George's Terrace outside the newspaper offices.

The Hon. R. Thompson: They would probably invite them inside out of the cold.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: Probably members are aware that the editorial I have just quoted expresses a view which is quite contrary to that expressed in a previous editorial.

What will happen to the grounds of Parliament House in future? One can conjure up all kinds of situations and eventualities. By what means can it be expected that other groups or individuals will be controlled? The situation is that the Government failed to take any action to control the use of the grounds before the board was given this authority.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Which Government failed to take action?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: There is only one Government in Western Australia.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: This situation has never occurred before.

The Hon. J. Dolan: You do not know the story.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I am telling the story.

The Hon. J. Dolan: You have been reading the papers for too long.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The Minister for Police is probably right there.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: The fact remains, the Government failed to take action to control what was happening on the parliamentary reserve and, I suggest, duck-shoved its responsibility, delayed the evil day—

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Are you sure of that word?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: —and used delaying tactics.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Would you not consider that the Federal Government was more humane? After all, it waited for nine months.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: This is not concerned with Commonwealth matters; it is a Western Australian parliamentary matter.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I am aware of that.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: Let us stick to the point.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: What would have happened if 50 others had done the same?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I am coming to that. All kinds of groups may decide to do the same. The situation is, the Government failed to exercise its responsibility. The Government passed the matter on to a board and, having done that, does not want the board to act until the 15th August when the Federal Budget is likely to be presented in the Commonwealth Parliament in Canberra. This is only a political gimmick.

Can we assume it will be open season at all times for all manner of people to use the grounds? What is to stop them? There could be a permanent open season for campers with hordes of caravans parking around the grounds of Parliament

House and people having picnics and barbecues on the front steps. There is nothing to stop them, because the Government will not.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The Minister for Lands could have stopped them.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: The power existed for the Minister for Lands to act. Boy Scouts could have jamborees in the grounds of Parliament House; after all, the view is magnificent. What is to stop church groups coming up to have picnics in the grounds?

The Hon. R. Thompson: A rock concert!

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: We could even organise a fund raising effort for a football club in the way of a barbecue in the grounds.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Or something for aboriginal advancement!

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: There could be a cubby house for kiddies who may be frustrated that they will not get the toys they want for Christmas. They could protest that Father Christmas may not bring them a bike, and could camp in the grounds for weeks prior to Christmas. What is the difference in this principle? It is utter nonsense that the situation should be as it is at the present time, and complete and utter nonsense that it is continuing. The Parliamentary Reserves Board apparently now has the power to do something but has been prevailed upon by the Premier not to exercise that authority. Again, this is frustrating authority where it has been directly delegated. On the Premier's own admission, he is using his influence to leave the "consulate" until the Federal Budget comes down on the 15th August. I think this is extraordinary.

I have a transcript from the Australian Broadcasting Commission News Service. It is an extract from the State News Bulletin on the 22nd July, 1972. For the record, Mr. President, I think I should read this bulletin which is as follows:—

The executive of the West Australian Trades and Labour Council met members of the Aboriginal Advancement Council yesterday in the tent in the grounds of Parliament House, Perth.

The president of the Advancement Council, Mr. Davis, told the T.L.C. officers that the Premier, Mr. Tonkin, had said that the Parliamentary Joint House Committee would have the power to order the removal of the tent by next Friday. However, Mr. Tonkin had said he would use his influence to allow the tent to remain until after the Federal Budget was brought down in Canberra on August the fifteenth. Mr. Davis said the object of the tent was to get funds allocated in the Federal budget for Aboriginal housing. After the Federal Budget had been

introduced, he would be prepared to remove the tent but he could not speak for other members of his Council.

The President of the Trades and Labour Council, Mr. Cooley, said the Aborigine had asked for a strike by unions if efforts were made to remove the tent before the Federal Budget was brought down.

Mr. Cooley said the T.L.C. executive would meet on Tuesday morning to frame recommendations about the tent for the meeting of the Council on Tuesday night.

The Leader of the House was kind enough to reply to a question I asked on this subject. I wanted to know whether Mr. Tonkin had been correctly reported, because I could not believe what I had heard over the air and had read in the transcript from the A.B.C. I simply could not believe the Premier of Western Australia would make this statement. However, the reply given by the Leader of the House reads—

I have conferred with the Hon. Premier who has informed me that on the understanding that the Aborigines' "Consulate" established in Parliament House grounds would be removed immediately after the Federal Budget was introduced, he had told Mr. Davis and Mr. Winder that he would do his best to ensure that the tent would remain until that time.

Is it not extraordinary that the Premier of a State, such as Western Australia, would use his influence to condone this sort of action on State territory in connection with a matter which has nothing whatsoever to do with the State Parliament? It is a Commonwealth matter. This is purely a political gimmick and I think it an utter disgrace that the Premier and the Government of this State should condone this sort of action.

The Hon. R. Thompson: We are sympathetic to their cause.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: It is not a case of being sympathetic. This Parliament, as Mr. Ron Thompson and all other members know, Mr. President, has full sympathy with the need to assist Aborigines. This sympathy has been amply demonstrated. Very recently this House and this Parliament passed far-reaching legislation to improve the lot of Aborigines in our community, and I commend all members for this. This action was taken with a great deal of goodwill and favour towards Aborigines. It is not a question of being sympathetic.

The Hon. R. Thompson: They did not receive much sympathy during the 12 years of the Brand Government.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: That is a matter of opinion. In actual fact, we, the members of this Parliament, went to extraordinary lengths to ensure we were

doing the best we could under existing circumstances. The legislation set up an Aboriginal Advancement Authority and dealt with other matters. That is fair enough. However, when the Premier and the Government of this State use a situation for purposes of political gimmickry in a Federal situation, it is about time the people of Western Australia knew about it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You should have done some research with the House Committee to find out how long we tried to get the previous Government to give us these rights in Parliament House grounds.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: That is beside the point.

The Hon. R. Thompson: No, it is not.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: It is side-stepping the issue. I have not been in the Parliament for a very long time, but certainly this is the first time in my knowledge that Parliament has been confronted with this situation. I do not believe that those charged with the responsibility of guarding the grounds have ever been faced with this situation before. It has simply never arisen, and Mr. Ron Thompson's point is hypothetical.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It was on the agenda of the House Committee every month for three years.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: That is a red herring and quite outside the matter we are discussing at the moment. I wish to refer to some words spoken many years ago—on the 17th October, 1894. I believe the words are pertinent to the situation, and I quote—

For my part, I believe in making a country's houses of Parliament, as convenient, as beautiful, and even as splendid as possible, so that those who enter them may regard them as something like sacred ground, and be impressed with a certain amount of reverence for their surroundings, and so behave themselves.

Mr. President, those words were spoken by Sir John Forrest, Premier of Western Australia, in the Legislative Assembly on the 17th October, 1894, on a motion for a commission to report on the expediency or otherwise of erecting a new House of Parliament. I believe the words used by Sir John Forrest, to whom I refer as a great Western Australian, are pertinent today, especially his concluding four words, "and so behave themselves." This applies not only to members of Parliament but to all other citizens, because the ground on which Parliament House stands is something which belongs to all citizens. Members of Parliament are but a passing parade.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Mr. Ron Thompson knows you are only speaking of a principle.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I am speaking purely of a principle. I believe we must jealously guard our right to have this reserve and the building thereon treated in the right and proper manner. I do not believe it should be open season for all and sundry to camp thereon.

If any people are misguided enough to take advantage of the grounds in future—and I certainly hope they will not—I expect the Government of the day will say that they may stay for as long as they like. I emphasise that it could be a kiddies' cubby house set up in September in the hope that Father Christmas may bring a bike on the 25th December.

I charge the Government with having double values in money matters and in dealing with people. I support the Bill.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West) [5.45 p.m.]: May I preface my remarks by making a few comments on that brief but fiction-packed address given to us by Miss Elliott.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: The truth hurts.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: What is that about?

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: Calling my speech fiction.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I meant to say fact. To use the word "fiction" would be quite unparliamentary although no doubt true. I am sorry for that obvious slip of the tongue but I have no doubt it was as obvious to everyone else as it was to me.

Miss Elliott had a great deal to say about unemployment. The amazing thing is how a person as intelligent as Miss Elliott—and let us make no mistake about it, I admit her intelligence—could in the same speech blame the actions of the Federal Government and give chapter and verse in support of her assertion and, after no more than three minutes, blame the international mineral market and give chapter and verse to prove that aspect. I would point out to Miss Elliott that one cannot have it both ways. Even the Premier has now come down on the side of agreeing that the international market has caused the recession in Australia. I feel it behoves her to go along with him and stop this nonsense of blaming the Federal Government.

The fact remains, of course, that inflation is an international and world-wide problem—not only in capitalist countries but in socialist countries as well.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Where?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Prices have gone up over the years in Russia just as they have everywhere else, despite control. Nobody seems to be able to quite put a finger on the causes of inflation. One can get as many and varied reasons of what is causing it as one can get prognostications of what the weather will be like next

Shrove Tuesday. In short, every authority has his own opinion and, in this country, the freedom to express it. And everyone does express an opinion.

Miss Elliott said that there were problems of unemployment during the previous Government's administration, and she quoted an increase of 2,000 unemployed in the months of December, 1969, and January, 1970—the Christmas period. Even the school children know that, without fail, the unemployment figures take a sweep upwards in those months because of the school leavers. Over the following two or three months these children are absorbed in the work force. I recall one period—and there was great suspicion at the time about which political party encouraged the trend—when the children leaving school for their Christmas holidays said that they were not going back to school and applied for unemployment relief. To our consternation we found a tremendous increase in the demands upon the Federal unemployment relief. This occurred about 10 years ago and the trend was stopped because many of these children had every intention of going back to school. However, for Miss Elliott to quote an increase of 2,000 is just not cricket. Fair enough perhaps—cricket is not a woman's game.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Oh, yes, it is, and on an international level.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It is not honest to quote these figures. Blaming the Federal Government for unemployment has really been done to death.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It has been done to death by all sections of the community.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I cannot deny that.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I shall be with you if you apply the same thing to State levels.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I do not think we will reach a contract on that one. The Premier publicly acknowledges that the blame for Australia's difficulties lies in areas beyond the control of anyone within the Commonwealth; that is, in the international primary produce and mineral markets. It is no good saying it is the fault of the Federal Government.

A point of interest to us all is why Western Australia's unemployment is so much worse than the unemployment in any other State. I must admit I found Miss Elliott's reasoning on this point difficult to follow; it was convoluted, and completely unimpressive, because these reasons would have applied with equal force to Queensland. Queensland had a very large mineral boom and export market. It is also largely a primary producing state and does not have a great deal of secondary industry. Queensland also occupies a fairly large land mass and, indeed, its problems and population are similar to those of Western

Australia. However, Queensland is seeking labour in our labour market and its unemployment is less than 2 per cent. whereas Western Australia's unemployment is just under 3 per cent. One would expect comparisons to be drawn between these two States.

My comments are now directed towards the key men who control the portfolios of Treasury, and Development and Decentralisation. I would like to exclude the Ministers in this Chamber because their portfolios do not affect these fields. This Government will be famous for the fact that Mr. Tonkin accomplished in 18 months what it took Mr. Hawke six years to accomplish; that is, he has created feelings of despondency and despair within the private business sector.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Would you not agree that the Federal Government has created an economic miracle in this State—inflation at the same time as rising unemployment? This has confused economists all over the world.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The Federal Government took particular action at a particular time to cure a problem. At that time the major problem confronting us was inflation, and it still is. The Federal Government took a course to stop this and the unemployment has flowed from overseas trends.

The point at issue is why Western Australia should be in a worse position than any other State. I feel we should closely examine the situations pertaining in Queensland and Western Australia. It is quite pointless to compare Queensland and Victoria because they are different types of States. Victoria has a very large industrial complex, very lush pastoral lands, and rich farm areas. Again for obvious reasons it is quite pointless to compare Western Australia with New South Wales. However, I submit that a comparison between Queensland and Western Australia would be valid in every way.

Queensland was as hampered or as assisted by the Budget reaction of the Federal Government as was Western Australia. So that is a common problem or benefit shared by both. It is difficult to see any particular aspect which is not common to both. The crucial matter is that with all these similarities there is this grave difference in the downturn. The State under Labor administration is in a much worse position than Queensland. It is also worse than New South Wales and Victoria, but let us put those States aside. I shall not even draw attention to the fact that South Australia, also under a Labor administration, has the second worst unemployment problem. We will put that to one side because I am comparing Queensland and Western Australia—which is a valid comparison.

The Federal Government has produced all the original thinking on a solution to the problem up to date, and I say it is pointless to blame the Federal Government as the problem is common to both States. I find the solutions offered by Miss Elliott to be completely uninspiring. It must be borne in mind that my memory goes back to the days of Mr. Hawke's Government when I distinctly remember the headlines in the paper concerning Mr. Tonkin's visit overseas to procure industry to the tune of £90,000,000. The net result was the little Carbon Brake show, and I think there was even a bit of a fiddle to establish that. Nothing came out of it.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: There was this much merit in it—it was a start to what followed.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: There always has to be a start. Does the Leader of the House claim this produced Laporte? I have heard that claim and it is wrong.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I am not claiming that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: This claim was made.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I heard one of your leading members say that at a conference.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Your memory is not so good. It was not Carbon Brakes at all, it was Klinger.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That is right—I knew the honourable member would come to my assistance.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: Fiction again.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Your memory is not so good.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: My remarks were entirely sparked off by Miss Elliott's speech. I have not had a chance to research this. Mr. Thompson is quite right—it was Klinger. Even he remembers the tidily result of the £90,000,000 industry.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You are forgetting to mention Alcoa and A.P.M. Alcoa recognised that it was the Hawke Government which brought it to Australia.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That is not true—it may have started this off.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Of course it did.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The Government may have planted the basic seed of the idea in Alcoa's mind. Any action that was taken was taken so long afterwards that the seed would have had to germinate, sprout, and be resown.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: And a lot of watering done in between.

The Hon. G. W. Berry: We might get the guayule rubber plant back into production.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: As my friend Mr. Willmott said, there was a lot of watering in between. Let us face it, Alcoa was a long while after that.

The Hon. R. Thompson: These people establish industries when the climate is hot, and you know it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Mr. Thompson has raised a very interesting point. This is one of the basic inaccuracies in Miss Elliott's assessment of the problems in this State today. As Mr. Thompson said, industry moves in when the time is right. This means that a good Government tills and plants—or to use a more common phrase, it keeps putting things into the pipeline. The fear is present in everyone's mind that there is nothing or very little going into the pipeline today. When the things put into the pipeline by the previous Government have run out the other end, our industries will very quickly decrease to a mere trickle. Certainly Miss Elliott mentioned \$14,000,000, but I feel there is a great fear that the flow will stop altogether.

I am sure members will all recall the cobweb campaign of about 14 years ago. A carpenter who wished to work at his trade worked for the P.W.D. or he worked nowhere because no-one else had any work. Miss Elliott brought this \$14,000,000 out of a hat with a flourish. Goodness me, even a fourth-year high school economics student would be a wake-up to this one. This is purely and simply the bringing forward by about a month of this year's Budgetary expenditure. This is a lot of nonsense. Of course, it is in this Supply Bill. This is not \$14,000,000 worth of new money—it is \$14,000,000 moved forward a month.

However, I suppose it is just as well the Government did something, because we are in a bad enough mess as it is. I wonder what would have happened had the Government not written a few letters to the Commonwealth Government on these matters? The unemployment position, at least, would have been shocking.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: From the report in this morning's newspaper it will get worse.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I cannot see any solution to the country's ills forthcoming in the next 18 months.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The writer of the article in the Press was not referring to Western Australia, of course, but to Australia as a whole.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I have noted that the unemployment figures for the past few years are as follows:—

1968	4,151
1969	4,007
1970	5,147

The unfilled vacancies for the same three years were—

1968	2,630
1969	3,786
1970	3,208

Over those years, it will be seen that the figures are fairly stable.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Now read the figures for Queensland for the same period of time.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The figures I have quoted were taken from the *Western Australian Year Book 1971*. The section of the book from which I am quoting was found by me rather quickly, and as everyone knows what statisticians are, I am afraid the honourable member will have to give me notice of that question.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Hand me the book and I will send the information over to the honourable member later.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I know what it is.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Then why are you asking Mr. MacKINNON for the figures?

The Hon. R. Thompson: I just wanted to test his knowledge.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The last speech I made concerning the unpredictability of this Government appears on page 209 of Volume 190 of the 1971 *Hansard*. At that time I was speaking about the promises that had been made by the Government and the way in which the Budget figures had been manipulated in order to square people off so that a slightly better picture could be presented. Of course, people will recall that at that time the possible deficits the State was facing varied considerably, according to the progressive reports that were made. First of all the deficit was to be \$34,000,000. There was then an estimate of \$12,000,000, and later The Hon. T. D. Evans who, at that time was the Treasurer, apparently felt he was not getting his threepenny-worth in and so he made an estimate of \$6,000,000. It was finally estimated to be \$3,500,000 but, as we saw the other day, it finished up at \$810,000.

There is not much mystery as to how it was reduced to that figure, because my colleague, The Hon. A. F. Griffith, pointed out the way in which every possible avenue for raising finance was investigated and researched and increases in charges were made by many hundreds per cent. I had an idea that a 20 per cent. increase might have been a good one, but when we consider the sort of increases that were imposed it was realised that the estimate I had made fell far short. Then again, the Commonwealth Government was very helpful to the present State Government. However, despite all the talk about the poor condition of the State's finances when

the present Government took office, the Treasury was, in fact, in excellent shape and the problems that did exist had been well and faithfully pointed out to everybody as was mentioned by me in a speech I made last year, and this speech was reported by the Press.

What I want to speak about today—and I will touch on one or two problems mentioned by Miss Elliott—is the loss of confidence in the present Government, because during the previous Government's administration the desire to ensure that what was promised was always exceeded by what was produced was kept constantly in mind. Anyone can go back over the promises and forecasts of what was to happen during the previous Government's administration and he will find that this was so. When the Brand Government spoke of what would happen within a certain period, there were all sorts of statements made such as, "I will eat my hat if that comes true," or "I will roll a peanut down the street of Port Hedland if ever that comes about," and all that sort of stuff, and yet all the predictions that were made did come true and, what is more, all the projects that were forecast were bigger than what had been promised.

However, what do we find now? On Friday evening I was fascinated, whilst watching television, to see The Hon. H. E. Graham, the Minister for Development—I think he has had the portfolio of Decentralisation tacked onto that designation to make it a little more grandiose—talking about what was going to be done at Northam. Such talk makes me very sorry indeed for the people of Northam, because I have seen the same thing happen in Albany when The Hon. H. E. Graham visited that centre. Headlines appeared in the Press and The Hon. J. M. Thomson, M.L.C., and The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth, M.L.C., will know all about this. On that occasion The Hon. H. E. Graham implied that Albany was to get a steel industry. This was just utter nonsense, and anyone associated with the industry years before knew that it was nonsense. The people at Collie felt they had been bypassed when they heard that this project was to be established at Albany, but I have no doubt that when such an eminent person as The Hon. H. E. Graham made a statement such as that, which drew large headlines in the Press, it must have made a great impression on the people of Albany.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: It left them with a hangover.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Not content with that, the Minister went to Collie, as The Hon. T. O. Perry and The Hon. S. T. J. Thompson well know. No doubt both those honourable members have kept a record of the front page of the *Collie Mail* which bore large headlines over an

article reporting that \$350,000 was to be spent in that town. The local builders were to get a 10 per cent. preference. This, too, was utter nonsense, because, here again, what actually transpired was that no local builders were engaged to construct the mines inspectors' building or the high school canteen. Once again, all they were left with was a hangover in much the same way as were the people of Albany.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: Previously it was a "pie in the sky", but this was a real promise.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: A real promise, but no performance.

Sitting suspended from 6.08 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Members may recall that prior to the tea suspension I was developing my theme. I was talking about Mr. Graham's announcements in Albany and his subsequent publicity in Collie; and I want to apologise here to the members who represent those areas. I am not trying to usurp their prerogative by mentioning this, but it happens to tie in with the theme I wish to develop.

