

which is amended to an unacceptable form is not tantamount to rejection are stupid in the extreme.

Mr. Thompson: The industry did not support it.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: The industry had certain difficulties with the vested interests, and I suggest the vested interests and the contribution to party funds may have had some bearing on the matter.

Mr. Rushton: I thought you were above that level.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: In case the honourable member suggests there was no political motivation, I remind him that one meeting at Donnybrook was attended by five Liberal members. It was held under the chairmanship of a Liberal member of this House. If that is not introducing politics into the industry, I do not know what is. It was one of the most disgraceful episodes that have occurred in this House.

For them to sell the industry down the drain—and so cheaply, too—indicates their principles would not measure up even to the standard of Judas.

Sir Charles Court: Where did you learn that? You have been copying the notes of the Deputy Premier. You can do better than that.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: There are a number of other points to which I could make reference—

Mr. Hutchinson: Just imagine if we were sitting on your side and said that. Wouldn't you think it was funny?

Mr. H. D. EVANS: If that were the case probably the honourable member would have no occasion to say it.

Mr. Hutchinson: Mystic! Wonderful!

Mr. H. D. EVANS: A number of other actions have been taken by the Government, including the establishment of the Meat Industry Advisory Committee, and the setting up of a checkpoint on the Eyre Highway following investigations carried out in previous years. The checkpoint is now firmly established and is achieving considerable results.

During the few days after the Government came into office an undertaking was given that farmers who were unable to obtain carry-on finance would be assisted. It was indeed refreshing to hear the commendatory remarks made about that undertaking at the opening of the Farmers' Union conference. It meant in effect that some hundreds of farmers were able to carry on to a stage where other forms of finance became available to them.

I could list a number of other achievements, but I will satisfy myself by concluding with this comment for the benefit of the member for Dale: Rather than try

to dissect his diatribe, I refer him to page 3 of this afternoon's issue of the *Daily News*. I support the motion.

Question put and passed; the Address-in-Reply thus adopted.

House adjourned at 10.33 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 5th April, 1973

The SPEAKER (Mr. Norton) took the Chair at 11.00 a.m., and read prayers.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by Mr. I. W. Manning, leave of absence for 14 days granted to Sir David Brand (Greenough) on the ground of ill-health.

LAPSED BILLS

Restoration to Notice Paper: Motion

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier) [11.03 a.m.]: There are two Bills mentioned in the list appearing on the notice paper which I do not seek to restore. Would I be in order when reading out the list to omit those two?

The SPEAKER: That will be in order.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I move—

That under the provisions of Standing Order No. 407 the undermentioned Bills be restored to the Notice Paper at the stages which they had reached in the previous session of Parliament, namely:—

Scientology Act Repeal Bill.

Second reading. Adjourned debate.

Parliamentary Committees Bill.

Second reading. Adjourned debate.

Dairy Industry Bill.

Second reading. Adjourned debate.

Door to Door (Sales) Act Amendment Bill.

Second reading. Adjourned debate.

Companies Act Amendment Bill.

Second reading. Adjourned debate. (Mr. R. L. Young, continuation of remarks.)

City of Perth Endowment Lands Bill.

Second reading. Adjourned debate.

Education Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

Second reading. Adjourned debate.

Mining Bill.

Committee progress. Clause 8, page 6, on the motion of Sir Charles Court to delete the definition "mining privilege" in lines 7 to 13.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Leader of the Opposition) [11.05 a.m.]: We do not propose to vote against the motion, but I feel I have a responsibility to make some comment on it. We hope that this device is not used as a matter of practice. There are circumstances, such as those following the Ascot by-election, where there had been a prorogation of Parliament, when there is good and sound reason for the Government to use this procedure as laid down in the Standing Orders.

I am not questioning the legality of this practice; I am merely questioning a number of principles which I think I should bring to the notice of the Premier and to the House. Incidentally, I should explain to the Premier that I shall not be staying very long, as shortly I shall be with his deputy in another place. He is explaining to those gathered why I have to be in this Chamber for a few minutes.

The reason I want to raise an objection to this device being used as a practice in this House, except on very special occasions, is that in some cases the background to the Bills we are to consider has undergone considerable change since they were introduced. For instance the Scientology Act Repeal Bill is to be restored. Since this Bill was introduced and the views of the Government were explained, the Commonwealth Government has made a pronouncement which is of some significance not only because of its import as a statement in relation to the right to marry, but also because of its impact on the Bill itself.

We will not have any speech from the Minister by way of introduction, because the Bill has already been introduced. If the motion is passed we will find this item becoming part of the notice paper on Tuesday next, and whichever member has taken the adjournment of the debate will have the right to continue.

Mr. Hutchinson: I have already spoken in the second reading debate.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It may be that somebody other than the person who took the adjournment of the debate, in accordance with the Standing Orders, will be able to speak to it. However, we will not have the benefit of any views of the Government arising out of the changed circumstances. It may be the Premier will arrange for one of his Ministers to intervene in the debate if there are any changed circumstances or changed emphasis which the Government would like to indicate. No doubt that can be done without any great difficulty.

We then have the Bill relating to the dairying industry. There has been a tremendous amount of discussion between the components within the industry since we last met and since the Bill was introduced. I understand there have been considerable discussions between the components of the industry and the department concerned, and perhaps the Minister himself. I also understand that some far-reaching amendments, which have been agreed to or are in the process of agreement, are to be proposed. We will be debating this Bill without a knowledge of any changed attitude which the Government has to it.

I know of no particular changes in circumstances so far as the Door to Door (Sales) Act Amendment Bill is concerned, but here again there could be some.

In the field of company law there has been a very important change in emphasis. There is the fact that the Commonwealth Government has made it clear that as a matter of policy it wants a Federal Companies Act to apply, and this Act will supersede the Companies Acts of the States.

If the Commonwealth succeeds in this, and it is constitutionally proper for it to have such an Act, it could turn out that our work here would be of no avail; because if the Commonwealth has a constitutional right, as it has in the case of bankruptcy law, then any legislation we pass is superseded by the Commonwealth law where there is a conflict. For that reason the State does not use its Bankruptcy Act, though officially it has one on the Statute book, as it would be completely stupid to try to operate under the State Act in every case where there is conflict with the Federal law.

Our views on the Education Act Amendment Bill (No. 2) are known and no change of circumstance has occurred in that instance. However, a great deal of change of emphasis has occurred in respect of the Mining Bill. The Commonwealth has declared itself in respect of resource development in a way which I believe will have a very serious impact on our own mining laws, and some of the provisions of the Bill could in practice be affected by the Commonwealth's policy decisions and actions. Despite this, we will not hear anything from the Government. We will be in Committee on the Bill and will have to commence straightaway on clause 8 and deal with the measure clause by clause without having a comprehensive statement by the Minister if in fact he considers any change in emphasis has taken place.

I mention these particular Bills because I think the Premier with his experience in the House would see the merit of the argument I raise. I repeat that we do not intend to oppose the motion, but we would not like it to become the norm in the House. I also repeat that after the by-election for Ascot we accepted the procedure as being

a practical and sensible way to overcome a temporary interruption of proceedings because it would have been farcical to go through all the various stages again when no change of circumstances had occurred. On this occasion a change of circumstances has been experienced, particularly in the Federal sphere; and a drastic alteration of national policy has resulted from the change of Federal Government.

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier) [11.11 a.m.]: It is inevitable that when certain advantages are to be derived from action to be taken those advantages can be experienced only at some cost. It is one of the facts of life that if a person seeks to gain certain advantages, unless he wins them in a lottery, some cost is involved.

Let us take a simple illustration. If a person wants to be able to free-wheel on a bicycle and have a period when no effort or exertion is required, then he must expend extra effort in the first place to ride the bicycle up a hill so that he can free-wheel down the other side. In other words he attains the advantage of free-wheeling a distance by paying for it first in the exertion necessary to pedal up the hill rather than pedal along the flat ground.

That is a simple illustration from life to indicate that if a person wants to take a short cut, that short cut must be paid for somehow.

I acknowledge that what the Leader of the Opposition has said with regard to disadvantages which will flow from this procedure is true enough, but I believe that the advantages to be derived are far greater. Where would be the sense in having to start *de novo* with all those Bills and go through the second reading speeches again when they already all appear in *Hansard* and can be read? If we did not adopt this procedure we would have to use up all that time again in order to get to the stage we have reached now.

Sir Charles Court: What about the changes in circumstances?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The reason the business accumulated is that members did not desire to sit longer last session. As far as I am personally concerned I am prepared to sit until Christmas every year.

Sir Charles Court: So are we.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: It is all very well to say, "So are we", but when the suggestion is made to individual members their faces become as long as a fiddle.

Sir Charles Court: That is unimportant.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: They do not want to come back for an extra week. I remember on one occasion in connection with a Bill involving iron ore I indicated that if we could not reach agreement that week we would come back the following week; and so agreement was reached.

Sir Charles Court: What has that to do with this motion? What about the change of emphasis in the dairy industry?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: It is illustrating the point I was making; that is, that the reason so many Bills are to be reinstated is because we did not sit in Parliament long enough last session to complete the discussions and put the legislation to the vote.

Sir Charles Court: If I had known you would adopt this attitude I would have opposed the motion.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: If any Bill had been rejected then we could have, had we so desired, reintroduced it by first of all giving notice of motion.

The purpose of this procedure is to save the time of members. This is why the Standing Order was altered—not to provide only for situations like that which occurred after the Ascot by-election. It was altered to enable the Government of the day to save the time of Parliament by putting back on the notice paper Bills the discussion on which was not completed previously.

I freely acknowledge that the procedure has some disadvantages, but we cannot expect to have advantages and no disadvantages. No matter what the situation in life is, if a person has advantages he must pay for them with a disadvantage in some other direction. The question which remains is whether the advantages to be derived are greater than the disadvantages which will follow; and I believe that so far as the time of the House is concerned, and the facility of business, the advantage of this method of dealing with the situation is greater than the disadvantage to be suffered. I believe this was the reason the Standing Order was amended. I can think of no other reason. Therefore we are simply taking advantage of a Standing Order for this purpose. During the Committee stage, if a change of thought has occurred, either on the part of the Government or the Opposition, it can clearly be made manifest during a discussion.

Sir Charles Court: Can you meet my request that some time during the second reading debate on these other Bills someone on behalf of the Government will intervene to state the changes, if any, which have taken place?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: If, when discussing the Bills, the Opposition says anything which calls for elucidation or further explanation, the Government will certainly see to it that it is given.

Sir Charles Court: The dairy industry is one example. I understand the Minister has been conferring with the industry and this could result in a complete change of attitude by all parties to the Bill.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I would hazard a guess that it probably will.

Sir Charles Court: Well, cannot we be told?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: We will be very happy to accommodate the Opposition.

Sir Charles Court: I am very sorry about the attitude you are taking and had I known I would have opposed the motion.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: What other attitude could I adopt?

Mr. Hutchinson: A reasonable one.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition adopted the attitude that there will be certain disadvantages. I freely admit this but I also emphasise that in my opinion the advantages will outweigh the disadvantages, and certain disadvantages cannot be escaped if a short-cut is to be made. That is all I am saying.

Sir Charles Court: I also point out with regard to sittings that if the Opposition had not been co-operative this morning you would not have had a quorum.

Mr. Gayfer: That is a fact.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: That is a guess.

Sir Charles Court: No; we counted them. You would have been five short of the quorum.

Mr. Gayfer: Five short.

Sir Charles Court: And that is not good.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir Charles Court: And you talk about working till Christmas!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: Everyone knows that as long as members are in the precincts of the building, it is the custom, unfortunately, for some to prefer to be outside rather than inside the Chamber; and that applies to members on both sides of the House.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: If the day ever comes in any Parliament when every member remains in his seat from the time Parliament commences to the time it concludes, the millennium will be here.

Mr. Hutchinson: It does not absolve the Government from the responsibility of keeping a House.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: I have been here a fair while and I saw empty seats on the Government side when the present Opposition was in office and I drew attention to the fact. I can recall that on quite a number of occasions when I was much more belligerent than I am now, I used to draw the Speaker's attention to the state of the House. The then Government was not doing too well on those occasions.

Mr. Bertram: It was called the Nationalist Party then.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: It is all very well to highlight the position now. It seems to amuse the Opposition.

Sir Charles Court: It will not if we keep on in this way.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: All the Opposition has to do is test the situation with a division. That is the best way to find out whether or not members are in the House. However, that is somewhat extraneous to the point at issue.

We will do the right and proper thing with regard to ensuring that the information desired in connection with Bills is made available. However, I would like to say it is my firm opinion that what is said during a second reading debate does not amount to very much with regard to the passing of the legislation. It is what happens in Committee, and the decisions reached at that stage, that count with the legislation.

Some Ministers make long speeches when introducing Bills, and others make short speeches, but the ultimate result is the same. What is said at the second reading stage does not determine whether or not a Bill gets a passage. It soon becomes evident which parts of the Bill are acceptable and which parts are not, once the Bill is argued during the Committee stage. There is then ample opportunity for the Minister in charge of the Bill to explain the attitude of the Government on every clause in the measure.

Mr. Hutchinson: Some Bills may not even get to the Committee stage.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: Then, there is no worry; such Bills are finished.

I am pleased that the Opposition is prepared to allow the lapsed Bills to be restored to the notice paper in order to expedite the business of the House. As I have said, we will do all we can to ensure that any information desired is freely given.

Mr. Hutchinson: The Premier mentioned that at the beginning of his speech.

Question put and passed.

Assembly's Message to Council

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier) [11.23 a.m.]: I move—

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council as follows:—

In accordance with the provisions of the Standing Orders relating to Lapsed Bills, adopted by both Houses, the Legislative Assembly requests the Legislative Council to resume consideration of the following Bills:

Electoral Act Amendment Bill.

Acts Amendment (Abolition of the Punishment of Death and Whipping) Bill.

I have moved this motion to enable a similar procedure to follow in the Legislative Council.

MR. O'NEIL (East Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [11.24 a.m.]: On this occasion we propose to oppose the motion. I do not know that our attitude was influenced solely by what the Premier had to say on the last motion, but I imagine that on that occasion the Leader of the Opposition was being exceptionally reasonable in pointing out that whilst we did not oppose the reinstatement of Bills in this place there were certain reasons why we felt such a practice should not be adopted as a matter of general course. The Premier went a little off the track and apologised, I think, for the reason which made it necessary to reinstate the Bills. The reason related to the last session of Parliament. I think the general tenor of the debate deteriorated from that stage to the point where the Premier, as a result of an interjection, challenged the Opposition to test the strength of his numbers in the House.

We would have opposed this motion under any circumstances. It relates to two Bills, the first being the Electoral Act Amendment Bill. This Bill is for the purpose of introducing a system of first-past-the-post voting in elections held in this State. It has been well debated in this place but, once again, significant changes have occurred in respect of the attitude of the Commonwealth Government, or the Australian Labor Party.

Mr. Jamieson: Can the Deputy Leader of the Opposition guarantee there will be a significant change in the attitude of the Liberal Party if the Bill is introduced again?

Mr. O'NEIL: I could not guarantee that. The present Prime Minister has said that he would not take any drastic action to change the method of voting at elections unless he had a very clear mandate from the people. He indicated that a change would not occur before the next election and, perhaps, that may be so.

The second Bill to which this motion refers deals with the abolition of the punishment of death and whipping. This matter has also been debated at length and, once again, I think there has been a change of opinion. I think that if the people of Britain had their way at the moment capital punishment would be re-introduced in that country. The same might be said of many other countries.

I do not want to delay the business of the House but I indicate that we on this side oppose the motion.

MR. J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Premier) [11.26 a.m.]: I regret that the Opposition is taking this most extraordinary attitude. All the motion proposes to do is to make it possible for the Legislative Council to reach

a decision on each of these Bills. Apparently the Opposition is not prepared to let the Legislative Council have an opportunity to do just that. It seems the Opposition wants to have another go in this House in an attempt to prevent the Bills from going to the Legislative Council, which Bills have already gone to that House.

I would say it would be hard to find a single argument to defend such an attitude. The contents of the Bills would have no bearing on this question at all. They were fully debated in this House and a decision made. Under our system of Government it becomes necessary and, indeed, desirable that such measures should proceed to the Legislative Council in order that a decision might be made there.

The Opposition is taking the view, "Do not let them have the chance of expressing an opinion. If the Government wishes to introduce such Bills, make it bring them in down here again so that we can go through what we went through previously and again reach the stage which exists at present." Such an attitude is completely indefensible and the Government does not accept it. Standing Orders provide for a motion of this kind, and I consider the only reasonable course is to carry the motion.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—21

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Jones
Mr. Bertram	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Brady	Mr. May
Mr. Brown	Mr. McIver
Mr. Bryce	Mr. Moller
Mr. Burke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Cook	Mr. Taylor
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. A. R. Tonkin
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Hartrey	Mr. Harman
Mr. Jamieson	(Teller)

Noes—20

Mr. Coyne	Mr. O'Connor
Dr. Dadour	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Rushton
Mr. A. A. Lewis	Mr. Stephens
Mr. E. H. M. Lewis	Mr. Thompson
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. R. L. Young
Mr. McPharlin	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. Mensaros	Mr. I. W. Manning
	(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Graham	Sir Charles Court
Mr. Fletcher	Sir David Brand
Mr. Davies	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Blakie

Question thus passed.

BILL

Leave to Introduce

THE SPEAKER (Mr. Norton): I ask the leave of the House to enable the Minister for Labour to give notice for leave to introduce a Bill. There being a dissentient voice, leave is refused.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 27th March.

MR. E. H. M. LEWIS (Moore) [11.32 a.m.]: The Bill is a comparatively small one but it is of great importance. The House would be justified in rejecting the Bill out of hand if we bear in mind the Premier's recent statement that the Bill is the important thing and not the second reading speech made by the Minister or anybody else.

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

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: The Minister explained the purpose of the Bill in his second reading speech and it is this explanation alone which justifies further consideration.

The Bill seeks to achieve three objectives which are separate and distinct. It proposes to amend the section of the Act which deals with assistance towards the recurrent costs of education in non-Government schools. The second amendment is a consequential one following the restructuring of the administration of the Education Department. The third amendment deals with assistance given to student teachers and their subsequent bonding when they actually become teachers.

The Minister dealt with these amendments in his second reading speech. Last year I had occasion to castigate the Minister for being too brief. On that occasion he read only a part of his second reading speech and it was necessary for members to refer to *Hansard* to appreciate the full import of what he should have explained when he introduced the Bill. Despite my criticism, I could sympathise with the Minister on that occasion because he had had a heavy day in dealing with legislation concerned with community welfare and Aboriginal affairs. Several of the Bills were related the one to the other.

On this occasion, the Minister's second reading speech extends over some 16 pages and deals with important aspects of education. I refer particularly to that part of the speech which deals with the subsidy towards the costs of education in non-Government schools.

Generally, I can say I support the Bill but I have some reservations particularly in regard to the first purpose embodied in clause 3 which seeks to amend section 9B of the principal Act. This section was introduced by the Government of which I had the honour to be a member. It was introduced by Act No. 17 of 1965 and brought to our Statute book the principle of tuition fees subsidies for non-Government schools.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Where is the Opposition which complained about members of the Government?

Mr. O'Neil: The Government has to keep the House, not the Opposition.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The Minister and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will keep order.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: The same Government amended the legislation by Act No. 48 of 1967 and No. 23 of 1968. On each occasion the amount of assistance to non-Government schools was increased. I give credit to the present Government—I always try to be fair—for extending the assistance further by Act No. 3 of 1972.

The point I want to make is that each of the amending Bills expressly stated the amount *per capita* of the subsidy for primary and secondary schools respectively. The Minister now seeks to amend section 9B and if his amendment is adopted the provision will read—

9B. (1) The Treasurer of the State shall in every year place at the disposal of the Minister, in addition to the moneys referred to in section nine A of this Act,—

That is the present subsidy. To continue—
—such moneys as will enable the Minister to pay to every efficient school at which fees are payable for the tuition of its scholars, the amounts specified in regulations made by him under this Act.

The Minister now proposes to meet this amount by regulations made by him under the Act. Section 9B(2) will read—

The moneys representing the amounts specified under subsection (1) of this section shall be paid, in every year, to those efficient schools at such times, in such manner and subject to such conditions as the Minister determines by regulations made by him under this Act.

In that respect the end result will not be very different from the existing provision. This is only the machinery of payment.

I repeat that the amount has been specified in all amending legislation which has been brought down previously. The Bill does not give us any information as to why this has been changed, but the Minister attempted to do so in his second reading speech.

I would like to make a point, particularly to one or two members who sit on the cross benches. They are inclined to tell us that the previous Government of the Commonwealth of Australia—which, herein and after, I refer to as the Commonwealth Government—

Mr. R. L. Young: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jamieson: Not the Australian Government!

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: —did nothing for the 23 years of its existence. Despite their statements, the responsible members of the Government, who occupy the front

benches, will know only too well that our progress in education would be substantially less than it is today had it not been for the very significant financial help given by the previous Commonwealth Government which was in office for 23 years until last December.

Mr. Hartrey: Would not the irresponsible members over here know that, too?

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: I am not referring to the honourable member who has just interjected.

Mr. A. R. Tonkin: To whom are you referring?

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: I am referring to one or two ex-academics, if we can call them that.

