

The very next day she could be sent back by one of the bureaux as a special nurse and I would have no authority whatever. When the special comes in she takes control. The matrons obviously want this situation altered. A special is required only when the situation is very grim, and she must be a highly trained nurse. There should be no doubt about her in the mind of the matron of the hospital to which she is sent.

I have spoken for a long time because this subject, as members all know, is very close to my heart. I want to see this plan succeed. I do not want one section of the public with a shortage of beds while there are empty beds hundreds of miles away. Something must be done, and if any help is wanted from me I will gladly give it. I am quite sure, having spoken to some members of the colleges, that they, too, would be very glad to assist.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. N. McNeill.

*House adjourned at 5.56 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 2nd August, 1966

### CONTENTS

Bill—	Page
Supply Bill—	
Standing Orders Suspension .....	32
Message : Appropriations .....	33
Committee of Supply .....	33
Committee of Ways and Means .....	33
Intro. ; 1r. ....	33
2r. ....	33
Com. ; Report .....	37
3r. ....	37
COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION—	
Appointment .....	32
DEPUTY CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES—	
Appointment .....	32
GOVERNMENT BUSINESS—	
Precedence on Tuesdays and Thursdays .....	32
LEAVE OF ABSENCE .....	32
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Betting—T.A.B. Agency No. 48 : Non-establishment of Credit Account by R. A. Stirling .....	22
Bridges—Woodbridge Creek : Siting and Commencement .....	27
Education—	
Commonwealth Scholarships : Variation in Distribution .....	24
Guildford State School—Playing Fields : Negotiations for Additional Land .....	27
Makeshift Classrooms, and Mixed-grade Classes .....	24
Second University or University College : Location and Erection .....	29
Housing—	
Houses at Exmouth—Rents : Subsidisation .....	23
Housing Programme—	
Current Financial Year .....	27
Eden Hill .....	27
Profit, and Cost of Repairs and Renovations .....	24
State Housing Commission—Homes and Multi-storey Flats : Number Constructed .....	23
State Housing Commission Homes—Rent Increases : Reaction of Tenants .....	20
Iron Ore—	
Deepdale Deposits : Development, and Effect on Exports from Yampi .....	28
Sales : Government Control of Prices .....	21
Land : Exchange Between University and Education Department .....	22
Liquor and Betting Prosecutions : Discontinuance between S. P. Mallis and W. G. Donehue .....	25
Meat : Availability at Reasonable Prices .....	29

### CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—continued	
Railways—	
Railway Buses : Tare Weights, Seating Capacity, and Maximum Width .....	28
West Midland Railway Station—	
Car Park : Provision for Passengers .....	27
Shelter for Passengers .....	27
Roads—	
Road Maintenance Tax : Receipts, and Payments by Interstate Hauliers .....	28
Stock Road Freeway : Resumptions, and Engagement of De Louw Cather & Co. ....	27
Swan River Reclamation : Plan 3034 T.B. 3324—	
Details, and Tabling .....	26
Examination of Plan .....	26
Traffic—Overwidth Vehicles : Signs, and Use of Headlights .....	28
Transport—M.T.T. Buses : Tare Weights, Seating Capacity, and Maximum Width .....	29
Water Supplies—	
Albany and Districts : Plans for Provision .....	29
Carnarvon : Applications for Domestic Water .....	29
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—	
Barracks Archway : Determination of Public Opinion on Retention .....	30
Carrington Street-High Road Junction : Effect of Construction of Median Strip .....	31
Iron Ore—	
Mt. Whaleback Deposit .....	31
Robe River, Deepdale, and Mt. Whaleback Deposits .....	31
Narrows Interchange : Disposal of Sand .....	31
Parliamentary Sittings : Introduction of Two Sessions .....	30
Road Maintenance Contribution Tax : Revenue .....	31
Wundowie Charcoal Iron and Steel Industry : Board of Management .....	30
SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE—	
Days and Hours .....	32

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

### QUESTIONS (28): ON NOTICE

#### STATE HOUSING COMMISSION HOMES

##### *Rent Increases; Reaction of Tenants*

##### 1. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Upon what criteria did he form the opinion there had not been any violent reaction from tenants over the recent rent increases of Housing Commission homes and that most people had accepted the increases as reasonable?
- (2) Were the rent collectors questioned concerning their experiences?
- (3) Did any collector express an opinion which would justify the conclusion to which he had come and which was reported in *The West Australian* of the 1st July?
- (4) If "Yes," in what district does that collector operate?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Soon after individual notices had been posted the commission reported that as a general rule those affected by the increases considered them as well as the method of catering for increases in excess of \$1.00 per week to be reasonable. This view was based on several checks of country and metropolitan officers and agents closely associated with the commission's

tenants as well as parliamentary liaison.

- (2) to (4) In the normal course of their operations rent collectors comment on tenant problems and reactions for the information of management. Generally the views expressed confirm the answer to (1) above.

### IRON ORE

#### *Sales: Government Control of Prices*

2. Mr. TONKIN asked the Premier:

- (1) Was he correctly reported as having said in regard to sales of iron ore: "We will sell it for as much as we can get and the buyers will pay as little as they can"?
- (2) Is it his belief that this policy of selling at any price should have general application to the natural resources of Western Australia?
- (3) Did he see the report in *The West Australian* of the 8th July that the Australians and Americans who proposed to concentrate on joint exploitation in the Mt. Newman area had claimed with regard to the prices to be charged the Japanese for pellets: "It would be difficult to agree to a cut in prices, because the change in their plan had been necessitated by the fact that the Robe River mines could not be developed under the prices provided for in the old contract"?
- (4) Did Cleveland Cliffs and B.H.P. give the Government the foregoing reason for their change in plans concerning joint operations at Cape Preston?
- (5) If, in fact the prices provided for in the contract for pellets produced from ore from Robe River are uneconomic, does it not indicate the possibility that companies may be over-anxious to sell?
- (6) Did he see the report in *The West Australian* of the 15th July that because the Japanese did not like the price of 19.1 cents for each unit of ferrous content of pellets being offered from Mt. Newman, the companies comprising the consortium had come down to 18.8 cents which they had said was their final offer?
- (7) As it was reported the Japanese mill executives did not seem entirely convinced of the finality of the offer and there is thus the possibility they may refuse to accept, as a substitute for pellets from Robe River, pellets from Mt. Newman at the price offered, might it not be that if his policy is put into operation and the pellets are offered for sale for as much as the Japanese will pay,

the result would be disastrous to the companies and against the State's best interests?

- (8) Under the circumstances outlined in the previous question, is not some government control of prices, at which sales may be effected, necessary?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) Yes. These words were used during a statement on the overall question of the sale of iron ore.
- (2) It is not a question of selling at any price. It is a fact of commercial life that the seller seeks as much as he thinks he can get and the buyer seeks to buy as cheaply as he can. This is the basis of all commercial negotiation to arrive at the price the seller will accept and the buyer will pay.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) No. The main reason was the much higher capital costs than originally estimated, due to a number of reasons, which made it impracticable for the required amount of capital to be provided at this juncture on the original Cleveland Cliffs pellet sales contract timetable. The capital provision problem was related to the Cleveland Cliffs part of the venture.
- (5) See answer to (4).
- (6) Yes.
- (7) No. It is reasonable to assume the companies with large scale investments in these projects and with considerable experience would not accept an order below an economic price. There is no obligation on them to do so. It should also be noted that Hammersley Iron are proceeding with their King Bay pellet plant to use hematite iron ore fines on a basis of 18.5 cents per unit and were prepared to supply supplementary tonnages at a lower figure. Mt. Newman pellets will be from hematite fines and are currently considered cheaper to produce than pellets from the limonitic ore of the Robe River area. This was one but not the only reason why Cleveland Cliffs initial pellet contract carried a higher price.
- (8) This is already possible both at State and Commonwealth levels through the conditions of the ratified agreements and export license conditions.

If we want these northern deposits developed to the extent they should be, a degree of commercial realism is necessary in negotiating and assessing acceptable prices.

## T.A.B. AGENCY No. 48

*Non-establishment of Credit Account  
by R. A. Stirling*

3. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) When it became known to the Chairman of the Totalisator Agency Board the agent at agency 48 had been accepting telephone bets from R. A. Stirling who had not established with the board a credit account as required by section 33 of the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act, was the information given to the other members of the board?
- (2) As there was no credit account and consequently each bet made by telephone was a bet which under section 33 the board, or any of its officers, agents, or employees was prohibited from accepting, who was it who decided no action would be taken against the agent concerned although it was clearly established on the facts known to the chairman there had been a number of offences committed against subsection (6) of section 37 of the Act?
- (3) Was the matter at any time referred either to the Crown Law Department or to the Police Department, and if so on what date?
- (4) As each time the agent accepted a telephone bet from R. A. Stirling he committed a separate offence of a more serious nature than did coffee lounge proprietor S. S. Mallis, why was the agent not charged on even one count, whereas Mallis was charged for nine separate sales under the Illicit Sale of Liquor Act?
- (5) Does he realise that during the period the agent was accepting telephone bets from Stirling, who had not established a credit account as required, the agent was not protected by subsection (3) of section 20, and consequently agency 48 was a common gaming house?
- (6) What explanation does he give for allowing the Chairman of the Totalisator Agency Board to condone the offences above referred to, the commission of three of which offences rendered the offender liable to a minimum penalty of six months' imprisonment without the option of a pecuniary penalty?