I was talking about the promises made in Collie and the publicity given to the 10 per cent. discount which had been offered to local builders were they to tender; and I indicated that nothing had come out of this. The building contracts went to other than Collie builders.

There was really nothing new about this because the previous Government had used the 10 per cent. proposal and, indeed, as Minister for Health I had interfered twice in the building of hospitals. I wanted local bricks to be used as they were quite suitable for the inside walls, and the 10 per cent. was offered then.

The point I am making is that in Collie specifically, despite all the headlines, nothing transpired, and what worries me is the consequent drop in morale. That was followed this weekend by the publicity given to a speech by Mr. Graham in Northam. I have no doubt that this publicity is still fresh in the memories of members so that they know all about it. I understand a factory is to be established there to produce grain alcohol. This may or may not eventuate, but if it does Northam will boom. Again the announcement seems to have been made on very flimsy ground, and I was a bit struck by one statement Mr. Graham made with some relish. He expressed his delight that at a recent seminar in Geraldton the people there had said they were pleased he had seen fit to buy some land in Bunbury because that was good for Bunbury.

If towns are to be elated by wild statements, and then are let down by lack of results, I can understand Geraldton being quite happy about being left out because the after effects must be quite disastrous to the towns concerned.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: They are not being left out. A multi-million steel complex is to be established up there.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I had not heard about that. I can understand that, having followed in the office previously held by Sir Charles Court, Mr. Graham must have a desire to excel Sir Charles. I suppose in the field of headlines, he is not doing badly. Sir Charles was pretty good at getting headlines himself—with one difference: Sir Charles' headlines were the result of accomplishments, not promises. Up to date Mr. Graham's headlines seem to be about promises, not accomplishments.

The theme I want to develop is that with all the talk of blame for unemployment and the downturn in business, and whatever the experts say and whatever statistics might prove—and we all know that statistics can prove virtually what we wish them to prove—the fundamental necessity in an area like Western Australia, where we depend on private industry, is confidence. It seems to me that confidence in Western Australia is being whittled away. Irrespective of the present trend in world metal markets, owing to the foundations laid by Mr. Griffith as Minister for Mines, Sir Charles Court as Minister for Industrial Development, and the previous Government, Western Australia is in a fantastically good position. All that is required is confidence because, make no mistake, the money is here. One has only to talk to second-hand car dealers to learn that although sales are down the remarkable fact is the high proportion of cash sales. People have the money, but, because of their lack of confidence, they are not putting it into the type of investment we would like.

One of the types of statements which undermine confidence was mentioned by Miss Elliott when she echoed *The West Australian* which was faithfully reporting, as it seems to do with monotonous regularity lately, the statements of the Premier or the Minister for Development and Decentralisation, about C.B.H. Here again I apologise to those members who represent wheatgrowing areas for mentioning this subject. However, as very little wheat is grown in the Lower West province, in a way it might come a little better from me than from them because all the credit for the effort of C.B.H. lies with the directors and farmer members and with no-one else.

During the tea suspension I spoke to Sir David Brand who, during his term of office, also guaranteed a considerable loan for C.B.H.—a matter of some \$12,000,000. However, he did it in a routine way. Money at that time was difficult to get at interest rates reasonable for an organisation such as this. The responsibility rested squarely with the members and directors of C.B.H.

who asked the Government for a guarantee. After obtaining proper advice, Sir David Brand said, "Yes, all right." The publicity at that time was along those lines. In short, "C.B.H. has done this. C.B.H. has been assisted by the Government in the guarantee of a loan of \$12,000,000."

The Hon. S. T. J. Thompson: And the farmers paid it back.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Look at the difference this time. If one read the newspaper report one would think the whole proposition was the idea of the present Government when it was no such thing. The newspaper report was to the effect that the Government had done this, that, and the other thing; and the last paragraph referred to C.B.H. having inaugurated the scheme. C.B.H. received the tail-end mention.

For the information of Miss Elliott, and for the information of any other member of the Government who happens to be interested, I assure them that C.B.H. members were far from amused, because theirs is the whole idea, and theirs is the responsibility; and more power to their elbow! They have faith in the future of their product despite the obvious difficulties over the past few years.

The Hon. J. L. Hunt: They must have faith in the Government.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: No. They have faith in their product. The fact is that the Government is acting in a caretaker capacity and it will go; but the State will go on.

The point I wish to make is that this type of statement made about C.B.H. does not build confidence. Surely the Government would have been much wiser to give all credit where all credit is due; and that is to the people who had contemplated the idea, who had planned it through, who had chased the possibility of obtaining the money, and who had finally saved interest by obtaining a Government guarantee. The Government has a good sound business proposition and it said, "Yes, O.K." Very little, if any, risk is involved. This is evident from the history of the wheat farmers and producers in this State and also the history of C.B.H. It is a magnificent organisation and it has taken a tremendous risk in this proposal. It behoved the Government to give credit where credit was due and not try to make a political gambit of it and try to take all credit to itself.

In this respect I was bitterly disappointed in *The West Australian* for going along with the Government on this one, but lately this seems to be the habit with virtually everything said by the Government. I must admit that at present the Government is blessed with having probably the best political writer in Australia on its staff. He does a mighty job for the Government and even makes it look good sometimes.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: How would C.B.H. have got on if it had not got the Government guarantee?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Knowing the persistence and determination of C.B.H. I think it would probably have swung the deal somewhere. It would have paid a bit more, but it would have swung the deal.

I had this experience myself. I wanted to have a particular building erected next to a hospital for the purpose of accommodating hospital staff and it meant a difference of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest if I could get a Government guarantee. I was successful on that occasion in getting the Treasury to underwrite and guarantee the amount which enabled the private enterprise syndicate to borrow the money at a saving of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I was vitally interested in achieving this at that time because I wanted the rentals for the multiple people flats—particular types of flats—to be within the reach of trainee nurses. I was able to accomplish this.

No risk was involved because at that time the building of flats was almost a trustee investment. No trouble was involved in borrowing, but with a Government guarantee the syndicate had access to money which was available at $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. less interest. This was good business on the part of the Government. It was no great virtue. I did not make a fuss about it and the Government did not make headlines claiming all the credit for that project which has now been completed. It is a massive block of flats, and was fully occupied within two weeks of its erection. As I say, we did not claim credit because we did not dream it up, although I did a darned sight more towards it than has this Government in regard to C.B.H.

I believe that such is the future of wheat that C.B.H. would have swung the deal, but it was easier with the Government guarantee. However, the Government had no right to take the credit.

The Hon. C. R. Abbey: It is not only for wheat, but for all grains.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That is right. The point I want to underline is that this Government talks about decentralisation, which word is now in the name of the department, but its members make the type of statement to which I have referred. It is only because I am such a cheerful fellow that I do not cry. As it is I just laugh. However, the despondency in country areas is quite disastrous.

We have heard of the proposition of a levy of 1c a pound on all meat killed in the country. The Government talks about helping unemployment, but I am quite positive that that announcement in one day stopped development and expansion to the tune of \$500,000, just like that, because abattoirs could not stand it. To verify that statement one has only to study their balance sheets.

The statements and headlines about the levy, and the headlines in Albany, Collie, and no doubt in this week's paper in Northam, undermine confidence and are responsible for nothing being produced. Confidence is the key to business; confidence is the key to progress. It must be confidence, confidence, confidence!

There are one or two matters of a parochial nature which I wish to mention, and which it is my right to mention. However, before I do so I want to revert to a matter I was discussing a little earlier because I did a discredit to Mr. Tonkin in that I did not mention another \$1,000,000 venture—the guayule rubber proposition.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What proposition?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The guayule rubber proposition, I think it was called. I thought it would never disappear from my mind because it was a bit sticky. However, the papers were full of it and the proposition was to save the agricultural industry. It was to be a borderline agricultural land industry to support the country areas in this State. Large areas were to be cleared and put down as guayule rubber plantations.

The Hon. J. Heitman: It is a small bush.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It was suggested during the administration of the A. R. G. Hawke Government. It was about as big as Klinger which was mentioned by Mr. Ron Thompson. I thought I would mention that project.

In answer to certain questions asked by Mr. Ron Thompson I will quote from page 709 of the *Year Book of Australia*, No. 57. I will quote only the figures for 1970 and 1971, and only those for Queensland and Western Australia. The number of persons registered for employment with the Commonwealth Employment Service numbered 8,585 in Queensland and 5,147 in Western Australia. In 1971 the number was 9,412 for Queensland and 6,683 for Western Australia. The number of vacancies registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service—jobs available—in 1970 numbered 3,240 in Queensland and 3,206 in Western Australia. Members can see that the job availability was higher than our population would indicate it should be, statistically. Of course, it always was in those years.

In 1971 the Queensland job availability figure had gone up to 3,305, but the Western Australian figure had gone down to 2,340. Our job availability had gone down as much as our unemployment had gone up. Those are the figures Mr. Ron Thompson asked about.

I wish now to leave the inadequacies of the present Government, to this extent, and deal with a couple of purely parochial matters. The first concerns a matter outside of my electorate, but I asked a question about it and I would like the present Minister for Fisheries and Fauna

(Mr. Bickerton) to give some consideration to this proposition. I refer to the question of turtles. There is a severe risk that turtles are a species which are under dire threat of extinction. Turtle fishing is barbarous in the extreme. It does not produce a tremendous amount of income; in fact, it produces very little. In answer to a question that was asked the Department of Fisheries and Fauna could not say what turtle fishing was worth to the State. Turtle soup can now be produced artificially, and tortoise shell is no longer of great value because it has been supplanted by plastics.

I believe turtle fishing should have been phased out because only two boats are engaged in the occupation. I would not advise anyone to inspect the boats when they come in because turtle fishing is not a very pleasant occupation. The fishermen take a lot of risks and it is probably an exciting occupation. However, I believe that this type of fishing should be phased out because it is already barred in most other parts of the world.

The life and history of turtles is fascinating and no doubt members have read accounts or seen documentaries on television on this subject. I suggest that from the publicity point of view it would be well worth while were we to abandon this type of fishing. Due notice could be given to the fishermen concerned so that they could move into some other type of fishing. I have no doubt that if they were given the opportunity to take part in a more lucrative type of fishing they would be interested to do so.

Another matter with which I wish to deal is the Lake Preston area in the vicinity of Harvey. Harvey is in the same situation as a number of other towns in this State, and I believe it ought to be the subject of a study by the Town Planning Department and the Department of Development and Decentralisation. The town is at the stage where only a slight increase in the population would make it eligible for a senior high school and the associated facilities which generate business and increase population.

The most promising part of the shire for development is the Lake Preston area. However, the area has been gazetted as being under the control of the National Parks Board and for that reason the whole of the area is virtually frozen. I have previously mentioned this matter. The gazetting of the area as a national park has caused some confusion in the Department of Fisheries and Fauna because people used to be able to shoot there. The shooters will now probably go to the Peel Inlet.

The Hon. N. McNeill: They cannot shoot there, either.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Where else can people shoot? The Harvey Shire has put forward a number of proposals

for the development of the Lake Preston area but they have all been knocked back. I believe the Government should give some encouragement to this type of development because it is true decentralisation. Such development would tip the scales in favour of Harvey and automatically lead to an increase in development and population.

Another matter with which I shall deal concerns the desperation of the Government to raise finance at any cost. I refer to the increase in boat licensing fees. The previous Government introduced a method of licensing boats, and it was to be a scheme to provide safety measures. Non-power boats and sail boats were exempt, as we are all aware.

However, out of the blue the fees were suddenly increased markedly. They were increased by several hundred per cent. Of course, the boating fraternity viewed the increase with quite a degree of distaste. The fee went up, in some cases, to as high as \$8, whereas originally it was \$2.

It is all very well for the Government to increase fees to that extent, but surely the boating people should receive some compensation and some advantages in return. Mr. Bodeker wrote two articles on the subject and he set out most of the problems faced by boat owners at the time. The boat owners were encouraged into thinking that the increase in fees was to be spent on the provision of better facilities, and the provision of more boats so that inspectors could police the waters. The boat owners thought they might be provided with more slipways and more facilities so that they could use their boats more easily. Strangely enough, a great number of boat owners do not require a lot of facilities such as harbours and the like because they put their boats on trailers and take them home so that they can look after them. However, boat owners do need somewhere to launch their boats, and the responsibility for the provision of launchways remains squarely on the shoulders of local government.

We again get to the matter of decentralisation. The city people can put their boats into the water at many points around the city but in many country areas the local governing bodies are comparatively small and it is difficult for them to provide launchways. Of course, in many areas they are simply not available.

A great deal of anger is felt by boat owners because the money raised from the increase in fees is being spent to provide better housing for inspectors in Perth, and in the provision of better boats to be used on the Swan River. Certainly, if a boat owner belongs to a boat club he receives a rebate of \$1.50. However, here again, in the city and the major towns it is fairly easy to form a club. Papers can be taken out, a club incorporated and registered, and the boat owners receive

their \$1.50 rebate. However, how do boat owners form a club in a town such as Bridgetown? I know a fellow in Bridgetown who owns a boat and he would not have a chance of receiving his \$1.50 rebate. This is a complete injustice to the people who live in country areas.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: It is discrimination.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Yes, it is discrimination and it happens all the time. Things are made easy for the city people and that is fair enough; that is where the Labor Party generally wins most of its seats. To hell with country towns and, more particularly, I think the smaller the town the further to hell it can go. This is quite unreasonable.

Bunbury, where I live, is big enough for the boat owners to form a boat club and they receive their \$1.50 rebate if they join the club. The members of the boat club are enthusiastic and are doing a great job in regard to the safety of those people who desire to go to sea in small boats. However, if those boat owners want to move about and put their boats in the water in other country areas the necessary facilities are not available. In spite of the extra money raised through the increase in license fees the responsibility for the provision of launchways still rests with local government.

These little things are in the form of a burr under the saddlecloth. People get very angry and, I believe, with some justification. I think it might be news to the Minister in charge of the department which handles the licensing of boats that boating is no longer the prerogative of the rich and the privileged. A great number of people by choice economise on some other particular activity for the purpose of being able to purchase a boat so that they can enjoy their spare time. Those people like to put their boats in the water at Bunbury, or some other town in this State. Mandurah, which is also in the Lower West province, houses a number of pensioners and the increase in license fees has become a burden to them.

Some of these matters should be looked at more carefully when there is this urgent desire to raise money at any cost. The original idea of the license fee was to establish the number of boats on our waters, and to provide facilities so that a proper examination of the boats could be carried out.

The increase in the license fee is purely and simply another method of raising money which will be spent in providing facilities in and around the city, or in the very big towns. The smaller towns will receive no advantage at all and I think this is quite wrong. In relative proportion, as one moves away from the city one is disadvantaged. As I said previously, I believe

all these things add up to an undercurrent which causes disaffection, dissatisfaction, and a lack of confidence.

I believe this State has a future that is unparalleled anywhere in the world. The difference between Queensland and Western Australia—the two States which provide a valid foundation for comparison, either statistically or in fact—is alarming to me; despite this I support the Bill.

THE HON. C. R. ABBEY (West) [8.01 p.m.]: I rise to speak about two matters which affect not only animal health but also human health. I refer to tuberculosis and brucellosis—or contagious abortion—in cattle. Both these diseases can be transmitted to humans.

We have before us a Bill which provides for the State Government a sum of \$200,000,000 from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and a sum of \$30,000,000 from the General Loan Fund; a total of \$230,000,000. That is a very large sum. I wish to suggest to the Government that it increase its contribution to the cattle compensation fund by \$100,000, making a total contribution of \$200,000.

On the statements which are issued by the agents at every cattle sale, at the present time each animal attracts stamp duty of up to 25c according to weight. The Stamp Act provides for a maximum of 50c stamp duty for each animal. Therefore, the present contribution is only half the allowable amount. On the present sale rate for cattle in this State, the contribution by the industry is approximately \$100,000, which is matched by the Government to the extent of another \$100,000. That legislation was introduced in 1965. Mr. Logan will remember it well.

I believe the situation is so serious that it warrants the Government attacking the problem by doing what I have suggested. At the present time compensation is paid for up to 3 per cent. of infected cattle. I remind the House—as did Mr. Heitman, Mr. Wordsworth, and others—that there are many herds and the situation is out of hand. If the incidence of disease in a herd is over 3 per cent., the owner must keep the infected cattle on the property. This is not satisfactory because the infection is spread from those infected cattle. I defy anyone who has a large property and a large number of cattle to keep the infected cattle segregated. It is impossible. The cattle get through fences. While the cows are calving the crows and other vermin carry infected material to other paddocks, so the disease spreads. The control measures are quite inadequate.

The Department of Agriculture is doing its best. It is taking effective action up to the limit of the funds available. It is doing a mighty job with those limited funds. We can all recall that perhaps 10 years ago the incidence of T.B. in cattle was fairly high, whereas it is now down

to about 0.5 per cent. It is very important, in the interests of our export markets, that the incidence of disease be reduced because the United States already has T.B. under control and has set a target for the eradication of brucellosis in seven years, and at the end of that time Australia and New Zealand will find it very difficult to export to the United States meat from cattle herds that have either T.B. or brucellosis. In fact, I can foresee a time when importing countries will not be prepared to accept meat from countries where those two diseases are prevalent.

When the Cattle Industry Compensation Act was introduced in 1965 it was really a composite measure. Prior to that time several funds were in existence, all holding fairly large sums which totalled approximately £144,000. Mr. Dolan will recall those figures because he quoted them during the debate on the Bill. With the passing of the Bill the consolidated funds were then called the Cattle Industry Compensation Fund and the increased attack on disease really commenced at that time. In 1969 the exotic diseases legislation was introduced, which embraced poultry and pigs as well as cattle. We therefore had a composite and more realistic measure. Without doubt, the exotic diseases are a future threat to this State and this country.

I raise this matter because we have three Ministers of the Government in this House and I hope they will regard the matter seriously. At the meeting of the Agricultural Council last week the Federal Minister promised further help for brucellosis control. As the Commonwealth is in the mood to help the States, I hope this State is in the mood to help itself. I am quite sure the producers will agree to an increased contribution of 50c per animal. Realising the seriousness of the threat to the industry, they will regard it as a minor matter compared with the benefits that could accrue.

At present the beef breeders contribute in the order of \$100,000. The Government matches that sum with another \$100,000. Therefore, \$200,000 is spent on brucellosis control. The fund is running down very badly and under the present circumstances it is not possible to handle brucellosis control properly. I therefore make this proposition to the Ministers in the House tonight: If the industry raises its contribution to \$200,000, will the Western Australian Government match it with a contribution of \$200,000? That would double the amount at present available. The Federal Government has promised it will consider ways and means of helping the States. Let us therefore propose to the Federal Government that it match the funds raised with another \$400,000, which would provide \$800,000 with which to make a real attack on the problem. I feel reasonably

certain the Federal Government would give a fair and reasonable reply to such a proposition because it realises how important it is to this major export industry that these problems be tackled.

Even a sum of \$800,000 would be insufficient. I think the contributions should be \$1 per animal from the producers, \$1 per animal from the Government, and \$2 per animal from the Commonwealth. We have a limited time in which to attack the problem—only seven years. It is important that these diseases be eradicated because they are transmissible to human beings. Brucellosis can cause undulant fever, as well as contagious abortion, in humans. We know the effects of T.B., which have now been minimised. The authorities in New Zealand realise the problem requires immediate attack and they have also embarked on a programme which should control it in seven years.

It is interesting to go back through *Hansard* of 1965 and read the contributions to the debate on the Cattle Industry Compensation Bill. At that time it was felt that £144,000 was a good sum to set aside from the three funds involved for the attacking of disease problems in cattle. For a number of years afterwards the contribution was increasing by about \$80,000 a year. Some of this money was used for the extension of disease control, but not all of it was so used. The fund gradually built up and two years ago the Department of Agriculture, in its wisdom, decided it would make a real attack on brucellosis. The department and the industry have been amazed to find that the incidence of the disease was greater than they thought, although I suspect the senior officers of the department had an appreciation of its extent.