Mr. A. R. Tonkin: There is not an academic in the House.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: Well, ex-teachers, if the honourable member wants me to be precise. I did not want to point the finger but as the honourable member has asked for it I will point the finger. I also remind him that from his previous occupation he should know that some members learn at a much slower rate than do others. He is only a new boy as yet and we hope he is not one of the slow learners.

The Commonwealth Government to which I referred—

Mr. A. R. Tonkin: You have learnt to be insulting, have you?

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: —has for many years given assistance for education throughout Australia. It is so long ago since that Commonwealth Government gave matching capital grants to our university and recurrent grants, which were not exactly matching, of \$1 for every \$1.85 spent by the States, that one has difficulty in remembering when these grants did not apply. Since then, that Commonwealth Government has given capital grants for technical schools, teachers' colleges, science laboratories in secondary schools, and libraries; it has given scholarships charged to recurrent expenditure; and it has given assistance towards the cost of recurrent education in non-Government schools. It has been able to give assistance on a greater scale than the State has, even though it did not come into the field as early as the State did.

Nevertheless, that so much derided Commonwealth Government spent hundreds of millions of dollars in assisting education in this State. It ill becomes the members concerned to deride that assistance. We needed help, and we need more of it. I will support the Minister and the Government in any approach they may make for further assistance, because we need it. But let us not deny the value of the assistance we have already received.

Indeed, the very Bill we have before us today arises out of an action taken by that same Government when it passed last September legislation which had two purposes. One of the objectives was to give unmatched capital grants to both Government and non-Government schools in a programme which was to continue for five years. The amount under that heading was \$167,000,000 a year for Government schools and \$48,000,000 a year for non-Government schools. I repeat that they were unmatched capital grants. Of course, they were subject to certain conditions. One of the conditions which applied to both Government and non-Government schools was that at least 70 per cent. of the grant should be used for new development and facilities—not for the replacement of former facilities.

With respect to non-Government schools, the Minister announced that a representative expert committee would be set up to advise the Minister on the development of criteria and standards for non-Government schools. The reason for this was that in those cases where the facilities—the buildings, capital works, and so on—were above what were considered to be acceptable standards those particular schools would not participate in the grant in full.

The second objective of the Bill to which I have referred was to provide for the payment of *per capita* grants to non-Government schools, also for a period of five years. I repeat that this was only an extension of a principle on which the Commonwealth and the States had been extending assistance to non-Government schools on a *per capita* basis.

On that occasion in last September the then Commonwealth coalition Government decided a better approach was needed. It felt the grants should be based on a formula, and after consultation with the States it was agreed that the Commonwealth would give a grant of 20 per cent. of the assessed national average cost of educating a child in the primary and secondary fields respectively. This assistance was to commence from the beginning of 1973 and was to continue for five years.

The Commonwealth Government hoped the States which had been consulted would also participate in the scheme to the extent of 20 per cent., but it was appreciated that some States might have difficulty in meeting the 20 per cent. a year as from the beginning of 1973, and it was agreed that, some States having already given some assistance, the assistance already given should be deducted from the 20 per cent.

In his second reading speech the Minister explained this situation. He informed us that the average cost of educating a primary school child is \$308 a year; therefore, 20 per cent. of that sum is \$62, to the

nearest dollar. The existing *per capita* grant paid by the State is \$30, and the other costs for books and material issued by the department to Government and non-Government schools alike are estimated at \$9 a year *per capita*, which makes a total deduction of \$39 from the \$62, leaving a shortfall of \$23. I will return to that matter later.

In his second reading speech the Minister said he intends to meet this shortfall on the basis of two moieties of \$11.50, commencing from the beginning of 1973 and the beginning of 1974. That is the arithmetic concerning primary education.

In the case of secondary students, the Minister told us that the average cost is \$519 per annum. Twenty per cent. of this is \$104 to the nearest dollar. If we subtract the tuition fee subsidy of \$40 which is now being paid and the other assistance which has been assessed at \$13 per annum, we have a total deduction of \$53, leaving a shortfall of \$51. In his second reading speech the Minister said that he proposed to pay this sum in two moieties of \$25.50. I have read the Minister's speech a few times, and I would like to quote his following comments—

After allowing for assessed costs for items of existing assistance as previously mentioned, the balance of the *per capita* grant will be paid in two moieties of \$11.50 per primary student and \$25.50 per secondary student, commencing from the beginning of this year and the beginning of 1974.

The Minister says nothing more on this issue. Perhaps my comprehension is not as good as it should be, but I am a little puzzled about the Minister's meaning. The shortfall is \$23 per annum for primary students, and the Minister has told us he is unable to meet more than half of this amount this year but that the whole of it will be paid next year. Does he mean he will pay half the amount this year and half next year? Of course, the same principle applies with the grants to secondary schools.

I would ask the Minister whether he will be good enough to answer this question because I believe this is a very important point. Perhaps he will indicate this by way of interjection.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I will reserve comment until I reply.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: For the information of the Minister, I would like to say that I intend to put some amendments on the notice paper. I wish to give the Minister as much notice of them as possible. However, the amendments will be tempered by the Minister's intentions in the matter. At the moment we are left guessing. If I could offer a criticism here, I feel that the Minister could have been a little more explicit about his intentions.

I would like now to turn to the Federal debate on this matter, which some members may not have had the opportunity to peruse. I will not deal with the capital grants because that is not the issue we are now discussing. I wish to deal with the current grants system.

Mr. Brady: What *Hansard* is this?

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: This is on page 1399 of the Federal *Hansard*, No. 16, of the 14th September, 1972. I have the Bill before me now and it is No. 108 of 1972. It is entitled the States Grants School Act, 1972.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Could I interject here? I wished to confer with the Treasurer on the point raised by the honourable member to ensure that my feelings about the matter were shared by the Treasurer. I referred to the payment of half the shortfall for primary and secondary students this year. We will pay \$11.50 this year for primary students and another \$11.50 next year. We also hope next year to meet the full assessed cost. Therefore, next year we will pay 20 per cent. of the assessed cost and also pick up the tab for the amount which will not be paid this year. This will apply to both primary and secondary students.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: I thank the Minister for the information as it clarifies the position. I would like the Minister to correct me if I have not understood his remarks. This year the Government will meet half the shortfall. Next year it will meet the balance of this year's shortfall together with the whole of next year's commitment.

Mr. T. D. Evans: That is the point, because otherwise we would not have been meeting the Commonwealth's 20 per cent.—it would have been 10 per cent. only.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: This would not have surprised me, because the State is not committed to meet the 20 per cent. The Federal Minister said that he hoped the States would meet it. Someone said—it may have been the Federal Minister—that the various States would be left to work out their own arrangements. It is interesting to note that the State will meet its commitment fully.

Mr. T. D. Evans: At the end of the two-year period we will have honoured our undertaking.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: That is right. However, I think we should go a little further as the Commonwealth Government is committing itself for five years. In his second reading speech the Minister said that the State Government will pay two moieties, commencing from the beginning of this year and the beginning of 1974. However, he made no reference to what will happen after 1974. Does the Minister propose to continue this grant for the full five years as set out in the Commonwealth legislation?

Mr. T. D. Evans: We do not know that the present system will continue with the change of Government. The Labor Government is setting up a schools commission. If the Government continues the scheme for five years, our undertaking is to match the Commonwealth grant. In any event we will endeavour to meet our commitment, but difficulties may arise. The present undertaking is on the basis of 20 per cent. of the cost, and we will endeavour to make progressive payments for the upkeep of non-Government schools. However, the Commonwealth may arrive at a new method of assistance to the schools.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: I believe the reason for the proposed amendment to section 9B is to allow the grant by way of regulation. This matter is far too important to be left to regulations. The whole House must have the opportunity to discuss such a very important question relating to education in Western Australia.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You would have the right under section 36 of the Interpretation Act.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: We have always discussed this matter in the House. It has given us the opportunity to talk about the education system, with particular reference to non-Government schools. As the proposals in the Bill relate to non-Government schools, I believe most members, and certainly Governments throughout Australia regardless of their particular complexion, should give serious consideration to this question. The Commonwealth Liberal-Country Party Government which served for 23 years, allegedly doing nothing, certainly indicated its interest in non-Government education. I must be fair and say that the present Government has not yet had time to demonstrate its interest. However, I have no doubt that in its turn it will show some sympathetic interest in non-Government education.

I do not wish to play politics on this matter. I know that if the State Minister for Education remains in office for five years, he will do his utmost to help non-Government schools. Nevertheless, this is such an important field that I believe the House should have the opportunity to discuss any intended alterations. It may happen that the grant will have to be decreased because of financial circumstances. At least the matter should come before Parliament. When regulations are laid down, we do not have the same opportunity to do anything about them. If we want to move for an amendment to the regulation so that the amount of money is increased, we must seek a Message from the Governor. Members on this side of the House are not able to do this. Therefore this 20 per cent. contribution should be spelt out in the legislation; and it would then be consistent with the existing Commonwealth legislation.

The Federal Government has announced that it proposes to set up a schools commission. If the schools commission has a

look at the situation and makes a recommendation that is accepted by the States that the amount of 20 per cent. should be increased to 25 per cent. or decreased to 15 per cent., or that some other condition should be attached to it, then the State Minister may bring legislation to the House and allow us to have a full debate on the matter. I think that would be a far better and tidier method—although it might not be the easiest way—of letting the public know what is being done; that is, by leaving the matter open to parliamentary debate.

I know it would be quite ridiculous for the Minister to introduce amending legislation in respect of certain aspects relating to the escalation of costs. I believe teachers' salaries comprise some 85 per cent. of the expenditure of the department, and they will certainly rise. Other costs will also rise. It is inevitable that the cost of education will continue to rise; but in my view there is no reason that the percentage should not remain the same.

I did a few sums to satisfy myself and to see how far costs could escalate. I presupposed that the cost of teaching per child per year in the secondary field, which is now \$519, would escalate to \$550; and that is a substantial rise. I also presupposed that the average cost of teaching per child per year in primary schools would rise from \$308 to \$320. Based on the enrolments as at the 1st August, 1971—I obtained these figures from the 1971 annual report, and I have no more recent figures—I found the escalation in costs would require the State to pay a further \$150,000 a year approximately.

Of course, the Minister is not so much concerned about the 20 per cent. or the cost of education per child; he is vitally interested in the amount of money he must hand over under this system. If he found that as a result of the substantial escalation in costs he was required to pay an extra \$150,000 in order to adhere to the 20 per cent. formula, I think he would have a very good case to go to the Commonwealth and say, "We have tried to match your 20 per cent. and this is what it will cost us." He would be in a strong position to ask for an increase in the grant made by the Commonwealth. If he did not receive an increase he would be obliged to tell the schools that whereas in the past the Government was able to meet the 20 per cent. formula it is now unable to do so and must reduce it to 19, 18, or some other percentage. That would be most undesirable because whilst the costs facing the Government are increasing, so too are the costs faced by private schools. My figures were based on Government schools; but, of course, the expenditure of private schools will also be increasing and they would be in need of even greater, rather than less, assistance than before.

I believe a tidier way to deal with this would be to incorporate the 20 per cent. payment for the full five years. If the commission which has been forecast is set up and can demonstrate that something other than the 20 per cent. formula is desirable, then the Minister can come to the Parliament. I am sure the Parliament would support any proposals to vary the formula if the Minister is forced to present them. After all, legislation is not binding forever; whilst an Act may be the law, it is only the law until it is changed; and it can be changed by an amending Bill.

The Minister said the increased assistance has been calculated as amounting to \$1,360,000. I take it that is for this year?

Mr. T. D. Evans: Yes.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: Of course, one cannot forecast the future. Incidentally, that is a little less than the calculation I made based on the number of children in the schools as at August, 1971. The Minister would be in possession of the most recent enrolment figures and would be aware of any rise or fall. I drew up a comparison between the years 1970 and 1971, based on figures from the department's annual reports. The figures show that in August, 1970, non-Government primary schools had an enrolment of 25,312; but in August, 1971, they had an enrolment of 25,228—a slight fall. On the other hand, non-Government secondary schools had an enrolment in 1970 of 16,248, which rose to 16,453 in 1971. Taking primary and secondary students together, in 1970 private schools had an enrolment of 41,558; and in 1971 the enrolment was 41,681. I have no idea of the current figures.

Mr. Mensaros: Approximately 42,500 is the total enrolment of primary and secondary schools, as the Minister said in his reply.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: Yes, I know the Minister answered a question, but I have not yet seen that answer. Nevertheless, I am making the point—and the Minister has admitted that the figures I have given indicate a substantial rise—that if the average cost of educating a secondary student rises from \$519 to \$550 that would represent a substantial increase in payments in a year. However, the assistance given would still be based on 20 per cent. of the average cost, less the value of the current assistance, so only a slight increase in the total assistance to be provided by the State would result. Probably it would be slightly less than my guess of an extra \$150,000 for a year.

If the burden upon the State becomes too great the Government would have a good lever with which to approach the Commonwealth Government for extra assistance.

Having made that point, I want to say that despite the fact that the State will be faced with an expenditure of \$1,360,000,

that amount will be offset by the action of the so-called "no-good Government" which has now taken over the payment of boarding-away-from-home allowances as from the beginning of this year. In answer to a question I asked, the Minister estimated this would save the State Government \$923,000 in a full year. Therefore, whilst we will be down the drain to the extent of \$1,360,000, we will also be saving \$923,000.

I am not suggesting we are making a profit out of the business and, also, I am not suggesting that we still do not have room to seek further assistance. Incidentally, I heard the Premier make a comment, by way of interjection, to the effect that the survey showed we needed some \$1,300,000,000 immediately. Here again, although this is not relevant to the Bill, that was a mistake. In fact the survey of needs showed we needed some \$1,300,000,000 to meet our needs over the next five years following the completion of the survey. That amount was not needed all at once, but was an estimate of what was needed to be spent over the next five years to raise education to a desirable standard at that time. It is open to question whether we are aiming at these goals within too short a period. In some instances the needs are urgent, but in others the needs could be spread over a longer period.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It did not embrace technical education needs.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: No, it did not. I agree with the Minister that we need assistance in all fields of education. Members should not gain a different impression from what I have said. I do not want to make too much noise about this because the Treasurer is listening, but I congratulate the Minister on the proportion of the total revenue available to the Government he has been able to obtain for education needs to date.

I mentioned I would quote from the Commonwealth *Hansard* in respect of recurring costs for education. In quoting from page 1399 of the Commonwealth *Hansard*, the Commonwealth Minister for Education at that time (Mr. Fraser) had this to say—

I turn now to the provisions in the Bill covering assistance for recurrent expenditure in non-government schools in the States. The Commonwealth and all State Governments have accepted a responsibility to make direct grants to non-government schools towards their running costs.

I will not quote all his speech, but only the salient points. Continuing—

The Commonwealth and the States have taken decisions from time to time about the amount and nature of their contributions towards the running costs of non-government schools, but there has been no arrangement for tying either the Commonwealth

or the State assistance to some factor which would permit the schools to look to the future with any certainty.

The Government believes that the only way of ensuring non-government schools of continuing basic support is to tie that support to a proportion of the recurrent cost of educating children in government primary and secondary schools throughout Australia. Any other approach would fail to provide a guarantee to non-government schools.

The SPEAKER: There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr. LEWIS: I continue to quote from the speech made by Mr. Fraser—

In future the Commonwealth will make annual *per capita* grants on the basis of 20 per cent of an amount assessed as the estimated average cost of educating a child in government schools throughout Australia. There will be separate rates for primary and secondary schools in each calendar year and these will be determined and announced towards the end of the preceding year. The *per capita* rates will be derived from information provided by the States and the Commonwealth about estimated expenditure in government schools in the financial year which ends in the middle of the year in which the grants are to be made. To illustrate, the *per capita* grants for 1973—

That is, the calendar year of 1973. Continuing—

—will be at rates of 20 per cent of the estimated cost of educating children in government primary and secondary schools throughout Australia during the financial year 1972-73.

The Commonwealth has invited the States to join with it in providing the non-government schools with an assured basis for assistance by themselves undertaking to make contributions towards the running costs of those schools equivalent to 20 per cent of the national average cost of educating children in the government schools.

The Commonwealth amending Bill lays down procedures under which non-Government schools would account for the expenditure of the *per capita* grants made available to them, and the Commonwealth Government is laying down many conditions which I am not suggesting the State should lay down. Under the Commonwealth legislation the non-Government schools will be obliged to furnish returns certified by an accountant showing the expenditure of the respective schools. If this is not done the schools in question will no longer receive a grant.

I have not studied the Commonwealth legislation very closely, but I believe that in it there is an obligation on the States

to ensure that this is done. However, I could be wrong in making that statement. Nevertheless, at least the Commonwealth is imposing that condition and I repeat I am not suggesting the State should do likewise at this stage. We have never imposed such a condition before and we have found that the non-Government schools always did the right thing and I think they always will. The Commonwealth Minister for Education at that time went on to say—

... the Minister will be able to exercise a discretion to enable special schools, as, for example, those for handicapped children where the courses of study do not parallel those in government primary and secondary schools, to qualify for assistance.

The final quotation from his speech reads—

When the Prime Minister—

At that time, Mr. McMahon—

—announced the new policies which are to be brought into operation by this Bill he said that they would represent a milestone in improving the education of all Australian children. I am sure that the House will endorse that view and that in the not too distant future Australians will look back on the enactment of this legislation as an historic event in Australian education.

It is a great step forward, I believe, to put this on a formula basis, in the same way as we do in this State with the kindergarten association. It could well be that the formula should be revised from time to time, but at least, while the formula exists, the recipients of the assistance know just what they can expect for the coming year; whereas, under the present arrangement, the non-Government schools, whilst they know the extent of the *per capita* subsidy, do you know what their own costs will be for the following year and what proportion of their costs the *per capita* subsidy will meet.

Therefore, putting it on a percentage basis is a good method, and I suggest to the Minister again that he accept some amendment to achieve that end. That is all I propose to say on that portion of the Bill.

The second amendment is a rather minor one. It proposes to amend section 21E. Section 7 (1) of the Education Act provides that the Governor shall appoint a Director-General of Education and "such other officers as he deems necessary". The Education Act does not provide for the appointment of a deputy director-general, but section 21C, the subject of Act No. 91 of 1969, which, was introduced by the Government of which I had the honour to be a member, established a board of secondary education which still exists, and that section provides that the director-general,

or, in his absence, the deputy director-general shall preside over any meeting of the board of secondary education. However, because of the change in the administrative structure of the Education Department there is now no deputy director-general, but there are two assistant directors-general under the existing structure. The amendment merely seeks to delete the provision relating to the deputy director-general and replace it with a provision relating to the assistant director-general. This is a consequential amendment, and we do not have any quarrel with it.

Clause 5 of the Bill aims to repeal and re-enact section 37A of the Act. I had extreme difficulty in finding this section. With most of our legislation the sections are numbered in numerical order, and where sections bear a letter of the alphabet after the numeral, such sections appear in alphabetical order. However, in the Act we do not find section 37A appearing in its proper order, but at the end of the section.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Who was the culprit?

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: This dates back to 1952, and at that time neither the Minister nor I was a member of this House. It may be that the Parliamentary Draftsman preferred to place the provisions relating to teacher education together. This provision was inserted by Act No. 30 of 1952, and was amended slightly by Act No. 57 of 1960.

Under section 37A where students are admitted to teachers' training colleges they are paid an allowance and are bonded to the Education Department for a period of years in accordance with the period of training. They are also guaranteed a teaching position on graduation; I think it is a guarantee of a position within six months of graduation.

It is proposed to rewrite section 37A to give student teachers the option of either continuing with the existing arrangement, which has operated for many years, or of taking out an interest-free loan which is limited to a maximum of \$700 a year for a student teacher up to the age of 25 years. The Minister did not specify whether this provision refers to males only or whether females are included, but if a student teacher is married or is over 25 years of age then he may borrow up to \$1,000 a year. The amounts are set out in multiples of \$50.

Mr. T. D. Evans: No distinction between the sexes is intended under that provision.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: The allowance is \$700 for a student teacher up to 25 years of age, and \$1,000 for a student teacher over 25 years of age or a married student teacher below 25 years of age. Although this is not specified in the Bill, according to the second reading speech of the Minister these loans are to be repayable from the day of graduation. The Bill provides that they be

repaid as specified by regulation, and that they be repaid over a period of one year longer than the aggregate period over which the loan is made. However, the second reading speech of the Minister did not spell out the position as clearly as that.

If a teacher undergoes the minimum period of training of three years and accepts a loan of \$700 a year, he will owe \$2,100 which is repayable over the four years after the date of graduation. Teachers who opt to obtain loans will not be bonded to serve the department, and this is made clear in the Minister's speech. I ask: Will they also be guaranteed jobs?

Mr. T. D. Evans: Yes, if they want a job in the Education Department.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: This is quite a significant factor, and I am pleased to hear that.

Having outlined some of the conditions which are attached to this benefit, I now turn to the current position. I find that students under 21 years of age receive, in each of the first and second years, an allowance of \$963, and in the third year an allowance of \$1,140. This allowance is not repayable, but in return the teacher has to serve a period in the department to offset the loan. Students over 21 years of age receive in the first, second, and third years an allowance of \$1,242 per year. I am dealing only with the three-year trainee teachers; and, of course, the allowance is increased if they train for a longer period. Where a teacher is married but does not have any children the allowance is \$1,770 per year. A married teacher with children is provided with an allowance of \$2,160 per year.