Mr. BOVELL (for Mr. Craig) replied:

- (1) It was, and still is, not known to the chairman of the board that the agent at agency 48 accepted telephone bets from R. A. Stirling that required the establishment of a credit account in accordance

with section 33 of the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act.

- (2) Answered by (1) above.
- (3) No.
- (4) Answered by (1) above.
- (5) No.
- (6) No explanation is required as there were no known offences to condone.

## LAND

*Exchange between University and  
Education Department*

4. Mr. TONKIN asked the Premier:

- (1) Will he give details of the land exchange agreed on between the University and the Education Department and to which he referred in a statement published in *The West Australian* of the 30th March last?
- (2) Was any part of the land which the Government agreed to pass to the University given in exchange for the land upon which the junction of Hackett Drive with Stirling Highway was constructed?
- (3) Will he table a plan drawn to scale showing the location of the areas of land the subject of the exchange?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) The Government proposes to acquire portion of Swan Location 3086 and portion of Perth Lot 440, bounded by Stirling Highway, Hampden, Clifton and Gordon roads, for the purposes of a third teachers' training college. These areas are presently held by the University and aggregate approximately nine acres. An additional 25 acres in the Daglish area is also to be made available to the Government by the University for the development of playing fields and residential areas for teachers' colleges. In exchange, the Government has undertaken to make available to the University the former Teachers' Training College site in the Crawley area abutting University land. This comprises 11 acres 3 roods 28 perches of land, of which 3 acres 3 roods 23 perches has already been re-included in the University reserve. The balance will consist of—
  - (a) a section of Hackett Drive to be closed by the 1st January, 1971, and containing 2 acres 2 roods 6 perches;
  - (b) two parcels of 5 acres 1 rood 17 perches and 22 perches excised from Reserve 17375 (National Parks Board) by the Reserves Act, 1957, and now vacant Crown land.

To facilitate this arrangement, it will be necessary to realign Hackett Drive to the south.

- (2) No.
- (3) Yes. Plans herewith for tabling. *The plans were tabled.*

5. *This question was postponed.*

#### IRON ORE

##### *Deepdale Deposits: Development, and Effect on Exports from Yampi*

6. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Is there any intention by B.H.P. actually to commence not later than the 30th June, 1970, its Deepdale project which was the subject of an agreement ratified by Parliament in 1964 and upon which its right to export iron ore from Yampi depends?
- (2) Are there any grounds for believing B.H.P. will meet the requirements of the agreement contained in the Act of 1965 and submit plans for the Deepdale project by June, 1969?
- (3) If "Yes", will he give the reasons for such belief?
- (4) If "No", will he answer the relevant question whether the Government is going to permit B.H.P. to continue to export iron ore from Yampi despite its failure to observe the requisite conditions upon which its right to export depends?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) The Government is satisfied that the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited has every intention of meeting its obligations under the agreement on the Deepdale project unless of course this agreement is varied in a mutually satisfactory way in which case another set of obligations will be agreed.

After the conclusion and ratification of the agreement it emerged that the partners in the Mt. Newman project were unable to proceed in the original form with the Mt. Newman development. It also emerged that the Cleveland Cliffs Company could not proceed on the original pellet contract timetable with their Robe River project. In each case the reason was that the amount of capital needed proved, on closer estimation, to be much greater than the companies originally envisaged.

The two partners in the Mt. Newman project, together with Cleveland Cliffs, then approached B.H.P. to see if the latter could assist the Mt. Newman project by the provision of some of the capital required and also by providing an outlet for an expanded ironstone

operation. B.H.P. advised the State Government that they were prepared to investigate the possibility of joining in the Mt. Newman project. They pointed out that it would be neither possible nor desirable for them to undertake both the Mt. Newman development and the Deepdale development at the same time. The State Government agreed the negotiations should proceed in the interests of the State generally and the Pilbara-Ashburton area in particular.

- (2) See answer to (1).
- (3) See answer to (1). It is pertinent to add that this company has always been anxious to honour its commitments.
- (4) See answers to (1), (2), and (3).

#### HOUSES AT EXMOUTH

##### *Rents: Subsidisation*

7. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Will the weekly rents of the 84 houses for which a \$1,360,630 contract for construction at Exmouth has been let by the Housing Commission be subsidised?
- (2) If "Yes", what will be the amount of the weekly rental subsidy?
- (3) Will the subsidy be met from the Commission's funds or grants from the Treasury?
- (4) If from funds of the Commission, is it implicit that tenants of the Commission's houses not subsidised will have to pay rents which include an element towards meeting such cost?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Rents will not be subsidised by either the State or the commission as the Commonwealth contributed two-thirds of the cost on an interest free non-repayable basis, which reduces rentals by \$11.60 per week on each of the 84 houses referred to and 44 houses built in previous contracts.
- (2) to (4) Answered by (1).

#### STATE HOUSING COMMISSION

##### *Homes and Multi-storey Flats: Number Constructed*

8. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Housing:

- (1) During the period the present Government has been in office how many dwellings has the Housing Commission completed?
- (2) Of this number how many were multi-storey flats?
- (3) How many of the dwellings were erected in the financial years 1964-65 and 1965-66 respectively?
- (4) How many dwellings is it planned to erect this financial year?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

- (1) After effecting the obligatory allocation (currently 30 per cent.) of Commonwealth-State funds to the building society movement, the commission completed, to the 30th June, 1966, 13,856 dwellings.
- (2) 189.
- (3) In 1964-65—2,131 dwellings.  
In 1965-66—2,480 dwellings.
- (4) For 1966-1967—2,350 dwellings. This figure could be increased if the Commonwealth provides additional funds for accommodation of families of serving members of the armed forces.

*Profit, and Cost of Repairs and Renovations*

9. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What was the amount of profit made by the Housing Commission for the financial year ended the 30th June, 1966?
- (2) How many home units in the metropolitan area and country towns respectively, were the subject of general repairs and renovations during the year?
- (3) What was the average cost of the repairs and renovations?
- (4) What was the average cost of complete renovation of country houses?
- (5) What was the total expenditure on periodic renovations, repainting, minor repairs, and preparation of vacated accommodation for re-letting?
- (6) What is the estimated profit for the current financial year after taking into account the increases in rents which have been imposed?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Until the commission's accounts for 1965-1966 have been finalised and audited, this figure is not available. In previous years these have been completed in late September. However, whatever the figure will be, the greater portion of the profit will be derived from sales of land and homes which will be realised progressively over the long term of repayment, which is of the order of 40 years. At the beginning of each financial year, profits have been progressively invested in additional dwellings and/or to dilute short-term, higher-interest rate borrowing so as to provide more housing for low and moderate income applicants.  
In regard to the rentals, which are assessed on the economic rent basis as prescribed in the first schedule of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, 1945, it is anticipated there will be a

loss, rather than profit, in respect of operations under the original schemes and only limited profit in respect of 1956-66 schemes after making provisions for long-term maintenance, bad debts, and insurance.

- (2) Completions:  
Metropolitan ... .. 989  
Country ... .. 641

Total 1,630

- (3) Mean average—\$280.
- (4) Mean average—\$400.
- (5) Pending finalisation of accounts and audit estimated at \$1,075,000.
- (6) This estimate will be made when current year's accounts and operational details have been finalised.

**EDUCATION**

*Makeshift Classrooms, and Mixed-grade Classes*

10. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many State school classes on the 24th June this year were being taught in the following makeshifts respectively: halls; cloakrooms; washrooms; staff rooms; lunch sheds; court houses; craft sheds; old, disused schools; entrance lobbies; and manual training centres?
- (2) What is the number of mixed-grade classes in primary schools this year?
- (3) How much more than last year is this number, and what is the reason for the increase?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Primary:  
Halls— 6  
Cloakrooms— 7  
Washrooms— nil  
Staff rooms— 3  
Lunch sheds— 2  
Court houses— nil  
Craft sheds— 1  
Old schools— 5  
Lobbies— 1  
Manual training centres— nil
- (2) 1,010 (excluding mission, one teacher, and special schools).
- (3) (a) 77.  
(b) As class sizes are progressively reduced there will be an increase in the number of grouped (mixed-grade) classes.