The point is that in two years the fund became so depleted that it was necessary to slow down the testing for brucellosis. That is not desirable. Testing should be accelerated.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: We will lose our markets if it is not.

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY: The simple fact is we will lose our very important markets in America and Europe. The E.E.C. countries will take our beef at very good prices. It is therefore up to everybody involved—the Government and the industry—to put their shoulders to the wheel and really attack this problem. The sum of money required from the Government is not very large: an increase to \$200,000 a year. If it is found that the extended attack on this problem requires additional money, then additional money should be found.

I foresee that in the near future the farmers' organisations will recognise that this is a serious problem which should

be tackled. No doubt they will make approaches to the Government in an effort to at least lift the contribution of the growers to the level of 50c. No alteration to any Act would be required.

Knowing the interest Mr. Dolan has displayed in this matter in the past I feel sure he will take an interest in it now. Usually he handles agricultural matters on behalf of the Minister in another place. I ask him to convey to the Minister for Agriculture the fact that we are concerned about this matter; that we feel it should be tackled very quickly; that the Commonwealth's offer of additional funds should be accepted; and that we will do our part to expand the necessary facilities.

At the moment I understand there is a restriction on the number of blood samples which may be taken by each centre. In fact, a few months ago as a result of the lack of facilities to test blood samples at our South Perth centre, some centres were cut down to testing one or two herds each week. They have a capacity far greater than that—it is probably at least treble that. This is a very serious indictment of our present efforts to tackle the problem. It is not caused by any lack of will on the part of the veterinary section of the Department of Agriculture. The officers of that section would like to expand the section and get on with the job, but when facilities and funds are inadequate their hands are tied and they cannot get on with their job.

I understand that at Bunbury provision is being made to expand the facilities for the testing of blood samples; and I also understand that provision is being made at Albany for the extension of the facilities there. However, we need these centres all over the State. We need a centre at Esperance; we need a centre at Geraldton; and we need a centre at an inland point to which blood samples from all districts where cattle are held—which is most of the State—may be taken and handled expeditiously in great numbers.

It is possible for stock inspectors to be quickly trained in the methods of taking blood samples. The sample is taken from the tail of the animal with the use of a needle. Quite a large sample of blood is taken, and each animal is tested at frequent intervals until the herd is cleared. Let me tell members it is very difficult to have a herd cleared. I know of herds which have been tested up to nine or 10 times but are still not out of quarantine. Testing is a large job when cattle herds run into hundreds and in some cases, thousands. It is a most expensive and time-consuming job for the owner; and for the operator it is sometimes quite difficult as a result of the limited facilities available on some properties. The department is cracking down on inadequate

facilities on farms. It is necessary now for the owners to install adequate facilities to handle their beef cattle.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: If the speeding up of the testing is going to take place—and it should—and the fund is not built up, then there will be much loss suffered by farmers whose herds are tested.

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY: That is very true, because even when a herd is released from quarantine, it may be in danger from infected cattle in a neighbouring herd which has not been tested because of inadequate facilities.

In some cases it is beyond the capacity of the operators to test herds on properties with inadequate facilities because they have too much to do. We could have a situation of an owner whose herd is under test because he is interested in the health of his animals and he recognises that it is necessary to have this disease eradicated. There are plenty of such herds, for instance, in the Avon Valley. The owner may have started testing one or two years ago, only to find that the facilities on the three surrounding properties are inadequate and the cattle are not being tested. Therefore, his effort is wasted. That can, and does, happen. Mr. Heitman mentioned the difficulties in this regard in relation to one or two herds he quoted.

I know the Minister will treat this as a serious contribution. I ask that we make a greater attack on this problem, particularly as the disease is transmissible to humans; and overseas countries which take our beef are aware of this and are cleaning up their own herds. They will expect all exporters to clean up their herds. This is the urgent plea I make to the Government: That it take action to make more money available for this purpose—at least a fourfold increase. I know the department can very quickly train men and supply facilities if the money is available. So let us find the money. I support the Bill.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan) [8.22 p.m.]: I rise to support the Bill, which gives members an opportunity which they are normally afforded at this time of the year in the Address-in-Reply debate. It is good to see members have this opportunity because they can voice the various problems facing their electorates.

I find that some of the statements made by members are a little off the beam as far as fact is concerned. One such statement which was completely wide of the facts, was made by Mr. Ferry when he took the Government to task for promulgating regulations covering the grounds of Parliament House.

In my experience on the Joint House Committee—and I am sure other members of the committee would say that I am telling the truth—I found that over a number of years the committee tried to have a Bill passed to vest full control of the grounds of Parliament House in the committee. From memory, I think this goes back some 21 years.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They still have not got that, of course.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Just let me make my speech for a minute.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I am trying to help you.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Mr. MacKinnon cannot help me because I know the answers. If I am wrong then by all means he may interject.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Not wrong; I was thinking more of your being misleading.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am not even being misleading because I am telling the truth.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: As you know it.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: As Mr. MacKinnon knows, during the period from 1968 to 1971, when I was again on the Joint House Committee, at every monthly meeting three items appeared on the agenda. Firstly, letters quite frequently were written to the Premier. Secondly, we had deputations to the Premier. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker and Mr. President made representations to the Premier. One of the requests to the Premier was in regard to a Bill to vest the Parliament House reserve in the Joint House Committee. However, we got exactly nowhere. We received acknowledgments and were told the matter was being looked into.

At the end of the three-year period, for which I can speak authoritatively because I attended almost every meeting of the committee, we were no closer to a Bill than we were when we started. However, when the present Government came to office the attention of the Premier was drawn to the matter. Members of the Joint House Committee know that I am telling the truth. I am not a member of that committee now, but I know that in a short space of time a Bill was prepared. It has been presented to the Joint House Committee, and its decision is still awaited. The moment the Bill is given the green light by the Joint House Committee it will be introduced into Parliament. Members of the Joint House Committee are present in the Chamber, and if I am not telling the truth now is the time to interject.

The Hon. J. Dolan: This was long before the Aboriginal tent was erected.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Yes, this was long before the Aboriginal tent was erected in the grounds of Parliament House. This matter went before Cabinet nine or 10 months ago.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: But that has nothing to do with the proposal Mr. Ferry was putting forward.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I interjected when Mr. Ferry was speaking and said that he should have researched the position to ascertain why protection was not given to the grounds of Parliament House. If one listened to his diatribe one could well imagine that very soon we would have hot pie stalls—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: "Diatribe" does not mean "reasoned explanation."

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: —toffee apple stalls, caravan parks, and Sunday School picnics.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: When are you planning these?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: This is Mr. Ferry's idea.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: He was not suggesting that we were going to have all that.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: No, but it was in his weird imagination. I know Mr. Ferry was called to the telephone, so I will repeat what I have said for his benefit.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: I would like to hear it.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: For three years the Joint House Committee tried to get the previous Premier to agree to the vesting of the grounds of Parliament House in the Joint House Committee. We waited patiently for three years during which time we received virtually no acknowledgment and made no progress whatsoever. However, when the present Government took office this matter was drawn to the attention of the Premier, and about nine months ago a Bill was prepared. It has been discussed by the Joint House Committee, and when that committee has made a decision it will be presented to Parliament. Then the committee will have complete control of the grounds of Parliament House.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: How is it that the Parliamentary Reserves Board now has powers—under the regulations, I take it—to control the use of the grounds, but the Premier still insists on the edifice standing there as it is?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I would go so far as to say that if anyone tried to remove that edifice from the grounds of Parliament House I would invite its occupants into my office and anybody who tried to remove them from there would have a difficult job.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: How would you remove anybody else from the grounds?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Nobody else has attempted to stay on the grounds.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: But what if they did?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Why kick these people off the grounds of Parliament House when they are attempting to draw attention to a serious position for which they received no sympathy during the last 12 years?

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: That is beside the point.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Would Mr. Ferry rather have them live on the rubbish tips or the river banks around Bayswater?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is absurd.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I would rather you didn't try to turn a matter of principle into a matter of politics. You are very good at that.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Who started this? I did not. I had no intention of speaking on this matter.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That was a good intention. Why did you not carry it out?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Because I just could not listen to the rubbish which was spoken tonight without foundation. Members opposite had 12 years in which to try to do something for these people, but they did nothing.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: That is beside the point.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Of course it is. The honourable member says that everything is beside the point. Another thing that has cropped up—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Are you referring to me?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Opposition was stultified for 12 years and it now has an opportunity to expand on matters. It is really an indictment of the activities of the previous Government in the 12 years of its term of office.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Or of any Government in previous years.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: We see Select Committees being sought for this and that purpose. I am not opposed to these committees.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: My word you are not. Do you mind if I put my plug in?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I think the honourable member needs to do that! In the short period that we have been in Government we seem to find very many things that are supposed to be going wrong.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What is this reference to "we"? You are not in the Government.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am talking about us as a body in the House. We are now told that many things are going wrong, but the native question in the north-west was not acute when the previous Government was in office!

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You did not think of asking for a Select Committee.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: We were aware of what was needed.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Why did you not move for a Select Committee?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: We made many speeches on this question. Since this Government assumed office it seemed that an inquiry into the potato industry was needed. At the time I said that inquiry would prove to be a flop, and that is what it turned out to be.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: You will be surprised if you read the report.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I was surprised when I read it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Mr. Dans is glaring at you.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I think the report rated about 1½ inches in the newspapers. Even the potato growers themselves were not interested in this Select Committee. They were happy with the way the board was operating, as was pointed out before the Select Committee was appointed.

It is very humorous to see what transpired when I tried to move for the appointment of several Select Committees while we were in Opposition. One Select Committee sought by me was agreed to, and it comprised myself, the Deputy President, and Mr. Syd Thompson. About 97 per cent. of the recommendations which this Select Committee made was incorporated in legislation within 12 months. It was a hard-hitting committee, and it presented a hard-hitting report. I am not being egotistic in any shape or form when I say this Select Committee did an excellent job, as did the officers accompanying it. I think it was the means of saving the crayfishing industry in Western Australia. I did not achieve this by myself; the committee achieved this.

I have no objection to the appointment of any Select Committee, provided it is warranted and it can be seen that a wrong should be righted. However, at the present time there is a desire by some members in this House to ask for an inquiry into this or that matter with a view to embarrassing the Government. If ever anyone was justified in moving for the appointment of a Select Committee, it was I; and I did so because of the actions of the previous Government during the industrial boom when it shifted people out of their homes without paying them just compensation. These were the people in respect of whom the

Government claimed it cared very much. It was proven that the previous Government represented only one sector of the community and that is big business.

When we were in Opposition I moved for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into land resumptions, and into the plight of land owners who were financially disadvantaged because they received only a pittance in comparison with the cost of replacement of their dwellings; but that Select Committee was not granted. If ever a Select Committee or Royal Commission were justified it was justified in relation to the question of compensation for land resumptions.

When the Leader of the Opposition spoke in this debate the other evening he made play of certain words relating to outside interference of members of Parliament and Ministers, and about their being taken over to Trades Hall. No-one can tell me that the Liberal Party does not succumb to outside pressures, because I can give a very glaring example that it did. It was through the actions of the Liberal Party that one particular person became a broken man. He was Mr. Caratti of South Coogee.

A surveyed railway line was to be put across the rear of his property over some limestone outcrops. This land was not suitable for his market gardening pursuits. However, representations were made by Cockburn Cement to the Government. All this is recorded in *Hansard* including the debates and questions asked in this Parliament. It was admitted by the then Minister for Industrial Development that representations had been made to the Government to the effect that if the railway line were built on the proposed route it would interfere with the limestone quarrying operations of the company.

Caratti was cast aside, and the railway line was moved to a new route through the centre of his market garden. As a result his livelihood was destroyed, but he received no just compensation. Is this not a classic example of outside interference of a political party? Of course it is. In this instance the owner of the land was denied the use of the land, so that the profits of the company concerned could be maintained.

Let members opposite not come up with the tripe that we on this side of the House succumb to outside interference. For the 14 years that I have been a member of this House I have not been put under any pressure by Trades Hall, and there has been no interference by the State Executive of the Labor Party.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: This is nonsense, as we can see from the examples which have been mentioned in the newspapers. Mr. Dolan himself has been subjected to this pressure.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That was reported in the newspapers; but my criticism is that members opposite say this only happens in the Labor Party.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Of course it does. That is why we are all sorry for you.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Why did members opposite kowtow to Cockburn Cement, and by so doing virtually deprive a man of his livelihood?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is not kowtowing to a State Executive?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: In the Caratti case, the Government surveyor surveyed the route of the railway line along the rear of the property over what was virtually waste land. The owner said the Government could have that land for nothing; but because of pressure from big business the Liberal Party succumbed and the route was altered.

We have also heard much play in this debate on the increase in taxes and charges since we have become the Government. There is very good reason why we have had to increase charges.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Did I understand you to say that I asserted that Ministers had been called over to Trades Hall?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I will tell the honourable member exactly what he said.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I would like to know what you said about what I said.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I said the honourable member had made reference to members of the Labor Party being called to Trades Hall if they stepped out of line.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Will you read my exact words?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I will quote from *Hansard* to indicate what the honourable member did say. On the 3rd August in the debate on the Supply Bill the honourable member is recorded in *Hansard* as having said—

I am anxious to see the Government giving some lead to the community but we seem to be mixed up in industrial strife and we seem to have a Government that must do as it is told. If it steps out of line it gets a message from Trades Hall, and Trades Hall brings it back into line again. One who has shown courage in this respect is a Minister in this House—Mr. Dolan. He has run into trouble with his own people, his own members, and Trades Hall, who have said, "No. You do it our way." The Government is being given directions by people who are outside the Government's sphere but closely connected with it. I think this is a bad state of affairs.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: From that it will be seen that I did not say your Ministers were called over to Trades Hall.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: No.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Why don't you say, "I am sorry I said that"?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I was speaking about the party generally. If I have upset the Leader of the Opposition, which is easy to do, then I apologise.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You were carrying on one of your usual performances. Since you have a bit of a gallery it might be a good idea to let people see how you misrepresent statements.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: To be honest I do not relish galleries.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I do not think I made any reference to your Ministers being called to Trades Hall.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I suggest that when the honourable member interjects he should do so briefly and not make second reading speeches.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: In his contribution to this debate the Leader of the Opposition laid stress on the taxes and charges which this Government has increased in its term of office. There was a reason for doing that; it was because the Government was forced into the position of having to increase taxes and charges.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You must admit that it was because of your silly election promises.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The reason we were forced into that position was that we were not told of the deficit in the State Treasury.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It was printed in every newspaper. Look at page 209 of the current *Hansard* where I quoted facts, pages, and dates of the newspapers. It was on the 11th or the 12th of December before the election.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am very pleased the honourable member has mentioned that, and he has made my day. I will now tell him something. On the 19th January, 1971, the then Premier of the State sent a memorandum to the Under-Treasurer for a report on the state of the economy of Western Australia.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You have been looking at the Government files again.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I have not. This matter has been mentioned in another place and is recorded in *Hansard*. However, I happen to remember the dates. On the 9th February the reply on the state of the economy was received, and that was how long it took for a re-examination to be made of the finances of the

Treasury and the Government Departments. On the 9th February that information was passed back to the Premier; yet members opposite said we were told about this matter in the previous December.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is right. It is recorded in the *Hansard* I mentioned.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The honourable member might have said it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It was printed in the newspapers in Western Australia.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Members opposite who were then in Government did not know in December, because this minute was written in February and the election was held on the 25th February.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You do not even know the date of the election.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I think it was the 21st February.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: It was held on the 20th February.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: There are so many members trying to help me to determine the exact date; anyhow the election was held late in February or 11 days after the report. In the intervening period between the 9th and 20th February nothing was said about the economy of the State. The then Premier had the temerity to start matching the promises made by the Labor Party.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We were never that silly.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It was impossible for us to match the promises made by the Labor Party.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It would have been impossible for members opposite to carry out the promises; but we will carry them out.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Look at the way you have increased charges.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: By 300 per cent. in the Kimberley.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: This is all quite beautiful! I could keep going for hours on such interjections. We had good reason for making these increases because of the state of the economy at that time. When we took office it was estimated that at the end of the year we would be \$11,000,000 in deficit.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is another figure.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Did you say figure or fallacy?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If members will look at *Hansard* of last year they will see that when the Treasurer introduced the Budget he explained the situation, and no interjection was made at all; no objection was raised.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Was it fallacy or fact?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If the honourable member will keep quiet and be patient he will learn something.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I doubt it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I doubt it too.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: He will learn that we were \$11,000,000 in the red and it was necessary under the Commonwealth Government's aid programme—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Have my handkerchief.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: —for that Government to assist all the States. I am now talking about the Premiers' Conference. The Commonwealth Government made available some \$50,000,000 and we received something like \$5,300,000 which decreased our deficit at the time.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You're telling me!

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: We had to cut spending drastically to try to get the State back to a working business organisation. We finished the year, after all our drastic cuts, with increased taxation to help get us out of the trouble in which the previous Liberal Government had left us.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are quite wrong.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The honourable member would not deny that we were left \$11,000,000 in the red.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I would, because the figure quoted by Sir David Brand was \$12,000,000, not \$11,000,000.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Treasury figures disagreed with his estimate.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That may be so, but the figure given by Sir David was \$12,000,000.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Until the \$5,300,000 from the Commonwealth aid programme was received the deficit was in the vicinity of \$11,600,000—but I suppose when one is \$11,000,000 in the red \$1,000,000 is not very much to worry about. At the end of June we finished with a deficit to the tune of \$4,300,000, and that was after increasing taxes. That is the reason taxes were increased.

We did not like the prospect of having to increase taxes, but it was necessary to do so. When the Leader of the Opposition spoke the other evening he made great play about the promises we made, but he did not give the reason for our having increased taxes. He told us about all the taxes we increased but said nothing about the reason for increasing them. Let us

now have a look at the taxes and charges which were increased by the previous Government.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That was over a period of 12 years.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That is not altogether so in the true sense of the word, because during the election years there were no tax increases, but immediately after the elections taxes were increased. There would be a taxation increase during the first two years and then no tax increase because of the election year.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Is that the pattern we can expect this year?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I sincerely hope not; I hope it will not be necessary. We are spending our money a little differently.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I'll say you are!

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: We are creating the maximum amount of work possible in the circumstances in which we are placed, and the community will benefit from our policy.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Are you suggesting we did not create a maximum amount of benefit?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I will deal with that at a later stage. It may be wise for me to deal with one subject at a time. On the 5th October, 1971, Mr. Dellar asked a series of questions about new taxes and charges as follows:—

During the term of office of the Liberal-Country Party Government from 1959-1971—

- (1) (a) What new taxes and charges were imposed; and
- (b) from what date were they operative?
- (2) (a) What taxes and charges existing at the date of assumption of office—1959—were increased during the period of office; and
- (b) what was the percentage increase in each case?

If members care to look at the answer contained in *Hansard* they will see it filled four-and-a-bit pages.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: An answer of four-and-a-bit pages in 12 years. At the rate your Government is going you will fill an entire book in three years.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If members opposite knew what they were talking about there would have been no necessity for me to rise to counter the allegations made by them. The main variations of taxes and charges in the period 1959-60 to 1970-71 have been listed, as follows:—

Betting Tax was increased by 100 per cent.

Stamp Duty on off-course betting tickets was increased by 50 to 300 per cent.

Stamp Duty on hire purchase was increased by $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. to 1 per cent.

Other taxes that were increased were entertainment tax, land tax, death duties, motor vehicle insurance, license fees—by 25 per cent.—drivers' licenses from \$1 to \$2, which is an increase of 100 per cent.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What year was the entertainment tax increased?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: This is all inclusive from 1959-60 to 1970-71.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What year did we drop entertainment tax altogether?

The Hon. J. Heitman: What were the reductions in S.E.C. charges?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Eventually the previous Government dropped entertainment tax, but at one stage that tax was increased on the cheaper entertainment and it was taken off from what might be termed the larger entertainment, and the following year the tax was discontinued altogether. Other taxes that were increased were those on conveyancing, which was increased by 25 per cent.; receipts for amounts less than £5 were varied, and the tax on hire-purchase agreements rose 0.5 per cent. A surcharge on motor vehicle third party insurance was also introduced in 1963, the amount being \$2.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That was one you increased by 300 per cent. the other day.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: A new tax constituting stamp duty was introduced and this dealt with the registration of motor vehicles and the transfer of second-hand motor vehicles.