Where a student teacher is obliged to live away from home an additional allowance of \$320 a year is granted. In addition to these benefits, which are not repayable, a book allowance is provided. The allowance in the first year is not exceeding \$55, in the second year not exceeding \$55, and in the final year not exceeding \$35. There are certain exceptions with which I shall not deal, such as students undergoing training in home economics and manual arts courses. In such cases the allowance is not exceeding \$55 in the final year. Any person who has graduated from the university and is studying to become a teacher receives an extra \$500 a year over and above the other allowances.

It will be seen that the minimum allowance for a three-year trainee teacher, including the book allowance, is \$3,211 in the case of one under 21 years of age. If such a teacher is living away from home he is provided with an allowance of \$960, making a total of \$4,171. This loan is not repayable, but against that, in the case of a three-year trainee teacher, he is bonded to the department for a period of three or four years after his training.

Let us compare that with the loan proposal. It is proposed that a trainee teacher up to 25 years of age shall receive \$700 a year, so that over the three years a total loan of \$2,100 is granted, and this amount is repayable. As the Minister has stated, in addition to the loan there is to be a cash, nonrepayable allowance of \$140 per year. I do not know what is the purpose of that.

He said that in addition to the loan they would have an allowance of \$140 per year in cash, but I do not know its purpose. I assume that is nonbondable also, but perhaps in his reply the Minister might explain it. He has expressly stated that it is not a book allowance. In any case it does not affect my argument that a teacher taking a loan cannot receive more than \$2,100 if he or she is up to 25 years of age; and if the person is over 25 years or married the amount is \$1,000 a year or \$3,000 in all which is considerably less than the amount received by way of allowances.

It is true that when the students receive allowances they are bonded to serve, whereas if they seek a loan they are as free as the breeze to seek a job where they will. I know that three or four years ago when the State's economy was very buoyant and businesses were thriving, great attractions were offered to student teachers, and although the department had increased the allowances and paid university fees, when some of the students graduated, because they had been offered by private businesses a salary greater than they would receive from the Education Department they elected to repay the bond and take the other jobs. We lost several teachers in that way. For other reasons, too, some teachers do not serve their full bond and therefore must repay the amount in proportion to the period they failed to serve as teachers.

When teachers make this decision they must inform the department which then assesses their liability because by then it is a cash liability. The teachers then must indicate to the department what arrangements they intend to make for the repayment of the amount. I always found that the department was fairly generous and would accept a figure as low as \$20 a month. We do not hear about those ex-teachers who meet their obligations on the due dates, but we certainly know of the ones who fail to do so. Many of them ignore the correspondence and entreaties of the department. Sometimes as many as half a dozen letters are written until finally in desperation the department indicates that it will approach the guarantors.

In many cases, of course, the guarantors by that stage are pensioners who cannot meet the debt and consequently the department has to write it off.

I must emphasise that there is very little difference between the allowances and the loan except in the amount and the

fact that the loan is definitely repayable from the day of graduation, whereas with the allowances the student knows that he or she will have the option of resigning from the department. There is no law against this even though the student enters into a commitment. Some students believe they are under a moral obligation and will serve their full time. Many people still consider that their word is their bond, and thank goodness this is so. On the other hand, many students will enter into a commitment to serve as a teacher for the required time, but they will subsequently opt out and undertake to repay the bond.

I know the department has always provided easy terms and that these people can repay as little as \$20 a month. Therefore, the position of those who have received the education—a further three years of tertiary study—as well as a fairly generous allowance will compare more than favourably with the position of those who elect to take the loan and repay it as from their day of graduation. The Minister has indicated that this will be over one year longer and I take it it would be an even repayment over a period. However, the day of graduation varies. I understand it is generally early in December, but the teacher is not in receipt of a salary until the 1st January.

Of course, a teacher does not usually get a teaching appointment until early February or even a little later, but the salary is paid according to grade as from the 1st January. However, between graduation day and the receipt by the teacher of a salary, two or three weeks elapse during which I would assume the repayment would have to be made. I think this is a point the Minister might well study.

Mr. T. D. Evans: The regulations will contain flexibility in that regard.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: The Minister said that the repayment would be expected from the day of graduation, but I think he should ensure that the regulations provide for the repayment to commence on the 1st January following graduation by which time teachers would be in receipt of a salary and able to meet any repayments.

While I have no objection to the proposal for a loan, at the same time I cannot see any advantage in it at all.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Some students have. Some have already elected to take loans.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: As I said earlier, some are slow learners.

The Minister did not indicate whether the Teachers' Union agreed with the proposal and approves of the terms of the loan in comparison with the terms of the allowances. It would be interesting to know the reaction of the union.

Another aspect which has just occurred to me is that allowances are reviewed from time to time. I reviewed them when I was Minister and I suppose the union will request the present Minister to do likewise.

Mr. T. D. Evans: They were reviewed at the beginning of the year.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: It can be taken for granted that any review would result in an increase and not a decrease, and this would further widen the disparity between the loan and the allowances. Will the loan be increased accordingly? The Minister might also comment on that aspect.

I repeat that, all in all, I support the Bill with some reservation about the 20 per cent. formula which I would like written into the legislation.

MR. A. R. TONKIN (Mirrabooka) [12.39 p.m.]: I rise to state briefly how appalled I was at the gratuitous insult offered to me and apparently to one other ex-teacher by the member for Moore. When we realise he was formerly the Minister for Education our concern about such a low standard in debate is increased. His reference to newness and the possibility that I was a slow learner was disgusting and not worthy of a member in this place.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: I did not say that. I said you were a new boy.

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: When people start suggesting that newness or youth is a handicap they are indeed on shaky ground and must feel insecure. I have been shocked many times to find that the former Minister should descend to this level.

Point of Order

Mr. MENSAROS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member making a personal explanation, by leave, or is he speaking to the Bill?

Mr. H. D. Evans: He is replying to points raised in the debate.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Debate Resumed

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: I would not take umbrage at anything the member for Mirrabooka said.

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: I have been shocked to find that the member opposite would descend to this level of personalities. I can assure the member for Moore that I am well aware of the previous Government's contribution to education. I have never suggested that the contribution was absent. For the member to suggest that I have ever denied the Liberal Government's participation in education is a flagrant untruth, as a study of *Hansard* will show.

If this is the standard of debate usually followed by the former Minister for Education I now understand—although I never understood it previously—why so many teachers lost respect for him.

Mr. Gayfer: His was one of the best replies to a second reading speech ever heard. It was well done.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: To suggest I have made the statements referred to is very wrong.

Mr. Gayfer: I am talking about the manner in which he answered the introduction of the Bill.

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: I am talking about the insults he directed to me, and I am shocked. I can understand why people lose respect for him if this is the standard of debate he chooses. I have never suggested that the Liberal Commonwealth Government did not make a contribution to education.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: You said it did nothing in 23 years.

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: I deny that. In conclusion, I do not feel sorry for myself, but for the people of Western Australia because they deserve a better standard of debate and better representation.

MR. MENSAROS (Floreat) [12.42 p.m.]: I could not agree more with the introductory remarks of the member for Moore. I was somewhat surprised and, indeed, sorry to hear the Premier say that second reading speeches are not important from the point of view of passing Bills. The member for Moore pointed out that the Premier was contradicted by the facts which followed his remarks.

I am sorry to observe that the Premier seems to have a different view regarding the role and the rights of Parliament from that which he held previously. I can remember the Premier as one of the champions of upholding the rights of Parliament—and for that I respected him. However, as the member for Moore has said, if in this case we had not received a second reading speech—or a very brief one—we would not have known the purpose of the Bill.

Clause 3 of the measure will amend section 9B of the parent Act. As members are aware, section 9B spells out certain *per capita* payments to private or non-Government schools. The Bill proposes to delete that provision and insert, in lieu, the words to provide that the aid should be subject to regulations. How could anybody in this House vote on that amendment—let alone express an opinion—if he did not know what it was all about?

During the course of his second reading speech the Minister gave some explanation of his intentions, but it was necessary for

him to explain further, by way of interjection, to make the situation clear.

The first of the three amendments contained in the Bill provides for the promised increase in subsidies or grants to non-Government schools. We welcome this provision but I emphasise that it is only a promised increase because the Bill does not state any figures or any increase. If I were to be impolite to the Minister I could even say that he made unfactual statements to that effect. I will refer to a letter which appeared in *The Record* on the 29th March, 1973. Part of the letter, signed by the Minister, is as follows—

Parliament will be asked to ratify the payment of these amounts in two stages, the first payment of \$11.50 per primary student and \$22.50 per secondary student to be paid this school year. The second will be paid for the 1974 second school year.

Sitting suspended from 12.45 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr. MENSAROS: With all respect, I am sorry to say that the Minister's statement in letter form, which I quoted before the suspension, is not factual. The Minister did not ask the Parliament to give sanction to any specific subsidy *per capita* of students. He only asked the Parliament to give him regulating power to do certain things.

I do not doubt the Minister's good intentions but I think members will agree with me when I say that we hear too often the argument, "I am an honourable man. The Parliament should not legislate about a concrete subject—just leave it to me and I will do it in the way I said." I do not think this is good enough. I agree with the member for Moore that the provisions spelt out by the Minister, together with his stated intentions, should be incorporated in the Bill.

Hence I welcomed the indication given by the member for Moore of his intention to move amendments at the Committee stage of the Bill to achieve three objectives. The three objectives are the actual ones which the Minister said he wants the Bill to achieve. The first is that the regulations should at least provide for not less than the residue—up to 20 per cent. of the national average of the costs of educating students in non-Government schools. The second is that the subsidy shall be subject to some sort of revision, even if the basis of revision is last year's national average. Obviously the average changes and the Minister saw this point. The third is that it should last for at least five years, in accordance with the intention of the Commonwealth scheme.

The member for Moore was courteous enough to consult me about his amendments. The second reading speech is ambiguous to some extent and, consequently,

he was not sure how to draft the amendments. The member for Moore did not know whether the Minister intended to pay half of the residue this year and half next year; to pay half this year and the full amount next year; or to pay half this year, and one-and-one-half next year.

I was grateful that the Minister clarified this point by way of interjection. Apparently it is only a shortage of money which prevents him from paying the full residue this year; namely, 20 per cent. of the assessed cost *per capita*. Instead, half of this sum will be paid this year and the other half will be paid next year. In addition, the Government will also honour the full amount next year. This is what the Minister said by way of interjection and I think it is worth repeating.

Members of the Opposition do not object to the Bill except for the remarks which have been made. I think all parties have agreed on the policy of giving subsidies to non-Government schools. This is now the established trend and, in this light, the Bill cannot be called a bad one. In accordance with the policy of school aid which has been developed up to date, the measure is obviously a step forward, although it cannot be called a great step forward. The Commonwealth scheme—again, in the light of the policies which have been developed up to date—is a reasonably sound one in principle. The Commonwealth will make a special grant but the only conditions attached are that the moneys so provided will be used for education. The Commonwealth has invited the States to offer the same amount of money for the same period.

I have mentioned the policies and their stage of development reached up to date. Let us look at how they developed and at what they should, perhaps, be. In saying this I do not want to go into the detailed history of Government assistance to non-Government schools. This was more than adequately covered in 1967 when the Minister for Education of the day (the member for Moore) amended the same sections of the Education Act. He gave the history step by step, going back to the early days. Last year I briefly listed the developments in recent years and the types of State Government assistance which had been given to non-Government schools.

I want to deal with the basic philosophy of this question of Government assistance to non-Government schools. When society in this State became more organised and the population increased, more than 100 years ago society agreed—and legislated accordingly—that it had a duty and responsibility to educate children up to a certain stage. Society—in other words, the State—further decided that this duty and responsibility for education would be discharged by the State itself but it would allow others to provide the same type of education.

I suppose one can say this action provided some choice in education, although when one thinks about it one finds the choice was not much greater than the celebrated choice which is often mentioned by the member for Boulder-Dundas; that is, the poor and the rich having an equal right to sleep under the bridge. This was the same sort of choice in reverse, because the only people who had a choice were those who had the means to educate their children at schools other than Government institutions. It took more than half of the slightly over 100 years since the legislation first appeared on the Statute book for it to be realised that no real choice was provided and that society had to do something in a fiscal way to discharge its responsibility to give a choice to its members.

Curiously enough, at the same time it was also realised that unless something was done in this respect the State might find itself in the situation that non-Government schools, or a great number of them, would be closing down because neither they nor the parents of the students at those schools had sufficient means to sustain the schools.

This sequence of events gave Governments of the day the thought that unless something was done in an economic way they would incur much greater expenditure—in fact, expenditure which they could not afford if they were to discharge their obligation to educate everyone. At that time the thinking of the socialists was not so far advanced that it occurred to anyone that they might expropriate the buildings belonging to private schools.

Mr. Brown: Are you suggesting it is further advanced today?

Mr. MENSAROS: I think the honourable member did not follow me.

Mr. Brown: I did.

Mr. MENSAROS: I say, apart from politics, that choice in education is the question. When it was realised that in order to give a real choice it was necessary to give assistance to the private schools, it was also realised that unless such assistance was given the State would be finished economically; because if the private schools closed down the State would be unable to find the finance to educate the additional pupils. I went on to say that not even the socialists thought they could expropriate the buildings belonging to private schools and acquire them for nothing. In order to acquire the buildings of private schools the State would have had to pay compensation, which would cost the Treasury more money than it had.

Apart from that aspect, there was the question of supplying and paying the teachers. At that time many of the teachers at independent schools were paid no salary whatsoever. They did their work purely out of a sense of vocation.

These two factors were obviously realised at the same time. It would be hard to speculate which of them prompted the State to advance a subsidy to non-Government schools, but I think it was actually the economic factor which finally prevailed upon all political parties—even those which originally opposed such aid on principle. I think that is a fair enough recapitulation of the history of this subject.

To prove my point that it was more the economic factor than the desire to give a choice in education, one has only to realise that the aid which slowly came forward under Governments of both colours was just enough to keep the independent schools alive. The situation was similar to the charges relating to the Suez Canal. They were always set so that it would be cheaper to pay the charges to go through the Suez Canal than to circumnavigate the continent of Africa.

The matter of economics raised its head slowly, step by step; but one must admit that seven years ago voices were raised to express the contention that I express today. I pay tribute to the present Minister for Health—who, unfortunately, is not in the Chamber at the moment. When the very same section of the Act was under discussion, as far back as the 9th November, 1967, he said—

The Opposition does not oppose this Bill in any way at all, but merely says the amount of assistance provided to denominational schools is not enough.

The honourable member repeated that statement four or five times in his speech. It was quite a good speech and I am sorry he is not here because I give him credit. It was difficult for him to make that speech at that time. He had to identify himself with the right wing of the Labor Party. He said he was in favour of aiding non-Government schools, and his main complaint was that the amount of money was not sufficient.

Of course the amount of money was smaller than it is today, but the principle is the same. We must give the schools some amount so that they can continue economically to help the State discharge the duty incorporated in the Statute to educate all the children of Western Australia, even if we do not do it for the desirable choice in education.

The principle of a grant on a percentage basis is quite logical. All members are aware of the continual escalation of prices and our monetary inflation. This is inevitable in a growing community and also is affected, to a certain extent, by world events. It is important that we give some meaning to our aid to independent schools.

Indeed, the Minister acknowledges this himself in his second reading speech. He talks of the actual figures and then says—

It is well to point out that movements in the national average base cost could undoubtedly result in the impact in 1973-74 being considerably greater than that shown in figures now quoted.

And he goes on to say—

—to avoid the necessity of repeated amendments to this section of the Act, it is considered most desirable to provide in section 9B for payments as shall be prescribed to—

This is a very important point. He continues—

—facilitate variations which will occur and be necessary for the purpose of matching Commonwealth grants in this particular instance and in the future.

It is therefore acknowledged that the assistance can, and indeed inevitably will, change. It is also clear that whatever the percentage is, it will always lag somewhere behind the actual expenditure. The base costs will rise and the percentage will only be adjusted later.

The first example of this is the recent eight per cent. pay rise which was granted retrospectively to teachers. The non-Government schools have been badly hit because of this retrospectivity. This is one more reason for our support to the endeavours made by the member for Moore to have the assistance actually spelt out in the legislation.

The Minister may stand up and say he is an honourable man, but we do not know what will happen in the future. The point is that if the increases are laid down by regulation, Parliament will not have much say in them. I realise that under our Constitution we are permitted to disallow any regulation in either House, but the Minister for Education, in his capacity as Attorney-General, would be the first to agree with me that we can only amend a regulation with the consent of both Houses. What will happen if a future Minister for Education wishes to decrease the grant?

Mr. T. D. Evans: A regulation can be disallowed by either House of Parliament.

Mr. MENSAROS: I said that, but it cannot be amended.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It can be disallowed.

Mr. MENSAROS: What happens if a successor of the Minister for Education decreases the amount payable? We can do one of two things: we can let the independent school continue with a decreased grant or we can disallow the regulation and the schools will not get anything. This is why the member for Moore has stated

that the legislation should set this out clearly. The Minister or his successor could not then go below the sum which the Minister now promises to these schools. I am prepared to accept his word that he intends to do this. However, the Bill itself does not say anything. It purely and simply seeks to give the Minister regulating powers, and under these regulating powers he can do anything. He can abolish the aid, decrease it, or do anything he wants to do. This is not good enough for such an important question.

I level criticism at the Minister in two respects. All members who are interested in education will remember that originally he came to the party very hesitantly. A great deal of quarrelling occurred between the Opposition and the Government over the Commonwealth scheme. We argued about how it should be implemented, and how it should be calculated on this percentage basis. The Minister will also recall that he quarrelled with the Federal Minister on this matter. Letters were exchanged, and indeed, originally the Minister wanted to include every possible item in this percentage aid. I believe this was an endeavour to say to Parliament and the public, "We already pay the 20 per cent. so there is no need for an adjustment."

The proof of my statement can be seen in the answer given by the Premier—I suppose in his capacity as Treasurer—to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition. I am sorry that I do not have the date of the question, but it appears in the *Votes and Proceedings* of 1972 at page 629. The Leader of the Opposition asked the Premier—

Will he also state how his Government plans to meet its share of this scheme and in particular—

- (a) the use of existing payments to independent schools by the State Government as part of this scheme including identification of the items involved;
- (b) the amounts included in the Budget currently before State Parliament which specifically refer to or are part of the scheme;

In his reply the Premier stated that in calculating this amount the present *per capita* grants had to be taken into consideration. However, he also included the interest on loans for residential accommodation at \$150,000; the grants for equipment at \$92,000; the library issues for matriculation studies at \$6,000; the subsidies, projectors, etc. at \$8,000; boarding allowances at \$305,000, and the bursaries at \$10,000. He also included the transport of pupils and fare concessions. Incidentally, a mathematical error occurs in this answer. The final total was nearly \$2,000,000, and the Premier claimed that this money had already been spent for these purposes.

This clearly indicates that the Minister first did not want to and then only came to the party very slowly. He wanted to argue all the way along that all the existing grants should be included so that the Government could get out of it as cheaply as possible. Hence I am more than amazed at some of the contents in the letter I quoted before the adjournment. In his reply to Mr. Paul Donnelly's letter, the Minister said—

Having unsuccessfully tried some months ago to raise the bogey of transport and boarding costs being included in the State's assessment, Mr. Donnelly is now attempting to discredit the Government again.

I ask: who raised these bogies? Did Mr. Paul Donnelly raise them a month or two ago?

Mr. T. D. Evans: Would the honourable member pronounce his name again, please?

Mr. Brown: It is Paul Donnelly, a regular writer.

Mr. MENSAROS: His letter appeared in *The Record* of the 29th March. The Minister accuses that gentleman of being responsible for the bogey of transport and boarding costs being included. Yet months and months ago in answer to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition the Premier himself included those and many other things in the calculation of aid to non-Government schools. So the only excuse I can credit the Minister with is that he signed a letter which he did not write; because I am sure he would not have forgotten—

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

Mr. MENSAROS: —the argument which continued day after day inside and outside of this House about what amounts were to be included and what were not to be included. It was not Mr. Donnelly who raised the bogey but the Government itself.

Later on, of course, the Government came to the party and said that it had agreed with the Commonwealth that only the present *per capita* allowances and the allowances for books and stocks would be included. At that time we also queried whether or not it was the intention of the Government to go ahead with the scheme 100 per cent. in the next year. To say the least, the Government was evasive and to my mind and the minds of other interested people the Government implied that it would do so as early as 1973.

You will recall, Sir, that during the short period of the Budget debate last year we asked the Government from where it would get the money. We quoted the same amount—which was easy enough to calculate—that the Government has now quoted; that is, an amount in excess of \$1,300,000. The Minister was not in the Chamber on that occasion when the Leader

of the Opposition and I, in succession, raised that query; but the Minister for Works replied on his behalf—and this, of course, is recorded in *Hansard*—that the Government will find the money for the purpose.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Where does any Government get money from?