*Commonwealth Scholarships: Variation in Distribution*

11. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) In connection with the distribution in this State of Commonwealth scholarships is there a wide variation between Government metropolitan, Government country, in-

dependent Catholic, and independent non-Catholic schools as is the case in Victoria?

- (2) What research has been undertaken here to ascertain the reasons for the variations in the proportions of scholarships gained?
- (3) Is there any evidence to suggest that the A.C.E.R. tests for secondary scholarships are more or less sensitive to socio-economic and family factors than is the matriculation examination for tertiary scholarships?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) As the scholarships are awarded by the Commonwealth, and the Western Australian Education Department merely acts as an administrative agency, no research has been undertaken here; but the Australian Council for Educational Research, which sets and marks the examination papers, is engaged on an investigation at the present time for the Commonwealth Government regarding this matter.
- (3) Not precisely, but it is probable that the same trend would be observed in both examinations.

#### LIQUOR AND BETTING PROSECUTIONS *Discrimination between S. P. Mallis and W. G. Donohoe*

12. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) Was coffee lounge proprietor Stephen Spiro Mallis charged and convicted under the Illicit Sale of Liquor Act for nine separate sales on the 22nd October, the 5th November, and the 12th November last year?
- (2) Was T.A.B. agency 23 Manager William Gerard Donohoe charged and convicted under the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act on the single count only between the 1st July, 1962, and the 4th July, 1963, of having accepted bets on horse racing from persons not having previously established a credit account for such bets contrary to section 37 subsection (b) of the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act?
- (3) As the acceptance of each prohibited bet is a separate offence under section 37 subsection (b) of the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act just as each separate sale of liquor is a separate offence under the Illicit Sale of Liquor Act, what is the reason for the latter Act being administered much more strictly than the former Act?
- (4) Taking as a criterion the penalties provided for offences com-

mitted against the above Acts respectively, are not offences under section 37 of the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act regarded as being much more serious than offences under the Illicit Sale of Liquor Act?

- (5) In the case of Donohoe, who had been continually committing offences over a period of twelve months, why was it he was charged with only one breach, whereas Mallis was charged with ten offences in the period of three weeks?
- (6) As he was Minister for Police when Donohoe was charged, how does he reconcile this discriminatory administration with his duty under his ministerial oath?
- (7) Was there any discussion between Donohoe or his representative and any officer of the Totalisator Agency Board or of the Criminal Investigation Branch or of the Crown Law Department as to or canvassing what charge should be laid against Donohoe and if so:
  - (a) when and where was such discussion or discussions held;
  - (b) who were the persons present at each of such discussions;
  - (c) was a promise extracted from or on behalf of Donohoe that if he were not charged with stealing then he would plead guilty to a charge of having committed a breach of section 37 of the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act, 1960;
  - (d) if Donohoe or his representative gave an undertaking to plead guilty to a charge of having committed a breach of section 37 of the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act, 1960, was there any, and if so what, discussion as to the way in which the complaint against Donohoe would be worded?

Mr. BOVELL (for Mr. Craig) replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) It is not accepted that the one Act is being administered more strictly than the other. Several factors are to be considered in the administration of an Act, one of them is the provision that the Act contains for penalties. In the case of a second or subsequent offence under section 3 of the Illicit Sale of Liquor Act, the maximum penalty provided is a fine of \$400 or imprisonment for twelve months, or both, but the offence has to be committed "after a previous conviction," and there is no provision for a minimum

penalty. Thus, all the offences of which Mallis was convicted as mentioned in question (1) had to be treated as first offences. Section 10 (b) of the Act made it abundantly clear that each offence should be the subject of a separate charge. However, the magistrate had full discretion to adjust penalties as he thought proper in all the circumstances.

In the case of a third or subsequent offence under section 37 of the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act, the section requires a minimum penalty of six months' imprisonment and a maximum of 12 months' imprisonment. There is no reference to a fine or to "previous conviction" and there is no provision corresponding to section 10 (b) above. Largely for these reasons, the board considered that, for the proper administration of the section, there should be no prosecution as for a subsequent offence unless the offence had been committed after a conviction for a first offence. Thus, as Donohoe had not previously been convicted of an offence under section 37, he was charged with one offence only, and on that charge he was convicted. The board, therefore, preferred no further charge in regard to any previous alleged offence under the section.

- (4) Not necessarily, because for a second or subsequent offence under section 3 of the Illicit Sale of Liquor Act a more severe penalty can be imposed than for a second or subsequent offence under section 37 of the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act.
- (5) and (6) Answered in (3) above.
- (7) I am not aware of any such discussion.

#### SWAN RIVER RECLAMATION:

PLAN 3034 T.B. 3324

##### *Details, and Tabling*

#### 13. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) When was plan 3034 T.B. 3324 first prepared?
- (2) Was this the plan to which he referred on the 9th November last as containing matters "currently under technical examination"?
- (3) When was the plan made available to the Swan River Conservation Board and some local government authorities respectively?
- (4) Does plan 3034 T.B. 3324 show some filling in of the Swan River which would turn Heirisson Island into a promontory?
- (5) Will he table the plan?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Plan 3034 T.B. 3324 was first prepared in July, 1964.  
It is a preliminary design exercise directed towards seeking a solution to the design of the Narrows interchange and to the proposed river-side freeway between this interchange and Burswood Island.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) This plan was not made available to the Swan River Conservation Board or to local government authorities, but it was tabled during discussion with representatives of the Perth City Council on the 9th September, 1964.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) No.

##### *Examination of Plan*

#### 14. Mr. TONKIN asked the Premier:

- (1) Did he show a newspaper reporter plan No. 3034 T.B. 3324 in his office during the week ended March 19th this year?
- (2) Did he enjoin the reporter not to give publicity to details of the plan?
- (3) Did the plan show a filling in of the river between Heirisson Island and the shore so as to turn the island into a promontory?
- (4) Did he say on at least one occasion that his Government was "determined to proceed" as shown in plan 3034 T.B. 3324?
- (5) If the plans were (as he claimed) "only of an interim nature", why were they shown to a newspaper reporter and explained by an officer of the Main Roads Department?
- (6) Bearing in mind that governments are sometimes changed, does he consider that a newspaper reporter has a stronger claim to be shown plans involving river reclamation than a member of the Opposition?
- (7) Was not his action in refusing the Deputy Leader of the Opposition permission to view plans which a number of persons not connected with the Government's administration had been permitted to see, one of grave discourtesy to the Opposition?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) and (3) Answered by (1).
- (4) No.
- (5) I am unaware of these circumstances.
- (6) Answered by (5).
- (7) No discourtesy was intended to the Opposition, but there was no point in publicising plans about which the Government had made no decision.

**STOCK ROAD FREEWAY**

*Resumptions, and Engagement of  
De Leuw Cather & Co.*

15. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is it proposed to construct a controlled-access freeway on what is now Stock Road commencing in Attadale and passing through Melville and O'Connor?
- (2) Have any plans of a preliminary or advanced kind been drawn?
- (3) Are such plans as are being studied based upon advice given by engineering consultants De Leuw Cather and Co.?
- (4) Is consideration being given to a requirement of a six-chain wide reserve in connection with the freeway?
- (5) Has an estimate been made of the cost of resuming the required properties and, if so, what is the amount?
- (6) Has a probable date been set for commencing construction and, if so, what is that date?
- (7) When is it expected approaches will be made to property owners along the proposed route in connection with the acquisition of the properties by the Government?
- (8) Has the firm of De Leuw Cather and Co. a town planner on its staff in Western Australia?
- (9) If "Yes", who is the town planner and what are his qualifications and experience?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) A proposal for a freeway on the Stock Road alignment passing through the Melville and Attadale areas is not included in the region scheme as at present approved by Parliament, but the Main Roads Department is investigating the possibility of such a facility in connection with a future river crossing.
- (2) Preliminary sketch plans have been drawn.
- (3) No.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) No.
- (6) No.
- (7) Unknown at this early stage of study.
- (8) No.
- (9) Answered by (8).

**GUILDFORD STATE SCHOOL**

*Playing Fields: Negotiations for  
Additional Land*

16. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Have negotiations been completed for purchase of extra playing fields for the Guildford State School?

- (2) When is it expected children will be able to use the extra ground for a playing field?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not known yet.

**HOUSING PROGRAMME**

*Eden Hill*

17. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Are there any plans for building further homes in Eden Hill area for the current financial year?  
*Current Financial Year*
- (2) What number of houses are to be built in the current financial year?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) In answer to correspondence addressed to the commission on the 26th July, 1966, by the honourable member, an explanation will be given on town planning, site development, and lease problems now being resolved—with the object of commencing a building programme in 1967-1968, the extent of which will be then related to the funds available and the demands of other parts of the State as well as the metropolitan area.