The Hon. J. Heitman: That has gone up 100 per cent. since.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: This tax was \$1 in \$100. The figure for drivers' licenses increased by 300 per cent.—from 10s. to £2—and unclaimed betting dividends were transferred to Consolidated Revenue. Hospital charges were increased, M.T.T. fares were increased, as were rail fares; and stamp duty on cheques was increased in 1965-66 by 100 per cent. Other increases were as follows:—

Duty on transfer of scrip or shares increased from 3d. for each £5 or part of £5 to 1s. for every £12 10s. or part thereof.

Duty on purchase and transfer of motor vehicles increased from 10s. per cent. to 15s. per cent.

Receipt duty increased from 3d. per £100 to 3 cents per \$200 for amounts in excess of \$10.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is not an increase.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The betting investment tax was increased, the State Shipping Service freights and charges were increased, as were railway fares, M.T.T. fares, hospital charges, and motor vehicle license fees—which were increased by an estimated 8 per cent. in the case of cars and 20 per cent. in the case of commercial vehicles.

The primary producers' license concession was limited to one commercial vehicle of 30 cwt. tare and above; road maintenance charges were introduced, and in 1966-67 variations were made in probate duty.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You said the drivers' licenses were increased from 10s to £2. Now you say it was from \$2 to \$3.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: We were so fair we even increased your salary.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That is true, but I have earned every penny of it.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Salaries have also been increased while we have been in office.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: A sliding scale of duty was charged in connection with gift-stamp-duty and a new scale of duty was prescribed for receipt duty. The betting turnover tax was again increased and drivers' licenses were varied. So of the amount of money a person paid for a driver's license a percentage was paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund instead of into the Central Road Trust Fund.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What does a driver's license cost now?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It costs \$3.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: How can we increase it from 10s to \$3?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am only quoting what is contained in *Hansard*; I took up the challenge raised by The Hon. Clive Griffiths. As I say, I am quoting what is printed here but no doubt the departmental answer contained in *Hansard* is wrong.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Say you are sorry.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I appreciate the point taken. I will now return to the charges that were increased. In 1966-67 we find that hospital fees were increased, train fares were increased, as were M.T.T. fares and W.A. Coastal Shipping fares. These were increased from the beginning of October, 1966. In the matter of receipt duty; in 1967-68 legislation was introduced to restrict the duty to a uniform flat rate of 1c for every \$10; and so it goes on.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: And so it goes off.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: We now come to 1968-69 when in the case of stamp duty receipts given for the exchange of money for money were exempted from duty. State Shipping Service rates again rose as did Land Titles Office charges. Rates of tax on unimproved land were further increased

on unimproved capital values in excess of \$25,000. In that year M.T.T. fares were again increased as were railway fares and companies' registration fees. I could go on and mention other increases that were made—there are a further two pages of them—but I will not weary the House.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: It took us 12 years to do this, whereas you have done it in two years.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The honourable member's party was placed in a state of continuity of Government; it knew what expenditure to expect from year to year. On the other hand, when we became the Government we did not know the state of the Treasury and the figure the Premier quoted, to which I referred previously, was not made public. It was only when we became the Government that this was drawn to the Premier's attention; it was only then that we knew anything at all about the situation. Does the honourable member think that had his Government been returned it would have been satisfied to face a deficit of \$11,000,000?

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: The deficit was not \$11,000,000 when your Government took office.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: There was a deficit to the tune of \$11,600,000.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Go back and read that *Hansard* to which I referred. You can apologise to me afterwards.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I heard a Cabinet minute read out in another place.

The Hon. F. R. White: During the 11-year period you have quoted, what was the percentage increase in wages? I think that is quite relevant.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That was quoted in the article early in December.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: How is that any more relevant than an attack on the present Government for increasing taxes and charges? Included in the Brand Government's last Budget was provision for a \$10,000,000 wage increase throughout the Public Service. In actual fact the increase was \$20,000,000.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That was listed in the paper. Mr. Tonkin was told about that.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am not taking the previous Government to task about this; I am answering a question. Since then, school teachers have received a considerable increase in wages. This has occurred during the term of the present Government. The rates paid to nurses have been brought up to the best that are operative in Australia. The Police Force has been increased and members of the force have been given just wages.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I suppose they were never given "just" wages before.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Leader of the Opposition knows that there was much dissension in the ranks of the Police Force.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I do not know that at all.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The number of resignations should have made this obvious. Wages were not sufficient.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I know what I am talking about. You ask the Minister for Police. Wages in this State were increased as the wages in the other States were increased. I suggest you ask your own Minister who will know because he has seen the files.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I will not make statements for the Minister. He will have the opportunity to correct me if I am wrong.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Which you are.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am pointing out the wages which have been increased since the present Government has been in office. There is nothing wrong with that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No, except you blame the Federal Government for your troubles, then you admit they stem from increased wages.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I have not started on the Federal Government yet.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Miss Elliott did it for you.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It might be a good time to start on it now.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I was going to say, "I bet you will."

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The present Commonwealth Government would be the most amazing one Australia has ever seen. On Wednesday, the 18th August, the Federal Government introduced a Budget and the headlines in the *Daily News* were, "Mr. Average to lose \$1.38 a week."

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! Will the honourable member please quote the date of that headline.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I did, Mr. Deputy President. It was the 18th August, 1971.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You forgot the "1971."

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Federal *Hansard* will reveal, as will newspaper clippings, that at the time Mr. Whitlam told the Government what the express intention of that Budget was. The Government said it was designed to curb inflation. There was no secret about that. Everybody knows the intention of the Government was to curb inflation. Many members of the Labor benches in the Federal Parliament told the Prime Minister that this would create mass employment.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: "Mass employment"?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am sorry, I meant to say, "mass unemployment." No notice was taken of this. Mr. Bob Hawke of the trade union movement pointed out in one article I read that the Budget was designed to create mass unemployment. That is exactly what it did. However it brought about something more remarkable than that. Not only did it create mass unemployment but also galloping inflation at the same time. World economists have been astounded that any Government could do this. I am not saying economists are the best people in the world to guide us, but they are the best we have to guide us in matters of economics.

The Hon. G. W. Berry: What do they know?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I suggest the honourable member should talk to any economist. Generally, economists say that this is impossible; it has never happened before; and they do not know how it has happened.

The Federal Government has brought about the situation although, at the time, it was warned this would happen. The Prime Minister took no notice of this warning. It was even said at the time that the Government would have to bring down a mini-Budget, but the Government would not listen to that suggestion. Instead it said that it had complete faith in the new Treasurer who would see the Budget through. It was stated that the policies were good and were designed to curb inflation. What did the Federal Government do? On the 3rd February it brought down a mini-Budget! It had to lift the surcharge on income tax and release credit restrictions. In other words there was an about face on the policies because the Budget was no good.

In October, 1971, Mr. Cameron, the shadow Minister for Labour in the Federal House, asked the Government at what figure it anticipated it could hold unemployment. At the time the unemployment figure in Australia was to the tune of 66,000 people. The answer given to the question by the Prime Minister, in his words, was that he was confident the Government would be able to hold unemployment around the 80,000 mark. Even then, which was shortly after the introduction of the Budget, the Prime Minister anticipated that unemployment would increase by another 14,000 throughout Australia.

What happened? Unemployment doubled and went from 66,000 in October to 120,000 in January. The Budget was designed for inflation and unemployment, to make people sit up and take notice. Unfortunately the people of Western Australia and other States bear the burden of unemployment because of the policies of the Federal Government.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Can you quote the school-leaving figures in that number of 120,000?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: They are still unemployed and I will give those figures in a moment.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: This happens annually, of course.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I have reams of figures if the honourable member is interested in hearing them.

The Federal Government must take the blame, because it is the only Government in Australia which can create opportunities for employment from a Government source. The Federal Government was responsible for spreading this gloom; it was not the State Government.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Is not the State Government claiming that it is creating employment opportunities?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: All the State Governments had rising unemployment. It was the action of the Federal Government in its 1971 Budget which dampened, depressed, and took away the incentive from the private sector. Make no mistake about that. No-one can deny it, because the Budget was designed for this purpose. I suggest members should read the Budget speech for themselves and they will find that what I am saying is true.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It stopped Japan from buying ore, I suppose?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: In February the point was reached where a mini-Budget had to be introduced. This was on the 3rd February, and on the 20th February there was a Premiers' Conference. At this conference the Prime Minister injected \$50,000,000 into the economy to try to relieve unemployment because it was in a scandalous state.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What year was this?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It was 1972.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It could not have been the 20th February, because that was the date of the State election.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The State election was in 1971. The Leader of the Opposition is one year out.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Yes.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The economy has not recovered yet. No gloom is being spread by the State Government, as the Leader of the Opposition said when he made his speech. I do not wish to misquote him again, and I shall refer to the exact words. I interjected and said, "There is no gloom as far as the Labor Party is concerned." I repeat, there is no gloom because we are confident we will be able to take charge of the situation given a reasonable amount of money to do so.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Take charge of the gloom?

The Hon. J. Heitman: Anyone can do that if they are given enough money.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I ask the Leader of the Opposition not to try the smart trick of putting words into my mouth.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What do you classify as a reasonable amount of money?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: A reasonable amount of money must be injected into the community to give confidence to the people so that they will start to purchase consumer products. It is a strange situation to see deposits with savings banks increasing; to see a slackening in sales of consumer products; to see unemployment increasing; and to see prices rising. This is the point I was making earlier.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: A 35-hour week will not help much.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I missed that interjection.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: A 35-hour week will not help much.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: A social service allowance of \$35 a week does not help an unemployed man with a couple of kiddies very much either.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I have been pleased to listen to your remarks, because I will prove later on when I speak that the Government is causing unemployment by some of its decisions.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Which Government?

The Hon. W. R. Withers: This present Government.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Do not get excited. He will not make any mistakes.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Someone, when speaking tonight, mentioned cobwebs and what happened in 1959. I think it was Mr. MacKinnon. At the time I made a note, "The Liberals used the cobwebs in an election campaign to get to the Treasury benches." It was a rather good gimmick, because they convinced the people that something was wrong.

The Hon. J. Heitman: The people were not far wrong, were they?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I think you are wrong in your figures. The cobweb campaign was 1950, I think. If I remember, 1959 concerned all employees being out of work and everyone working for the P.W.D. and the State Engineering Works.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I think 1959 was the cobweb campaign, and it was aided and abetted by Lionel Carter.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I am not convinced. That year was not the cobweb campaign.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: He was running the campaign on his own through some bogus organisation. We could never find out if it existed. It had a registered name.

Let us return to the subject of criticism being levelled against the present Government in comparison with that levelled against the last Government. Anybody would think the previous Government did a wonderful job. I never once criticised the previous Government for the industrial expansion it brought about and for getting out and doing things for the progress of the State. As I have said, not once did I criticise that, but I did criticise the Government for hurting the people in the process. Let us look at the unemployment situation from 1959 onwards.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Before you do, I think you will find that the cobweb campaign was in 1950, and the Premier of the day, following the election, was Ross McLarty who subsequently became Sir Ross McLarty.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I was not here at that time.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The 1959 campaign was at the end of another period where Labor had brought us to a standstill. That time we campaigned on restrictive trade practices.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Leader of the Opposition makes good second reading speeches while he is sitting down.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He is helping you because you seem confused.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I will refresh his memory with unemployment figures over a period of time. I will quote the Australian and Western Australian figures, on a yearly basis, and not on the basis of months or days. In 1959 the Australian average unemployment was 1.7 per cent., and the Western Australian average was 2.4 per cent. The reasons for this are well known.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The worst of the lot.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: It was the end of a term of a Labor Government.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The reason was that we had just finished some of the projects we had undertaken. Previously, there had been fairly heavy immigration to bring in specialist people for the construction work on some of the Kwinana projects. The Leader of the Opposition would know that about that time—1959—the satellite township of Medina was chock-a-block with people. People were living in single quarters in and around Medina. However, because that project had been finished, certain specialist tradesmen could not be absorbed into the work force; there was nothing else to carry on with.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You did not put anything into the pipeline.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I will remind Mr. MacKinnon of his Government's actions in a minute. At the time, as I have said, we had unemployment. In just one year, from 1959 to 1960, the Australian average dropped .4 per cent. to 1.3 per cent., but the Western Australian average was still 1.8 per cent.

In 1961 the Australian average was 2 per cent., and the Western Australian average was 2.1 per cent. In 1962—this is the fourth year of the Brand Government's term of office—the Australian average was 2.3 per cent. and the Western Australian average was 1.9 per cent. So it took four years before there was any drastic reduction in the unemployment figures of this State compared with the national figures. In 1963 the Australian average was 2 per cent. and the Western Australian average was 2.1 per cent. In 1964 the Australian average was 1.3 per cent., and the Western Australian average was 2 per cent. In 1965 the Australian average was .9 per cent., and the Western Australian average was 1.3 per cent. In 1966 the Australian average was 1.3 per cent., and the Western Australian average was 1 per cent.

In 1967 the Australian average was 1.4 per cent., and the Western Australian average was 1.1 per cent. In 1968 the Australian average was 1.4 per cent., and the Western Australian average was 1 per cent. In 1969 the Australian average was 1.18 per cent., and the Western Australian average was 1.05 per cent. In 1970 the Australian average was .96 per cent., and the Western Australian average was 1.07 per cent. In 1971 the Australian average was 1.21 per cent., and the Western Australian average was 1.46 per cent. These are the official figures.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Now tell us about 1972.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I will come to that in a moment. The official figures from the Commonwealth show clearly that for seven of the 12-year term of office of the Brand Government the unemployment in Western Australia was higher than the Australian average. In 1962 the unemployment was .4 per cent. under the Australian average; in 1966 it was .3 per cent.; in 1967 it was .3 per cent.; in 1968 it was .4 per cent.; and in 1969 it was .13 per cent.

The Hon. S. T. J. Thompson: How has the population increased?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Big projects were constructed in Western Australia during the years 1966-69, and it will be noted that these are the years when our unemployment figures fell below the Australian average. Projects such as Alcoa at Kwinana, the power station at

Kwinana, the nickel refinery, Alcoa at Pinjarra, Hamersley Iron, Tom Price, and Port Hedland were all constructed in that four-year period. I do not blame the previous Government for what happened from then on because this was due to the world downturn in the demand for minerals and the lack of available money.

Contracts and agreements were signed by the previous Government but the projects were not proceeded with. I do not blame the Government for that. At the same time we had mass immigration—specialised people in the various fields had come to Western Australia to help with the construction of the projects at Kwinana and in the north-west.

It would be equally unfair for the Opposition to blame the present Government for the unemployment situation. Had the Brand Government remained in office, the same effects would have been felt because of the world monetary situation. Nothing was left in the pipeline for either the last Government or the present Government. Alvest did not proceed. I cannot remember the name, but there was another project which did not proceed.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The Pacminex people were happy to proceed.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Last year we lost \$2,000,000 in royalties. This is a sad state of affairs.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: How did you lose that?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: We lost that because of the lack of demand for iron ore.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I think I can tell you how you lost another big sum of money: By increasing rents on mineral claims.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: This may be true. However, I am attempting to tell the House the factual situation. The effects would be the same had the last Government remained in office.

I made the point by way of interjection that big business people invest and come into the country when it suits them—when the situation is right for them.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: We went out and got people to come here. We did not sit on our backsides waiting for them to come—we went out and got them.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Of course we have signed agreements. We have gone out and got people interested.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Who have you got?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The climate is not right because of the money situation. There is no demand for the goods.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Who have you got?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Brand Government took complete credit for—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You said you went out and got people. Who did you get?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am not going to divulge that. However, members will see this in the agreements which will come forward.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You said you went out and got people.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Of course we have people interested in Western Australia. Our Minister for Development and Decentralisation is just as efficient as the previous Minister—probably more efficient in some respects.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No, I do not think that is right.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It is a matter of opinion. I can express my opinion and I do not mind the honourable member expressing his. The Minister for Development and Decentralisation is a very efficient Minister. He is doing the best possible job in the present world-wide monetary situation. It is not fair to blame the whole of the downturn in unemployment on the present Government since its brief period in office. I have pointed out that it took four years for the Brand Government to increase employment in Western Australia.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: We had nothing to start with in 1959.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: What did we have to start with?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Plenty.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition would tell us.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You had a booming State.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You have been telling us about all the projects in the north.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The only project which would have carried on for a sufficient time was Alcoa.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That was the only project?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I said that that was the only project which would have carried on for a sufficient time. There were others in the course of completion. The Leader of the Opposition knows that as well as I do.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You know you have introduced half a dozen agreements which have been variations of the ones which we introduced.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I said that a while ago. Some of the Bills we introduced did not come to fruition.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: We did not have much help with Pacminex.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What about the big teeth legislation that mucked up Pacminex?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: This is what we stood for. We were honest with the people. We obtained a report and that was it.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I'll tell you what—you soon pulled their teeth.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Nobody pulled their teeth or used any influence whatsoever. Like everyone else, I am very pained about the unemployment we are suffering in Western Australia.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Did you say "pained"?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Pained, yes. I probably deal more directly with these people than do members opposite. I see their daily problems and the situation is not good. I do not like it. Unless there is a change of Federal Government the present situation will continue for a long time. Only a change of Federal Government will inject money into the economy and give the States a fair go.

I trust that a Federal Labor Government would spend money more wisely and follow better policies than those of the present Government. I never know who is the leader of the Liberal Party—they change leaders so often.

The Hon. J. Heitman: If we had a change of Government here there would be more confidence.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: There is no stability within the Federal Government. Until we have a stable Federal Government, all the States of Australia will suffer.

There are a few people who believe that the Tonkin Government will not continue in office. This is strange because I have found, particularly when I have been in the country, that people are more than satisfied with the actions of this Government.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You must speak to different people from those to whom I have spoken.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Many of the people who speak to me would not know to whom they were talking. They appear to be more than satisfied with the actions of the Tonkin Government. The honourable member may have only spoken to Liberal sympathisers who are dissatisfied with the present Government. I can assure members that every promise we made will be fulfilled if we are allowed to keep it by the members of this Chamber. I support the Bill.

THE HON. F. D. WILLMOTT (South-West) [8.30 p.m.]: It is not my intention—I hope—to speak at the considerable length at which Mr. Ron Thompson spoke, but then, I suppose, it is necessary to speak at great length when one attempts to defend the indefensible, and there is no doubt that Mr. Ron Thompson seemed to go to great pains to do that.

Before I proceed to other matters, I express my thanks to the Minister for Railways for his attitude in regard to a question I asked on bulk coal facilities at Bridgetown. In answer to my question he told me that tenders would be closing shortly for the work of dismantling this equipment. He also agreed to defer the dismantling work until such time as the proposition I put forward was considered by the department; that is, the use of this equipment for the handling of bulk super. So I say again that I thank the Minister for his attitude and the co-operation he offered so readily in this matter. I wish to tell the Minister that I have not examined the equipment myself with the idea that it may be used for the handling of bulk super, but the man who put the proposition to me is rather ingenious with mechanical matters and he feels sure the equipment can be used for this purpose. I do not know whether this is correct or not, but, as I say, the man who put forward the proposition is very good mechanically and he may, perhaps, be interested in operating the equipment himself.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I suggest that if you gave me his name the Railways Department, in making its examination, might contact this man.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I promise the Minister I will do that privately.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Thank you.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: So much for that matter. The principal subject to which I want to address myself this evening is the problem of fruit-fly control. This matter has interested me for a long time and I have spoken on it on previous occasions but with no great success for reasons I cannot understand. To my mind the department has never shown any real interest in the eradication or control of fruit fly. For what reason, I do not know.