Mr. MENSAROS: I am not dealing with that question. I am dealing with the fact that the Minister representing the Minister for Education said to the Opposition, "Don't worry about where the money comes from; we will find it." I have not enough time to cite the *Hansard* record of that debate, but the Minister can look it up. Consequently the Minister waited until Parliament rose and then made a statement saying that the Government would go only half of the way.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Your statement is not correct. I issued a Press statement on the 29th November, before Parliament concluded, setting out the basis of what I gave Parliament when the Bill was introduced.

Mr. MENSAROS: The Press statement undoubtedly appeared in the Press after Parliament rose; that is the point I am making.

The second criticism I level at the Minister—again, with respect—is in regard to the lack of consultation with interested persons from independent schools. I think in this respect again—

Mr. T. D. Evans: Will you substantiate that statement?

Mr. MENSAROS: I substantiate that statement by saying that representations were made to me and the Leader of the Opposition, when he was kind enough to invite me, to that effect.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Will you name the persons who made the allegation?

Mr. MENSAROS: I have not time.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You are not prepared to.

Mr. MENSAROS: To prove my point I refer to the comments of none other than the present Minister for Health who, in the debate to which I referred previously, continually castigated the then Government and said that an inquiry should be conducted into the question. I ask for much less; I merely ask that proper consultations should be held because the representations I received were all to the effect that the schools could not budget because they did not know what they would receive. Indeed, the member for Moore, who made a magnificent speech and who has tremendous experience in this field, did not know as little as two hours ago what the Minister meant, because the information was not included in the Minister's speech. That is the second criticism I level.

As my time is running out, I must turn to the second subject contained in the Bill—a brief and a very technical subject. This technical amendment is necessary because now instead of the deputy director-general there are two assistants. We read about that in the newspaper; we did not hear it from the Minister, nor did we hear whether it was good or bad or why it was necessary. The Minister should say why it was necessary to appoint two assistants.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Why should he?

Mr. MENSAROS: Well, I am speechless, because the Minister's—

Mr. T. D. Evans: That is a transformation.

Mr. MENSAROS: —leader stated time and time again that this is the most important court of the State. Yet the Minister for Education has the audacity to ask why should he tell Parliament about the administration of his department. I think this situation is just short of dictatorship when the Minister asks why he should tell Parliament what goes on in his department. I only ask him with respect whether the changes made were necessary. The least we can expect is to be told that.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You have not bothered to ask.

Mr. Hutchinson: He is asking now.

Mr. T. D. Evans: But he didn't ask before.

Mr. MENSAROS: With regard to the third provision of the Bill I again agree with the member for Moore that this is no alternative to the bonding system—which, by the way, is not spelt out in the Bill; again we have only the second reading speech of the Minister to debate and not a Bill. The Minister has made a promise which, no doubt, he will honour; but once again we have nothing concrete to debate.

I agree with the member for Moore that in many senses this is not an alternative to the bonding system because the past policy of the department has been that anyone who is bonded may go to the department at any stage during the period of his bond and apply to repay the money. As the honourable member pointed out, the department is fairly lenient in this regard and allows the amount owing to be repaid in small instalments.

However, I suspect—although this was not said—that it is included in response to the many criticisms of the bonding system which we have read in various journals and union publications. The Minister is wise enough to realise on advice that we in this State cannot operate without some kind of bonding system, so he has provided an alternative system.

I agree with this because I think it has another benevolent result. Whether or not that was the intention I do not

know because nothing was stated about it. However, it definitely will have the result that if somebody wishes to teach in independent schools he will now have the opportunity to be educated as a teacher not only through the university, but through the normal channels also by way of a loan. He can then go to Scotch College or an independent primary school and take a position as a master or teacher. Previously that opportunity was granted only in small numbers to prospective students; and the innovation was introduced only a few years ago. My observation here is that I agree with the proposed alternative provided that it will be the subject of the regulations, as the Minister indicated in his speech.

I agree with the system of loans being made to prospective students. In fact, such a system was proposed a year ago to the Liberal Party Policy Conference as an alternative to scholarships. If a system of loans were introduced it would give an incentive to students, because if a student is granted a loan after taking up his respective profession or occupation and when he is earning sufficient money, he can then repay the loan. I would go even a step further—and I do not think this suggestion is anti-social—by suggesting that a certain amount of interest be charged on the loan in order that this incentive be maintained. The student who has no means of educating himself—even if education were to be entirely free he would still have to sustain himself—would be given an opportunity to obtain a loan at a particular rate of interest. If a small interest rate were to be charged the State Government would be up for only a small difference in interest rate on the money it is making available for loan purposes.

Mr. Brown: What would you call a small interest rate?

Mr. MENSAROS: I could not go into any details at the moment; the matter would have to be considered.

Mr. Brown: What interest rate would you charge?

Mr. MENSAROS: I would charge a rate sufficient to maintain the incentive to students to take out a loan to further their education. Without any interest rate being charged, some students may consider it is easy money. If the loan were to be repaid over a period of five, six or seven years, it would just be a matter of speculation. That would give him an incentive to study and the education of that student would be to the benefit not only of himself and the community, but also of the State, because after some time the original amount provided in the loans would be repaid continuously and only the interest—which would cost the State more than that which the student pays—would have to be borne by the Treasury.

So, in principle, I strongly support the contention of a student eventually becoming a teacher with the assistance of a loan. In this connection I do not believe in the principle of free tertiary education. This would be a case of someone having to make a choice, and, rightly so, the person who is not chosen could complain of discrimination. There should not be any discrimination, of course, but even if the choice were made purely on merit the system would still be unfair in the eyes of those who were not selected. I know of countries behind the Iron Curtain where the choice of whom to take in is made for political purposes, although the university is absolutely free. However, if one holds any political views, such as I do, one finds that some members of one's family cannot attend the university because of the political views that are held by the parent.

I can imagine future discrimination on the grounds that if somebody praised the Yugoslav Government he will be admitted to the University; whereas if somebody praised the South African Government he will be rejected.

There is one more question the Minister, in his role of Attorney-General, will appreciate. This deals with a slight alteration to the drafting of the bond. I think I am correct in saying that anyone who is 18 years of age can take this responsibility upon his own shoulders. In other words, he does not need a guardian or a parent to sign any bond or document for him. So in actual fact, only a small number of students participating in the bonding system would require guardians or parents to sign bonds for them.

I repeat that we do not oppose the Bill; in the circumstances it would be a step forward and we would definitely like to see the Minister give the member for Moore sufficient time to enable him to put his amendments on the notice paper so that they can be considered during the Committee stage of the Bill and eventually be incorporated in the legislation.

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie—Minister for Education) [2.55 p.m.]: I thank the members who have contributed to the debate, for their study of the Bill, and their support of it to the extent it has been offered. I hope, when I have concluded my speech, the member for Moore, who has given an outline of the amendments he proposes to move, may have second thoughts on them, and thereafter I hope I will command his full support of the measure in the form it has been presented to the Parliament.

Firstly, let me be quite candid about the variations. I would venture, and be bold enough, to say, and would be prepared to stand up and be counted as having said, that no Government has ever contemplated reducing the amounts which hitherto have been paid to support the dual education

system in Western Australia. The fact is that costs will escalate, whether we like it or not, in both the Government and non-Government schools. Therefore it was thought desirable that within the independent schools sector section 9B should be drafted in such a way as to facilitate these upward variations that will be inevitable.

As late as yesterday—and perhaps the member for Floreat will take cognisance of this point—I met a deputation from the Catholic Parents and Friends' Association, and the principle of facilitating upward variations by providing a regulation-making power was accepted by the members of that deputation. Before lunch the member for Floreat quoted from an edition of *The Record*, dated the 29th March last. He quoted from a letter which I had contributed to that newspaper, which letter was published in that edition. In the same edition was published a letter from Mr. Donnelly which the honourable member also quoted. Mr. Donnelly is alleged to be—and I believe is—the one responsible for the formation of the Catholic Parents and Friends' Association in Western Australia back in the 1950s. I believe the association which he formed at Highgate at that time was the forerunner of the Catholic Parents and Friends' Movement throughout Australia.

If one examines that letter dated the 29th March, one would readily come to the conclusion that Mr. Donnelly accepts the principle embodied in the Bill; namely, that section 9B be amended in such a manner as to facilitate the upgrading, from time to time, of amounts made available to independent schools. When I listened to the member for Moore on this point during this morning's debate on the Bill, I took it from what he said that he desired to amend the Bill; that is, to write into section 9B of the Act a provision relating to the 20 per cent. of the assessed costs which the Commonwealth Government invited the State Government to contribute.

On listening to what the member for Floreat had to say it appears he has taken this view: that what the member for Moore intended to do was to ensure that the regulations made under the proposition in the Bill should refer to this 20 per cent. Until I saw the proposed amendments I was not able to indicate whether his understanding of what the member for Moore had said and what I had said was correct.

However, I have now had an opportunity to study the amendments sought by the member for Moore, and I thank him for his courtesy in giving me advance notice of them. These amendments seek to write into the Act a provision relating to the 20 per cent. in such a way as to carry out what the Government has indicated it will do in 1973; and also to carry out what the Government has indicated it is prepared to do in 1974. These amendments go on

to have regard for the initial policy outlined by the former Federal Government; that is, these grants are to operate over a five-year period.

Since this policy was enunciated by the former Federal Government a change of Government has taken place, and the new Government has indicated that in general principle it believes in the dual system; that it is setting up, and indeed it has set up, a committee to blossom forth into a commission to be known as the Australian schools commission; that this commission will make recommendations to the Government in respect of grants to both the Government and the non-Government schools; and that these grants will operate as from 1974.

The Australian schools commission has as yet no statutory existence. I understand that it is expected to make recommendations to the new Federal Government by the 30th June next, so that the information will be available to that Government to enable it to carry out its budgeting operations.

Normally the Federal Budget is brought down in mid-August, and at that point of time the prospects and the intentions of the Federal Government will be made known publicly in mid-August, 1974. If this House accepts the well-intentioned programme outlined by the member for Moore, and if the Federal Government announces its decision in August and discontinues making the national assessment, then if we go ahead with the amendments suggested by the member for Moore we will write into section 9B of our Act a reference that in 1974, firstly, the State will pick up the tab, to use an expression, as from 1973, and pay another specific amount relating to a formula which would by then be meaningless. There would be no assessed figures upon which a calculation under section 9B could be made.

In answer to an interjection this morning I clearly indicated that in 1973 this Government intends to meet half of the 20 per cent. for this year in both the primary and secondary sectors. Having regard for what the Australian schools commission does, if there is an assessed figure we will meet it in full to make up the leeway—which we have not been able to do this year. However, there can be no guarantee that there will be a series of assessed figures arrived at in 1973 to operate in 1974. I am quite candid in saying that.

If we were to adopt the amendments proposed by the member for Moore we would have to consider the situation confronting the Government—a situation which would concern the independent schools to a great extent—as at the beginning of 1974 in so far as the Government, contemplating assistance to non-Government schools in 1974, proposes to provide. I am being quite factual and not being facetious when I say this.

The next State general election will not have been held by then. If there are no assessed figures for 1974 or thereafter, and as Parliament will not be meeting until July or early August subsequent to the State general election, it will be in July or early August of that year before it is possible to request Parliament to rectify section 9B of the Act. So, the independent schools will be the ones to suffer.

I am prepared to concede the point that when this Government proposed amendments to section 9B of the Act in the 1971 Budget it was not able to give effect to the budgetary provision until 1972, but when payments were made they were made retrospective. In the long term it can be said the independent schools have not suffered, but long delays do cause severe budgetary difficulties for them.

I would ask the member for Moore to have regard for a set of difficulties which I can foresee arising; but I make the point quite clearly that it is the intention of this Government—and I believe of any Government—to appreciate sympathetically the position confronting the non-Government schools, because the same situation confronts every Government. I refer to the difficulty of maintaining services, and of meeting increased payments for services where there is a limit in the revenue that is received by a Government by way of fees and taxes. So far as independent schools are concerned there is a limit also to what payments can be made. At the same time the difficulty remains of matching expenditure with revenue. So, any Government would be sympathetic to the position in which independent schools and those administering them find themselves.

The member for Floreat was critical of the form that this Bill takes. I am referring to the principle relating to assistance to independent schools, and also to the provision for enabling a system of loans to operate as an alternative to the bonding system by providing in the Bill a regulation-making power.

I make the point that Governments and, indeed, Parliaments, have always recognised that a regulation-making power is necessary for the proper and efficient administration of government. In regard to a regulation-making power in any legislation some argument, either in a second reading speech, a personal statement, or a white paper, must be presented to justify its inclusion.

Mr. Mensaros: We do not deny this but—

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I come to the point that the major piece of legislation which is introduced into any Parliament is obviously the revenue and expenditure statement presented by the Treasurer of the day; in other words, the Budget. Surely to goodness the Budget itself must be

looked upon as an indication by the Government of the day of what it intends to do by way of receipts and revenue and in terms of disbursement of those receipts in the form of expenditure. Very rarely does Parliament not accept the undertaking given by the Government of the day in its Budget.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: Are you talking about loans now?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: The principle remains the same whether we discuss loans or revenue. However, I am still on the question of the undertaking I have given concerning section 9B.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: With regard to loans—

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I will come to them.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: I thought you were dealing with them now.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: No. The Budget itself is an undertaking by the Government of the day concerning its future intentions in terms of revenue receipts and disbursements of that revenue. From time to time it transpires that a Government is not able to exactly give effect to what it has in good faith indicated to Parliament it intended to do, because the revenue does not reach the estimate. So it could well be that some form of expenditure is not, in fact, then proceeded with.

Sir Charles Court: But that is not comparable.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: Parliaments have been prepared to accept undertakings given by Governments in what is, after all, the major piece of legislation as far as any Government is concerned; that is, its Budget. Consequently if Parliament is prepared to do that, I cannot see why the undertaking given by this Government in respect of section 9B is viewed any differently from the Budget. Why should a different attitude be adopted on this occasion?

Mr. Mensaros: You did not have a provision in the Budget for this expenditure.

Sir Charles Court: The Minister's example of the Budget is not comparable for two reasons. First of all, the Budget next year has to contain two columns, one for last year and one for the proposed year; and, secondly, you have the Auditor-General sitting there as an officer of Parliament so it is an entirely different thing.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: When the Government of the day makes a regulation, it does not have the Auditor-General, but 81 members to challenge the legislation as well as outside interests which are prepared to assess and evaluate the regulation.

Sir Charles Court: You are missing the point.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I am not missing the point. I am carrying on with my speech.

Sir Charles Court: What you say in Parliament has no statutory effect; only the Bill has an effect.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: The Leader of the Opposition has not improved over the years. Someone once referred to him as "the know-all from Nedlands".

Sir Charles Court: You get on and do your job properly.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I was asked to comment—

Sir Charles Court: What you said is not correct.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Why not give him a go? All you do is yap, yap, yap!

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Sir Charles Court: The worst offenders are over there.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You will have your chance later on.

Sir Charles Court: What he is saying is not correct.

The SPEAKER: Order! Both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition will keep order.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: The member for Moore this afternoon asked first of all whether the \$140 referred to in the second reading speech had any significance. It is a basic allowance and would be expected to be applied by the student largely to the purchase of books and the payment of fares. The honourable member will be aware that students who are bonded also receive special allowances. They receive book allowances and independent or separate travel allowances, and these will not be paid to the student who elects to take a loan. However, a global amount of \$140 will be available and will be nonrepayable. It may be applied by the student in whatever manner he deems best to suit his own needs.

The second point raised by the member for Moore concerned whether a student on graduation was automatically qualified to receive a teacher's salary above the allowance obtained as a student. This query was raised in reference to a statement I made that the loan, if taken, would be repayable as from the day of graduation, and that the loan would need to be paid over a period of one year in excess of the period for which the loan was taken.

A student who has completed a course at a teachers' college becomes eligible for a teacher's salary as from the 1st January, so I will have regard for this fact and will ensure that the liability to repay the loan will not commence before

the student becomes eligible for a salary greater than the student allowance he had received. The point raised by the honourable member was quite valid.

Unless the member for Moore has any specific question to ask concerning the loan system, I will conclude.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: Has the Teachers' Union made representations regarding the option of taking the loan, and is it satisfied with the amount?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: No; the Teachers' Union has not made representations to me in respect of the loan system. I had no request from the union to institute such a system. However, I did refer the principle to the union for its appraisal and inviting its comments, which appears to be that while it is not satisfied with the bonding system it could see no harm in the loan system. On the other hand, it cannot see a great deal of virtue in it, either.

As the member for Moore would know, the union would prefer the bonding system to be abandoned completely, but, for reasons well known to the honourable member, the Government is not prepared at this time to dispense with it and therefore it offers an alternative under which a student may qualify for a loan, but there is no compulsion on a student to take a loan.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: Did you inform the union of the amount proposed?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: Yes. It is the Government's intention to proceed with the Bill into Committee this afternoon unless the member for Moore would prefer time to consider the points he raised.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: I am happy about it.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I thank members for their support of the Bill which I commend to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr. A. R. Tonkin) in the Chair; Mr. T. D. Evans (Minister for Education) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3: Section 9B amended—

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: I have circulated to the Minister, and to members, a copy of an amendment which I propose to move to this clause. I was not clear about the intentions of the Minister so I consulted the Parliamentary Draftsman on the basis that three propositions could be involved. I told the Parliamentary Draftsman that the Minister's comments could be interpreted to mean that he would meet half of the shortfall for 1973, but the whole of it in succeeding years. It was also possible that

the Minister intended to meet half the shortfall this year, half next year, and the full amount in following years.

It was not until I persuaded the Minister to advise me, by way of interjection, that I knew just what his intention was. I think the Minister had consulted with the Treasurer when he advised me that it was intended to meet half of this year's obligation this year, and to meet the other half of this year's obligation next year together with next year's obligation in full. The Minister has indicated he is not prepared to go any further than that.

Having arrived at that conclusion, which I had suspected, I went to the Parliamentary Draftsman and had my amendment prepared. That is the reason for the amendment not appearing on the notice paper and I apologise for any inconvenience. I move an amendment—

Page 2, line 15—Delete the passage "those".

If my amendment is agreed to I intend to move for the insertion of several new subsections. I listened very carefully to the Minister when he gave his reasons for not being able to accept my proposed amendment. I have no quarrel with the successive upgrading of assistance; I am not worried about that. We agree with the Government and readily accept the Minister's assurance that the Government would not downgrade assistance to non-Government schools, and that it would at least maintain the present level. Do I understand the Minister correctly?

Mr. T. D. Evans: You do.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: We are in agreement on that point. The Minister has mentioned that the present Federal Government intends to set up a commission to inquire into the needs of schools, and that it may come up with something else. The commission might also come to the conclusion that the proposals made by the previous Federal Government were acceptable to it. In that case there is nothing wrong with the proposed amendment because it will merely write into the Act the amount of the assistance.

If, on the other hand, the commission comes up with a more generous suggestion than that proposed by the Federal Government in September, 1972, the amendment will safeguard the situation because it will specify, "not less than".

Whatever the Government does my amendment ensures that the level of assistance already given to non-Government schools will at least be maintained.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I have no objection to the first part of the proposed amendment, as it appears on the sheet you have distributed. My objection is in respect of proposed new subsection (2b) which refers to 1974. There may not be an assessed

figure in 1974 to which this can refer, and that would be required to make the amendment meaningful.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: Very well.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I would like the member for Moore to comment on that.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: I do not know to what extent I can discuss the words after "those".

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. A. R. Tonkin): I think that is in order, because the deletion pivots on that.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: The Minister had a word or two with me while the debate was in progress and I said I could appreciate his difficulties. At the time he mentioned to me—and he referred to it in his reply to the second reading debate—that there is to be a State election next year. I listened carefully but I do not think he said there would be a change in Government.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I am not contemplating any change. Whether or not there is a change, the situation would remain if there is no assessed figure.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: I hope the Minister will be patient with me. The Minister did not say that there would be a change in the State Government next year but I seemed to hear him thinking that there could be.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You did not hear correctly.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: Regardless of whatever Government assumes office next year—and with due regard for the Minister's fears about the 1974 situation—the words "not less than" appear in subsection (2b) of my amendment. Whatever formula is used or, even if no formula is used, whatever the Committee may come up with, it is the end result with which we are concerned.

Mr. T. D. Evans: In subsection (2b) you refer to an amount calculated according to the formula X-Y, which refers to an assessed national figure. If there is none, this becomes meaningless.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: The important words are "not less than".

Mr. T. D. Evans: Whether the amount is more than, less than, or equal to, there must be an assessed figure. If there is not one, the provision is meaningless.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: I shall read the contentious subsection (2b) which is as follows—

(2b) For the year commencing on the first day of January, 1974, the amount specified under subsection (1) of this section shall be not less than

an amount equal to the sum of the amount specified for the preceding year—

I interpolate to say that the preceding year would be 1973. To continue—

—and an amount calculated according to the formula X-Y.

The formula X-Y is the assessed national cost less the assistance already given; it is one-fifth of that.

The Minister need not have any fears. Let us not worry whether there is a formula or an assessed national cost. We are concerned with the end result. Suppose that this year X dollars are given in assistance under the formula. The effect of the amendment is to state that the assistance for 1974 will not be less than X dollars. It would not matter whether it were 20 per cent. or some other percentage. It would certainly not be assessed on 20 per cent. of a lower sum because the end result would be that non-Government schools would receive less than they are now receiving. The Minister certainly would not go along with that.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. A. R. Tonkin): The honourable member has two minutes.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: I plead with the Minister to accept the amendment, which is not as bad as he thinks it is. The formula may go by the board or something else may be devised in its place, but we want to ensure that the end result is such that non-Government schools will receive not less than that amount regardless of the State election or budgetary difficulties.