**BRIDGES**

*Woodbridge Creek: Siting and  
Commencement*

18. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has any decision been made regarding the bridge to be built over Woodbridge Creek at West Midland?
- (2) What street is the bridge to lead off—Archer Street or Chatham Street?
- (3) When will the bridge be commenced if the decision to build is in the affirmative?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes. Funds have been approved on the department's current programme of works.
- (2) The proposed bridge site is a little east of Archer Street.
- (3) Towards the end of 1966.

**WEST MIDLAND RAILWAY STATION**

*Car Park: Provision for Passengers*

19. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Is the public being encouraged to leave cars at railway stations and use trains?
- (2) Will provision be made at West Midland for car users to park cars and use trains?



- (3) What provision has been made for parking cars at West Midland and what number of cars will be catered for?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Yes. Parking areas have been provided at all suburban stations where the demand has existed and "Park-'N-train" publicity is continuing.
- (2) and (3) Surveys respecting parking requirements conducted in 1962 and 1964 found that no such demand existed at West Midland. An inspection between noon and 1 p.m. on the 29th July, 1966, revealed that one car only was parked in the vicinity although ample space with reasonably good surface is available both on and off railway reserve on each side of the line.
- The situation will be kept under observation and should it become necessary an area will be provided at West Midland.

#### *Shelter for Passengers*

20. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) What was the approximate area of the buildings under cover and used by train passengers at West Midland prior to building new station?
- (2) What is the size of the present shelter shed on West Midland Station?
- (3) How many passengers can the shelter shed cater for?
- (4) Why cannot a fully enclosed shelter shed be provided?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Approximately 800 sq. feet, but bearing in mind that passengers could not safely stand within five feet of the edge of the platform, only 50 per cent. of this area could be regarded as available to passengers.
- (2) 140 sq. feet. However, approval was recently given to increase the size of the shelter provided and the matter of design is now in hand.
- (3) The present shelter provides protection for 20 persons in good weather—10 in wet weather. This capacity will be increased (see answer to No. 2).
- (4) The provision of enclosed shelters at unattended stations is not favoured due to the incidence of vandalism.

#### **ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX**

##### *Receipts, and Payments by Interstate Hauliers*

21. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What was the amount of road

maintenance tax collected during the first three months of the operation of the Act?

- (2) By how much did this exceed the original estimate?
- (3) How many interstate trucks paid the road maintenance tax?
- (4) What amount of tax was paid by interstate hauliers for the three months?
- (5) How many sightings of interstate trucks were made over the three months?
- (6) How many of the sighted interstate trucks failed to submit a return or pay the tax?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Collections to the 30th June, 1966 were \$391,389.35.
- (2) No specific estimate was made for the first three months.
- (3) 223.
- (4) \$20,712.
- (5) 3,196.
- (6) It is thought the figure would be in the vicinity of 110.

#### **TRAFFIC**

##### *Overwidth Vehicles: Signs, and Use of Headlights*

22. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) What width vehicle is required to carry the "Over Width Vehicle" sign?
- (2) What width vehicle is required to drive with its headlights on during daylight?
- (3) Are there any exemptions in respect of questions (1) and (2)?

Mr. BOVELL (for Mr. Craig) replied:

- (1) Any vehicle or load in excess of 8 feet.
- (2) Any vehicle or load in excess of 10 feet.
- (3) Buses which may be 8 ft. 2½ in. are exempt from (1) and (2). Agricultural implements from (2).

#### **RAILWAY BUSES**

##### *Tare Weights, Seating Capacity, and Maximum Width*

23. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) What is the tare weight of the front axle of the standard W.A.G.R. passenger road bus?
- (2) What is the total tare weight?
- (3) What is the seating capacity?
- (4) What is the maximum width of the buses?

Mr. COURT replied:

Type of Omnibus	A.E.C.	Foden	Guy (Single Deck)	Guy (Raised Deck)	Leyland	Leyland (Freighter)	Leyland (Air Conditioned)
Question 1	T. C. Qr. Lb. 3 19 0 0	T. C. Qr. Lb. 3 17 0 0	T. C. Qr. Lb. 3 4 3 21	T. C. Qr. Lb. 4 11 1 7	T. C. Qr. Lb. 2 14 2 0	T. C. Qr. Lb. 1 16 3 14	T. C. Qr. Lb. 2 2 2 0
Question 2	T. C. Qr. Lb. 8 7 3 0	T. C. Qr. Lb. 7 18 0 0	T. C. Qr. Lb. 3 16 0 0	T. C. Qr. Lb. 10 8 0 0	T. C. Qr. Lb. 8 18 2 0	T. C. Qr. Lb. 8 6 2 0	T. C. Qr. Lb. 12 0 2 0
Question 3	30	34	36	36	36	20	36
Question 4	8 feet	8 feet	8 feet	8 feet	8 feet	8 feet	8 feet 2½ in.

### M.T.T. BUSES

#### Tare Weights, Seating Capacity, and Maximum Width

24. Mr NORTON asked the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What is the tare weight of the front axle of the larger M.T.T. buses?
- (2) What is their total tare weight?
- (3) How many passengers do they seat?
- (4) What is their overall width?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) 75 cwt.
- (2) 162½ cwt.
- (3) 48 seated and 24 standing.
- (4) 8 feet. The latest type bus being introduced is 8 ft. 2½ in.

### WATER SUPPLIES

#### Carnarvon: Applications for Domestic Water

25. Mr NORTON asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Have the owners or occupiers of the following land made application to his department to have a domestic water supply—

Carnarvon Town Lots 400, 404, 405;

Gascoyne Locations 1, 2, 41 and 42?

- (2) If "yes", on what dates were the applications made?
- (3) Have the applicants been advised of the acceptance or rejection of their applications?
- (4) If the applications have been approved, have the applicants been advised of any required pre-payments?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes, with the exception of Gascoyne Location 42.
- (2) Lot 400—24th May, 1965  
Lot 404—24th May, 1965  
Lot 405—6th April, 1965  
Loc. 1—2nd April, 1965  
Loc. 2—2nd April, 1965  
Loc. 41—29th March, 1965  
Loc. 42—No application.
- (3) No, but now that the loan allocation for 1966-67 has been received an early decision can be antici-

pated, and advice should be given to the applicants within the next two weeks.

(4) Answered by (3).

#### Albany and Districts: Plans for Provision

26. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Can he advise if the Government has shelved or put aside the plans for the major water scheme for Albany and districts?
- (2) If "Yes", how does the Government intend to cater for the ever increasing water needs of Albany and its districts?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Albany will be supplied from other known sources when existing sources are fully developed. This will not be for several years because drilling south and west of the harbour has disclosed good reserves of water.
- (2) Answered by (1).

### EDUCATION

#### Second University or University College: Location and Erection

27. Mr. HALL asked the Premier:

As the final decision to build a second university or university college in this State rests with the Government, can he advise if a decision on the town and the time for the erection of a second university college has been reached?

Mr. BRAND replied:

No. The appointment of a committee to consider and report on matters of this kind is expected soon.

### MEAT

#### Availability at Reasonable Prices

28. Mr. FLETCHER asked the Premier:

- (1) Is he aware:
  - (a) That *The West Australian* of the 30th December, 1965, referred to the "Sharp Fall in Australian Meat Consumption" quoted by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics;

(b) that the bureau said:

- (i) that lower consumption arose from higher meat prices;
  - (ii) that Australia for the first time exported more than half its beef production in 1964-65?
- (2) If he is aware that high meat prices still prevail, will he inform the House what measures the Government are taking to ensure that, prior to export, adequate meat is available at reasonable prices to, in particular, those on pensions and low incomes?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) (a) Yes.
- (b) (i) Yes.
- (ii) Yes.
- (2) The domestic price of meat moved with the world price. Any arrangement to restrict exports and create an artificially low price in Australia would have to be nationwide and farmers would almost certainly claim a subsidy to the level of the world price. The Government is of the opinion that a scheme along the lines mentioned above would raise more problems than it would solve. Adjustment to the basic wage allow for changes in meat prices and no doubt the Commonwealth Budget will consider the pensioners' position.

#### QUESTIONS (9): WITHOUT NOTICE BARRACKS ARCHWAY

##### *Determination of Public Opinion on Retention*

1. Mr. HAWKE asked the Premier:

- (1) What method, or lack of method, does the Government intend to employ in its move to interpret public opinion on whether the archway of the Old Barracks should, or should not, remain permanently in its present position?
- (2) When is a decision likely to be made in this matter by the Government?

Mr. BRAND replied:

There is no immediate decision to be made, and the Government has not decided what method it will adopt. However, I intend to take an opportunity of conferring with the Leader of the Opposition as to what he thinks.