Recently the matter was brought to my attention again by an approach that was made from the Donnybrook Fruit-Fly Foliage Baiting Scheme. The complaint of those operating the scheme is that they applied for assistance by way of subsidy again this year, but no assistance was granted. I think this scheme was first implemented in 1966 and since that time the scheme has gradually been able to reduce its demands for subsidy. In 1968 it was granted \$1,200; in 1969, \$800; in 1970, \$700, and last year it was granted \$500. This year, those in control of the scheme were refused a subsidy on the grounds

contained in letters received from the department. This letter which I have before me says, in part—

It is considered essential that baiting charges, particularly to non-commercial growers, must be considerably increased if the scheme in Donnybrook is to continue operating on a sound financial basis in the future.

I am sure the Government will be well aware of the considerable difficulties under which fruit growers are operating at the moment. Nevertheless, as I have pointed out, those controlling the Donnybrook fruit-fly baiting scheme were refused any assistance by way of subsidy. The reason given for this refusal is that the men in charge of the scheme run a No. 2 account into which they place a certain amount of their funds for plant replacement when this is required. I think this is a sound proposition, and this baiting scheme has operated on sound lines for some time.

I would also point out that Donnybrook, prior to the introduction of its baiting scheme, was a real disaster area so far as fruit fly was concerned. The fruit growers were in everlasting trouble with it, but since the introduction of the scheme they have, to all intents and purposes, completely controlled fruit-fly infestation. This demonstrates the value of the baiting scheme; but this year, because the scheme has a certain sum in its No. 2 account for the purpose of replacing plant, the department refused to grant a subsidy. As a result, those in charge of the Donnybrook scheme had to take \$300 from the No. 2 account to balance their working account.

To me this seems to be a rather short-sighted policy on the part of the department; that is, to be niggardly in the matter of granting a subsidy to the Donnybrook baiting scheme, because I am of the opinion that the baiting scheme is the only single factor that is making a real contribution to the control of fruit fly at the moment.

The Hon. G. W. Berry: You would think it would have full support.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: It does not get full support in the way of subsidy for the reason that over the last five years the average annual amount that has been advanced throughout the State—and some 48 fruit-fly baiting schemes have been operating during that time—has been \$9,231.

The Hon. G. W. Berry: That is only messing about with the problem.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I agree that it is only messing about with it.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: That is over five years.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: Yes, over five years. As I said earlier, there always seems to be reluctance on the part of the

department to make any real effort to solve the fruit-fly problem. For years this has been the attitude of the department. I have just stated that \$9,000-odd annually was only a small amount to be spent over the past five years in an effort to eradicate fruit fly. I would like to know how much South Australia, which has eradicated fruit fly, spends in keeping fruit fly under control after eradicating it from its State.

The Hon. J. Dolan: It has returned since.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I venture to suggest that that State spends a great deal more annually on the control of fruit fly than what Western Australia is spending now. The present attitude of the department towards fruit-fly control is incomprehensible to me. I believe that this attitude will eventually mean that all schemes will cease to operate, because some are already folding up. In the last five years at least three baiting schemes have folded up. There may be more. These schemes will continue to fold up if the department continues to insist that they must be self-supporting. That is the attitude of the department at present. I have told those in charge of the Donnybrook fruit-fly baiting scheme that this is what the department expects; that they must be self-supporting.

I consider that unless a more realistic attitude is adopted by the department, the Donnybrook scheme will fold up. In view of the present situation of the fruit-growing industry, I do not think it is capable of financing a baiting scheme without obtaining assistance from the department. Those operating the Donnybrook fruit-fly baiting scheme were informed, by a letter from the department, as follows:—

Annual subsidies to fruit fly baiting schemes in commercial districts have been paid on the understanding that schemes were expected to become self-supporting. Several years have been allowed for schemes to adjust their scale of charges accordingly . . .

I do not think this is a realistic attitude on the part of the department. However, those controlling the scheme in Donnybrook, in an endeavour to cover the losses made in its working account, have had to transfer \$300 from the No. 2 account for equipment replacement and other contingencies, because they never know when equipment will need to be replaced. Those in charge of the scheme run it very efficiently.

The charges made to the commercial growers have been increased. This year their contribution for pear trees has been increased from \$3 a 100 trees to \$4 a 100 trees to cover the expense of running the baiting scheme as a result of their application for a subsidy being refused.

The contribution by commercial growers of stone fruits has been increased from \$3 a 100 trees to \$4 a 100 trees, and the contribution for citrus fruits has been increased from \$6 a 100 trees to \$7 a 100 trees. That may not sound much to the layman but it means a great deal to all the growers who are battling to get anywhere, and I might point out that the situation at the moment looks like becoming a great deal worse; it will certainly not get any better.

At present non-commercial growers pay \$1.50 for the first tree and 25c for each additional tree in the scale of charges that has been set to operate the fruit-fly baiting scheme. This is considered to be a fair contribution by those growers. I do not know how the charges compare with those set by other baiting schemes. However, I do know that the Donnybrook scheme is a very efficient one and the refusal by the department to pay any further subsidy this year to those controlling the scheme is quite incomprehensible. It is definitely a short-sighted policy because in the long run many of the baiting schemes will fold up if such a policy is continued.

There is no doubt that the department is just fiddling with the problem, when one considers that it is spending only \$9,000 odd every year by way of assistance to the 47 fruit-fly baiting schemes operating throughout the State. I think the Government should pay greater attention towards improving the present situation, because it would be quite disastrous if these schemes were forced to fold up. If this did occur we would revert to the situation, in areas such as Donnybrook which are subject to heavy fruit-fly infestation, in which they were placed previously, and I am sure that this would mean the crippling of the commercial growers completely, especially in view of the prices they are receiving for their fruit today.

Prior to 1966 the fruitgrowers managed to keep ahead when they first started to operate their fruit-fly baiting scheme, because at that time prices were good, but prices are certainly not good today. I do not have sufficient information in my possession as yet, but I feel that some of the efficient schemes may be missing out on a subsidy as they become more and more efficient in order to subsidise other schemes which are not efficient. I have a lurking suspicion that this could very well be the case, and I repeat that the Government should make a greater effort to appreciate the true situation in regard to fruit-fly control. I say that because members will recall that not so long ago a Bill was introduced into the Parliament that proposed to repeal the registration of fruit trees, but thank goodness the measure never reached this House.

Somewhere along the line the Government must have received the message how foolish this was, because that Bill was not

proceeded with after it had been somewhat heavily criticised. Surely the Government should realise that the continued registration of fruit trees is essential if baiting schemes are to be successful. Registration is the only means by which the existence of fruit trees can be known, and it has not been treated as seriously as it should have been. It is common knowledge that hundreds of trees are not registered and it is high time serious action was taken so that people either register their trees or uproot them. It is hopeless to attempt to control fruit fly if the whereabouts of the trees are unknown. I hope no further attempt is made to dispense with the registration. Even if the cost of administration is more than the amount received in fees, the scheme would still be worth while in order that the existence of the trees can be known.

If we are to make a serious attack on the fruit fly—and I mean a serious attack—the Government must do a great deal more towards subsidising the schemes instead of believing that the schemes will be able to carry themselves financially. That is the wrong concept altogether. Many schemes will fail by the wayside if they are not subsidised. Those involved cannot continue to increase charges, but this is what they will be forced to do if the schemes are not subsidised. The result will be that the growers themselves will be short-sighted enough—and I say that advisedly—to get rid of the scheme. They will not want it if it is going to cost them any more. I feel sure this will be the attitude in many districts, particularly in the main fruit-growing districts of which Donnybrook is one. In fact, Donnybrook is in one of the main fruit-growing districts. It has all types of fruit—apples, pears, and citrus. It has the lot. Consequently Donnybrook is subject to considerable attack by the fruit fly.

Further south in my home town of Bridgetown outbreaks occur, but not to any extent because the same range of fruit is not grown there as in Donnybrook. The colder climate of Bridgetown is not so kind to the fruit fly. However, Donnybrook has always been a disaster area.

I do hope the Government will have another look at this subject and not completely withdraw the subsidies. If it does I am afraid the schemes will in time simply fold up, and that would be that. I support the Bill.

THE HON. W. R. WITHERS (North) [9.49 p.m.]: During the Address-in-Reply debate in 1971 I indicated that some inequalities existed in the north of this State. Since that time the situation has deteriorated and the inequalities have increased. Much of the increase has been traced to the actions of this Government.

I noted with interest the interjections of Mr. Dans when my colleague, Mr. MacKinnon, was speaking. Mr. Dans implied that the reason for unemployment lay with the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not think I said that exactly. I said there was a peculiar condition of continuing inflation and rising unemployment and that it was an economic phenomenon.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I did say that Mr. Dans implied it. It was the impression I gained from his interjections.

This Government has increased the hardships and unemployment in the north. The cost of living has increased at a greater rate in the north than in the metropolitan area. It has become so worrying that the people in the north are holding public meetings to discuss the problem. Mr. Hunt and I attended a meeting at Port Hedland at which between 450 and 500 discussed the matter in an effort to evolve ways to correct the rising cost of living in the north.

Last year this Government increased the freight rates to the north by \$5 per ton. Perhaps \$5 does not sound very much per ton when it is spread out on a per pound basis, but I must emphasise that that increased freight rate increased by \$385 the cost of a framed house in the north. Already housing costs had risen in the north as well as in the metropolitan area and the rest of the State. Consequently the people in the north were faced with those extra charges plus the \$385. In addition to this the contractors must charge a little more because of the percentage and the person borrowing money must borrow more and, as a result, becomes involved with higher interest rates.

What is the result of all this? The result is that less building takes place, and consequently unemployment is increased.

Another recent action of the Government resulted in an increase of 300 per cent. for the leasing of Kimberley pastoral properties. That is bad enough on its own, but it is completely unjust to backdate that increase to 1969 when those concerned have already budgeted. They now are to be hit with this backdated 300-per cent. increase.

Recently the Valuer-General revalued properties in the north at the inflated northern value. This resulted in shops in small towns in the north paying higher rates than shops in the metropolitan area. This is a ridiculous situation, but it is condoned by this Government.

Another point: The Minister for Education increased the living-away-from-home allowances for those students receiving education away from their home town; but at the same time the cost of hostel accommodation was raised so that this ate up the increases in the allowances.

The reverse has been applied to travelling allowances. One departmental officer whose name I cannot give at the moment, although he intends to give me a letter containing the full details, commented to me that he was receiving a \$10 a day living-away-from-home allowance whilst travelling in the north. Incidentally I must say I find this is most inadequate at any time. However, what has this Government just done? It has decreased that \$10 to \$5 a day. That officer is thinking of leaving the area and this would be disastrous. Here we have that word again, but a lot of disaster is encountered up our way.

Another action of the Government, or an action which is condoned by the Government, concerns new settlers at Karratha. When these new settlers move on to industrial blocks no accommodation is provided for them. The caravan parks are full and yet they are told they cannot live in their caravans on their industrial blocks.

I must emphasise that this is not a town which has been developed for years and years with people moving in and out. People have not established accommodation and businesses and then allowed someone else to take over. This is not the situation at all. These people are building new towns right from the dirt up, and they have no accommodation provided for them. They are not even permitted to build caretakers' quarters on their industrial blocks which are away from the rest of the town. They are expected to leave their industrial sites with all their stock and goods unprotected. This is another factor which is causing concern and will increase unemployment unless this Government corrects the situation. I have already been advised that one man who employs only five men is in difficulty and that if the situation is not corrected he will, within the next three months, have to leave the area. This situation is compounded because he is only one little man who employs only five men. He, his wife, and family, and his five employees and their families will leave the area.

The mining rentals have been increased more than somewhat and as a result the money which could have been spent on exploration is not being so spent. Consequently the people involved do not stay in the north. Instead, they leave, once again coming to the city where the unemployment is already rife, but is increased further.

Another inequity which forces people to leave the north is also evident in Karratha. Some accommodation is available in that town for those who are eligible for a State Housing Commission rental home. Similar flats in Balga near Perth are let for \$13.50 a week. These have two bedrooms and are of brick construction. However in Karratha a two-bedroomed flat made of fibro-cement, and fan cooled—a reasonably neat

flat but nowhere near the standard of a Balga flat—costs \$29.50 a week. The rental is \$13.50 in the city, but is \$29.50 in the country where people are working to develop this State in an effort to bring revenue into it.

Another point: Let us look at the assistance the kindergartens obtain from the State. I am referring to kindergartens in new towns with development problems, towns which are only from one to seven years old. They are young towns made up of young people and are not like our suburbs where a sprinkling of old people are to be found. In my home town I am an old man, but in this Chamber I am considered relatively young. The average age in the north is in the vicinity of 30 and although I do not know the average age in the suburbs I am sure it would be much higher.

In this situation one would expect that the young population would have young families. However, let me give one instance of how a kindergarten is being hindered. Recently a departmental officer visited Kununurra and informed those in charge of the kindergarten that it could not continue to handle the number of children attending. It was told it must decrease the number or it would obtain no assistance. Of course the kindergarten had to decrease the number attending. I appealed to the Minister, but was told the decision was correct and could not be changed. This type of action hinders the development of the town because what happens? The families with young children will leave and once again come to the city where things are easier. Of course unemployment is rife in the city and it is increased further by the migration from the north by those who must leave because of hardship.

This Government repeatedly tells us that it cannot achieve what it desires because the Commonwealth will not give it enough money, yet this Government has received more aid from the Commonwealth Government than the previous Government ever did. It is my opinion that this Government is more interested in centralisation thus placating the metropolitan electors. I might add that it is not doing a very good job of this either.

The Government does not seem to be interested in bringing equality to all people in Western Australia. It does not realise the importance of decentralisation in developing the State for the benefit of everyone within it.

If any member of the Government wishes to refute what I have said, I challenge him to produce the evidence of State income and expenditure directly or indirectly attributable to the north of this State. If he does so, his argument will immediately be lost because he will find that approximately 50 per cent. of the State's

income can be attributed to the activities in the north; yet the people in the north suffer inequality.

It appears to me that the Government does not realise that the section of the community in private enterprise supports the community, and that any restrictions or increased charges that are possibly unfair in one area will cause people to leave that area and go to the city. This of course brings further unemployment to the city and decreases the income that can be derived from the developing areas of the State or the areas that should be developing with minerals and other industries.

I would like Mr. Ron Thompson to take particular notice of what I am about to say. I will give him a classic example of a decision given by the Government last week which will cause unemployment. I mentioned it in an interjection. It will cause the loss of \$228,000 a month to this State. It might cause the loss of a \$500,000 a year pilot scheme in this State.

A firm named Ord Beef Pty. Ltd. at Kununurra is growing sorghum and running a pilot scheme for the feeding of cattle. It has recently been offered by Japan, through the Wyndham Meat Works, a contract to provide cattle to Japan. The contract is worth \$228,000 a month. The firm is not yet at the stage where it can grow sufficient grain sorghum of its own but it will be able to do so next year. The meatworks will close down in November of this year; it is a seasonal close-down. To meet the contract prior to the meatworks closing down, Ord Beef needed to import 2,000 tons of sorghum from the Northern Territory to Kununurra, which is only 22 miles from the border of the Northern Territory.

The firm was denied the contract on the grounds that sorghum midge would infest the grain sorghum. I made an appeal to the Minister. The Minister gave a permit for the importation and then cancelled it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You are not reflecting on the Government at all. You are reflecting on the officers of the Department of Agriculture, who would have advised your Government in the same way.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Who runs it—the Minister or the departmental head?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: In my opinion, the officers of the department made the correct decision but it needed overriding for other reasons, and the Minister, if he were strong enough, should have made the overriding decision and given the public and his officers his reasons for doing so.

I will explain why I say the officers made the correct decision and the Minister made the incorrect decision. This firm is the sole grower of grain sorghum in Kununurra. The officers of the Department of

Agriculture knew there was a risk of introducing grain sorghum midge, which is a very small insect. The male of the species has a breeding cycle of only 24 hours; it has a flight range of about three miles. It is a nasty little beast; and I might add that Ord Beef Pty. Ltd. does not want the little fellow in the Ord River area and is most anxious to keep him out.

The firm wants to have the grain sorghum fumigated by the Australian experts under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture. That seems to be fairly reasonable. The departmental officers said, "We do not agree that this importation should be allowed because it might bring sorghum midge into the area." The officers do not want to risk making a mistake. At a later date someone might ask, "What research did you do on sorghum midge?" They would have to reply, "We did no research on sorghum midge. In fact we know nothing about sorghum midge except what other people have told us."

Therefore, the decision of the officers was reasonable. They want to keep their jobs. They do not want to make a mistake and they need a very good reason—a ministerial reason—for changing their decision.

I tried to find out who was the expert in Australia on sorghum midge. It is a gentleman in Toowoomba, Queensland. I phoned him twice and had conversations with him. I asked him his opinion of sorghum midge, how it would be likely to enter this State, and whether or not supervised control and fumigation could prevent it. His answer was that sorghum midge will enter this State, particularly the Ord River Valley, at some time in the near future—it could be three months or it could be three years; however, it does not matter what controls one places on the importation of grain; it will come in on small amounts of illegal grain.

I asked this gentleman, "Do you think it would be wise to undertake fumigation and control the importation of the grain, to prevent the loss of a contract worth \$228,000?" His answer was, "Yes." I said, "Where is the Western Australian Department of Agriculture getting its information on sorghum midge?" He said, "I am feeding the Department of Agriculture the information on sorghum midge."

We have a situation where the departmental officers have no research programme. Members heard the questions I asked in this House last week. Yet the departmental officers accept advice from a person in the Eastern States who told me the midge would get into the area anyway. The Minister did not override the departmental decision by saying, "O.K., let us supervise this. Let us make 99.9 per cent. sure that the sorghum midge does not get in, but as it will get in anyway let us supervise it and control it. In that way we will

not increase unemployment. We will not jeopardise a \$500,000 a year pilot scheme. We will not lose a \$228,000 contract."

If it is the function of Ministers simply to agree with their departmental officers every time they make decisions, of what use are Ministers? A Minister is meant to weigh up the problems of the people, to look at the problems of all departments in relation to his own, and make a ministerial decision.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He is there to make a political decision.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Your colleague was complaining about the infestation of fruit fly. If fruit infested with the Adriatic fruit fly had been barred by the department, fruit producers would not have had this problem which came into the country.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I am speaking about a little midge that is already in Australia and is probably only 22 miles from Kununurra. It will eventually arrive there, so let us at least control the entry of grain sorghum.

The Hon. R. Thompson: To answer your question, this is prohibited by legislation. How can a Minister override legislation?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I think Mr. Ron Thompson will find that is not totally correct. I think he will find the sorghum midge is not mentioned in legislation.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The importation into Western Australia is prohibited by legislation.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I would like Mr. Ron Thompson to ask in the House the question: What legislation contains a reference to sorghum midge? I would like the honourable member to ask in what legislation is the sorghum midge mentioned.

The Hon. R. Thompson: This is sorghum grain I am talking about.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I would like the honourable member to ask the question.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Let him do it some other time. He is not supposed to be speaking at all.

The Hon. J. Doan: Here is the pot calling the kettle black.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I hope everybody got the message on that particular point. The people who are denied the import license, the people whose business may collapse, the people who may have to put employees out of work, the people who may not again put \$500,000 per annum into a pilot scheme, are the sole commercial growers of sorghum. So who is the department or the Minister trying to protect? He will just create further unemployment without a sound reason.

For many of the reasons which I have mentioned it would appear that the present Government is trying to force the people of the north into considering secession from the rest of the State.

If this is not so, I would like to ask Government members why they have not attempted to bring equality to all the people of Western Australia and why they have increased hardship to the people of the north and in other communities.

I have taken this opportunity to draw attention to the inequalities which exist in the north and it is because of their existence that I reluctantly support the Bill.

THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [10.12 p.m.]: I would like to take this opportunity, in spite of the hour, to make a few remarks on the immediate need for decentralisation in this State. We must attempt, in some way, to stop the drift of people from the country to the city. This trend is taking place throughout Australia, but unfortunately it is progressing more rapidly in Western Australia. In this regard I quote Professor Gates who, at the National Development Conference on Decentralisation, said that in 1966-70 Australia's population increased by 8.2 per cent. and Perth's population increased by 18.5 per cent. The figures for other cities show that Brisbane increased by 9.6 per cent.; Sydney by 9.4 per cent., and Melbourne by 8.7 per cent.