Mr. MENSAROS: I thought the ruling given from the Chair an extremely logical one. We would not get anywhere if we only debated the deletion of the word "those".

I understand that the Minister opposes the amendment purely on a technical basis. He is saying that there could well be a time in the future when there is no assessment and we would not have a determined national average upon which to base percentile aid. The Minister may be right, technically, in his argument, but the crux of the matter is that we want to ensure that a minimum is specified in the legislation, regardless of who the Minister may be or the different circumstances which could apply.

Suppose the Minister is right—and he may well be—in saying that there may be no determined national average. Of course, in practice there would always be one but let us assume none is officially announced. Under the present amendment, the most recent determined national average would remain in the legislation.

If the Committee accepts the amendment, there will be nothing to prevent the Minister from doing the good things which he intends to do, because the amendment only states that the amount should be

"not less than". The present national average is \$300 plus and \$500 plus respectively for primary and secondary schools. Even if these figures were adopted as a basis, the amendment would mean that non-Government schools could not fare worse.

I know the skill of the Attorney-General and I do not think his argument is valid. The amendment, as it stands, may have some technical faults; indeed, the member for Moore would probably be the last person to claim that it is perfect. It is no argument to say that something cannot be done because there may be a technical fault in the amendment.

I have no doubt that the Attorney-General's intentions are as he has stated. The amendment would achieve a purpose and, with his skill, the amendment could be varied by him to achieve the same purpose we desire. I am arguing not about the wording of the amendment but about the principle. It should be legislated for, not regulated for. We should write into the legislation that the amount cannot be less. In practice the amount should grow with changed circumstances and future monetary devaluation.

We would only be establishing a minimum in law. I go one step further. The Minister has not spelt out his thoughts loudly. He is not thinking that there may be a change but is quite sure that there will be a change in the attitude of the Federal Government. I am not ashamed to say here and now that I support the amendment for a further reason; I do not want to see an adverse change. In saying this, I am sure I speak for all members of the Opposition, although I have not had time for consultation.

Mr. T. D. Evans: No-one is contemplating an adverse change, but a change, no doubt, is contemplated.

Mr. MENSAROS: The Federal Government could well contemplate a change which, in my book, would be adverse. In all probability the Commonwealth Government will not say that it will give a lesser amount but that the amount should not be given *per capita*. Doubtless it will be based on some devious needs system which, indeed, has been accepted in South Australia. Accordingly, the Commonwealth will give aid to the schools which it chooses to aid.

Mr. T. D. Evans: The former Federal Government adopted a needs basis.

Mr. MENSAROS: A Government of our political colour may have adopted this as a basis for capital grants only, but this certainly does not mean that this is our bible, that it never should be changed, and will always be good.

I still do not agree with it. I feel the *per capita* basis for grants is much better and more equitable and just than any-

thing which is devised on a so-called needs basis, which will come to the same situation as the one I mentioned in my second reading speech—there will be no choice at all. Certain electorates, areas, and chosen schools will get the benefit for certain reasons and others will be left with nothing while the Government says, "Those parents can look after themselves."

We see the writing on the wall. I feel the Minister has already tasted the sweet chocolate the Federal Government gave him but he has not yet come to the bitter pill, and when he does he will realise there is truth in what I am saying. I wish I were wrong—

Mr. T. D. Evans: You are.

Mr. MENSAROS: The time might very well come when the Federal Government, having taken over education completely, will reduce the Minister to a filing clerk. He will then throw his hands up in the air and say, "What can I do about it? I have no more responsibility. Education is a matter for the Commonwealth."

Mr. T. D. Evans: Have you no more faith in or understanding of the Australian Constitution than that?

Mr. MENSAROS: Unfortunately, I have no faith in the Federal Government's present use of the Constitution. Section 96 can be used and the Federal Government can take over in every area covered by the State Ministers.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Have a look at section 51 and perhaps you will understand it.

Mr. MENSAROS: I support the amendment on those grounds but I am flexible enough to suggest that if the Minister honestly thinks this amendment as it is drafted—and it was drafted within a few minutes by the member for Moore, who gave up his lunch time to do it—cannot be accepted, he might consider not rejecting it but adjourning the debate to allow time for the devising of a new formula which is technically acceptable to the member for Moore and the Opposition and which contains in it these provisions: (1) that the aid shall be not less than it is now; (2) that it shall be included in the legislation; and (3) that no matter what the Federal Government does the end result shall remain the same for five years in amount and quality.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: Whilst the amendment before the Chair is simply the deletion of the word "those" with a view to substituting the same word followed by a semi-colon, I agree you have ruled correctly, Mr. Deputy Chairman (Mr. A. R. Tonkin), in allowing debate to take place.

I indicate to the member for Moore that the Government has no objection at all to the provision of terms for definition, which I refer to as paragraph (c) on the

sheet of amendments, which reads as follows—

- (c) by adding after subsection (2) new subsections as follows—

(2a) For the year commencing on the first day of January, 1973, the amount specified under subsection (1) of this section shall be not less than an amount calculated according to the formula $\frac{1}{2} (X - Y)$.

Subsection (2d) gives meaning to the formula " $\frac{1}{2} (X - Y)$ ".

However, when we come to 1974, for subsection (2b) to be meaningful there will of necessity have to be an assessed national figure, and it could well be that there is no new assessed national figure as such. Whilst the member for Moore says I have safeguarded the situation by providing that the State shall give an amount "not less than", we would still have to have regard for a formula of some type—and the type is referred in subsection (2d)—to determine whether the amount given is equal to, greater than, or less than. This determination would depend upon a national figure, and it could well be that there is no national figure.

To establish its *bona fides*, the Government is prepared to accept the provision relating to 1973, followed by the operation of the formula, which will facilitate the member for Moore's amendment; but the Government cannot contemplate doing this for 1974 or thereafter. The member for Moore might consider this during the afternoon tea suspension.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.05 p.m.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: I was about to conclude by pointing out, if it is necessary to establish our *bona fides*, that for 1973 the Government is prepared to accept the principle outlined in proposed paragraph (c) submitted by the member for Moore. This provides for the operation of the formula, $\frac{1}{2} (X - Y)$, referred to in proposed subsection (2d). However, for 1974 and the years thereafter, we will need a series of assessed figures to make paragraph (c) meaningful. When I conclude, I will ask the member for Moore to move to report progress, and we will examine the offer.

The Government is prepared to approve of such legislation, provided that a provision shall be written into the Bill for 1974 that the amount available for any one school will not be less than the global amount made available in 1973, together with the shortfall for 1973.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: In other words, it will not be less than three times what is being offered in 1973?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: No. If we look at the case of a primary school student, at the present time the *per capita* grant is \$30.

The Government now intends to grant \$41.50 for each primary school student in 1973.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: In other words, half the shortfall.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: Yes. In 1974 it will be provided that the amount will not be less than \$30 plus \$23; that is, twice the \$11.50.

Mr. Mensaros: You said the outstanding \$11.50 will be paid next year also.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: Yes. In 1974 we will have to take into account another increment based on the assessed figure. If we do not have an assessed figure in 1973, the paragraph will be meaningless. The Government is prepared to write into the legislation a minimum amount. In 1974 the grant will be not less than \$41.50 plus another \$11.50, the shortfall for 1973.

In 1974 it will then be competent for the Government, when it meets again in August or late July after the general election, to review section 9B in the light of the recommendation of the Australian schools commission.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: Before you sit down, if you are prepared to accept half the shortfall this year, as you have already indicated, next year you will accept the other half plus the whole shortfall for that year?

Mr. T. D. EVANS: This will depend on the determination of a national figure in 1973 to operate in 1974.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: This is where you will run into trouble.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: The figure may not be arrived at in 1973.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: Would you accept the proposition to pay half the shortfall this year, the full shortfall next year, plus the half left over from this year? In other words, that will be three times this year's grant. If you pay \$10 this year, you will pay \$30 next year.

Mr. T. D. EVANS: The Government will give consideration to the proposition put forward by the member for Moore. I invite the member for Moore to report progress.

Progress

Progress reported and leave given to sit again, on motion by Mr. E. H. M. Lewis.

QUESTIONS (30): ON NOTICE

1. TEACHING HOSPITALS

Loan Funds: Expenditure

Dr. DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:

Would he please itemise how each of the teaching hospitals disposed of their loan funds, other than Government funds, under their private borrowing powers in the past 12 months and proposed in the ensuing 12 months, showing each item and cost thereof?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

Borrowings	1971/72	1972/73	Proposed 1973/74	Purpose of borrowing
	\$	\$	\$	
Royal Perth Hospital	162,000	300,000	400,000	Nurses quarters
	138,000			Hospital laundry and linen service
Princess Margaret Hospital	300,000	300,000	400,000	" "
King Edward Memorial Hospital	300,000	300,000	400,000	" "
Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital	300,000	300,000	400,000	" "
Fremantle Hospital		400,000	400,000	New ward block

2.

ELEVATORS

Safe Operation

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Minister for Labour:

- (1) As at 3rd April, 1973, how many orders had been served on owners of city buildings by the Inspection of Machinery Branch to have lifts made safe?
- (2) What action is expected of the owner if, because of union ban on supply of labour, the owner is unable to comply with the order?
- (3) What action is available to the branch or the Minister if the owner does not comply with the order?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) During the year 1972, 702 orders were issued in the State—approximately 97% of these being in the metropolitan area.

Since the beginning of 1973, 240 orders have been issued in the metropolitan area.

Such orders were issued not only to have lifts made safe, but to endeavour to ensure that they remain in this condition at least until the next regular inspection.

- (2) If for any reason the owner is unable to comply with the requirements of an order, he has two alternatives—

(i) place the machine out of service;

(ii) approach the department, put forward his reasons for non-completion and request an extension of time.

- (3) If the machine is placed out of service, no action is required until the owner wants to use it again. If an extension of time is requested the matter is re-considered by the department and, depending on the seriousness of the requirements of the order, will be granted or refused. In the latter case, the lift shall be taken out of service until the work is done.

Dependent upon the circumstances of each case, action for breaching of the Inspection of Machinery Act may be contemplated.

BY-PASS ROAD AND BRIDGE

Mandurah

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has the Main Roads Department abandoned its plan to construct a by-pass road in the Mandurah area from the coast road to the Fremantle Road?
- (2) Has it also abandoned its previous consideration to erect a bridge upstream from the present traffic bridge in Mandurah?
- (3) If not, can he give some details of the department's considerations on this project?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) No. A bridge some distance upstream from the existing traffic bridge is an integral part of the proposed by-pass.
- (3) Planning for the by-pass road and bridge has reached the stage where future land requirements can be defined. No decision has been made concerning the commencement of the project, the construction of which is dependent upon priorities in relation to other major projects.

BREAD

Price Increase

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Minister for Prices Control:

- (1) On how many occasions in each of the last five years has the price of the 2 lb. standard loaf of bread been increased and what was the amount of the increase on each occasion?
- (2) When was the wheat products prices fixation committee appointed?

- (3) How many price rises for the 2 lb. standard loaf have been approved by this committee, what was the increase and upon what dates were they agreed to?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) There have been five price increases since 1st January, 1968, these were—

17/3/69—1 cent increase.

2/1/70—1 cent increase.

12/8/71—1 cent increase.

4/3/72—1 cent increase.

18/12/72—2 cent increase.

- (2) The Wheat Products Prices Fixation Act was originally proclaimed on the 5th December, 1938 and the committee appointed on the 6th December, 1938. The committee lapsed on the 9th May, 1959 and was reconstituted on the 28th January, 1972.

- (3) It is assumed that the Member is referring to the new committee. Two price rises have been approved by this Committee viz:

4/3/72—1 cent increase.

18/12/72—2 cent increase.

5. CONSUMER PROTECTION

Used Cars: Dealers

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Minister for Consumer Protection:

- (1) Has he taken action in the public interest against any used car dealers?

- (2) If not, why?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) No.

- (2) In one case a legal opinion was obtained, but was inconclusive.

All complaints are initially referred to the firm in question. In complaints where a civil action may have been successful, the complaints were satisfactorily resolved by negotiation. A number of complaints currently being investigated may be the subject of legal action depending on the outcome and the evidence available.

In cases of apparent breaches of the Used Car Dealers Act, complaints are referred to the Police Department.

The present Used Car Dealers Act is not considered to be broad enough in scope to cover many of the complaints being received and the Government is preparing appropriate legislation.

6. CONSUMER PROTECTION

Used Cars: Transactions

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Minister for Consumer Protection:

- (1) Has the Consumer Protection Bureau recently published an information bulletin touching on "used car transactions"?

- (2) Where may the public obtain copies of this information bulletin?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) Yes.

- (2) Copies have been widely circulated and at present are available at no charge through—

(i) The Consumer Protection Bureau.

(ii) All sections of the Department of Labour.

(iii) The Citizens Advice Bureau.

(iv) The Consumer Action Movement.

(v) Both Commonwealth and State Immigration offices.

(vi) Migration hostels.

(vii) Department of Community Welfare.

(viii) The Good Neighbour Council.

(ix) The Trades and Labor Council.

(x) Women's Service Guild.

(xi) Royal Automobile Club.

(xii) Several used car firms.

The Education Department will be supplied with sufficient copies for one to be given to each third, fourth and fifth year student of high schools.

In addition, the following organisations have been approached to see if they wish to take copies for distribution—

(i) The Aboriginal Advancement League.

(ii) The Harvest Guild.

(iii) The Association of Civilian Widows.

(iv) The Central Methodist Mission.

(v) The Society of St. Vincent de Paul.

(vi) The Western Australian Housewives Association.

The Western Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce is publishing the Bulletin through its monthly journal.

Many copies have been sent to individuals or small organisations at their request and copies are available to any organisation wishing to distribute them or to any individual.

7. CONSUMER PROTECTION

Used Cars: Licensing of Salesmen

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Minister for Consumer Protection:

For the better protection of the public is consideration being given to legislation requiring the licensing of used car salesmen and used car yard managers?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:
Yes.

8. KWINANA-BALGA POWER LINE

Armadale-Kelmscott Route

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) Will he table a plan of suitable scale for identification showing the 330 kV powerline from the southern terminal at Kwinana to the boundary of the Gosnells and Kalamunda shires where the powerline passes from the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott, or as much of the route that is decided?
- (2) Now that it has been confirmed that the land along the route north of the Allen Road alignment at Armadale and Kelmscott is zoned rural and mainly undeveloped and the land south of this route is zoned rural and substantially subdivided and developed, will he have the powerline moved the few yards to the north through this area to give relief to the many householders adversely affected?
- (3) If he refuses to act as requested in (2), will he give the factual reasons for declining, having regard for the disturbance to the many householders on the present route as against no public inconvenience on the other?
- (4) Has the land adjacent north or south of the Allen Road alignment now been rezoned urban?
- (5) Has the State Electricity Commission conferred with the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott regarding the power line route from the South Western Railway at Kelmscott to the boundaries of Gosnells and Kalamunda shires?
- (6) If "Yes" to (5), what is the decision?
- (7) If "No" to (5), when will these negotiations take place?

Mr. MAY replied:

- (1) Plans of the route are available for inspection and explanation at the head office of the State Electricity Commission.

(2) to (4) Foundations for most of the towers in this area are now in place. No householders are adversely affected. The statement and questions on zoning are not understood.

(5) to (7) Officers of the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott have been kept informed of route planning. When surveys are completed and plotted in the near future, the shire will be informed officially.

9. WATER SUPPLIES

Sand Pit: Lilian Avenue

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What are the agreed conditions for transferring the water board's Lilian Avenue sand pit to the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott?
- (2) When will the authority be given to the shire to plan the redevelopment of the sand pit for recreational and associated activities?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) and (2) This is still the subject of negotiation with the shire and an arrangement has been agreed to whereby the Lilian Avenue land will be disposed of to the shire, which will make available to the board a part of lot 427 Gibbs Road, Armadale.

The shire is at present examining the Gibbs Road site to determine the proportion to be vested in the board which will be satisfactory to their plans and development of that site.

10. WESTFIELD PARK SCHOOL

Canteen, Classrooms, and Resource Centre

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has allocation of Government subsidy for Westfield Park primary school canteen been approved subject to presentation and approval of plans and specifications and evidence of the association contribution being confirmed?
- (2) If "No" to (1), when will the subsidy be available?
- (3) When will the last segment of the cluster be built at this school?
- (4) Will a resource centre and covered assembly area be built at the same time as the last cluster or before?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) The application for subsidy assistance has been listed for consideration in the estimates for 1973-74.

(3) The last cluster is scheduled for commencement in the next financial year.

(4) Yes.

I take it that the resource centre will be built at the same time as the last cluster.

11. KELMSCOTT SCHOOL

Classrooms and Additions

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Has approval been given for modification of Kelmscott primary school classrooms to provide doorways to open areas?

(2) If "Yes" to (1), when will this work be carried out?

(3) When will the three Bristol pre-fab classrooms at this school be replaced with a cluster-type building?

(4) What building replacements and additions are planned for this school?

(5) Will the present inadequate toilets for teachers be rectified by suitable provision in the new cluster-type building?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

(1) No.

(2) Not applicable.

(3) Replacement is dependent on the availability of finance. No allocation of loan funds has been made for replacement of Bristol rooms at this school.

(4) No additions are planned for the present.

(5) It is possible that toilets will be considered as a separate project.

12. ROCKINGHAM HIGH SCHOOL

Upgrading

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Is the Rockingham high school to provide for fourth year education next year?

(2) If "No" to (1), will he give reasons for this decision, considering the large number of third year students at the school this year?

(3) Relating to the provision of accommodation—

(a) what additional facilities are to be built at this school this year;

(b) when will the construction commence?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Answered by (1).

(3) (a) and (b) Adequate accommodation for general purposes is available but a more detailed survey is being undertaken.

13.

POLICE STATION

Jurien Bay

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

Is it proposed to build a police station and quarters at Jurien Bay and, if so, when?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

Yes. It is proposed that a police station and quarters be built at Jurien Bay in the 1973-74 financial year, subject to finance being available.

14.

DRAINAGE

High Wycombe

Mr. MOILER, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) Are flood gates installed in the drainage system which caters for the general location of the High Wycombe hotel?

(2) If so—

(a) where are the gates installed;

(b) when were they installed;

(c) what is the purpose of the gates?

(3) Are the gates closed at present?

(4) Were the gates closed during the past summer?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

(1) Gates are installed in this system. They are not flood gates but control gates.

(2) (a) There are four gates—one at the outlet to the basin at the rear of the hotel, another immediately downstream of Kalamunda Road and two in the section between Kalamunda Road and the railway.

(b) During summer of 1970-71.

(c) To control the groundwater level as protection for the rural properties between Kalamunda Road and the railway.

(3) and (4) Yes, partially.

15. SWANBOURNE HIGH SCHOOL

Sports Ground Reticulation

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Works:

(1) Is he aware that the grounds of the Swanbourne high school are unusable because of lack of reticulation caused by one pump being out of order, one pump not reaching the water level and a third bore

and pump not being installed, despite constant requests over the past 12 months by the principal to remedy these faults?

- (2) Is he aware that as a consequence the school has to hire outside grounds for sports days which causes inconvenience, loss of time and unnecessary cost to the school parents and citizens' association?
- (3) Will he ensure that the pumps will be repaired and/or installed within the shortest possible time so that the grounds could be reticulated?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) and (2) On 2nd April, 1973, I received a letter from the Swanbourne senior high school parents and citizens' association informing me of the problem with reticulation of the school grounds.
- (3) Yes.

16. EDUCATION FACILITIES

Use by Public: Investigating Committee

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Who are the members of the special Government committee he was reported to mention as investigating the possibility of using Education Department facilities in schools for community amenities?
- (2) What are the terms of reference of the committee?
- (3) Has it submitted a report?
- (4) If so, would he table the report?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Mr. J. H. Barton (Chairman)—Education Department.
Dr. D. Mossenson—Education Department.
Mr. F. Bell—Community Welfare Department.
Mr. W. T. English—National Fitness Council.
Dr. M. Keyes—Youth Council.
Mr. M. Williams—Architectural Division, Public Works Department.
Mr. L. McCarrey—Treasury.
Mr. M. Gatti (Executive Officer)—Education Department.
Mr. English was the Director of the National Fitness Council when the committee was formed, and Dr. M. Keyes was the Chairman of the Youth Council. Both those councils have ceased to exist. They were responsible for the new

Youth, Community Recreation and National Fitness Council, and Mr. English is the director of the new council and Dr. M. Keyes is a member of it.

- (2) (a) To investigate the concept of the "community centre high school".
(b) To examine the social and educational requirements.
(c) To assess the financial implications.
(d) To submit the committee's findings to the Minister for Education for transmission to the Government.
- (3) No. The investigations have not yet been completed.
- (4) Answered in (3).

17. TEACHERS' TRAINING COLLEGES

Admissions and Conditions

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

Can he give information about the conditions which were applied in admitting applicants to—

- (a) teachers' colleges;
- (b) the secondary teachers' college, at the beginning of the current school year?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

The selection of applicants for entry into the teachers' colleges is extremely complex and involves the consideration of many factors. If the Member could be more specific as to the meaning of the word "conditions" information will be supplied.