Mr. Hawke: The Premier and I might agree.

Mr. BRAND: There could be a number of points of view and, undoubtedly, it is a matter of opinion between people who look up the Terrace and people in Parliament House who look down the Terrace.

#### WUNDOWIE CHARCOAL IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY

##### *Board of Management*

2. Mr. HAWKE: I would like to ask the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Will he now give the names of the present members of the Board of Management of the Wundowie Charcoal Iron and Steel Industry?
- (2) On what date were they appointed?
- (3) Which one of them is the representative on the board of the employees of the industry?
- (4) What are the names of the men who were members of the board immediately prior to its recent reconstruction?
- (5) How long had each of them served on the board before being retired by the Government?
- (6) Why were they retired?
- (7) How much written notice of their proposed retirement by the Government did each of them receive before being actually retired from the board?

Mr. COURT replied:

I thank the Leader of the Opposition for notice of this question. The answers are as follows:—

- (1) Mr. N. Fernie (Chairman).  
Sir Alex J. Reid.  
Mr. A. C. Harris.  
Mr. P. K. W. Butterworth.  
Mr. W. Heeps.
- (2) 13th August, 1943.  
13th August, 1943.  
19th October, 1953.  
14th August, 1944.  
30th June, 1948.
- (3) Mr. W. Heeps.
- (4) The Board of Wundowie has not been reconstructed, recently. A Bill dealing with the future constitution of the board will be submitted to Parliament later this session. The present board continues in the meantime and this position is known to board members.
- (5) to (7) See answer to (4).

#### PARLIAMENTARY SITTINGS

##### *Introduction of Two Sessions*

- 3. Mr. HALL asked the Premier:  
As there appears to be a growing weakness in the actions of Parliament brought about by controls of State by Cabinet and Public Service administration and regulation and a long period of Parliamentary inactivity, will he agree to two sessions of Parliament in the one calendar year?

Mr. BRAND replied:

The Government has considered this matter and has decided as at this point to continue with the traditional one session of Parliament.

## ROAD MAINTENANCE CONTRIBUTION TAX

### *Revenue*

4. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What revenue has been collected to date from the road maintenance contribution tax?
- (2) What revenue is it expected to produce during the current financial year?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

I thank the member for Pilbara for giving me some notice of this question. The answers are as follows:—

- (1) \$622,063 up to lunch time today.
- (2) Because of seasonal and other reasons this is difficult to assess but, based on the average of the last three months, approximately \$2,500,000.

## NARROWS INTERCHANGE

### *Disposal of Sand*

5. Mr. GRAYDEN asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is it a fact that the Public Works Department intends to dispose of 1,000,000 tons of sand which has been used at the Narrows interchange reclamation area?
- (2) If so, and in arriving at any decision as to what to do with this sand, will the Minister keep in mind the fact that this could be used with advantage on the low-lying portions of the South Perth foreshore, and that its disposal in this fashion would, in all probability, be the most economical way of disposing of the sand?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes, the Public Works Department does intend to dispose of 1,000,000 tons of sand.
- (2) I will give consideration to the request of the member for South Perth.

## IRON ORE

### *Mt. Whaleback Deposit*

6. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for the North-West:

Could the Minister inform the House when he expects a decision from the consortium of companies which anticipate dealing with the Mt. Whaleback iron ore deposit?

Mr. COURT replied:

I could not be specific as to when

a decision will be made but very satisfactory progress has been made in the discussions on what will be an enlarged project at Port Hedland. However, I think it would be rather risky to suggest that a decision will be made within a specific time. The way things are going, I should imagine we would have a decision within a few weeks—by this I mean between four and eight weeks. However, I would not like to be pinned down to this period, because it is a tremendous negotiation and a lot of detail has to be ironed out both between the companies and the Japanese, and the companies and the State Government.

## BARRACKS ARCHWAY

### *Determination of Public Opinion on Retention*

7. Mr. GRAYDEN asked the Premier:

In view of the difficulty which confronts the Government in assessing public opinion in respect of the archway to the Old Barracks, will the Premier give consideration to setting up points in the city block—as has been done on former occasions—in order that the people of Perth might have some opportunity to express their opinion on this issue?

Mr. BRAND replied:

We will investigate all avenues. We will consider the possibility of Gallup polls and other mediums similar to that suggested by the member for South Perth. I will discuss this matter later.

## IRON ORE

### *Robe River, Deepdale, and Mt. Whaleback Deposits*

8. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for the North-West:

Assuming that the companies dealing with the Robe River and Deepdale deposits do, in fact, go to Mt. Whaleback, is it anticipated that the Government will allow the two companies involved to still hold the leases at Robe River and Deepdale, or will these leases be thrown open for new tenders?

Mr. COURT replied:

I would not be prepared to say at this juncture exactly what will be the arrangement in respect of the Robe River and Deepdale deposits. These will have to be considered in the light of the total project that is placed before us in respect of the Mt. Newman project based on Port Hedland. At the time this matter will be

considered by the Government, due regard will be taken of the State's interest in respect of Robe River and Deepdale deposits.

### CARRINGTON STREET-HIGH ROAD JUNCTION

#### *Effect of Construction of Median Strip*

9. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Was there any special reason for having two officers of the Main Roads Department stationed at Barr's garage, Carrington Street, Fremantle, to make a traffic count during yesterday morning's peak period?
- (2) Was this action related to the fact that a "Keep Left" sign on the recently constructed median strip had been demolished by a vehicle mounting the strip?
- (3) Is he aware that many more than just an odd vehicle are mounting the median strip at its northern end when either turning left into Carrington Street from High Road or turning right from Carrington Street at High Road when travelling north?
- (4) Have any accidents been reported at or near the Carrington Street-High Road junction since the construction of the median strip?
- (5) If "Yes", what number?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

This question should properly have been directed to the Minister for Traffic and—

Mr. Graham: Where is he?

Mr. BOVELL:—as I am representing him I will endeavour to—

Mr. Tonkin: Are not these workers associated with the Main Roads Department?

Mr. BOVELL:—answer the honourable member's question because this is a traffic matter. I do not care where the answer comes from so long as it is appropriate to the question. The replies to the honourable member's questions are as follows:—

- (1) Two Main Roads Department officers were making a vehicle survey of vehicles using High Road, and the High Road-Carrington Street intersection was one of the survey points.
- (2) No.
- (3) No. Observations by Main Roads Department officers do not indicate any turning problem at this junction.
- (4) Yes. One accident was reported to the Hilton Park Police Station on Saturday last. It concerned a vehicle which skidded on the wet road and mounted the median strip, damaging a "Keep Left" sign.
- (5) Answered by (4).

### SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

#### *Days and Hours*

MR. BRAND (Greenough-Premier) [5.20 p.m.]: I move—

That the House, unless otherwise ordered, shall meet for the despatch of business on Tuesdays and Wednesdays at 4.30 p.m., and on Thursdays at 2.15 p.m., and shall sit until 6.15 p.m. if necessary, and, if requisite, from 7.30 p.m. onwards.

Question put and passed.

### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

#### *Precedence on Tuesdays and Thursdays*

MR. BRAND (Greenough-Premier) [5.21 p.m.]: I move—

That on Tuesdays and Thursdays, Government business shall take precedence of all motions and Orders of the Day.

Question put and passed.

### COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION

#### *Appointment*

MR. BRAND (Greenough-Premier) [5.22 p.m.]: I move—

That for the present session—

- (1) The Library Committee shall consist of Mr. Speaker, Mr. Crommelin, and Mr. Norton.
- (2) The Standing Orders Committee shall consist of Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, Mr. Guthrie, Mr. Cornell, and Mr. Bickerton.
- (3) The House Committee shall consist of Mr. Speaker, Mr. May, Mr. Jamieson, Mr. Dunn, and Mr. Mitchell.
- (4) The Printing Committee shall consist of Mr. Speaker, Mr. I. W. Manning, and Mr. Fletcher.

Question put and passed.

### DEPUTY CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES

#### *Appointment*

THE SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I wish to announce that I have appointed the member for Claremont (Mr. Crommelin), the member for Victoria Park (Mr. Davies), and the member for Stirling (Mr. Mitchell) to be Deputy Chairmen of Committees during the present session.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by Mr. May, leave of absence for four weeks granted to Mr. Rowberry (Warren) on the ground of urgent private business.

### SUPPLY BILL

#### *Standing Orders Suspension*

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [5.23 p.m.]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable resolutions from the Com-

mittees of Supply and of Ways and Means to be reported and adopted on the same day on which they shall have passed those Committees, and also the passing of a Supply Bill through all its stages in one day, and to enable the business aforesaid to be entered upon and dealt with before the Address-in-Reply is adopted.

Question put and passed.