We can readily see why Perth does not have the problems of Melbourne and Sydney. However, we are very rapidly approaching their size. In fact, we see by a Bill presently before the House that the new Perth railway will cost some \$400,000,000. This is just to get the people living in the suburbs in and out of the city. It is certainly time we took more active steps in regard to decentralisation.

Mr. Graham has at times mentioned a satellite city of 100,000 people. Undoubtedly quite a lot of research has been undertaken into the proposition of satellite cities in Australia. Mr. Graham has not just dreamt this up for our State, although he obviously has trouble deciding where the satellite city should be built. As Mr. MacKinnon has pointed out, there is no country town in Western Australia which has not been promised this at one stage or other.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: That is not quite right.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I am sorry, Carnarvon has not been considered. Much research has taken place as to how much it will cost to develop a city of 100,000 people. Mr. Lansden submitted a paper on this subject to the ANZUS Conference and he gave some interesting figures. He said that if a Government were willing to invest \$11,000,000 in the first year of the project and increase this to \$60,000,000 by the sixth year, in 10 to 15 years the city would be making a profit. When one considers the amount of money

necessary in most Government projects in large capital cities, this outlay is small in comparison.

New South Wales has proved that if it could develop five of these cities of 100,000 people it would save \$120,000,000.

I am not sure what work has been undertaken in Western Australia on this proposition. I have not seen any figures such as these quoted for New South Wales. I nevertheless feel that the time is opportune for such a study to be made. We have towns such as Albany, Bunbury, Geraldton, Esperance, and even the inland town of Katanning, which desire to increase in size. However, these towns are receiving little help in the way of decentralisation. I did think we were doing something in this State, but when I read what is taking place in New South Wales I realise we have a long way to go.

I do not think it would be unreasonable to report some of the action which is taking place in regard to decentralisation in that State. I would like to quote from a speech made at the National Development Conference in Canberra in August, 1971, by The Hon. J. B. Fuller, M.L.C., Minister for Decentralisation and Development in New South Wales. He said—

Government aid is mostly provided from the Country Industries Assistance Fund administered by my Department and embraces:

Finance on a reasonably long-term basis at concessional rates of interest for the purchase of land and erection of factory premises.

The interesting thing here is that the finance is available at concessional rates of interest. To continue—

In most country areas of the State the Government provides 60 per cent. of the finance required and invites local councils to participate by providing 30 per cent. with the applicant industry providing 10 per cent.

In certain cases the applicant industry does not have to provide even the 10 per cent. Other assistance is as follows:—

Housing for key employees of country-based industries,

Rail freight subsidies,

Training of labour.

The training of labour subsidy is usually confined to \$50 for each employee. Nevertheless, it is considered to be quite a help.

There is also a technical advice subsidy by which the Government pays up to 75 per cent. of the cost of technical consultants to permit country manufacturers to keep abreast of technical developments and improve efficiency.

Another provision is a removal costs subsidy whereby part or whole of the cost of moving is paid for plant, machinery, and the personal effects of key employees from the metropolitan area to a country location. The final provision is as follows:—

As from July 1, 1970, country manufacturers registered with my Department as eligible to participate have been accorded a preference margin of five per cent. for Government tendering.

We have a similar provision here when decentralised industries are tendering for jobs for Government departments.

I have listed these various provisions because I feel it is pertinent to compare the work accomplished on this project in New South Wales with what we are doing here. The Minister for Development and Decentralisation refers to the need for abattoirs and the fact that the State Government is willing to give a guarantee for the establishment of an abattoir at Esperance.

As this is in my electorate and in my home town perhaps I have a better idea of what the Government is willing to do and what it is doing. Firstly, we find that the Government has only stated its intention—there is nothing definite; it has not actually given a guarantee—to provide \$1,300,000 out of the total cost of the project of \$3,400,000; and that is not a very high percentage. We find that the farmers are required to raise \$600,000 amongst themselves, and that a further \$300,000 must be raised which can come from those who are not farmers but are in the trade.

The Shire of Esperance indicated that it wished to help with the project, but it found that the guarantee does not apply to any money contributed by the shire. This is in complete contrast to what happens in New South Wales, where country shires are invited to participate.

A block of land in Esperance has been set aside for the abattoir. The area of the land is under 400 acres, which is hardly sufficient once large numbers of stock are congregated in a sandy region such as this. I could understand that, in the metropolitan area where land which may be subdivided for factories has considerable value, perhaps an abattoir could be established on a smaller area. But this should certainly not occur in an area such as Esperance, where land is worth probably only \$50 an acre.

The Government has not done very much to find more land for the project. The particular site is 11 miles from Esperance, and the water is in Esperance. The committee investigating the project, which has now been formed into a company, is faced with the problem of having a site

10 miles from water. Several deputations have been sent to Perth, but all that has been ascertained is that it will cost \$250,000 to get water from the town to the site. However, the Government has not offered financial help to get the water to the site.

In Esperance electricity for industrial purposes costs 25 per cent. more than it does in other country areas, let alone Perth. The Government has not come forward with an offer of railway facilities, either. The fact of the matter is that literally the Department of Development and Decentralisation has done very little. The committee has been forced to work completely on its own. It has presented deputations to the Department of Development and Decentralisation and other departments, too. One would think that the Department of Development and Decentralisation would be trying to co-ordinate this project especially if, as the Government claims, it will solve the abattoir situation and help with employment.

However, we find the company cannot go ahead because it cannot get anywhere with the Government departments. I think if one considers the way New South Wales handles these matters one would certainly think that the Government should do something about getting water to the site at a cost similar to that which will apply to the project currently under consideration in Perth. One would think that there would be an offer of connection to the railway. I think some 24 chains of siding are required, which is not a vast amount. One would also think that some freight concessions would be offered.

With regard to housing I have already mentioned that New South Wales quoted key staff. Admittedly I think the S.E.C. would provide some assistance for the workers, but there is still the problem of the key staff who require a different standard of housing.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You mean the S.H.C. and not the S.E.C.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Yes, I am sorry. I think the shire should be able to participate in such a project. I am sure everyone is well aware of the financial position of the farmers in Esperance. To get this project under way each farmer will have to find \$2,000-odd. It is very difficult for farmers on conditional purchase land, who started off farming with as little as \$2,000 and who are facing fairly hard times, to find \$2,000. The shire is willing to do this through its rating and to lend money to the farmers, yet there seems to be no way in which this can be done. I think it is up to the Government to hop into this problem and to do something to help the company overcome its problems.

The next subject to which I wish to refer is similar to the matter of decentralisation. Members will realise that I

have asked a number of questions on rural reconstruction and its effect on the town of Ravensthorpe. I have done so because the Minister announced at a meeting in Ravensthorpe that some 80 per cent. of the applications for rural reconstruction from that district have been rejected. The average of the whole State is about 60 per cent.; so if we take away the Ravensthorpe factor from the State figures we find there is a difference of 30 per cent. Therefore, something must be definitely wrong with the applications from this area. It is about time the Government decided what it will do with towns such as this. The Government must decide whether it is going to have Ravensthorpe or whether it is not going to have Ravensthorpe. At present there is a lack of policy in regard to such matters, and the people in the town do not know what is to happen or what is their future.

This is not something which has just occurred. Members have heard me quote on previous occasions the preparation leading up to the introduction of rural reconstruction. In this regard I quote the Bureau of Agricultural Economics report entitled "The Immediate and Longer Term Needs for Debt Reconstruction and Farm Adjustment with Special Reference to the Sheep Industry." I think this report is significant because it was presented in February, 1971—a date we have heard mentioned often in the debate today because the last State General election was held on that day. I point out that the report was based on the assumption that the price of wool would remain at 40c, and would not change.

So whilst perhaps the Government may consider that because the price of wool has risen there is no need to act, this report was actually based on the assumption that the price would remain at 40c, without having regard for the wage rises and the differences in working hours we have experienced in the last year. I would like to quote the conclusions of this report because I feel they are relevant. I will quote the conclusions in part—

- ... providing some improvement in wool prices eventuates, more than half the industry would be in a sound financial and economic situation.
- (ii) At least a third of the industry is facing significant economic and/or financial problems.
- (iii) Many wool producers, particularly in Queensland and Western Australia, have already reached, or are close to, insolvency.

Those conclusions are quite definite. The report was presented with an attachment which was prepared by the Western Australian Department of Agriculture.

Part of this is an appendix and it details exactly the situation that will occur in these new land areas. Once again I quote from page 71 of this report, as follows:—

Analysis of those solely dependent on their new farm (Group 1) shows that 59 per cent. are in a hopeless financial position. There is no way of determining just how long these people will 'hang on'. It will probably be another year or so before the majority of them realise the inevitability of their failure. Most of the remaining new land farmers in this group are in a doubtful position. Generous Government assistance of various forms is the only hope for the majority of these.

The report goes on to list the various shires and the percentages of those it is considered will be able to survive. This was when election promises were being made in February, 1971. Since then the Government has had plenty of time to investigate this problem.

In fact, the report goes into a great deal of detail and I think perhaps I could quote a little more of it to the House. It highlights the particular difficulties that farmers experience. It gives a summary of the indebtedness of new land farmers, compared with the indebtedness of the established farmers. With hire purchase payments, the new land farmer has an average debt of \$3,000 or 17 per cent. of his total debts, whereas the established farmer borrows only half that amount of money which represents only seven per cent. of his total debts. In fact, the established farmer is able to borrow 50 per cent. of his total borrowings from other than the pastoral firms, the Development Bank, the trading banks, and the hire purchase companies. In other words, these farmers are able to get long-term finance; whereas, in fact, the new land farmer is able to borrow only 18 per cent. of his total debt in this way.

This highlights the need for the granting of hire purchase loans to alleviate their situation. This is a field which perhaps the State Government could have entered, but it has made no attempt to do this, despite the fact that the Rural and Industries Trading Bank and its savings bank could have been used for this purpose. This report also points to the difficulties of establishing wheat quotas and states that development quotas should be granted. This is a field that could be investigated by the State Government. The report goes on to deal with farm amalgamation, and it also refers to the factor of the cost of land to the new land farmer. This applies also to holders of C.P. land.

The Farmers' Union has made representation to the State Government for a reduction in the base cost of land under

conditional purchase agreement. This is of significance, because when farmers are investigated for the purpose of rural reconstruction, their debt position is investigated, including the cost of the land. In the Ravensthorpe area, because the soil is not very good, most of the farmers hold 3,000 or 4,000 acres, and as the land costs \$2 or more an acre, automatically a debt of \$8,000 on the farm is created. This is a Government debt and one which the Government could alleviate.

In the same way the Government could do something to assist those holders of C.P. land who do not pay their instalments on time. I draw attention to all these factors because they represent areas in which the State Government could constructively help the rural situation other than relying entirely on assisting farmers from funds set up under the rural reconstruction board, and which have been drawn from a Commonwealth grant. The State claims it has provided carry-on finance up to \$2,000, but the interesting factor is that despite the two years' drought and the floods in the Ravensthorpe-Gnowangerup area, the money that was lent by the State Government has been paid in full, except for \$20,000.

This is rather amazing. In spite of all the problems they have had to face, the farmers in that area have been able to pay off the money that has been made available by the State, and yet the State Government has stated that such funds will be made available only once. The interesting feature is that the State Government does not intend to proceed with this assistance, but it is time it did proceed to offer assistance to farmers in places such as Ravensthorpe. Conditional purchase allocations started to be made in Ravensthorpe in 1962 but, in the main, they were granted in 1966, and were still continuing to be made available in 1969. The people concerned have practically only just gone on to their farms. The argument is often advanced that these people continue to occupy the farms simply because it suits them, that the properties are just not viable, and therefore it is just too bad that the occupiers are in this position.

But all these farmers were hand picked by a Government board and their financial position was fully investigated by that board. In fact, the same economists who investigated them and set them up on their properties, subject to the amount of money they needed, are today conducting the investigation into rural reconstruction needs. Yet the statement is made, "No, they are all not viable." It would appear that the economists are starting to change their ideas. The important thing is that those who sought land under the conditional purchase scheme—those with insufficient money to purchase their own blocks—were advised to buy a block in the vicinity

of land being sold by the Esperance Land Development Company; the company which was granted large areas of land at Esperance. In other words, a ceiling was placed on the holders of C.P. land.

I think it is up to the State Government of Western Australia, after setting up this scheme, to do something positive, even if it means a reduction in some of the rural population. It should do something to help these people. It should at least give some indication of Government policy. If it is at all possible, it is vital that these people should remain on their properties, because this does concern Esperance as a whole.

They are part of a unit comprising schools, hospitals, the harbour, and the C.B.H. facilities which have been developed in Esperance, to include the development of Ravensthorpe. Those farmers also play a part in the abattoir development. One of the frightening things is that if the situation is left as it is now, the 45 per cent. of farmers who would survive without Government help would be dragged down by those who did not, because if the others are forced to walk off their properties there will not be any school buses, and the storekeeper would not have enough business to carry on. So it is vital for all farmers to carry on their activities if this is at all possible.

Moving on from Ravensthorpe, I would like to make a few comments on Esperance. I have mentioned the development of the Port of Esperance, and those who have visited the town would realise that Esperance was founded on a little bay overlooking Dempster Head. Since then we have built a land-backed wharf and carried out considerable land fill. This year, after some fairly heavy rains, we find that the whole of the area, comprising all the old part of Esperance, is completely under water. Toilets are out of action, bitumen roads have fountains coming out of them, and the water level is actually on the surface.

Houses which have been built on timber footings have pools of water underneath, and those with concrete floors are in reality floating houses. This is a matter in respect of which the Government should provide some form of assistance. The shire council has spent about \$20,000 to relieve the flooding by bulldozing drains to take the water out to sea. Unfortunately this problem is affected by the reclaimed land, and some of the area is a little more than a foot above sea level.

It seems that the occupier of every house in the affected area has a pump in his backyard to pump the water away; and the shire council has put into use fairly large pumps to take the water out to sea. Obviously there is need for something to be done. Of course, if we had the old sanitary pans still in use, the problem

would not be as great. It seems that this is one of the problems which has arisen with progress.

The flooding has been brought about largely by the development of the harbour and the filling in of the natural drainage. The Government should make available both the finance and the qualified engineers to the shire council immediately.

In speaking about Esperance, one cannot fail to mention the electricity charges. The association of ratepayers and electors has been carrying out a considerable amount of research into this question. In communication with the State Electricity Commission the association has discovered that for the consumption of 450 units of electricity in an ordinary domestic connection the price at Esperance is \$19.50, whereas the price in the other rural areas supplied by the S.E.C. is \$11.55. For 600 units the charge at Esperance is \$25.50, compared with a charge of \$13.80 for the other rural areas. In other words, the power charges at Esperance are nearly double those of the other rural areas of Western Australia.

It has been argued that as Esperance is not connected to the grid system, the S.E.C. is able to work out the cost and fix the charges accordingly; but I hardly think this is a fair approach. Perhaps the electricity supplied under the grid system is cheaper because the costs of the old installations have been paid off. If we stick to this method of pricing then all new connections will have to pay far more for electricity than those which have been connected under the old system. If the Government desires to further decentralisation, it has a means to achieve that objective by making the electricity charges uniform.

While I am dealing with the S.E.C. I should mention some other aspects of rural connections. Some members are no doubt aware that when a farming area, which has not been connected to a power supply previously, decides to join the grid system, the cost is worked out under a scheme embracing all the farmers concerned, and every one of them has to participate before the power is connected. Such a scheme might have been workable when rural finance was easier, but nowadays it has little hope of success. We see instances where schemes have been held up because two or three of the prospective consumers out of a total of 50 are not in a position to co-operate.

It seems to me that the S.E.C. should do something about such cases. This is only a question of providing a loan to enable a scheme to be proceeded with. Who knows that next year or the year after the owner of a property, who is not able to co-operate at the present time, may not obtain a rural reconstruction loan or sell his property? This problem has reached such

an acute stage that various shire councils are considering the raising of loans under their own borrowing powers, so that money will be available to lend to property owners to contribute under these electricity schemes. I would point out that the S.E.C. is able to raise loans on its own behalf. The shires realise the importance of these connections being made as early as possible, and some of them have already made decisions on this matter.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Quite a number of shires have done that.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I am aware of that. The next point I wish to raise concerns housing. The Federal Government has agreed to increase the home savings grant from the existing amount of \$500 to \$750. These grants are made to young couples under the age of 35 years, who put \$1,500 into a bank account over a period of three years for the purpose of building a home. I also realise that the Federal Government has agreed to increase the limit of eligibility for a house and land from \$17,500 to \$20,000. This has been predicted for inclusion in the forthcoming Federal Budget.

All this illustrates the point I wish to make: that is, young people on the land are not able to enjoy these benefits. Most of them are not able to put \$1,500 into a bank account, because their money is tied up in their farms. Many of the present-day farmers are not the bloated capitalists which some people would have us believe. Many of them have been granted conditional purchase blocks and are still in debt. Surely they are entitled to some help in respect of housing.

I see that Victoria is doing something to abolish the limits placed on housing loans. Last week the Minister for Housing in Western Australia made an announcement that the gross income limit of eligibility for State housing will be increased from \$60 to \$100 per week. All this is done to boost the building industry and to alleviate the housing difficulties.

I do not think that any of us is unaware of the difficulties associated with the housing of Aborigines, but I would take this opportunity to point out the conditions under which many battling farmers are living—some live at the end of tin sheds and under shocking conditions. Yet it seems that few people worry about them.

We can understand why the banks do not lend them money for housing. The banks would sooner see the money being channelled into some earning capacity. If we analyse the reasons why farmers, particularly new land farmers, have got into financial difficulty and are in need of rural reconstruction assistance, we find that many of them have built houses without having adequate finance to do so; and they have had to enter into hire-purchase agreements and to borrow money from

stock firms for the purchase of sheep and cattle. They have been using their income without ensuring that it is in fact capital and consequently they have run out of money for day to day running expenses.

It is about time that we found some way in which financial assistance from the State Housing Commission or from other sources can be made available to farmers, because their housing needs are just as great as those of any other section of the community.

With those remarks I support the Bill.

THE HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan) [10.50 p.m.]: I rise to support the Bill. After listening to the contributions by members tonight it is apparent that the major topic has been the unemployment in Australia. I do not refer to Western Australia only because I consider myself to be an Australian and not a supporter of State rightism. An endless stream of statistics have been quoted, and all kinds of propositions made, but what we must understand is that when we have one person who earnestly desires to work and he cannot get a job, then we have unemployment. If the figure be 50,000, 100,000, or 200,000, it is only a multiple of the original one.

It would be quite incorrect to say that the cause of unemployment in this State falls squarely on the shoulders of the present Government. Signs of cracks in our economy were evident way back in 1970 and, in fact, at a number of conferences connected with the shipping industry which I attended in that year, this matter was raised most forcibly by those representing shipowners.

Let me acquaint the House with the contents of an article which appeared in *The Australian Financial Review* on the 21st December, 1970. The article reads—

The University of Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research in its December quarter issue of "The Australian Economic Review" has plunged Australia into the heart of the great world economic debate by calling for measures as comprehensive as the Premier's Plan of 1931 to avert a cost inflation crisis in Australia.

I remind the House that in 1931 through the Premier's plan Australia achieved a social contract under which workers, employers, landlords, pensioners, shareholders, farmers, and Governments—every section of the community—joined together in an equally shared effort to meet the crisis of the great depression.

I do not want to be one of those who destroy confidence in Western Australia—if that is the word to use—or, for that matter, in Australia. However, people discussing this very complex question should

keep their feet firmly on the ground and go beyond the borders of Western Australia and the Commonwealth to look at some of the problems we face.

It is undeniable that the Treasury officers who advised the Commonwealth Government in August last year failed miserably. No-one could convince me that in an election year a Government which has held the Treasury benches for some 23 years would not be trying desperately to hang on again. But the situation is out of control. Inflation continues to rise as does unemployment and only three or four months are left before the next Federal election.