18. CENSORSHIP

Advisory Committee

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

What were the conditions and/or qualifications taken into consideration when nominating the committee appointed to advise the Chief Secretary on censorship of publications?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

Sub-section 2 of section 7 of the Act defines that—

- (a) at least one member of the committee be a woman;
- (b) at least one shall be a recognised expert in literature, art or science; and

- (c) one shall be a practitioner as defined by section 3 of the Legal Practitioners Act, 1893.

As a result Mrs. E. Wood and Mrs. S. Landquist were selected because of the first qualification, Miss D. Hewett (an authoress-playwright and tutor in English) and Mr. W. H. Edwards (an author and journalist) as recognised experts in literature, and Mr. E. M. Heenan as a legal practitioner. In view of the introduction of restricted publications it was felt desirable to select a person associated with youth and in this category the Chairman, Mr. C. A. Hamer, has had wide experience. Mr. W. McM. Brown, the seventh member, has, as an officer, had wide local government experience and was selected as a member of the public.

19. IRON ORE

Trade with Japan: Industrial Action

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Has he investigated the statements of participants at a recent industrial seminar in Busselton where it was reported—
 - (a) that Australia's iron ore trade with Japan had been irretrievably damaged by industrial action;
 - (b) that workers could not see that their jobs were being affected by their own action; and
 - (c) that some union members had broken their agreements with the Mount Newman Mining Company at a time when it was felt the unions had bargaining strength because of the recent effects of cyclones that had caused reduction in stock piles?
- (2) If (1) is "Yes" what were his findings and recommendations to correct the situation?
- (3) If (1) is "No", will he investigate the statements which, if true and they are not corrected, could leave many Pilbara families in financial difficulties?
- (4) Did the majority of the 900 workers at Mount Newman vote for strike action or was the strike action initiated by organisers?
- (5) What are the conditions requested by the men and refused by the Mount Newman Mining Company in relation to the strike action?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) to (3) The words used in parts (a) to (c) of question (1) were not "statements of participants" at the conference. They were views aired by an individual participant and I believe should be interpreted against the background of circumstances associated with their utterance.

As a participant of the conference and present at the time the views were expressed I offer the following impressions—

- (a) The comments were not part of a prepared address or made in a programmed session.
- (b) They were incidental comments in support of a case put forward by the person concerned that unions in fact broke industrial agreements.
- (c) The case was not offered as an affirmation but in rebuttal to claims by a trade union official that in fact employers broke more industrial agreements than did employees.
- (d) The matter arose because the trade union official requested permission to make a statement to the gathering and that the person quoted agreed to offer rebuttal; in other words, but for the request of the trade union official to address the gathering and the subsequent "attack" by that official,—on a non-programmed item the words quoted would not have been uttered.
- (e) The person quoted is the Industrial Relations Manager of the company and not of the executive level from which one might normally expect such an important statement.

However, at the morning tea break I did approach the speaker and we spoke for some minutes on industrial problems in the north. It was agreed that on a convenient date he, and any of his colleagues so desiring, should meet with me in my office for further discussions on the matter.

In the circumstances above, no investigations have been instituted at this stage nor do I anticipate doing so unless the matter is formally raised by the company.

- (4) Unknown.

- (5) I understand that a list of alleged grievances by the men is in the possession of the company. I do not have the details.

Incidental to this matter, I have received a telegram from worker representatives at Port Hedland requesting my intervention because of alleged poor industrial relations in the area. After consulting both the Trades and Labor Council and the company I replied by telegram offering involvement in those areas considered appropriate to my department.

20. DECENTRALISATION

Incentives

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

- (1) What has been the cost of incentives to encourage decentralisation introduced by the Labor Government?
- (2) What new industries have been encouraged to commence operations as a result of these incentives and in what towns are they located?
- (3) What additional employment opportunities have these industries directly created?
- (4) What has been the actual cost to date of incentives granted to Thomas Borthwick & Sons, Albany, prior to the commencement of that company's extension programme?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) Firms granted incentives have not yet made claims, as they are either still under construction or have only recently commenced production.

- (2) Eleven new firms have been encouraged to commence in Lancelin, Wittenoom, Northam, Derby, Manjimup, Denmark, Moora, and Katanning. In addition, 29 existing firms have been assisted to expand their operations.

- (3) 538 persons in the new industries, and at least 200 persons as a result of expansion of existing firms.

- (4) Thomas Borthwick & Sons enjoyed a 10% rail freight concession for the five years ended 30th June, 1972. The actual cost of the benefit is not separately recorded in railway accounts.

21. WATER SUPPLIES

Stirling Electorate: Expenditure

Mr. STEPHENS, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) With regard to town water supplies at Mount Barker, Cranbrook and Tambellup, what is the respective capital expenditure to 28th February, 1973?
- (2) Of this amount, how much has been expended in each of the preceding five years, and what was the operating and maintenance costs for the same period?
- (3) What is the estimated cost of the pipeline from Denmark River to Mount Barker?
- (4) Can he give any indication of the probable cost of extending the above scheme from Mount Barker to Cranbrook and Tambellup?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Total capital expenditure to 28th February 1973—

		\$
Mount Barker	598,009
Cranbrook	386,122
Tambellup	227,511

(2)—

			Mount Barker		Cranbrook		Tambellup	
			Capital	Operating & maintenance	Capital	Operating & maintenance	Capital	Operating & maintenance
			\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
1967/68	5,756	12,562	19,099	6,744	1,568
1968/69	8,279	15,812	15,105	4,248	22,656	3,137
1969/70	21,771	17,384	1,895	3,301	5,884	9,516
1970/71	4,802	20,566	201,920	5,149	1,090	14,451
1971/72	3,629	18,726	39,605	6,740	1,016	40,723
1972/73 (to 28/2/73)			667	10,539	1,760	7,347	65	5,919

(3) \$1,400,000.

(4) Not possible in the absence of field surveys.

22. BENBULLEN GRAZIER'S AND PRODUCERS PTY. LTD.

Investigation

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Attorney-General:

Further to the answer to a question on Wednesday, 4th October, 1972 where advice was given that an investigation had been carried out by officers of the Companies Registration Office into a company known as Bunbullen Graziers and Producers Pty. Ltd. and that the report had been completed and submitted, will he now table the report?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

Consideration will be given to tabling the report when Crown Law advice has been received.

The file is still being examined.

23. LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Oath of Allegiance

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Has he received objections from the Local Government Association and individual local authorities against the Commonwealth Government's announced intention to omit the oath of allegiance to the Queen from the service of naturalization?
- (2) What action has he taken to support the local authorities or does he support the Commonwealth Government's intention?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) This is not a subject requiring my support of either the municipal councils or the Commonwealth Government, the matter being outside the scope of my jurisdiction.

24. KWINANA BEACH

Swimming Fatalities

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

- (1) Will he table the findings of police investigation of the swimming fatalities at Kwinana Beach earlier this year?
- (2) Do the police consider there are any circumstances in the area which cause unusual danger to the swimmers?

- (3) If "Yes" to (2), what actions have been taken to minimise the risks to the public?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Yes, following completion of the coroner's inquiries.
- (2) Not that they are aware of.
- (3) Answered by (2).

25. ROCKINGHAM-KWINANA HOSPITAL

Building Contract

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What is the extent of the work completed on the site of the Rockingham-Kwinana hospital other than excavations?
- (2) Are there any circumstances which will prevent the letting of the contract to build the hospital and the contractors to commence construction before Christmas 1973?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), will he specify the circumstances?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) Work has commenced on the pouring of concrete for the basement floor slab and the footings and approximately half of the slab floor for the multi-storeyed building has been completed. Work is also proceeding on the erection of columns, and approximately 20% have been completed.
- (2) None is known.
- (3) Answered by (2).

26. DEVELOPMENT

Power Offer: Job Opportunities

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

Further to the article in *The Sunday Times* of 25th March, 1973 headed "Big Power Offer to W.A. Could Mean 300,000 Jobs" and which statement the Premier is credited with making, will he advise the current position to date and, if progress has been made, in particular—

- (a) numbers and names of companies involved;
- (b) how much has been expended;
- (c) how many have already been employed to date;
- (d) how long will it be before the 300,000 will be employed?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

In reply to the member for Mt. Lawley—

Mr. O'Connor: I hope it is the right date this time.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: —the answer is—
The Sunday Times of the 25th March, 1973, has been carefully scanned throughout, and no such article as that referred to by the member appears. The question is, therefore, irrelevant.

27. **TRADE UNIONS**

Disallowance of Question

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Speaker:

In view of the fact he permitted a question without notice from the Member for Dale regarding an inquiry into allegations of blackmail and intimidation, why was a similar question from me not permitted?

The SPEAKER replied:

I would remind Members that questions without notice are governed by the same rules as questions on notice.

The question of the Member for Dale appeared to be of a general nature regarding a proposed inquiry into the particular activities of certain unions.

The Member's two questions were more direct in their reference to a particular union, and therefore, in my opinion, infringed the rule, matters—*sub judice*.

28. **PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT**

Tenders, and Day Labour Force

Mr. R. L. YOUNG, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) How many and which major public works (\$100,000 or more) have been put out to tender since February 1971?
- (2) What was the total day labour work force under his administration—
 - (a) on 15th March, 1971; and
 - (b) on 28th February, 1973?
- (3) How many people under 2 (b) are employed—
 - (a) on normal State works under ordinary State financing;
 - (b) on Commonwealth financed works under special grants?
- (4) What is the estimated expenditure on wages for people employed under (3) (a) and (3) (b) for the year ending 30th June, 1973?
- (5) What is the estimated cost of each project listed on the two schedules supplied as part of his answer to my letter of 17th January, 1973?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) The information requested is contained in Appendix "A" which, with permission, I hereby table.

- (2) (a) 3,316.
 (b) 3,872.
- (3) (a) 3,623.
 (b) 249.
- (4) (a) \$15,654,826.
 (3) (b) \$1,283,803.
- (5) The information requested is contained in Appendix "B" which, with permission, I hereby table.

Appendices "A" and "B" were tabled (see paper No. 98).

29. **CENTRAL BUS STATION**

Construction and Cost

Mr. R. L. YOUNG, to the Minister for Works:

- (a) Who built the central city bus terminal;
- (b) what is the total cost of that project;
- (c) was the project put out to tender?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (a) Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust with a registered builder, J. & E. de Francesch as co-ordinator.
- (b) The total cost has not been finalised but it is now expected to be approximately \$560,000, without land.
- (c) All sub-contracts were put out to tender to a number of selected tenderers under the supervision of the Principal Architect.

30. **SEWERAGE**

Mandurah: Cost

Mr. R. L. YOUNG, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

What is—

- (a) the cost to date;
- (b) the estimated total cost, of the Mandurah sewerage works?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (a) Cost to date—\$403,296.
- (b) The estimated total cost to the State of stage 1 of the Mandurah sewerage works, excluding land resumption and consultants' fees, etc., is \$663,000. It is programmed that this will be completed this financial year.
 Work on stage 2 will commence in 1973-74 financial year. The total cost of stage 2 has not yet been estimated; however, detailed planning

has been completed up to 3.
1975-76 and the expenditure
is estimated to be—

	\$
1973-74	306,000
1974-75	211,000
1975-76	200,000

QUESTIONS (12): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. INDUSTRIAL STOPPAGE

Shipping in the North-West

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Minister for Labour:

Arising out of the answer he gave to question 19, is he able to advise the House how many ships are currently held up at Port Hedland or any other Pilbara ports because of the industrial trouble? I refer not only to ships held up in the ports, but also those awaiting berths.

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

I have no knowledge of any, but if the honourable member will place the question on the notice paper I will have the information made available.

2. WATER SUPPLIES

Ongerup and Jerramungup

Mr. W. G. YOUNG, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has any decision been made regarding the piping of water from Mills Lake to Ongerup; if not, when will this decision be made?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that the towns of Ongerup and Jerramungup will be without water by the end of May?
- (3) If no attempt is made to pipe water to these towns, what provision is the Government making to ensure that water will be supplied to these areas?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) No. A decision will be dependent on the outcome of field investigations and a drilling programme which will take some time to complete.
- (2) Storages at Ongerup and Jerramungup, although low, will not be exhausted by the end of May.
- (3) (a) Ongerup—improvements to be adopted have still to be determined and will be subject to the availability of finance.
(b) Jerramungup—a design has been completed for a new 12,000,000-gallon dam and 24 acres of bitumen catchment. Work will commence when finance becomes available.

PRICES CONTROL

Legislation

Mr. BERTRAM, to the Minister for Consumer Protection:

- (1) When does he intend introducing an excessive prices Bill, and what will it be styled?
- (2) What makes the Minister feel that this Bill will be acceptable on this occasion to members in another place?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) At the next sitting of the House it is my intention to move for leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to make provision for the regulation of prices and rates for certain goods and services, and for matters incidental thereto.
- (2) I believe this will be acceptable because, firstly, such legislation is based on that which has been in operation in South Australia and has apparently stood the test of time; and, secondly, such legislation had been used there by a State Liberal Government apparently successfully for about two decades.

4. DEVELOPMENT

Power Offer: Job Opportunities

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

Relating to question 26 I have the file of newspaper cuttings before me, and the correct dates. Does the Premier have the reply to the question which I asked relating to an article which appeared in *The Sunday Times* of the 25th March, 1972?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

Thrid time lucky! In searching for the article referred to by the honourable member I discovered this morning it was in a newspaper of 1972. Naturally I anticipated that the honourable member would come back and ask a question without notice. I am pleased to say that in his question he mentioned that the article credited me with having said what is mentlond there.

I say straightout that I never said it at all. On no occasion did I state to anybody that what I had in mind would provide 300,000 jobs. What I did say was that whilst I was in Japan I spoke to several Japanese companies which were anxious to invest their money in Western Australia in the provision of generating plant for the supply of electric power; and they were prepared to come in as soon

as the Government indicated to them that there was an opportunity for them to do so.

The offers are still open, but it has not been necessary for us to proceed. One of the things we had in mind was this: If there is an industry which desires particularly cheap power and large quantities of it, and the Government itself does not have the finance to provide for the purchase of the generating equipment, this is a way in which the power can be provided.

As a matter of fact I think the honourable member has knowledge of a proposal which was put to his own Government by Mr. Edgar Booth who had been in touch with some people overseas. These people were prepared to do what I have just outlined.

I repeat that at no stage did I supply the information which was the basis of the newspaper article, nor am I responsible for the way it was written up. All I can say is this is a case of poetic license.

5. PRICES CONTROL

Research into Effectiveness

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Consumer Protection:

- (1) Having regard for the total involvement of all Western Australians in the economic stability of the State and his own refusal to have the Consumer Protection Bureau research and report on vital aspects of price control, will he at his earliest convenience have research carried out and report to Parliament upon the effectiveness, advantages and disadvantages of—

- (a) selective price control;
- (b) price control by freeze of prices, wages, and Government charges;
- (c) alternative ways and means of ensuring adequate supply to match demand at the best possible price?

- (2) Is the Mrs. Ruth Coleman—

- (a) who was so active in price control issues before the last State election;
- (b) a member of the endorsed Senate team for the Australian Labor Party;
- (c) a member appointed by the Government to the Consumer Protection Bureau;

one and the same person?

- (3) If "Yes" to (2), does he consider this person is "trading unfairly" or has a vested interest?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) to (3) Because of the obvious and considerable expense involved should I agree to such an inquiry as suggested in the question being held, and because I only received notice of this question at 3.15 p.m. today, I ask that it be placed on the notice paper.

6. STATE SHIPPING SERVICE

Round-Australia and Albany Voyages

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

- (1) In what year did the State Shipping Service cease the round-Australia voyages?
- (2) In what year did the last State ship call into the Port of Albany either to take on or discharge cargo?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) 1969.
- (2) The 27th to the 29th August, 1969.

7. QUESTIONS

Replies by Minister for Works

Mr. R. L. YOUNG, to the Minister for Works:

In respect of the answers to questions 28 to 30 on today's notice paper, how can I obtain an answer from him on the 5th April, 24 hours after putting a question on the notice paper, when I was unable to obtain answers to the same questions posed in a letter dated the 26th February which he must have received the day afterwards and to which I have had no reply?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

I must have this matter researched as I am unable to answer the question off the cuff. Therefore I ask that it be placed on the notice paper.

Mr. R. L. Young: It will be.

8. LAPORTE TITANIUM

Effluent Disposal

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Premier:

- (1) Is it correct that the proposal announced yesterday for treatment of the Laporte effluent would, if successful, only partly treat and resolve the effluent problem?
- (2) If so, to what extent would the process be able to treat and reduce the objectionable features of the effluent both as to content of the effluent and discolouration?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) and (2) The effluent responsible for the trouble at Bunbury consists mainly of iron and sulphuric acid. In the first stage of treatment of the effluent it is proposed to deal with the iron which is the major source of pollution. The further stage of treatment will remove the sulphuric acid. So it can be said that this is a complete and effective treatment of the effluent.

Both products will be obtained as explained previously. In the first case it will be manganese dioxide because the iron will combine with the manganese. I am informed that the iron which is now in the effluent will be taken from the works in crystal form so it will not be in the liquid at all.

Mr. Hutchinson: Does not a part of the iron remain?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The iron will be taken from the works before it gets into the liquid. It will be taken from the works in crystal form.

Mr. I. W. Manning: Does this completely remove the discoloration?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: How many questions must I answer?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Hutchinson: It is interesting.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The main pollutant is the iron which will be taken from the works in crystal form. There will still be in the liquid sulphuric acid which will not be dealt with in the first stage of treatment, but will be dealt with in the second and further stages.

The advice to me is that this will be a complete and effective method to deal with the pollutants in the effluent which are the cause of the existing problem which is expensive.

9. SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Thursday Evenings

Mr. NALDER, to the Premier:

Last evening he advised the House that Parliament would not sit after tea tonight and on the Thursday preceding Good Friday. Has he been able to consider whether the House will sit next Thursday after tea?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

Since yesterday, further consideration has been given to this matter. I can see that it would

be appreciated by members if they were able to plan on the basis that they would not be required to be here for the remaining Thursday in the period under discussion, so I am prepared to give an assurance that we will not sit after tea on Thursday evenings until after the Easter break. In other words, including this evening, Parliament will not sit after tea on Thursdays for four weeks. However, after the Easter break we must be prepared to sit after tea on Thursdays.

10.

LAPORTE TITANIUM

Effluent Disposal

Sir CHARLES COURT, to the Premier:

Arising from the answer he gave concerning the treatment of effluent at Bunbury, would he be prepared to table on Tuesday, as I assume he does not have the information with him now, a full technical statement regarding the effluent proposal, as my information from qualified people is that the announcement made yesterday is for a process which from the information made public will remove only half the iron and none of the sulphuric acid? The Premier has answered the query concerning the sulphuric acid as this is to be dealt with in the second phase. However, my information is that even the second phase will remove only half the iron. In other words, the discoloration will continue, but there should be a lesser iron content. Can he give a full statement on Tuesday so the House can study the new proposal?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

The information conveyed to me by the person most concerned in this experiment is that there will be no discoloration at all. For reasons which should be obvious I am not prepared at this stage to table the papers which indicate the formula.

Sir Charles Court: I am not asking for the formula.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The only papers I have set out the complete formula and the stages. The Leader of the Opposition must appreciate that a patent has been applied for. As is always the case, a number of people who have been looking for a solution say it cannot be done. A number of others claim they can do the same thing

as has been the case with the Sarich engine. So I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition be a little patient and wait to see what happens with regard to the process.

Sir Charles Court: I want information to verify what you said—to explain in layman's terms the proposed process. We are not asking for the formula.

Mr. Jamieson: You asked for more than that.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition certainly did.

Sir Charles Court: All right, give us as much as we can have.

Mr. J. T. TONKIN: The answer to the question as to whether I will table the information is, "No".

11. ECONOMY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Signs of Improvement

Mr. W. G. YOUNG, to the Premier:

(1) Further to the question asked by the member for Ascot without notice of the Premier on Wednesday, the 4th April, commenting on the *Daily News* article of the same date "Signs Point to W.A.'s Return to Prosperity", and in view of the Premier's obvious delight at this article, does he not agree that this confidence in the economy has been brought about by the increase in wool prices, as this article points out?

(2) What steps has his Government taken to ensure that this confidence is not destroyed by the dramatic drop of 45 per cent. at yesterday's Fremantle sale?

(3) Will he immediately press the Federal Government to expedite the implementation of an acquisition scheme for wool, which has been asked for by the industry?

Mr. Bertram: What? More centralism? Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: To continue—

(4) Will immediate representations be made to the Minister for Primary Industry to see that the Wool Commission operates at all future wool sales to prevent any further decline in prices?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

(1) The improvement in the economy is due, in part only, to the increase in wool prices. There are a num-

ber of other contributory factors as the honourable member very well knows.

(2) The prices at auction fluctuate with the ebb and flow of demand, and the recent drop in wool prices is a result of Japanese buying. There is no action the Government can take to control this.

(3) and (4) I have full confidence that the Federal Government will take the necessary action to implement the wishes of the woolgrowers with regard to the sale of wool.