*Message: Appropriations*

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the Bill.

*In Committee of Supply*

The House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, the Chairman of Committees (Mr. W. A. Manning) in the Chair.

**MR. BRAND** (Greenough—Premier) [5.24 p.m.]: I move—

That there be granted Her Majesty on account of the services of the year ending 30th June, 1967, a sum not exceeding \$61,000,000.

Action is now proceeding to prepare the Revenue Budget and the Loan Estimates for this current year, and these will be presented in due course. At a later stage in the session an Appropriation Bill will be introduced. In the meantime it is necessary to provide funds to carry on the services of the State, and that is the purpose of the Bill now before members.

The amount of supply being sought at this stage is the estimated requirement for the first three months of this financial year, and this follows the normal pattern developed over the years. An issue of \$42,000,000 is sought from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and \$14,000,000 from moneys to the credit of the General Loan Fund. These amounts exceed the provisions in last year's Supply Act, No. 1, by \$2,000,000 in each case, and are needed to meet the current higher cost of Government services, and a general expansion of these services.

Provision is also made in the Bill for an issue of \$5,000,000 from the Public Account to enable the Treasurer to make such temporary advances as may be necessary to carry on the services of the State. This is \$1,000,000 more than the provision made last year. Full details of proposed transactions, on both the Consolidated Revenue Fund and the General Loan Fund will be available to members when the Estimates are presented.

At this stage it is too early to give a firm estimate of prospects for this year, but rising budgetary costs, particularly as a result of substantial increases in salary and wage payments, are posing major problems to all States.

Our budgetary position reflects to a large extent the course of events in New South Wales and Victoria by virtue of our posi-

tion as a claimant State, and it makes me sad to say that both major States are in a difficult financial situation. Drought, of course, has had a heavy adverse impact on the finances of New South Wales and, in addition, a large sum has to be found to pay for the recent \$2.00 rise in the Federal Basic Wage.

Members have no doubt seen Press reports of the serious financial position in Victoria, and the Acting Premier of that State has made no secret of the fact that he believes the situation to be critical. He has already announced a steep increase in certain charges and promises more when Victoria's Budget is brought down. The standards used by the Commonwealth Grants Commission will reflect the financial difficulties of New South Wales and I am afraid we face a rather difficult year.

On the brighter side I can say it is anticipated that the deficit which we incurred for 1964-65 of \$4,697,000 will be recouped to the State in this current year. We will know for certain when the Federal Budget is brought down shortly. Last year we finished with a deficit of only \$10,000, but our final budgetary position will not be known until August, 1967, by which time the Grants Commission will have completed its analysis of the accounts for that year.

By the time the Estimates for this current year are presented I shall be in a position to give a clearer indication of prospects for 1966-67, and members will then have the opportunity of obtaining any desired detailed information in respect of anticipated revenue and expenditure from the Ministers controlling the various departments.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

*In Committee of Ways and Means*

The House resolved itself into a Committee of Ways and Means, the Chairman of Committees (Mr. W. A. Manning) in the Chair.

**MR. BRAND** (Greenough—Premier) [5.29 p.m.]: I move—

That towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty for the services of the year ending the 30th June, 1967, a sum not exceeding \$42,000,000 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund; \$14,000,000 from the General Loan Fund; and \$5,000,000 from the Public Account.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

*Introduction and First Reading*

In accordance with the foregoing resolutions, Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Brand (Premier), and read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**MR. BRAND** (Greenough—Premier)  
[5.30 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**MR. HAWKE** (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) [5.31 p.m.]: As we were going through the various procedures necessary to enable this Bill to be introduced, the thought came to me that Parliament did not sound to be a very businesslike institution. I think it might be worth while for someone in authority to look very closely into all of these procedures which are antecedent to the introduction of the Supply Bill to see whether, in future, a much more businesslike procedure might not be possible. I know that alterations would have to be made to Standing Orders, and possibly to some of the Statutes. However, I think the Treasurer would find both Houses of Parliament very receptive to any amended and more expeditious set of proposals, were he to have these prepared and introduced into this House for consideration.

Irrespective of whether the archway of the Old Barracks remains in its present position, permanently; whether it is demolished; or whether it is shifted to some other site, governmental expenditure will be involved. The situation in regard to the matter has reached a rather farcical stage. This seems to me to be a subject which could have been decided, one way or another, a long time ago. I have not seen any necessity at all for the matter to drag on and on. I know the reason or excuse given by the Treasurer for not having made a decision is that he wishes to give public opinion an opportunity to express itself upon the subject.

In that regard I think the controllers of *The West Australian* newspaper did the Treasurer and the Government a wonderfully good turn by running a newspaper poll on the subject. My only complaint about the newspaper poll is that it was wide open to plural voting by supporters of having the archway remain permanently where it is, and also by the opponents of that proposition.

I must frankly admit I did not exercise my right to vote; in fact I gave away my voting slip to one who was in favour of keeping the archway permanently on its present site. However, I do appeal to the Treasurer and to his ministerial colleagues to make a decision soon about this matter. I do not think there is any justification whatever for dragging it on.

I have had a very strong feeling all through that the Government will decide the archway will not remain. I know the Treasurer has been of the view it should not remain. I am inclined to think most of the Ministers—if not before the newspaper poll, at least since then—are of the opinion the archway should not remain permanently in its present position; and the sooner the Government makes a final

decision in the matter and publishes it the better, I think, for all concerned.

This afternoon, with your indulgence Mr Speaker, I submitted seven questions to the Minister for Industrial Development in relation to the personnel of the board of management of the Wundowie charcoal iron and steel industry. Under the Statute which was initially responsible for legally establishing this industry the sole and total rights of management and control were legally vested in the members of the board of management, and that situation has existed ever since.

As it stands today the Act gives to the board of management absolute and total control of the management of the industry and of everything associated with its operations, including the management of the staff. The questions I submitted to the Minister for Industrial Development this afternoon arose from a statement published in *The West Australian* on the 25th June, this year. The report in the newspaper is headed "Sydney Firm to Build Wundowie Foundry," and it states—

Australian National Industries, of Sydney, will build a mechanised foundry, costing at least \$600,000, at Wundowie.

It will take over the complete management of the State-owned Wundowie charcoal iron industry from next Friday—

That was from the 1st July this year—

—and will hold a ten-year option to buy it for not less than \$800,000.

The report goes on—

These are the main points of an agreement which Premier Brand signed with A.N.I. yesterday.

I cannot believe the Editor of *The West Australian* imagined the proposition that Australian National Industries of Sydney would take over the complete management of the Wundowie charcoal iron and steel industry from Friday the 1st July, 1966. I refuse to believe the editor of the newspaper did that, or that anyone associated with the newspaper did it. Someone in authority in the Government must have given a statement of that kind—if not the actual statement as reported in the newspaper on the 25th June last—to a representative of the newspaper.

There is only one conclusion which anyone reading this part of the report could arrive at, and that is the conclusion at which I arrived. If we compare the sub-heading in the newspaper with the provisions in the Act itself, then clearly it was not within the power of the Government, or any Minister of it, to give to this company any authority whatever, let alone complete authority, to take over the total management, or any part of the management, of the charcoal iron and steel industry at Wundowie as from the 1st July this year.

Until the appropriate law is altered complete, total, and absolute powers of management must legally reside, as they have done in the past, with members of the

board of management. I want to know who, since the 1st July, has been in control of the management of this industry. I should think either the Treasurer or the Minister for Industrial Development could say straightaway what the position is in that situation.

Do the members of the board of management still exercise complete, absolute, and unrestricted control over the management of the industry; or does someone associated with this private industry exercise total or partial control over the management? Are the members of the board of management now mere figure-heads with no right or power except to agree with what some representative of a company might lay down or decide?

This appears to me to be an extremely important subject; a critical subject. The Government had no right to give this company any authority to manage the industry; no right whatever, because the law lays it down clearly that total and absolute rights of management shall legally be vested in the members of the board of management.

Who is managing the industry today; and who has been managing it since the 1st July, this year? Who is the authority? Is it the board of management, or is it the representatives of Australian National Industries? Cannot the Treasurer answer this question? Cannot the usually loquacious Minister for Industrial Development answer it? What has happened to the Minister since we last met some seven months ago? Has he lost the power of speech?

Mr. Court: I am trying to be on my best behaviour.

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister for Industrial Development is not trying to be on his best behaviour at all; he is trying to evade the issue.

Mr. Court: We will give you the answer.

Mr. HAWKE: The answer can easily be given. Either complete and total powers of management and control are, in accordance with the law, in the hands of the board of management, without any influence, interference, or restriction, or they are completely, or partially, in the hands of representatives of this company. What is the situation?

Mr. Court: The situation at the moment is quite within the powers given by Parliament to the State Government last session. An agreement has been entered into and will be presented to Parliament in due course. The only restriction placed by Parliament last time was against an actual sale.