Let us go back in history a little. The late Ben Chifley produced the first and only white paper in Australia on the question of full employment and from that day up until last year every succeeding Government has followed the theme of that paper in trying to maintain full employment. It is beyond a doubt that the one thing the Australian community will not accept is unemployment.

The lead for economic stability must come from the Federal Government. In the last five years we have returned almost to a *laissez-faire* economy. Business leaders in Australia are now crying out—and in many cases crying out desperately—to make their voices heard. They are indicating that the Commonwealth must give some economic plan for the future so that we do not ever again enter into this stop-go stop-go situation.

I congratulate the previous Governments on the amount of economic progress made in the boom years, but even the most optimistic of those previous Governments must have known that an economy based on constant growth must come to an end. The simplest explanation I can give is that it is like putting air into a paper bag—if one blows too hard one bursts it, and if one does not blow hard enough it goes flat. That is exactly what has happened, not only in this State, but across the length and breadth of this land.

We are now faced with other considerations and I would like members to take note of what I am about to say. It is a well-known fact that Japan has been kicked out of the American protectorate. Mr. Sato has resigned as Prime Minister, not because he wanted to, but because it was an economic necessity. Japan is desperately seeking a peace treaty with Russia, and it will be signed. Plans are being made for a visit to China and it is known that Mr. Sato was not welcome in those two countries where he and his brother were considered to be war criminals.

What does this mean to us? If a peace treaty is successfully negotiated with the Soviet Union it means that Japan will get

what it has been after for years; that is, the development of the vast national resources of that area of Siberia known as the Pacific Maritime Province, will be jointly developed by Japan and the U.S.S.R. This in turn will mean that many of the manufactured goods will be sold in Japan again in return for the exploitation of her natural resources. It seems to me that we in this country must get rid of this malaise which has overtaken us, that the only business any good for Australia is the constant development of our natural resources. We must remember the dire consequences when the initial construction phases are completed.

Along with a number of other members in this House I become a little tired of hearing the old story of previous Governments, that next week will be better because we will sign a bigger and better iron ore agreement or an agreement for an alumina plant.

I would far rather our Agent-General, assisted by competent officers, bring into this State 1,000 small industries of an enduring nature employing 10 men each. I was alarmed to read this morning that Mr. Lynch predicted that unemployment would continue well into next year and at a higher rate in this State. Let us convert those unemployment figures into terms of human misery because that is what is involved. We are not really dealing with cold statistics and no true Australian, whether on this side of the House or on the other side, wants to see even one of our people who really wants to work not being able to do so. However, because of a number of failures by the Federal Government this is the situation we face and it is no good skirting around the problem. It requires a concerted effort by all sections of the Australian community to raise ourselves out of this downward slide. We must adjust our monetary policies to stop the money flowing into Australia day by day in the hope that the Australian dollar will increase in value. We must desperately and quickly study overseas reserves before another revaluation of sterling takes place. If this is not done our economy will be worse in the future than it is at present.

I think that given the time, the effort, and the co-operation, and provided they are told the truth, and provided also that every section of the community—I emphasise every section—is prepared to pull its weight, we can put this country back on the map. I would go as far as to say that it would be possible, although highly improbable, that with our national resources and energies we could put a fence around this country and comfortably live inside it.

A great deal has been said tonight about a number of other factors which, to my way of thinking, could have been pursued during other debates. Evidently, members

have taken the opportunity to speak during this debate on matters concerning their electorates and, of course, I do not see any reason why I should not at least have a look at some of the questions raised in an effort to clear up, or refute, what has been said.

Let us look at the situation in Collie concerning contracts, and about which Mr. MacKinnon was speaking earlier. As far as I can ascertain—and I am at a disadvantage because I did not know that Mr. MacKinnon would speak on the subject tonight—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I will give the honourable member all the help I can.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I must say that assassination by flattery will get the honourable member nowhere with me! Returning to the subject of Collie, as far as I can ascertain the building contracts were initiated by the Labor Party. It is true that none of the contracts went to locally based builders.

I have had a look at the question of contract prices. In the case of the contract for the Mines Department it was awarded to Mr. Ietto, and the price was \$31,925. The nearest quoted price was submitted by J. Devereaux, and the figure was \$35,300. Devereaux came from Collie but the contract went to Ietto.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: If there had been a 10 per cent. preference—

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I am coming to that. Do not be like a virgin on the verge who does not know what she is likely to get.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It is hardly appropriate to refer to me in that way.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I did not think the Leader of the Opposition would take offence.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I think he would like to live his life over again.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: No, that might apply to the Leader of the House.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: On the question of the contract for the police station and quarters at Collie, it was awarded also to Ietto whose price was \$87,792. The nearest quote was \$112,940.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Despite which the people were quite adamant that they were misled by Mr. Graham.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I would not admit that for one moment. So the figures go on. The member for Collie gave me some information and he pointed out that the Collie builders were awarded sub-contracts for building the extensions. I will quote from a letter written by the member for Collie (Mr. Jones) as follows:—

Might I point out that the following Collie Builders were awarded sub-contracts for the building of the Canteen. McCamish & Sheppard, Brick

work, Blakemore & partner sewerage installations, Alan Sheppard, Plastering, R. & N. Palmer, Bitumen surfacing and R. G. Ellery & Co. supplied the concrete. Whilst it will be seen that a Collie Builder was not awarded the contract five Collie Firms were employed on the construction.

The Contract for the Police Station & Quarters was also awarded to A. Ietto & Co. . . .

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The local builders got several contracts, but not the major contract.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: The average builder these days is only a financier.

The Hon. S. T. J. Thompson: The honourable member did not read out the figures for the contracts regarding the canteen.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I will do so later.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: But surely a builder from the area should get the job. Surely it would be a simple matter to give the contracts to the local builders.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: This does not occur only at Collie. I have had a talk with the Minister for Works, and I will quote what he had to say in correspondence with the member for Collie in another place. His letter, in part, reads as follows:—

You refer to 10% preference for local builders. It appears there is a misunderstanding on this matter. A Committee was set up to investigate some form of preference to local industry. The Committee's recommendation, which was adopted by the Government, provided for local preference for supplies and services but specifically excluded building contracts. The Government recently re-affirmed the exclusion of building contracts with the proviso that, should the local labour situation warrant, then a particular case could be treated on its merits.

So the facts, as far as I can ascertain, show that there was no preference shown towards local tenders. It would be dangerous to allow a 10 per cent. advantage over other contractors.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It was published on the front page of the Collie paper and credited to Mr. Graham.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I condemned newspaper reports long before I came to this place. I would say that when we read something in our favour we quote it, but when we do not agree with what is printed then the paper becomes some kind of villain. I have noticed that trend, year in and year out, and I suppose it will go on for ever more.

While speaking on the question of decentralisation, of course, we in our party consider that although we have a Minister for Decentralisation this is a problem for the Federal Government.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You do?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: We do, and the honourable member knows very well it is so.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You consider that everything is a problem for the Federal Government.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Not if the Federal Government gave us back the right to collect taxes.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I would like to hear the honourable member on that subject.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The honourable member might hear me one day. We are committed by the Federal Government to establish X number of new cities in future years. The areas are defined and can be found by reading our publications. In X number of years more cities will be under-way.

I do not know that the State, under any Government, would be able to generate enough finance from its limited areas to set up a comprehensive plan of decentralisation. This is desperately needed in Australia. I can provide Mr. Wordsworth with a book written by one of my friends on urban redevelopment in Australia.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: We suggest that the \$400,000,000 should be put into it.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: What \$400,000,000?

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: The money involved in the railway plan.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I think that is a long-range programme.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I have never been inspired by these artificially produced projects, such as new cities.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Whether we like it or not we have to come to the inescapable conclusion that we will either strangle in our cities or create new ones. I think Queensland has an advantage over the other States because it has a number of large towns.

The strength of the British Isles and America lies in the fact that the majority of the industries are centred in small communities, despite what we hear about developing bigger areas.

May I answer one or two points raised by Mr. Withers regarding the increase in freights to the north-west. I agree it would be desirable to reduce freights and it would be desirable if our primary producers in Australia had the facility of a Government-owned and subsidised shipping line to carry their goods overseas. It might stagger some people to know that

nearly every country in the world subsidises its own overseas shipping to allow its primary products to reach the market at competitive prices.

I know the increase of \$5 a ton is a burden to the north-west, but the question of freights has always been a burden to the north-west. I have long been a supporter of not subsidising freights, but subsidising people. Mr. Withers has been in the north-west long enough to know the position which existed even when freights were much more heavily subsidised than they are today. When a bottle of beer cost 2s. in Perth, it staggered me to know it cost 4s. in Port Hedland, and the further north one went the dearer it became. The calculation of the freight rate on a bottle of beer was one penny, and the same applied to a bottle of whisky of the same size. However, by the time the hard spirit had reached the hotel in Wyndham it was certainly a very dear commodity.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You expressed your views on the State Shipping Service during the speech you made on the Address-in-Reply last year. That was a very good speech and I think you should carry on in the same vein as then.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I agree there is a great need to upgrade transportation systems to the north-west. In fact there is a need to upgrade the transport system in the whole of the Commonwealth, because people interested in transport economics tell us that the bad road, rail, and transport system in our country adds one-third onto the cost of goods. Perhaps we will see some improvement in the State Shipping Service in the not-too-distant future if much faster and much more efficient ships are put on the run.

Let us face facts. When overseas freight rates are to be raised—the freight on wool, for instance—the conference lines do not go along and parley with the farmers. The freight rate simply goes up. Of course, the sad story of containerisation is still to be told when talking of freights. Very many container companies in the world are battling to earn a living and the person who is carrying them is the man behind the plough.

I sympathise with Mr. Withers, but I think it would have been a much better proposition had the previous Government acted more quickly in providing the money and the means to put the LASH type vessels on the run. Had that been done people in the north-west would have had not only a better and more frequent service, but a much cheaper one. I am reliably informed that two ships on the State Shipping Service lose \$80,000 a trip. Both those ships carry passengers. On the basis of 12 trips a year this loss is quite considerable. As I said in my first speech in the House, the accumulated loss to the State Shipping Service was \$32,000,000.

Let me conclude on the point that the question is not high freight rates. The question is subsidy of the people in the north-west by direct means, by taxation relief, and by the provision of power and facilities at a sensible rate. Certainly provisions such as these would make life in the north-west a little less difficult to bear. I went to the north-west 25 years ago and my thoughts on the matter were the same then as they are now.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You are referring to subsidies, in effect, but when you look at the overall income from the north and also the commitments of Government expenditure in that area, would you agree that, in effect, the people in the north are subsidising the rest of the State?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Why not go further and say they have been subsidising the whole of Australia?

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I cannot say on that, but they are working towards it.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Let us not go off on tangents. The problems in the north can be solved by more frequent and more efficient transport systems and by action in connection with other matters which I have outlined. Surely the Commonwealth Government must look at this.

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

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The Commonwealth Government is the taxing authority and has the money. This is the place in which it should be spent.

Before I conclude, I would like to refer to one other document which I have with me. I think that Mr. White, by way of interjection, suggested that the work force has grown considerably. He can correct me if I am wrong, but I understood him to refer to take-home pay and matters of this nature. The figures I have only go to 1970, because they are hard to collate. However they reveal that at that date—the 21st December, 1970—danger signs were starting to glow and glimmer in this country. Despite what we are told about high wages and the rest, in the years 1955-56 to 1959-60, the percentage paid in wages from the gross national product was 63.2 per cent., but in 1960-61 to 1964-65 it had fallen to 61.9 per cent. Again, in the period from 1965 to 1969-70 it had fallen to 61.8 per cent. For the period 1969-70—the last one for which I have figures—it had fallen to 61.7 per cent.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The point you are making is increased productivity.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: No. I am quoting the take-home pay from the gross national product in those years. I should like to mention the work-force percentages in the same years. In the first years I quoted,

1955-56 to 1959-60, those classified as employees receiving salaries and wages comprised 89.6 per cent.; in 1960-65, it was 90.2 per cent. Members will see that the work force was steadily growing. In 1965-70 it was 90.8 per cent., and in 1969-70 it had risen to 91 per cent. I also wish to give the average annual increases in earnings for those years. In 1955-60, it was 5.1 per cent. It fell alarmingly in 1960-65 to 4.5 per cent. It went up the following year to 6.6 per cent. and settled down at 8.9 per cent.

There are no easy answers, but one answer certainly comes out of this: despite our increased productivity and increased gross national product, in fact the labour force in the year 1970 received less of the gross national product than in the first years I have quoted. It is not true to say that any State in the Commonwealth—whether it is Sir Robin Askin's Government, Don Dunstan's Government, or John Tonkin's Government—is responsible for unemployment today. To make that statement is fallacious and dishonest, because every economist theoretician in Australia and any responsible businessman will tell us that the whole problem has been caused by the inability of Treasury officials to forecast accurately what would happen when they dampened demand and at the same time did not have enough initiative to look further afield to what was happening overseas.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are flogging a dead horse.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: We are a nation of 12,000,000 people who depend on export markets for the well being of our development. I suggest that unless these matters are properly researched by those responsible for the economic well being of this country this will occur time and time again. In fact, with two or three months to an election and unemployment and inflation still rising, I am not sure that we have not passed the point of no return. I support the Bill.

THE HON. J. L. HUNT (North) [11.19 p.m.]: In rising to speak to the Bill there seems little further to say which has not been mentioned tonight. One of the subjects which has come up again and again is unemployment.

This is something of a problem in the north, although not to the same extent as in the city. However, there is unemployment in the north country and from my observations when travelling around my electorate I have found that 80 per cent. or more of people who are unemployed in the area come from overseas or from other States. During the construction projects in the north over the last four or five years the work force was up to 6,000 or 7,000 people, the great majority of whom came from other States or from overseas.

Some came from the islands in the north and I refer, in particular, to Thursday Islanders who came to work on the railway lines. Most of those people have gone back. I think we should consider the unemployment situation in regard to the whole of Australia and not in regard to individual States.

It has been impossible to continue the development that has been going on in the north country over the last five or six years. There has been a huge influx of workers into the area. When the work is finished, where do they go? Some of them have gone back to other States. Some of them have remained in the area. The majority of them have come to the metropolitan area. The majority of the unemployed in Western Australia are people who have become redundant in the iron ore projects in the north.

I think it would be fair to consider unemployment throughout the whole of Australia rather than say we are in a worse position than South Australia, that Queensland is better off than South Australia, and so on. It is a problem, and the sooner the country as a whole gets down to tackling it the better off we will be.

Mr. Ferry, who is not here at the moment, gave an elaborate speech about the Aboriginal embassy in Parliament House grounds. He read cuttings from newspapers, and so on. Personally, I have the greatest admiration for those people, about whom I have spoken in this House on a couple of previous occasions. Their main problem now is housing; that is all they want.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: That is their only problem, is it?

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: It is their biggest problem. They maintain that they require \$10,000,000 for housing. I think their demands are quite within reason.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Mr. Winder says \$30,000,000.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: These people are claiming \$10,000,000. As Mr. Wordsworth said a moment ago, where there is smoke there is fire. There is no doubt that they will not receive anywhere near \$10,000,000 under the Budget. It seems rather ironical that when the first settlers arrived in this State and came up the Swan River the Aborigines were observed camped on the banks of the river; 140 years later they are camped a little further up the creek on the site of Parliament House. In that time they have progressed about 200 yards up the slope. I think it is disgraceful that a situation like that should exist in this country.

In the paper the other day we were told the Government would purchase three new destroyers at a cost of about \$300,000,000. It will also purchase new trainer planes

from New Zealand. Incidentally, that project was commenced in Australia a few years ago by the Victa company. The Government at the time did not see any merit in that aeroplane, and the project was taken over by New Zealand. It is now being bought by Australia as a training machine for the Air Force at a cost of many millions of dollars. Those two programmes alone will run into about \$400,000,000. The Aborigines want only \$10,000,000 for housing for their people.

One member spoke tonight about the formation of Select Committees on everything one can think of. Before we have a Select Committee on the education of natives we must first get them housed. I would be the last to want to see them removed from the grounds of this establishment at the moment. I have the greatest confidence in these people. They say they will leave the area when the Budget is brought down, and I do not think they will go back on their word. I think they will have made their point by that time. I think the embassy will have gone by the end of the month, without all the fuss, bother, and unpleasantness that occurred in Canberra recently.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Would you allow other groups to camp there, too?

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: This situation has been continuing for a long time and, as Mr. Ron Thompson said, endeavours have been made to bring it under control. To my mind it is under control. When this situation is finalised in the middle of this month, the bylaws will be put into operation and there will be no more bother.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Shutting the gate after the horse has bolted.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: If we were to turn these people away, we would have a repetition of what occurred in Canberra. If that is the honourable member's idea of what should happen, I do not go along with it.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: It is not my idea for a moment.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: We will see what these people will receive from the Government when the Budget is brought down. The matter will come to a much more pleasant conclusion than it would reach if they were forcibly removed from the area.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: There is nothing in the Budget. No-one will know whether or not they are there. No-one knows they are there now.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: I will have a shade of odds they will be gone after the 15th August.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: There is nothing in the Budget.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: They have had nothing over the last 200 years.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: The Minister for Community Welfare would not agree with you.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Which Budget are you talking about now? You had better confine yourself to matters you understand. Ten million dollars comes out of the Commonwealth fund already, plus \$2,500,000 direct from this State for me to spend. Let us keep our feet on the ground in this issue. That is expenditure on Aboriginal people.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: Very little of that will be used for housing for the people. I imagine \$10,000,000 would house only the people in the metropolitan area; it would not also house those in the north country.

Until recently, natives in the north were living under the same conditions as those in which they lived 5,000 years ago. They had no accommodation whatsoever. If we had \$10,000,000 to spend on native welfare or community welfare it would not go very far towards what is needed.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: The vote for community welfare in this State alone will be \$16,000,000.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: I hope it continues to increase because it is certainly required in order to help these people.

Mention has been made of freights in the north. It has been said that the State Shipping Service has become a burden, but I do not think that is the fault of this Government or of the previous Government. It was unfortunate that large ships were unable to use the harbours in the north prior to the development of the harbours, particularly in the Pilbara area. A few years ago, ships of only 2,000 or 3,000 tons were able to use the ports on favourable tides. With the deepening of the harbours following the advent of mining, larger ships have been able to use the ports. With the resultant greater tonnages, I think freights in the north should not be increased. Despite increases in costs and wages, the larger ships should make it possible to keep freights steady with no further increases.

It has been unfortunate that over the years costs have gone up with the increase in population. More goods were needed in the north and the smaller ships were unable to transport them. The deepening of the harbours enabled the Government to purchase larger ships. If all goes well, when the additional ships go on the run in the near future there should be no further increase in shipping freights in the north.

Road costs have increased a great deal in the last three or four years. It was expensive getting goods to the north over the bad roads. Upkeep and maintenance on the vehicles was very high. However, I expect

that road transport will remain fairly static with the completion of the all-weather roads in the north.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You are referring to costs remaining static and not the amount of traffic?

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: I was referring to the costs. I do not see that a big influx of material will be needed in the north in the foreseeable future unless there is further development in mining or steel production. The costs should at least remain static, even if they are not reduced, with the completion of the all-weather roads.

Some mention has been made of the inland road from Meekatharra to the north. This is quite an important road and I hope the present Government gives consideration to its further sealing. The road passes through Mt. Newman which has a fairly large population and also through Nullagine and Marble Bar. It is debatable whether the road will go from there or the Hamersleys and White Springs. I would like to see this Government spend more money to facilitate the cheaper transport of goods to the inland areas, particularly after the completion of the coastal road.

The mineral field to the east of the Hamersley Range is very important in the north. It is more important than the fields on the coast. I would like to see the inland road bituminised as money becomes available. This will facilitate cheaper transport to the area.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Not all the mineral deposits are inland.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: Not many mineral deposits are on the coast.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Mitchell Plateau has a fair amount of bauxite.

The Hon. J. L. HUNT: I am discussing the road from Meekatharra to Port Hedland. The Mitchell Plateau deposits are in a different area altogether. Roads into the Kimberleys become very expensive. This is particularly heavy terrain from Kununurra to Derby and Mitchell Plateau; it is some of the roughest country in the world. However, when the Mitchell Plateau project gets under way I should imagine that roads will be required in the area. This will be a major development and we hope the Government of the day will be able to assist the project.