12. CONSUMER PROTECTION

Pyramid Selling

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Minister for Consumer Protection:

Yesterday the Minister tabled a tape recorder, and a number of documents. I do not think members are quite familiar with what is indicated by the production of the instrument and I ask the Minister if he would be prepared to elaborate to the House what was actually involved in the tabling of the recorder and documents?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

The honourable member was good enough to advise me that he would ask this question, and I will take advantage of this opportunity to add one or two comments to what has already been said.

Members have had an opportunity to examine the material which has been tabled. That material was purchased at a price of \$3,000 by a person who lodged a complaint with the Consumer Protection Bureau. An assessment of its worth would be, roughly, \$100. With the purchase of the material for \$3,000 is included the right to introduce other people to the company concerned. The purchaser is advised that a commission of \$1,200 will be paid to him for introducing a subsequent purchaser.

The material on the tape seems to be innocuous, and is almost laughable in some of its forms. It is obviously intended to prey on emotions.

The recordings, allegedly, are to motivate people to sell more of this equipment and thus make themselves quite wealthy. An advertisement appeared in *The West*

Australian on the 3rd March, and it was to run for a month. The advertisement read as follows—

BUSINESS FOR SALE full price \$3,000 finance arranged nett profit \$1000 per month for further information apply in writing . . .

The complainant who approached the department gave the following information: Having agreed to purchase, but not having sufficient funds, she was invited to lodge an application with a credit firm. She was accompanied to the credit firm by the wife of a director of the company who assisted her to fill in an application. The information filled in on the application was false in that it advised the money was to be borrowed for another purpose. The woman who accompanied the purchaser then waited outside until the transaction was completed. The complainant claimed that the person who accompanied her then called daily until the cheque from the credit firm arrived. She also went to the bank with her, waited while the cheque was cashed, and received the sum of money.

The department understands—from phone calls received—that others may also have paid \$3,000 for similar material.

This matter has been brought to the notice of the public in the United States. It has also been referred to by Ministers and others connected with consumer affairs in the other States of Australia.

I believe that full publicity should be given to this matter which is obviously misrepresentation and nothing short of robbery.

ACTS AMENDMENT (ROAD SAFETY AND TRAFFIC) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 29th March.

MR. O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley) [4.53 p.m.]: I have been in this House now for a period of over 14 years and it seems that during each session, without exception, Bills in connection with traffic matters have come before us. The various pieces of legislation have dealt with tyres, vehicles, alcohol tests, speed limits, seat belts, and so on.

Despite the large number of amending Bills which have been presented to this Parliament the position regarding the number of road deaths in Western Australia has continued to deteriorate. Action

has been taken by various Governments but it is still very difficult to see how the road toll problem can be overcome.

According to the Minister the present Bill is brought forward in an attempt to reduce the road toll in Western Australia. I fail to see how the introduction of this Bill—or the implementation of its provisions—will achieve that objective. However, I do agree with certain parts of the measure.

It is relevant for members to realise that this Bill has been introduced as a result of the findings of an interdepartmental committee. The committee was set up on the 1st July, 1972—and I hope that in this instance I have quoted the correct date. The report of that committee was completed in December, and I take it for granted that it was handed to the Minister at that time. However, as ordinary members of this House, we had an opportunity to see the contents of the report, for the first time, on Thursday of last week when it was presented in conjunction with the Bill.

Mr. Jamieson: The report was fully reported in the Press at the time it was released—almost in its entirety.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I ask the Minister whether the report was made available to members of Parliament prior to last Thursday?

Mr. Jamieson: Members could have had it at any time. It was made available to the Press.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I think my assertion in connection with this matter is accurate. I know that many members are concerned at the lack of opportunity to examine the report and the Bill. Quite a lot of work is involved in comparing the proposals in the Bill with the Act, and in ascertaining what the amendments involve.

Mr. Jamieson: Despite the fact that the report was fully publicised, not one member requested a copy of it between the time of the announcement and the time of the report being tabled.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I must admit I did not know, until last Thursday, that the report was available.

Mr. Jamieson: It was freely given to the Press.

Mr. O'CONNOR: It was not freely handed out to members.

Mr. Jamieson: But they could have had it.

Mr. O'CONNOR: When dealing with a Bill of this nature—a very important one—many members desire to discuss its contents with their local authorities. However, because of the lack of time many members have not been able to do so. I am sure that other members will deal with this point at a later stage.

I would like to draw to the attention of members the terms of reference of the committee because I believe those terms were a little restrictive. I will refer, briefly, to some of the details in the terms of reference because I consider them to be relevant and quite important with regard to road safety and the overall position of traffic.

In July, 1972, the Minister for Traffic Safety set up an interdepartmental committee to inquire into and establish a new department. I emphasise the words "establish a new department". It is to be responsible for traffic safety, accident research, and related matters such as the registration of motor vehicles and the licensing of drivers.

The need for the inquiry arose from the several recommendations made by Superintendent Monck after he made a study tour to overseas countries during the first half of 1972. The report stated that in making the inquiry the committee had paid regard to the Premier's policy speech delivered in February, 1971, in which he outlined the Labor Party's policy on traffic safety.

I think the policy of the Government considerably restricted the work of the members of the committee. They were not able to proceed with and organise what they considered would be the most satisfactory traffic control authority in this State. The members of the committee were not able to make recommendations to be put into operation by a department which already existed. The terms of reference were to the effect that the committee was to look into and establish a new department, and for that reason I take it that the findings of the committee would not be able to be worked within the present system. Also, the committee had to take into account the relevance of the Premier's policy speech made in 1971.

To my mind the committee was unable to form its report with a completely open mind, and it had to report on a restricted basis.

I would like to refresh members' memories on what the Premier said in his policy speech. This is relevant because members of the committee had to take it into account. An extract from the Premier's policy speech reads as follows—

As the present system of multiple traffic control and vehicle licensing is incompatible with State-wide efficient traffic management we shall place complete control of traffic with the Police Department . . .

I ask members to listen to the last few words, "we shall place complete control of traffic with the Police Department".

The Bill which the Minister has brought forward and the committee's report do not do this entirely. In fact, the legislation will take away from the control of the Police Department some matters which closely affect traffic. It is proposed that these matters shall be under the control of another department.

Mr. Jamieson: That is not so.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I will expand on this later.

Mr. Jamieson: You need to.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Is the Minister telling me that vehicles and other licensing will be the responsibility of the Police Department?

Mr. Jamieson: That is not control.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I said "related matters".

Mr. Jamieson: There was nothing about that in the Premier's policy speech.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I shall refer to this later. I am not being unfair to the Minister but I did say "related matters". The legislation before us proposes to take some away from the control of the Police Department.

I sincerely believe we should have one department which has overall control of traffic and all, or most, related matters. The Premier also said in his policy speech—

To permit the most effective attack upon the problem all departments other than the Police Department will cease to have any jurisdiction in the field of road safety.

He further said—

Local Government authorities will vacate the field of traffic control and vehicle licensing.

We know the Government has endeavoured to do this and will do whatever it can to take control away from the local authorities.

I, together with other members on this side of the House, believe we should try to relate all these matters together. As far as we possibly can we should bring traffic, *in toto*, under one head, one department, and one Minister. This is what we wish to push for.

The committee concluded from its study that it would be desirable for vehicle registration and driver licensing to be combined with traffic safety under a new department. I speak for other members on this side of the House when I say that these matters should be very closely related. They should all come under one Minister. Initially I thought the Government had this in mind.

On the present figures, there are in excess of 300 deaths a year on the roads in Western Australia. Consequently, this

is something which we should approach with a completely open mind. If a committee is appointed to study something, it should not be restricted in any way but should go ahead in an endeavour to achieve the best possible system for traffic operation and safety measures throughout the State. The committee should operate virtually without any restrictions at all.

The committee made two major recommendations. It made a number of other recommendations, as members who have studied the report will see, but there are two major ones. In considering these, we must bear in mind that the committee essentially had to recommend in terms of a new department and not something within the existing structure. The committee recommended that a new department to be known as the department of motor vehicles should be established. It also recommended that there should be a road traffic safety authority.

The Minister who introduced the Bill explained the details quite clearly and did not endeavour to cloud the issue in any way. His explanation was clear and readily understood by anyone who took the trouble to read the Bill and the report. The Bill introduced by the Government is in line with the recommendations of the report although, as I say, the committee was restricted in what it could recommend.

Members on this side of the House believe that all traffic matters should come under one authority. This authority should be responsible for vehicle registration, driver licensing, traffic safety, driver instruction licensing, tow truck operators, used car dealers, traffic control, and other related matters. Traffic should come within the authority of one department and one Minister.

I know that main roads have a great bearing on traffic matters but the Minister for Traffic Safety is also the Minister for Works and consequently main roads come within his portfolio. Consequently there would be no difficulty in bringing these together.

The Bill, in the form presented to the House, will only cause a fragmentation in the overall control of traffic. When I speak of traffic I am not only talking about the vehicles on our roads but also about vehicle licensing, driver licensing, driver instruction licensing, and all related matters. I am sure further fragmentation will result if we set up two new departments; namely, the department of motor vehicles and the road traffic safety authority.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation in the Chamber.

Mr. O'CONNOR: These two departments would be under the control of the Minister for Traffic Safety but the Police Department would be under the control of another Minister, the Minister for Police.

Doubtless members are aware that other States have worked on this problem and some have tried to standardise traffic operations. The system in New South Wales appealed most to me when I studied what has happened in the various States. As far as road operations are concerned, New South Wales has standardised more than any other State in Australia. There is a Department of Motor Transport in New South Wales and this department handles traffic safety jointly with the Police Department.

It is not possible completely to exclude police from traffic safety matters. If a person commits an offence and a policeman is around, it is his duty to take action.

In New South Wales the Department of Motor Transport handles traffic safety, accident statistics, accident research, vehicle licensing, driver licensing, and traffic control devices. This is what we should aim for in this State. In this way all related matters would come under the control of one department and one Minister.

Each of the other States has a different set-up and I do not intend to go into each one, even though I know that you, Mr. Speaker, would allow me to do so because it is relevant to the Bill. As I have said, each State has a different set-up and, from time to time, transfers a section of traffic matters to another department. In some States two or three different departments handle traffic matters. I have already mentioned that the Department of Motor Transport handles traffic matters in New South Wales.

I wonder how necessary it is even to talk of setting up a new road traffic safety authority in Western Australia. For instance, we have the National Safety Council in this State. This organisation has to hand a tremendous wealth of information in connection with traffic accidents and safety measures, not only in terms of road safety but also in terms of industrial and household safety.

Let us consider only the matter which we are discussing; namely, traffic safety. Not only does the National Safety Council have a wealth of information on this but every Government in Western Australia has put a tremendous amount of time and effort into the subject. This has not been confined to State Governments alone but the Commonwealth Government, too, has done a tremendous amount of work. I had the pleasure to sit as a member of the Australian Transport Advisory Council. The National President of the National Safety Council (Mr. Darling) was a member of that council. We had regular meetings and conferred with him in an endeavour to improve the situation on our roads and reduce the toll. We discussed ways and means of improving the present unsatisfactory situation which exists not only here but throughout the rest of the world.

If the National Safety Council is not suitable for the handling of the safety aspect of this matter under the guidance of the Minister for Police, why not reconvene the council and appoint to it the members suggested by the Minister for Traffic Safety? It has been suggested that the new traffic safety committee should comprise the Commissioner of Police or his representative, a representative of the Main Roads Department, a member of the medical profession, and a representative of the insurance companies. Surely those people could be incorporated in the National Safety Council's operations. I believe there are 16 or 18 members on the National Safety Council. I think that number is too large because a committee of that size frequently gets bogged down in debate instead of paying attention to the really important matters.

If the Minister proceeds with this Bill, I hope he will give consideration to the points I am raising. If we continue setting up committees, organisations, and authorities to deal with all these matters we will finish up with departmental heads or representatives having so much to do with these by-products, as they may be called, of their departments and attending so many meetings that they will be unable to run their departments satisfactorily and they will not have sufficient time to devote to the work of the other organisations.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask members to be quiet.

Mr. O'CONNOR: In his policy speech the Premier clearly indicated that all traffic matters would be handled by the police. I believe he has a mandate to bring that proposal to the House in an endeavour to push it through. I do not think this policy was the sole reason for his winning the election, but when the policy was put forward most people believed traffic matters would be placed entirely in the hands of the police and that they would cover all the related matters I have previously mentioned.

In bringing this Bill forward, I believe the Government is taking a slice away from the Police Department and supplying more justification for the scheme put forward by the Liberal Party; that is, the creation of one authority, under one head, for the control of traffic right throughout the State.

Another point mentioned in the report which was tabled in the House is compulsory vehicle inspection. I have been looking into this matter not only in recent weeks but over a long period, and I support compulsory vehicle inspection because statistics throughout the world have proved that it reduces the toll on the road.

Mr. Jamieson: That is not quite so. The States in America which have compulsory vehicle inspection have no better record than the other States.

Mr. O'CONNOR: In looking at the report of the committee—

Mr. Jamieson: The committee has not indicated that.

Mr. O'CONNOR: If I remember correctly, the report states that the States in the U.S.A. which have compulsory vehicle inspection have a lower toll on the roads than the States which do not have it. The report went on to say that statistics showed that between 5 per cent. and 25 per cent. of accidents were prevented by compulsory vehicle inspection, but more conservative people claimed that compulsory vehicle inspection prevented between 5 per cent. and 10 per cent. of accidents.

I ask the Minister to have a further look at this matter because I believe he is wrong. I am quite confident that the report stated that compulsory vehicle checking depots in the United States had resulted in a lower road toll.

I do not oppose compulsory vehicle inspection, and it is quite obvious that Superintendent Monck is completely in favour of it because he stated that as far as he was concerned this was the most important matter in the report.

I also wish to say that I believe Superintendent Monck is a very conscientious man. I would like to dissociate myself from remarks which were made about him in another place. Irrespective of whether he is right or wrong—and we are all right or wrong at different times—I believe Superintendent Monck works extremely hard in the interests of road safety in this State and that he certainly does the best he can.

If the statistics from other countries which are given in the report are correct, and 7½ per cent. of accidents could be prevented by compulsory vehicle checks, I would say we have no alternative other than to do something about it. If the statistics are correct, compulsory vehicle checks would save the lives of 25 or 30 people a year on our roads. This would be a major contribution. The Minister has not actually recommended that a compulsory vehicle checking centre be set up but he has indicated—and I hope he will correct me if I am wrong—that the committee will investigate this matter with a view to establishing such a centre in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Jamieson: The committee will investigate and make suggestions. This is a very large State and it will be impossible to check vehicles coming into the metropolitan area without humiliating people or causing some problems.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I realise there could be difficulties, and I have some suggestions which may or may not appeal to the Minister and which he may or may not have

already considered. Members on this side of the House, generally, support compulsory annual checking of vehicles because we believe it could contribute to a reduction in the road toll, according to statistics from inside and outside Australia. If 25 or 30 lives can be saved each year as a result of it, we will achieve something we have so far been unable to achieve despite all the efforts of Governments and members of Parliament to reduce the road toll.

I mention, for instance, seat belts. I think any responsible Government would have introduced the Bill which provided for the compulsory wearing of seat belts. There were so many indications in favour of it. The indications were that it would save many deaths on the roads. However, despite the introduction of that measure, and despite the fact that seat belts are probably being worn by about 60 per cent. of the people in this State, there appears to have been an increase in the road toll. I am not putting this down to the use of seat belts, but when we get such disappointing results from measures like that, where do we go from here? The statistics throughout Australia suggest that there may be other reasons for the disappointing results, and I will mention some of them as I go along.

Three methods of vehicle inspection are used throughout the world. One is inspection by authorised garages; the second is inspections by Government-operated stations; and the third is inspection by a combination of Government and private enterprise stations. The report suggests that the latter method could be used only in the metropolitan area and that inspections in country areas would have to be carried out by garages.

In other words, I suggest the establishment of a compulsory vehicle inspection centre operated by the Government in the metropolitan area. In the country areas, the compulsory vehicle checking would be undertaken by garages.

If we decide to proceed with such a scheme, we must look at several factors. The first one is the money involved. Initially it will cost about \$1,000,000 to set up a vehicle testing station. That is a fairly large sum of money and it will have to be provided by the taxpayers—they are the ones who will pay. In my opinion we should standardise vehicle testing throughout the State. I do not think it is a good idea to have part of the testing performed by garages and part at a Government-operated centre. The Minister pointed out the size of our State, and I quite agree it would be impracticable to set up compulsory vehicle testing centres throughout the State. Authorised garages could be appointed to perform the checks on their own premises. In other words, a person whose registration is due would have to

present his car for a check-up before applying for renewal. The garage could issue a sticker which would indicate that the vehicle is roadworthy.

Members will be aware that registration stickers are issued in different colours every year. The roadworthy sticker issued to the owner could be in the same colour. This would mean that a car would have a purple registration sticker and also a purple roadworthy sticker, and it would indicate immediately that the car had been registered and checked for mechanical faults. It would be very easy for a police officer to pick up any malpractice.

It is possible that a garage owner could be persuaded to commit an offence. However, such a garage could be struck off the authorised list. If a garage were found to have wilfully handed out a sticker to the owner of an unroadworthy vehicle, the garage would no longer be authorised as a compulsory checking station. It is absolutely necessary that each authorised garage should employ at least one person with the qualifications necessary to determine a vehicle's roadworthiness.

It is interesting to note that in many parts of the world garages are already doing this. Such a system operates in many parts of the United States, in the United Kingdom, in New South Wales, and latterly in Queensland. So we already have authorised garages in two States of the Commonwealth.

I believe vehicle testing in the Australian Capital Territory is carried out at a Government centre. Sweden carries out vehicle testing by a combination of the two methods. Members will see that such schemes are already operating in other parts of the world.

The implementation of such a system would save the Government a large capital outlay, and vehicle testing would be standardised throughout the State.

I must say I was very surprised to see one statement in the departmental committee report. I am surprised that the man who wrote this report would make a comment such as the following—

Irrespective of the lack of evidence, however, there is a danger that a system using private garages would be open to malpractice...

I believe it is a little unfair to say, "Irrespective of the lack of evidence this could apply." Irrespective of the lack of evidence, it could also apply in a Government office. There is no real reason to cast one system aside in favour of the other. As a matter of fact, members may recall that about two weeks ago a departmental officer in Fremantle was fined or gaoled because he unlawfully removed unroadworthy stickers from cars. This can happen within

government, and it can happen outside government. I believe it is quite unfair for the committee to say that irrespective of the lack of evidence it believed the private garages would be open to malpractice. If any malpractice occurred, the garage concerned should be immediately struck off the list.

I believe it is essential to establish a central authority with complete control of vehicle registration, driving licenses, traffic safety, and control. I realise this is not in accord with the suggestion put forward by the Minister, but I would ask him to give the matter a little further consideration. I also ask the Premier to consider my suggestion; that is, to bring traffic completely under the control of one Minister and one authority. I feel this would be better than fragmented authority.

I wish to refer to another section of the report regarding law enforcement. It is relevant to note that the committee had this to say—

In view of the rationalisation of responsibilities that the transfer would make possible and the benefit to the community from the fact that the Police Department will be able to concentrate on its real function—law enforcement, the Committee recommends that vehicle registration and driver licensing be transferred to a new department which should be called the Department of Motor Vehicles.

On this side of the House we have always believed that the policeman's job is the prevention and detection of crime and the apprehension of criminals. These should be the principal duties of the Police Force. Police Commissioner Napier made a comment on one occasion. He said that the motor vehicle section was established as an appendage to the Police Department. He went on to say that the Police Department is now an appendage to the motor vehicle section. Most of us will agree with this comment.

Traffic control is taking up more and more of the time of the Police Force. The effectiveness of the Police Force is substantially reduced. I believe it is important that the Police Force should concentrate entirely on crime detection and prevention. I have spent a fair amount of time around police stations, and I have seen some of the problems which arise. The average policeman today is tied up with so much paper work he is often battling to get out and do the work which the community feels he should be doing.

I am strongly of the opinion that traffic should be controlled by one authority. We should establish a highway patrol, and the officers of this section would move continually around the metropolitan area to keep traffic flowing and to make certain that drivers stayed within the law. The

officers of the Police Department are very pressed for time. I have often heard a policeman say that he may have to put in five, six, or seven hours a day on paper work. If the Police Force is relieved of its duties involving traffic, it can concentrate on crime detection and prevention.

The proposal referring to the licensing of driver instructors, vehicle dealers, and tow truck operators by the proposed department of motor vehicles is acceptable to us provided it all comes under one authority. As a matter of fact, we see a lot of good in this proposal. These matters are all related, and we still agree with the suggestion we put forward previously.

It is suggested that a safety advisory panel should be established—I have already referred to this—and that the panel should include representatives of the Royal Automobile Club, the National Safety Council, the medical profession, the legal profession, and insurance companies. The report also states—

When the new department is established, departmental responsibility for traffic safety in Western Australia will rest with the Police Department, the Main Roads Department and the new Department of Motor Vehicles.

That worries us because we believe all these matters should be brought under the control of one authority. In connection with the road traffic safety authority the report has this to say—

This role could be performed by a Road Traffic Safety Authority comprising the Commissioner of Police, Commissioner of Main Roads or their nominees, the head of the new department and one other member.