Mr. HAWKE: By the use of many more words than is necessary the Minister dodges the question. He does not attempt to answer it.

Mr. Court: It was not the answer you wanted.

Mr. HAWKE: It is a simple question.

Mr. Court: You are overlooking the legislation passed last year.

Mr. HAWKE: I am overlooking nothing, because the legislation passed last year did not hand over the powers of management to anybody but the members of the board of management of the industry. The only part of the amending law which we passed last year, and which has been legally acted upon, is that part which gave to the Government authority to negotiate with a private company for the establishment of a large scale foundry on land owned and controlled by the board of management at Wundowie.

The amending law which we passed last year gave no right to anybody outside of the board of management itself to have any power in controlling and managing the industry.

Mr. Court: The board of management still exists under the terms of the Statute, and it has not raised any complaint.

Mr. HAWKE: The board of management exists as a ghost-like figure. That is the only opinion I can come to in view of the fact that the Minister for Industrial Development has carefully dodged the issue.

Mr. Court: The board of management was consulted before any agreement was entered into. It fully understands the position, and the board of management was constituted under section 11, I think, of the parent Act, and still exists.

Mr. HAWKE: It is not section 11 of the parent Act at all.

Mr. Court: Whatever section it is.

Mr. HAWKE: The board is given its powers in another section of the Act, and the board of management, I would like the Minister to know, cannot give away its authority; cannot give away its powers.

Mr. Court: It has not done so.

Mr. HAWKE: Will the Minister say who is managing and controlling the charcoal iron section of the industry? That is the question.

Mr. Court: The day-to-day management of the industry is in exactly the same position as before. It is in the hands of A.N.I.; it is managing it on a day-to-day basis. For the complete consummation of this agreement, an Act will be presented to Parliament. What else can you do?

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister is anticipating Parliamentary approval.

Mr. Court: No, he is not.

Mr. HAWKE: In anticipating it, he is allowing illegal acts to be perpetrated.

Mr. Court: You are saying Crown Law advised the Government wrongly.

Mr. HAWKE: These acts have not the force of law; cannot possibly have the force of law until such time as the principal Act is appropriately amended.

Mr. Court: I think you are jumping a hurdle too quickly.



Mr. HAWKE: I am not jumping a hurdle; I am drawing the attention of the House and the public to a hurdle which, clearly now, the Minister himself has set up without realising what the legal requirements of the situation are.

Mr. Court: This particular point was discussed with Crown Law to see what was the position and they, as you know, drew up this agreement.

Mr. HAWKE: What is the use of the Minister talking about an agreement which has been drawn up but which has not yet been brought to Parliament—which has not yet been ratified by Parliament? What force has that agreement—

Mr. Court: Of course it has.

Mr. HAWKE: —except in relation to the foundry which the private company is establishing upon land owned by the board of management at Wundowie? How can an agreement which proposes to give to the company the right to manage the whole of the existing industry and a 10-year option to purchase it at a price of not less than \$800,000 have any force when it has not even been presented to Parliament—when it has not received the endorsement of Parliament?

Mr. Court: You are overlooking the fact that the agreement could be in two parts, one needing ratification and the other not.

Mr. HAWKE: The agreement could have 10. or 20 parts. and could have 10 subparts, and all the rest of it. What has that got to do with the argument I am putting forward?

Mr. Court: Plenty.

Mr. HAWKE: I am saying any agreement made by this Government with the company cannot be applied legally if the agreement as a whole—or portions of it—is outside of the existing law. That is what I am saying. If all the Government has done in the making of this total agreement with the company is legal—has the full force of law—why bring it to Parliament?

Mr. Court: Because Parliament imposed a restriction on the powers of the Government.

Mr. HAWKE: Of course Parliament put a restriction on the powers of the Government; and that is why the Government is not entitled, in the legal sense, to do what it apparently has done. Parliament, when this Bill was here last year, did put a very severe restriction on the Government in regard to the disposal of the existing industries. Parliament laid it down they should not be disposed of unless and until an agreement for their disposal was brought to Parliament and ratified by both Houses of Parliament. That is what was done last year.

So anything the Government has so far done in the direction of disposing of the existing industry to a private company

has not any legal effect. Anything the Government has so far done, or that is to be done, under this agreement to give the total management and control of the existing industry at Wundowie to a private company cannot have any legal effect. Anything done under that setup has been done illegally, and any further actions done under it in the future will be done illegally until such time as the agreement which the Minister talks about has been brought to Parliament and ratified by both Houses of the Parliament.

How can the Minister argue that by putting certain things in an agreement which the Government and the company have decided upon, one overrides an Act of Parliament? One cannot do that. I am sure the Premier, on consideration of the situation—and I should hope, the Minister, on reconsideration—would clearly see that one cannot, by making an agreement as between the Government and a private company, override the express provisions of an Act of Parliament? Such provisions of the agreement as run counter to the Act of Parliament cannot be enforced legally; cannot be operated at all legally; and can only become legal following their submission to Parliament and their approval by a majority of members in both Houses of the Parliament.

I was amazed when I read in an article in *The West Australian* newspaper of the 25th June this year that the company would take over the complete management of the existing industry at Wundowie as from the 1st July this year. I was astounded. The appropriate sections of the Act place complete legal powers of management in the hands of the members of the board of control. The amending Act which Parliament passed last year altered that in no degree whatsoever. Therefore the position has been and still is, and will be until the Act is altered, that total and absolute powers of control and management are in the hands of the members of the board of management.

However, it is clear from what I have been able to drag out of the Minister this afternoon that most of the power and control of management over the industry and the staff have, by executive act of the Government, been given to a private company. Evidently the law in this situation is as it has been with others. During the last seven years it has not meant a thing—

Mr. Court: Yes it has.

Mr. HAWKE: —when it has conflicted with the desire or the decision of the executive. The executive becomes greater and more powerful than Parliament. There is nothing new in that with this Government, but it is most disturbing to find that the Government repeats this offence every so often, and has repeated it, undoubtedly, on this occasion. Any member of this House who cares to study the principal Act—and it is a short Act—in relation to the

setting up of the board of management, its personnel, and its legal powers, would soon come to the conclusion that the executive Government has no right whatsoever to take to itself authority to give a private company, or to anybody else, the legal powers of management and control over the industry and over the staff.

I sincerely hope the Premier and his Ministers will look very closely into this. I cannot believe that any responsible law officer has advised the Government that it can give away or take away from the board of management the powers of control over the industry and give them to a private company or to a private individual. I cannot believe that any law officer with responsibility would give advice of that kind in view of what the principal Act contains and in view also—if the Minister likes it that way—of what is contained in the amending Act as approved by both Houses of the Parliament last year after the Bill was amended in the Legislative Council.

So I want to know very clearly, and without any mucking around, just what the present situation is. I want to know who is managing the industry at Wundowie; who is controlling it; who is giving the orders; and who is making the decisions? It seems to me that although the Minister has not taken action to retire the present members of the board of management, they have, in effect, become figureheads—not even rubber stamps. The representatives of this company who have gone to Wundowie have, on the authority of the executive Government, taken over the management and control of the industry and are acting without legal authority. I do not think there is any shadow of doubt about that. I would like the member for Subiaco and the member for Perth to give a few moments' study, or longer if they wish, to this situation.

Mr. Durack: How do you interpret section 3(1)(b) of the Act we passed last year?

Mr. HAWKE: What does that mean?

Mr. Durack: What you are talking about.

Mr. HAWKE: In general terms, but what specifically does it mean? The member for Perth does not know.

Mr. Durack: I cannot make a speech like you.

Mr. HAWKE: The honourable member could in fewer words than the Minister for Industrial Development.

Mr. Durack: You complained about the number of words he used.

Mr. HAWKE: He tried to get around the proposition, but the member for Perth is trying to help me. That is the difference. I understood the member for Perth drew my attention to section 3 (1) (b).

Mr. Durack: Read section 3 (1) and then (b).

Mr. HAWKE: All right. Thanks very much. The member for Perth is helping

me far more than he realises. Subsection (1) of section 3 reads as follows:—

3. (1) The execution by the Premier and Treasurer of the State, on behalf of the State and any public authority, of an Agreement for all or any of the following purposes, namely—

I presume the honourable member would like me to read (b), and it is as follows:—

(b) the formation and registration of a company or companies limited by shares under the Companies Act, 1961, for the purpose of acquiring the Wundowie works or of such a company to operate, control and manage or lease or otherwise deal with the Wundowie works or for the purpose of doing all or any of those things, and for the sale and allotment of shares . . . .