THE HON. S. T. J. THOMPSON (Lower Central) [11.34 p.m.]: I did not intend to speak on this debate. However, I feel as a member of the board which is now controlling the grounds of Parliament House, I must refute the remarks that members of the board were influenced by Press statements.

I am representing my party on this board. I discussed this matter at a meeting of the party. My party endorsed the decision I had made and the board in its wisdom, at a meeting last Tuesday night, decided that we should present the members of the "embassy" with a copy of our by-laws. At some future meeting we will decide on what further action will be taken. These are the simple straightforward facts and I refute the statement that I was influenced by an outside source.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What was the decision the board made?

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: The decision made by the board was that the occupants—and I think Mr. Jack Davis was named—would be presented with a copy of the by-laws we had adopted and which had been gazetted. This copy of the by-laws was presented to the occupants that night.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What brought about the situation? I am not talking about the tent but how can anyone erect something on the grounds of Parliament House and not have to remove it straight away?

The Hon. R. Thompson: Where did the date, the 15th August come from?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: How does that come into it?

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: That is the date of the Federal Budget.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Why did it come into it?

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: No-one said our next meeting was to be the 15th August or any other date.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You are a member of the board.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: Yes, I am a member of the board.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What was the decision?

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: I have already told the House: The people in the tent were to be presented with a copy of the by-laws. At our next meeting we will make a decision as to what is to be done.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Would I be safe in saying that your next meeting will be after the 15th August?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The next meeting of the House Committee is the 16th August. However, that is not a meeting of the Parliamentary Reserves Board.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: I am refuting that I was influenced by any other opinion.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The board must have been influenced by someone. Apparently the tent is not to be moved until after the Federal Budget.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The board is made up of representatives from all parties.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: I would say the board used its common sense in coming to this decision.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What was the decision it came to?

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Are all parties represented on the board?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You say that the board came to a common-sense decision. If you are a member of the board, you will know what the decision was.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: I will tell the Leader of the Opposition what the decision was.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Can you tell us what it was if it was a common-sense decision?

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: The decision was to present the occupants of the "embassy" with a copy of our by-laws so that they know they are infringing the by-laws. At our next meeting we will decide whether to take further action or not.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I'll bet you are not going to.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: The Leader of the opposition may bet any way he likes.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Somebody used the expression "duck shoving."

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: I would use the expression "chasing publicity."

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I did not use that.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: I will come out into the open on this matter. The tent was put up for one purpose—to gain publicity. It has not achieved a great deal of publicity but it may if somebody tries to pull it down. This would then give the occupants a lot of cheap publicity.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I suppose if the Ku Klux Klan put up a tent tomorrow morning you would give the occupants a copy of the by-laws?

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: No, the position is entirely different.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You must admit that the people of Western Australia said the decision was a sensible one.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: We had no by-laws at the time the tent was put up. We now have by-laws.

I next wish to mention an omission on the part of Mr. Dans. The honourable member said he had not been supplied with some figures. The third tender in respect of Collie was for the high school canteen.

The figures were very interesting, and I quote the following:—

A. Ietto, Shire Crescent, Brunswick—\$17,282.

J. & N. Corradetti, Hutton Street, Colliie—\$17,710.

Well within the limits of the percentage.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I thought I got it across to you that there was no percentage.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: There are many things upon which I could speak, but at this late hour I will not go through them all.

THE HON. G. W. BERRY (Lower North) [11.40 p.m.]: I rise to support the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: For a moment I thought you were going to adjourn the debate.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Don't spoil a good thing.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: I intend to speak about a few matters, and I will be as brief as I can, considering the lateness of the hour.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: The first will be the Gascoyne River.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: As a matter of fact I intend to mention that. First of all I will quote a question I asked on Thursday, the 11th May, 1972, which is as follows:—

As the feasibility study of damming the Gascoyne River at Rocky Pool is unfavourable, has the Government any plans or work in hand to meet the fast developing water crisis in the Carnarvon area?

The Leader of the House replied:—

In conjunction with the feasibility study carried out by Sir Alexander Gibb and Partners the Public Works Department, during the past three years, has carried out an extensive investigation of the underground water potential of the Gascoyne River Delta.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Would the honourable member speak a little louder. It is difficult for *Hansard* to hear.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: Bellow like a bull.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: I will do that, Sir. To continue—

These investigations have indicated that there are further useful quantities of groundwater yet to be developed. Proposals for the development of these resources are at present being formulated. While these investigations have been proceeding the Department has been progressively developing and extending the irrigation supply scheme.

The works currently in hand when completed within the next few months will allow the scheme to supplement supplies to 50% of the plantations and to supply 50% of the current town water supply needs.

Of course, that does not mean very much in terms of stability, especially in the situation facing the area of Carnarvon. On Tuesday, the 1st August, I asked the following question:—

What, in order of priority, were the factors in the feasibility study by Alexander Gibb & Partners that influenced the Government in their decision not to proceed with the damming of the Gascoyne River at Rocky Pool?

The answer I received was—

The factors which influenced the decision not to proceed with the construction of a dam at Rocky Pool were the high cost of the dam for a small yield of water. The estimated cost of the dam was between \$14 million and \$19 million for an additional yield of 7,000 acre feet over a critical drought period.

We already knew that it would not be possible to store much water at Rocky Pool. I believe a considerable amount of the cost of \$14,000,000 to \$19,000,000 quoted by Alexander Gibb & Partners would be made available by the Commonwealth Government, which has set aside some millions of dollars for approved water conservation schemes throughout the Commonwealth.

As members are aware, I spoke about the situation of the Gascoyne River on the 18th March, 1972, during the Address-in-Reply debate. On that occasion I was most concerned because the river had not flowed. I was rightly concerned because restrictions were imposed in the area. In fact, the river did not flow until July, something which is almost unprecedented in its history. I think this is the first time in about 70 years that the river has flowed in July. During the Address-in-Reply debate I spoke at length on the serious situation which was developing, and I expressed my concern about what would happen if the feasibility study was unfavourable. At the time I mentioned the matter of using unconventional means to create water storage; namely, atomic energy. I now come back to this again.

I do not consider the cost of nuclear energy to be too great. We must remember that 5,000 people live in the area, and water is a most valuable commodity which we allow to flow into the sea year after year. I feel it will be criminal neglect if we do not do something about retaining the water, and thereby retaining the productivity of the area and keeping the people in Carnarvon.

On page 47 of the current *Hansard* there appears portion of an article which appeared in the *Northern Times* of Thursday, the 9th March, 1972, which I quoted in the Address-in-Reply. In part, it reads as follows:—

The Premier's department had advised council that the time had not been reached when the government could seriously consider using nuclear explosives to create a water storage at Carnarvon.

I think the time has now come for some serious investigation to be conducted. I refer now to a publication entitled *Science and Technology*, of March, 1972. In an article headed, "Nuclear Explosion Economics and Gas Storage," a diagram appears showing the peaceful use of a nuclear explosion to create a gas rubble chimney. In part, the article states—

Relevance to Australia

In many places in Australia where major works might be contemplated, the population density is extremely low and safety considerations would not, in general, prevent the use of nuclear explosives, or render projects uneconomic because of the cost of ground motion or air blast damage.

Australia is a relatively dry country, and many areas have water supply problems. In the northern part of the country most rivers only flow seasonally during the summer monsoon period, and nuclear explosives may have application for the formation of deep craters, rubble chimneys or dams for water conservation.

I now appeal to the Government to start looking at some means whereby we may use nuclear energy to form either deep craters, rubble chimneys, or dams for water conservation to stabilise the supply of water in the Carnarvon area. Although the river flowed in July of this year, the situation is serious because when summer commences the position will deteriorate very rapidly. The flow was only small and will virtually only tide us over the winter months. We are fortunate in that rain has fallen, but it has been only local rain and has not contributed greatly to the storage in the sands of the river.

I ask the Government seriously to consider this problem because sooner or later the situation of which I have been speaking year after year will arise; that is, the river will not flow for a full year. Although the Public Works Department is investigating the position and proposals have been put forward for the development of underground water resources, no-one knows how much water is there because very little work has been done on this over the years. Therefore, we must do something more than simply tap the storage sands of the river.

That will certainly supplement the supply, but I cannot envisage that the draw on supplies necessary to keep the town of Carnarvon in existence will be able to be maintained. I appeal to the Government to use its influence and to approach some of the people with the necessary know-how who may be able to give us some information in regard to the future use of nuclear energy. When I spoke last March I inquired whether anyone had spoken to Commander Koch who had been stationed in Western Australia and who was in charge of nuclear energy operations. I suggested that this gentleman should be contacted as a commencement to see what might be offering in this particular field. I understand Sir Phillip Baxter at a conference made the statement that with new methods it is quite feasible to use atomic energy for blasting purposes in order to create catchments in which water can be stored. I am very pleased that this gentleman now appears to favour the use of this method to create water storage in the arid areas of Australia.

Another matter I wish to bring to the notice of the House relates to the houses to be constructed by the Government Employees' Housing Authority in the Carnarvon area. I assume that this is the same type of house that will be constructed throughout all the areas in the north. I refer particularly to one part of this type of house; namely, the garage. The architects have designed a new type of garage which costs an extra \$500 over and above the cost of the previous type of garage that was built to house a motorcar. I am neither a builder nor an architect, but on the advice of the builder who is tendering for these houses his words to me were, "Why can't you do something about altering the design of these garages so that they can be built at a reasonable figure, because at the moment money is being wasted on the present design? The garage requires a concrete floor six inches thick."

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: What housing authority is this?

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: It is the Government Employees' Housing Authority, generally known as the G.E.H.A. On present costs, it means that four garages will cost a total of \$2,000, and I fail to see the necessity for this. If this is the design that has been set for all the houses built by G.E.H.A. in the northern areas, it is certainly not being put to good use for the erection of garages such as this which are not necessary in those areas.

Another matter I wish to raise is the estimated annual values which are used to determine the rating structure in local authority areas. I refer particularly to country sewerage schemes and country water schemes. In the Carnarvon area recently a revaluation was carried out. I

do not know how this came about. Probably it was because the Public Works Department, or some other department, sought a revaluation in the Carnarvon area following a valuation that was to be made of the blocks in the new townships of Karratha and Mt. Tom Price. The officers apparently carried out a revaluation of the Carnarvon area on the way through.

As a result of this revaluation, sewerage rates particularly, will rise considerably. When blocks were purchased in the new Morgantown scheme, the area had been subdivided by the Carnarvon Shire and it was estimated that the sewerage rates for those blocks would be approximately \$50. I might mention that after the revaluation the sewerage rates in some cases will rise to \$117, and the water rates will be increased from \$31 to \$45. The rates for some blocks in the new Morgantown area will increase to about \$250; that is, for shire, country sewerage, and country water.

In my opinion, these rating charges are getting out of hand, and I think the situation has now been reached when it is necessary that a Royal Commission be appointed to investigate the system of annual rental values. I cannot see why a flat rate cannot be struck for both water rates and sewerage rates. The figure could be averaged over an x-number of years. I cannot understand why an average rate cannot be struck for those areas that are served by sewerage. It is certainly time the Government had a look at some of these country sewerage schemes, because soon we will find they will be too expensive to operate and the Government will have to close them down.

I now wish to refer to road maintenance tax and permit fees and their relation to the losses that are incurred by the Perth Metropolitan (Passenger) Transport Trust. The collections made in the field of road maintenance tax continue to rise though not proportionately with the losses that are made by the M.T.T. Unfortunately, the losses incurred by the M.T.T. are rising at a much more alarming rate than the collections made under the road maintenance tax legislation. I believe that in those areas in the north which are not served by rail or ship and which require their provisions to be carried by road are being inequitably penalised when the charges they are paying are related to the cost of subsidising the losses incurred by the Metropolitan Transport Trust in the metropolitan area.

If the Government intends to continue subsidising the losses that are made by the M.T.T. some review should be made of those areas in which the people are subject to the payment of road maintenance tax and permit fees.

A great fanfare of trumpets heralded the establishment of a \$4,500,000 project by the Texada Company in the Carnarvon

area. However, in my opinion there was no need for any fanfare of trumpets, because that project is the subject of an agreement that was passed by Parliament some years ago, and the company is only conforming with the conditions that were laid down under the agreement.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: It is nice to see it going, though.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: The fanfare of trumpets was quite unnecessary, because under the agreement the company was bound to honour its commitment if it wished to continue operating in the area.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: In fact, it was one of the things left in the pipeline.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: Yes, and apparently it is fast running out. I also wish to raise the question of zone allowances. There has been a great deal of talk about the holding of a Government inquiry into our taxation system. I want to bring to the notice of the Government that if and when the inquiry takes place it should prepare a case regarding zone allowances as they relate to taxation; that is, it should prepare a case in regard to the boundaries of these zones.

I will not elaborate further on that matter, because the House is already aware of the problem that exists, particularly in the remote areas of Western Australia, in regard to the taxation allowances that are made in Zones "A" and "B".

Another matter I wish to mention has been raised by Mr. Willmott; and that is fruit fly eradication. This matter has been mentioned many times by the growers at Carnarvon, which unfortunately has been declared to be an infected area. Fruit fly was introduced from the southern areas of the State by the bringing in of infected fruit.

On many occasions we have made a request to the department to introduce an eradication programme, because we considered the Carnarvon area to be eminently suitable for the application of an eradication programme in view of its isolation. However, as yet we have not met with any success.

I say it is an ideal place in which to commence an eradication programme. This Government should adopt the policy which has been adopted by South Australia which does not have any Mediterranean fruit fly.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: The whole State has a buffer in the Nullabor.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: Apart from that there is the Queensland fly over east which is just as serious a pest as is the Mediterranean fly. If there is any outbreak of fruit fly in South Australia, the problem is attacked vigorously and immediately. The affected area is quarantined, the trees are stripped of the fruit which

is destroyed, and the growers are compensated. A standing fund is available in South Australia to enable immediate action to be taken on fruit fly eradication. The performance of Western Australia in the field of fruit fly prevention is something to its discredit. People cannot grow any fruit in the metropolitan area, because of the presence of fruit fly. Now that we have abandoned any semblance of fruit fly control the problem will run riot.

We have heard a great deal about the lot of economists. I would like to recite a little interlude. A statement was made by Dr. Schapper at a study conference held in Carnarvon, organised by the John Thompson Bureau of Economics in the 1960s. In his opening remarks Dr. Schapper said that he did not want people to think that everything said by the economists is right, or that all economists are infallible. He recounted the story that after the first world war the economic advisers to the Government of the U.S.A. predicted that that country would experience the greatest boom in its history. In fact it experienced the greatest downturn in its economy and a depression. After World War II the economic advisers to the American Government predicted the greatest depression, but during those years it experienced the greatest boom ever. So we should not accept what economists say as being gospel, or that they are infallible.

One other matter I wish to raise before I conclude my contribution to the debate relates to a question which I asked of the Minister for Police. This concerns pornographic literature. My question was—

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the publication *Ribald* being sold at newsagents?
- (2) Is it considered to be pornographic?
- (3) If so, are any measures being taken to have it withdrawn?

The Minister's reply was—

- (1) Yes.
- (2) This is a matter of opinion.
- (3) No.

I have three magazines which I bought at a newsagent. The first is entitled *Searchlight*, the second *Sexy*, and the third *Ribald*. I will not open them now for fear of offending some members, but with the permission of the House I will leave them on the Table of the House for members to peruse. I would like their opinions subsequently as to whether they consider these pornographic. I would like Miss Elliott in particular to look at them in her own time and at her own convenience, to see whether she considers them to be pornographic.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: We are all members of this House. Why should we not look at them as well?

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: We should. It is high time the Government started to look at the indecent literature which is being displayed.

The Hon. J. Dolan: You should come up to my office and look at some of the publications that have been brought before me.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: I did not know that such magazines existed, until they were brought to my notice. I discovered they are readily on sale at newsagents. The *Ribald* is marked "For sale strictly to adults only." Each of these publications costs 20c and is readily available. On top of the front page of *Searchlight* appears this caption, "Free intimate personal ads." On the back page under the heading of "Apology" the following appears:—

Searchlight Publications Pty. Ltd. apologises sincerely to its readers.

You can thank the former N.S.W. Chief Secretary, Mr. Eric Willis, but plans to start the "Sex Review" have had to be temporarily abandoned. We hoped that the "Sex Review" would be Australia's first truly informative newspaper tabloid dealing exclusively with sexology.

We have employed a doctor to answer medical problems of a sexual nature, which are so important to so many. We had arranged for analytical reviews of "R" certified movies and pictures. Journalists were ready to report accurately and in depth the latest developments and innovations in the ever-changing field of sex.

We believed that "sex" was not a dirty word.

We hoped to create a publication that would deal in an informative and honest manner with a subject that interests practically everybody.

However, we quickly discovered that to present such a publication would have brought the wrath of the ever-sensitive Chief Secretary's Department down on our heads.

Searchlight Publications has approached the Chief Secretary's Department on a number of occasions, asking what they consider is permissible to print. They will never give an answer, except for the buck-passing, political gobbledy-gook at which they are so adept.

Mr. Willis' last dictatorial move to abolish the jury system in trials of offences under the "Obscene and Indecent Publications Act" had us astounded.

It was then that we decided to throw in the towel . . . temporarily, anyway.

A publication such as the "Sex Review" could never hope to be free from attack under a Government which deals in fascism and stand-over tactics.

If Mr. Willis and his ilk have their way, the people of New South Wales will never read anything more daring than Grimm's Fairy Tales.

Where will your vote go next time?

The Hon. J. Dolan: I should point out that the Willis mentioned is not related to our Mr. Willesee.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: I would ask members to look at these three publications in their own time, and to consider whether or not they are pornographic. It is high time we looked into the position which appears to be getting worse.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: It appears to be worse in the other States.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: These publications come from other States.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Obviously the Chief Secretary of New South Wales has taken some action.

The Hon. G. W. BERRY: Apparently so. There is much more I can talk about in this debate, but as the hour is rather late I will conclude my remarks by indicating my support of the Bill.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. J. Dolan (Minister for Police).

TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

(No. 2)

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. J. Dolan (Minister for Police), read a first time.

House adjourned at 12.11 a.m.
(Wednesday).

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 8th August, 1972

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

HANSARD

Availability

THE SPEAKER (Mr. Norton) [4.31 p.m.]: I mention to members that *Hansard* will not be available for general distribution until tomorrow afternoon. This is due to the excessive work with which the Government Printer is faced. Should any member require a copy for a special purpose there is a limited number within the House.

HIRE-PURCHASE AND OTHER AGREEMENTS

Honorary Royal Commission: Report Presented

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier) [4.33 p.m.]: I present the report of the Honorary Royal Commission appointed to inquire into hire-purchase and other agreements.

The report was tabled.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Report

MR. HARMAN (Maylands) [4.34 p.m.]: I present to the House the fourth report of the Public Accounts Committee. I move—

That the report be received.

Question put and passed.

MR. HARMAN (Maylands) [4.35 p.m.]: I move—

That the report be printed.

By way of explanation, I would like to say that on the 15th March the Public Accounts Committee presented report No. 2. This report concerned itself with criticisms made by the Auditor-General in his report for the financial year ended the 30th June, 1971.

In accordance with a practice adopted by other Public Accounts Committees in Australia, the committee referred report No. 2 to the Treasurer for his comments. The Treasurer has returned his comments and these are now tabled as report No. 4.

Question put and passed.

The report was tabled.

QUESTIONS (50): ON NOTICE

HOUSING

1.

Electricity Meter Charge

Mr. HUTCHINSON, to the Minister for Housing:

(1) In regard to my unanswered letter to him dated 21st June, 1972 regarding the newly suggested \$10 electricity meter charge that is proposed for all State Housing Commission tenants of apartments and units, will he advise whether pensioners, people on fixed incomes and unemployed will be exempted as I have requested?

(2) Does he agree that the proposed \$10 meter charge for people who have been living a way of life under the former S.H.C. scheme is an unnecessary and harsh imposition on these people, particularly