The report goes on to say—

The authority could be empowered to authorise traffic control devices and traffic regulatory measures by an amendment to the Traffic Regulations. At the present time, the Minister for Police approves all installations of traffic lights, regulatory traffic signs and other regulatory measures though he has the authority under the Traffic Act to delegate these powers.

I think we have all known for a long time that such methods are quite unsatisfactory because at the moment many people in the community just do not know where to go if they want to approach someone regarding a "Stop" sign or a crosswalk. They may go to the Police Department and be referred to the Main Roads Department or some other department. We are in full agreement that there should be one authority to handle these matters, as suggested by the Minister and in the report.

The functions of the authority suggested by the report are not very great, but they are quite relevant. The first function is

to co-ordinate the activities of the three departments. We hope that will not be necessary because we want the whole situation to be handled by one department.

Mr. Jamieson: In other words, you would take the construction of highways away from the Main Roads Department and place it in the hands of this organisation?

Mr. O'CONNOR: Well, it would not hurt to have a combination of the two.

Mr. Jamieson: Be careful, because you go from the making of highways to the making of roads in municipal areas.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I realise there is a difference.

Mr. Jamieson: They must all be safe.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Minister for Traffic Safety is also charged with the responsibility of administering the Main Roads Department, so if my suggestion is accepted the departments would be under one head. I think that would be good because the Minister could make decisions without having to refer to departments under the control of other Ministers.

Mr. Jamieson: He cannot do that under this proposal.

Mr. O'CONNOR: No, but I would prefer that he could. The Minister mentioned the Main Roads Department, and I am suggesting that if we have one authority under the Minister for Traffic Safety, who also looks after main roads, the whole matter would be under his control.

The next function of the proposed authority is to approve the erection of traffic control devices and other regulatory measures. We are quite happy about that. The next function is to make recommendations to the Minister and other authorities concerned with road construction or road traffic. We also agree with that.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR: Another function of the proposed authority is to arrange the publication of information for the instruction of road users on road safety and traffic laws and regulations. Here again we have no quarrel with that. The next function is to supply technical information and advice regarding road traffic problems to all the authorities concerned with road safety. Again, we are quite happy with that proposal.

The remaining functions mentioned in the report are: To investigate and report on proposals for alterations and additions to traffic laws and regulations; and to investigate and report on any other matter relating to traffic and traffic safety referred to it by the Minister.

When the Government previously brought forward a proposal that traffic throughout the State should be brought under the

control of one authority we put forward a proposal and were criticised on the basis that our suggestions would prove very costly to implement. However, when we consider the structure of the proposed department of motor vehicles, we find that an additional 333 employees will be required.

Mr. Jamieson: Not an additional 333 employees. You should restructure that. You have the figures.

Mr. O'CONNOR: All right, the department will require the services of 333 employees. I think 35 may be taken from that number. Is that correct?

Mr. Jamieson: No, a lot more than that, because many of them will be seconded from other departments. They are not additional.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I see. Of the 333 employees, five will be executive and administrative officers, 319 will be required for vehicle registration and driver licensing, and nine will be involved in accident research. I should imagine—and I am only guessing here—that the wages bill for those employees would be somewhere between \$1,500,000 and \$2,000,000; a fairly substantial sum. I know none of us would say we can spend too much money on the matter of road safety; but when we put forward our original recommendation we were criticised because of the cost factor. The Bill we are discussing today will involve a heavy cost to the taxpayer.

Mr. Jamieson: It will be \$330,000 more than is paid at present.

Mr. O'CONNOR: We will see whether or not that is so. The report states that some 35,000 square feet of office space will be required, and we know how these requirements tend to grow in Government departments. At \$4 a foot that would amount to \$140,000. I have yet to find a departmental set-up which was established at a cost less than that initially suggested. Usually they grow along the way and substantial further expenditure is required. Furniture and other immediate requirements of the proposed department will cost another \$200,000.

The stated cost of vehicle registration and driver licensing in the metropolitan area is \$2,100,000; and that for accident research is \$56,000, making a total of \$2,156,000. Obviously this proposal will cost a great deal, irrespective of what some members might think. Of course, those figures do not take into account any cost which might be incurred in the registration of motor vehicles, etc., in country areas. I think the Minister said the annual cost of running the department would be \$320,000.

Mr. Jamieson: From memory I think I said \$330,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The amount is \$320,000 annually; and, as I said, I am sure that will increase. It is proposed that the additional money required be provided by an increase in the cost of vehicle registration of \$1, and a corresponding increase in the statutory deduction for collection. The increases would provide approximately \$380,000.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask members to be more quiet.

Mr. O'CONNOR: In the summary, the report goes on to say that a road traffic safety authority should be established as early as possible. That is what the Government is hoping to do under the Bill before the House.

The second recommendation is that a new department of motor vehicles be established as soon as this is practicable. The recommendation went on to state—

Its functions, which are listed below, should be implemented in the following stages:—

- (a) Accident Statistics and Research.
- (b) Vehicle Registration and Driver Licensing—
 - (i) Metropolitan Area.
 - (ii) Country.

The third recommendation was—

The new department take over existing vehicle inspection facilities from the Police Department in conjunction with vehicle registration.

There is nothing wrong with that.

It was also suggested that the new department should conduct a detailed study of a State-wide compulsory period for vehicle inspection so that it can advise the Government on the form that such a scheme should take. Our main objection to this is that we do not want any further fragmentation of operations relating to traffic control. We believe this would be unwise and would not provide the overall control which we think is necessary. Therefore we press very strongly for a sole authority to control and handle all traffic throughout the State. This system would not fragment the existing set-up of traffic control, but would amalgamate control of all traffic matters under the jurisdiction of one traffic body.

The Government should give some consideration to this suggestion, because its members and the members of the Opposition are extremely concerned about the rising road toll and the increased power of vehicles that are now being placed on the road. Further, I am sure that we are all greatly concerned about fatalities that occur on both country and metropolitan roads. In mentioning that members of Parliament and Governments have done

all they can in an effort to reduce the road toll, I give credit to the media for what it has done in this regard, because it has worked extremely hard with the publication of many articles in the Press aimed at reducing the toll on our roads. Nevertheless some of the reporting in the media strays a little from the facts. In one report which appeared in the Press on the 12th February, 1973, if I remember correctly, it was stated that a certain number of road deaths had occurred in the country and this number indicated that the rate was much greater than the rate for the city.

However, after making reference to the official statistics in this State for this year it was found that the percentage of road deaths in both the country and the metropolitan area was exactly the same; that is, up to the same date mentioned in the Press. One must bear in mind that last year the number of road deaths in the country was much greater than in the city. Therefore Press reports such as that are inclined to indicate a bias in regard to the road toll as between the figures given for the country area and those for the metropolitan area, although I would not object to a biased view if it were successful in reducing our road toll.

I suggest that we should set up a department which would be called a department of motor transport. I believe that criticism should not be made unless one is prepared to make constructive suggestions as an alternative in an effort to try to do what we think would reduce the road toll in Western Australia. What we should do is to press for the establishment of such a department. So many departments are referred to by the A.T.A.C. that, when we go through them it is very easy to become confused with the names of many of them.

This department of motor transport could be made responsible for driver and vehicle licensing; the licensing and control of tow trucks; the licensing and control of driver instructors; traffic safety; traffic control; vehicle inspection, and driver training. Further, it would be most important for this department to have records of all vehicles and other related matters. If we are to have an authority such as this it would be necessary to have a central records office, but whether this would be operated with a computer or by some other method, would depend, to a degree, on the reports coming forward and the money that would be made available to establish it at the proper time.

A centre should be established at which records relating to traffic throughout the State should be kept. Naturally it would be necessary that the records be made available to the police so that they may use them to facilitate their work and to assist in the apprehension of any

offenders. Traffic safety would be the most important matter to be handled by this authority, because there is no doubt that this subject is causing concern to all those who are faced with the solving of traffic problems in this State.

The department of motor vehicles should have authority to ensure that it is provided with any number of police officers it deems necessary to exercise control, or whatever number of traffic inspectors it can obtain in order to get the department established as soon as possible. For example, a number of officers connected with local government in country areas could be used to advantage by this authority for the collection of license fees, and so on.

With the set-up we are suggesting, a training centre for traffic inspectors could eventually be established. They would be required to attain a certain standard and to hold the necessary qualifications before they would be permitted to operate as traffic inspectors. I do not know whether this could be arranged through the auspices of the National Safety Council, but if it could it would be of great assistance. These traffic inspectors could also be trained in regard to extending courtesy to drivers on the roads.

Mr. Lapham: There is not much wrong with the courtesy shown by police officers.

Mr. O'CONNOR: No, and I have not found any courtesy lacking among traffic inspectors in the country. I do not know whether the honourable member has found this to be so. In future we should train any candidate for the position of a traffic inspector at a school so that he may learn the methods I have mentioned to ensure that a high standard among the traffic inspectors can be maintained and that, as far as is possible, co-operation is given to them from other drivers on the roads.

I am sure the member for Karrinyup would agree that if courtesy is shown by a traffic inspector it assists in the execution of his overall duties and is beneficial to all concerned.

Mr. Lapham: I find the police most courteous, but of course I do not get picked up very often.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Once is too often. I am making these suggestions because we have spent a great deal of time on investigation to ascertain how we can improve the traffic safety position and assist in reducing the road toll. We think that this could be done if we obtained a sensible set-up that would be workable and satisfactory.

A great deal has been said about police takeover of traffic control and that if this were done it may help to reduce our road toll. However statistics throughout Australia indicate that this would not be the

case. If the statistics had shown that the police takeover of traffic would effect some improvement this would make me lean towards such a move. If members care to study the figures that have been compiled in other States they will find that what I say is correct. In Queensland, where the police have complete control over all traffic throughout the State, the figures show that this year the ratio of road fatalities in the country areas to those in the metropolitan area is four to one.

Mr. Lapham: The position is the same in Western Australia. Queensland has a climate and an area similar to that of Western Australia.

Mr. O'CONNOR: That is correct. That is one of the major reasons for the large number of road fatalities in the country compared with the number of road deaths in the metropolitan area. In New South Wales the position is different. When we consider the position in Sweden, we find it has the lowest road toll in the world. The reason for this is that that country is densely populated and because of that the drivers of motor vehicles are not able to travel as fast as they can in other parts of the world.

I have here a letter from the Minister in Queensland, to whom I referred for information. He has this to say—

Dear Mr. O'Connor,

In response to your telephone call regarding road fatalities in Queensland, I submit the following information:—

The letter then points out that in 1971 there were 141 road deaths in the metropolitan area, and 453 road deaths in country areas, making a total of 594; and that in 1972 the metropolitan road deaths totalled 102 and country road deaths totalled 469, besides one road death in an unidentified area, making a total of 572. This indicates that the ratio of country road deaths to metropolitan road deaths is about four to one.

In New South Wales the position is somewhat different. In 1972 there were 463 road deaths in Sydney, and 629 in the rest of the State. This is a ratio of less than two to one for the country and the metropolitan area. The figures for New South Wales show that from the 1st January to the 27th February last there were 62 metropolitan road deaths, and 119 road deaths elsewhere.

This indicates very clearly that major factors we have to recognise in Western Australia are the large area of the State and the long stretches of road.

Mr. Lapham: Open roads.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Yes. From statistics which I have seen it is obvious these are factors which contribute to road deaths. Obviously speed is a major factor. If we had one overall State authority which operated from a central point we could have the roads patrolled continually to ensure that drivers reduced their speed at various points. If two-way radios are provided for these patrol officers much more would be achieved than by fragmenting the department or the control set-up.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Would you afford to a member of such a highway patrol the rights of arrest equal to those enjoyed by or given to police officers?

Mr. O'CONNOR: In some cases we would have to, but I do not think we should extend their powers to the full. Overall I would be prepared to answer "Yes" to that question.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Often a motor vehicle becomes an element used in the commission of a crime unrelated to the use of the motor vehicle.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I would be happy to look into that aspect, and determine whether or not we would be prepared to give the patrol officers those rights. I can see some problems arising in connection with this matter, and not being a qualified legal man I find some difficulty in answering the point raised.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I am not trying to trap you.

Mr. O'CONNOR: In answer to the question by the Minister I can say that I am not prepared to give overall authority to these officers without going further into the matter. There are many instances when the conferring of such power is advantageous, such as in drunken driving cases; but not in other cases.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Suppose a highway patrolman interrogated a driver in respect of some breach of the Traffic Act, and then discovered the car was reported as having been stolen or that the passengers were suspected of having committed some other offence unrelated to the vehicle. Should he have the power to detain those persons?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I would like him to have that power, in cases such as this.

Mr. Lapham: He becomes a policeman.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Every traffic inspector is a policeman to some degree. These matters would have to be gone into. It would be a great pity if a patrol officer struck a driver who was a murderer, but could not apprehend that person because he did not have the authority. I can see some merit in the Minister's proposal.

However, I would like to obtain advice from people with more knowledge of this than I have.

Mr. Lapham: Have you any idea of the cost of this proposal?

Mr. O'CONNOR: No. It would require a set-up in the metropolitan area which is no bigger than that suggested in the Bill. We know that about 35,000 square feet of floor space is required, and this costs about \$4 per foot per year. In addition \$200,000 is required for furniture. The set-up I am suggesting could cost the same amount, but not having the same facilities at my disposal as the Government has I am unable to give the particulars.

In the country centres the shire offices would be used, and already they have all the required facilities. By doing this we will help to retain people in country towns and so aid decentralisation. I am sure the Minister for Development and Decentralisation will support my proposal.

Mr. Lapham: If we use the shire offices would we not be in a similar position to what we are now in?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I would not agree to its being placed in the present position, and that is why I am suggesting an overall control authority. At the present time we find that traffic control is administered by many authorities, and in my view this is wrong. I believe it is of advantage to bring traffic under one controlling body so as to bring about some stability. Such a body could offer advice, and the Government could act upon it.

The proposal of the Liberal Party is the establishment of a single State-wide authority to be administered by one Minister who also has control of the appropriate departments. The authority we suggest should comprise seven members, although the number is quite flexible and could be altered as and when required.

We suggest the chairman should be a person nominated by the Minister; and that the other members should comprise a representative of the Country Shire Councils' Association, a representative of the Country Town Councils' Association, a representative of the Local Government Association, a representative of the Commissioner of Main Roads, a representative of the Commissioner of Police, and a representative of the Treasury.

This is our suggestion. In my view no-one should just put up a plan without giving reasons in support thereof. Whilst we have suggested an authority comprising seven members, other people have suggested that the number should be nine. We are quite flexible and are prepared to alter our views if we think it worth while to do so.

The duties of the authority should include complete control of traffic throughout the State, and the establishment of

regional offices. We think this is important. With a State as large as Western Australia it is difficult to administer the authority from one central point. I am sure the Minister for Education will support me when I say that regional centres should be established in places like Kalgoorlie, Bunbury, Albany, Geraldton, and Merredin. However, this is a matter for the authority to decide, and certainly it is up to the Government to co-operate with the authority.

Mr. Lapham: Is that not similar to the way in which the Police Force operates at the present time?

Mr. O'CONNOR: No, the Police Force is not charged with one particular duty; it is charged with many duties. Often police officers sit behind a desk for five or six hours of the day doing paper work. We are suggesting the establishment of this traffic authority to relieve police officers of this traffic work, and enable them to devote all their time to police matters. Whereas now the police officers devote some of their time to crime detection and crime prevention, we prefer them to devote all their time to these aspects. In so doing the efficiency of the Police Force would be improved.

Mr. Lapham: The traffic control officers would also have to do their own paper work.

Mr. O'CONNOR: That is so. They cannot avoid having to do some paper work, but it would be interrelated to other work in the office. In country centres when a police officer is off the road he may receive a report that some driver is speeding, someone is creating a nuisance, or there is a brawl at the local hotel. I believe that, as the report suggests policemen should be reserved for law enforcement which covers both crime detection and prevention.

We also believe that the authority should be responsible for the establishment of a sophisticated research station. Here again whether this could be organised at the National Safety Council or somewhere else would depend on the recommendations of the authority.

The responsibility for the employment, training, and discipline of traffic officers throughout the entire State would come under the control of the authority. If, for instance, a traffic inspector at the Merredin Shire Council resigned, someone from the council would ring through to the authority to ask for a replacement. The authority might indicate that Jim Brown would be sent.

Mr. Brown: Careful now.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The council might stipulate that it did not want Jim Brown because he was not acceptable. The council might want someone else, although I am sure that Jim Brown would be acceptable!

Some sort of co-operation would have to exist, but the authority would have the say. A number of traffic inspectors would be available at all times to be sent to the various areas.

Mr. Lapham: What standard of training should the authority require of its traffic inspectors?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I suggested earlier that we should establish a training school at which a certain standard would have to be reached. Courtesy on the road and so on should also be taken into account. Here again the authority should make recommendations to the Government regarding this set-up.

The authority would also be responsible for the licensing of vehicles in the metropolitan area, tow trucks, driver licensing, driving instructor licensing, motor vehicle licenses, used car dealers, and so on. Among its further responsibilities would be that of supervising an overall vehicle inspection system through local authorised garages in the metropolitan area and the country.

The authority would also have the responsibility to endorse driver training schools, and the responsibility for road safety, and supervision of crosswalks, parking, road signs, and so on.

In other words the authority would devote all its time to traffic control and safety. It would do nothing else except endeavour to improve driver training and reduce the road toll.

Initially in order to establish such a system it will be necessary to employ experienced people, and these could be obtained from the Police Department and from the local authorities which employ traffic inspectors. Many of these officers have had long experience in the field of traffic and I would like as many as possible of them to be utilised to give them the opportunity to continue with the type of work to which they are accustomed. Many have been on this work for 20 to 25 years. Of course other people may have to be employed as well, but the authority would be left with the responsibility in that regard.

I think I have covered most of what I wanted to say. I have indicated to the Minister that I am not keen at all on the idea of further fragmenting the system. If the Minister would be prepared to go further and incorporate all traffic matters under the one body we would support his proposal. Otherwise we will oppose the Bill.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. McPharlin.

DISTRESSED PERSONS RELIEF TRUST BILL

Second Reading

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

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this measure is to establish a trust which is to be responsible for distributing funds placed at its disposal, to assist in the relief of personal hardship and distress.

In the course of my speech on the 1972-73 Budget, I referred to a provision in the Estimates for refunds of receipts duty paid on transactions involving goods produced or manufactured in Australia.

As members know, this tax was found by the High Court to be invalid and therefore the Government undertook to refund amounts paid to the State in previous years.

I also announced that where claimants agreed to forgo refunds on condition that the sums involved were used for charitable purposes, the amounts due would be paid to a trust fund for subsequent disbursement.

The trust to be set up under the provisions of the Bill aims at this objective. Included in the funds of the trust are to be such amounts as are appropriated by Parliament from time to time. In this respect, a sum of \$29,000 has been appropriated in this financial year under an item titled—

Receipts Duty—Contribution to a Charitable Trust in lieu of grants to sundry persons on account of receipt duty collections in previous year.

It is intended that this amount be paid over to the proposed distressed persons relief trust.

The total of refunds which claimants have agreed to forgo is in the order of \$290,000 and the payment to the trust of \$29,000 in 1972-73 will be the first of ten annual instalments on this account. There is, of course, nothing to prevent a larger appropriation in any year if this is considered desirable for the purposes of the trust.

Gifts, devises, bequests, and donations may also be made to the trust and I would hope that with the passage of time it will be able to attract additional funds in this way.

Although in recent years social services have been expanded and extended both at Commonwealth and State levels, with a result that main areas of need are generally covered, instances do occur where help is not readily available from an existing agency.

It will be the function of the trust to examine these cases and to grant assistance for the relief of personal hardship and distress where such assistance is unobtainable or unlikely to be obtainable from the various statutory and voluntary social welfare agencies operating in the community.

For many years now I have considered that there is a real need for a body of the kind proposed in the Bill and I am sure that it will have the support of all members, many of whom would have knowledge of particularly distressing cases of hardship and the absence, on occasions, of a suitable agency for the relief of this distress.

I want to express the appreciation of the Government to those persons and firms which indicated that although they were entitled to a refund of receipts duty they were prepared to forgo the money in order to set up a fund from which distressed persons could be assisted.

Over the years, and from time to time, I have come across some very distressing cases. I recall one case when I took a deputation from the Melville R.S.L. to the then Premier, Sir David Brand, and asked him if there was any way in which he could assist in this particular instance.

The case was that of a working man—a truck driver—who had a son born to him who was malformed. The malformed son had to have the services of a doctor and a nursing sister every day of his life. No hospital fund was available at the time which would meet the costs. The unfortunate father had mortgaged practically everything in his home to meet the cost of the service. I asked the then Premier if it would be possible to find some way of granting assistance, but he was unable to help.

It was that particular case which set me thinking along the lines that there ought to be a fund to which application could be made. I envisage cases such as the one which occurred in Collie a few years ago where a child had a serious affliction. It was considered that medical treatment was not available in Australia, but it was available—I think—in Germany. The local people in Collie contributed the necessary money to send the child abroad. That is the sort of case I envisage which will receive assistance from this fund.

I am, therefore, pleased indeed to commend the Bill to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Dr. Dadour.

Message: Appropriations

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the Bill.

House adjourned at 6.13 p.m.