Is that right? Does the member for Perth want me to read any more? He seems to have lost interest all of a sudden. This proposal has not been acted upon in the sense which I have been discussing. There has been no agreement made for the formation of a company or the registration of shares. This Australian National Industries Company has been in existence for many years, as far as I know. So there is nothing in the agreement which the member for Perth talks about, or anything in that part of the amending Act which he talks about, which applies. It is quite irrelevant. I thought he was trying to help me, but now I have some doubt.

So it is clear that the Government has not acted in association with the company under subsection (1) (b) of section 3 of last year's amending Act. The agreement which the Government has made with the company is, first of all, for the establishment of a large-scale foundry, which I applaud, and which I applauded when the legislation was before us last year.

The second proposition in this agreement is that the Government has given the company an option to purchase the whole of the existing works for a sum not less than \$800,000, the option being for a currency of ten years, presumably from the first July, 1966. That is the agreement in broad terms which the Government has made with the already existing company. It has not made an agreement with some group to form a company to issue shares, or all that sort of rubbish, as suggested by the member for Perth.

Mr. Tonkin: I would like to hear the member for Perth on this subject.

Mr. HAWKE: I hope he gives a lot more study to it than he appears to have done, although I must admit he helped me without intending so to do.

There is one other subject on which I want to speak for a few moments in connection with the Supply Bill. It has to do with the infant mortality rate in Western Australia. I am very sorry indeed the Minister for Health is not a member of this House because it would be desirable,

naturally, for members when discussing this subject to be able to talk directly to the Minister concerned. I quite realise it is not possible to have all the Ministers of the Government in the Legislative Assembly, so I accept that situation without any complaint at all.

Earlier this year figures were published on behalf of the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics which showed that the infant mortality rate in Western Australia had been rising and last year had reached a figure which was the highest, and therefore the worst, in all of the Australian States. I can take my mind back to a time when it was the proud boast of people in Western Australia who were interested in this matter that the infant mortality rate in Western Australia was the lowest of all the Australian States.

Therefore I am disturbed and apprehensive at the developments which, in more recent years, have caused Western Australia to fall from being the best State in this vital field, to being the worst State. When these figures were published I naturally expected the Minister for Health in Western Australia would have something to say along the lines of assuring the public that everything possible was being done to keep the infant mortality rate in Western Australia as low as possible.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Was any mention made of the percentage figure?

Mr. HAWKE: Yes. The figure for Western Australia was 22.92 per thousand live births.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: How did this compare with the other States?

Mr. HAWKE: It was the highest in Australia. I expected the Minister for Health would have something to say to the public about this problem because it is undoubtedly a very serious problem. But no, no statement from the Minister; no statement to the public from the Premier; and no statement to the public from the ex-Minister for Health.

But some people in other fields were having something to say. I am not saying they were organised to say something to the public, but they did say some things to the public. Why is it that when the Government has something which it thinks is favourable, politically, for the Government to say to the public, the Premier or some Minister says it, but when there is something unfavourable to be given to the public, no matter how vitally important it is, no Minister wants to touch it with a forty-foot pole?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is a generalisation that does not apply to every case.

Mr. J. Hegney: They call it "tactics."

Mr. HAWKE: I think the Minister would agree there would hardly be a more important subject than the one we are now discussing.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: All I say is that we accept the good with the bad in most cases.

Mr. HAWKE: Apparently no Minister wanted to accept the bad in this situation. The following appeared in *The West Australian* newspaper of the 8th July last year:—

The acting head of the Child Health Department, Dr. Ian Lewis, said yesterday the principal causes were premature births and respiratory distress.

Later on in the same article, the executive officer of the Health Education Council, Mr. J. Carr, said—

W.A.'s infant mortality rate reached its peak in 1902, when it was 142.01 per 1,000 live births.

Then, Mr. Carr went on to deal with the dramatic fall from that time until more recent times. Further on in this article it is stated—

Doctors and statisticians agreed that the pattern of infant deaths fluctuated from month to month.

This was shown in the April statistics for W.A. released this week.

Twenty babies died, giving a mortality rate of 15.56 compared with 35 deaths and a mortality rate of 21.22 for the corresponding month last year. That is the conclusion of that quotation.

On the 22nd July this year, the Public Health Commissioner, Dr. Davidson, gave a statement to *The West Australian* newspaper in which he advised that plans to investigate the rise in Western Australia's infant mortality rate were under way. Dr. Davidson told the newspaper reporter the increase had accompanied a decline in the State's birth rate, and so on. Dr. Davidson later said the statistics did not include full-blood native babies. Those statistics showed that the infant mortality rate for the period in question rose from 22.92 to 27.28 per 1,000 live births. Dr. Davidson said—

His investigation would include a study of infant death certificates.

The report concluded by stating—

W.A.'s infant mortality rate fitted the pattern of a growing State with a big outback area. The rate was very low in urban areas.

I am worried about the fact that this situation develops over quite a long period—a year, two years, or perhaps three years—and when the unfortunate situation develops that Western Australia's infant mortality rate becomes the highest in Australia, someone comes along and tells the public the situation will be investigated; the death certificates will be studied.

I am very surprised indeed to find there is not a continuous study of death certificates of infants in operation. I would have thought this would be a day to day, a week to week, or a month to month

procedure. After all is said and done there is a great deal of suffering—not so much these days as in former years, thank goodness—and a great deal of expense involved in the birth of children. Once they are born, it is indeed a sad tragedy that within 12 months they have ceased to exist. From any point of view, this must represent not only a heart-breaking loss to the parents but also an economic loss—taking the long view—to the State and to the Commonwealth of Australia as a whole.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: At this time I say that regular meetings are held in the big maternity hospitals where cases are discussed.

Mr. HAWKE: I have no doubt the Minister for Works is quite right in what he says and I accept it fully. However, I emphasise the unfortunate retrogression we have suffered in Western Australia in relation to this matter. I am certain no-one would wilfully, or knowingly, do a thing—no matter how small—to contribute to a situation of this kind. I am sure everyone in his, or her, conscious moments and conscious actions would do everything possible to keep the infant mortality rate down to the very lowest possible figure.

When I was studying these reports and relative statistics, I found the infant mortality rate in Tasmania was round about 11 per thousand live births. I think in New South Wales the figure was about 16 per thousand. It may be that Tasmania has some special advantages; it may be that the smallness of population and the total number of babies born each year gives it special advantages.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I think their rules for the registration of births would probably be more restrictive than ours. The legislation has not yet reached the point our legislation has reached.

Mr. HAWKE: That might be. However, I was going on to say the comparison between Western Australia and New South Wales should be a reasonably appropriate one.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Depending on when you register a live birth.

Mr. HAWKE: I should think the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics would have comparative figures. I do not think it would set up tables of figures in its official publications, as between the various States, which would mislead people into believing that one State is worse, or better, than another. This position is brought about because the situation in the various States differs in relation to the registration of births and in relation to other factors. However, I have no intention to delay the House further at this stage.

The SPEAKER: I should just like to remind the House that tomorrow the annual parliamentary church service is to be held in St. George's Cathedral. The

number of acceptances has been disappointingly small but I hope that members will endeavour to attend.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

MR. HALL (Albany) [7.30 p.m.]: The measure before the House is a commendable and valuable one. Its passing through this House is also extremely urgent. The preamble to the Bill reads as follows:—

An Act to supply out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund the sum of Forty-two Million Dollars and from Moneys to Credit of the General Loan Fund Fourteen Million Dollars, to the Service of the Year ending 30th June, 1967.

This brings me back to the question I asked earlier today relating to the importance of Parliament. If I may I will reiterate the question I asked the Premier this afternoon. It is as follows:—

As there appears to be a growing weakness—

I interpolate here to emphasise the word "weakness". Continuing—

—in the actions of Parliament brought about by controls of State, by Cabinet, and Public Service administration and regulation and a long period of parliamentary inactivity, will he agree to two sessions of Parliament in the one calendar year?

The Premier replied to this question in the negative, and apparently the Government had already given the question some consideration.

In dealing with this subject it is interesting to have a look at what other Parliaments are doing. At this stage I refer to the journal entitled *The Table* which is *The Journal of the Society of Clerks at-the-Table in Commonwealth Parliaments* which are associated with the sovereignty of Her Majesty, the Queen.

In the United Kingdom we find that there are two parliamentary sessions. The first is held from February until July, and the second during November and December. In Northern Ireland there are also two parliamentary sessions, one being held from January until June, and the other during the months of October, November and December. In Jersey two sessions are held, the first from January until April and the second during September, October and November. The Isle of Man also has two sessions of Parliament, the first extending from January until July, and the second from October to December. In Canada the Federal Parliament sits from January until July only.

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, but it never sits longer than three weeks.

Mr. HALL: I realise that, but I do not want to go into any further details, because we want to get the Supply Bill through all stages tonight.

Dealing with the Commonwealth of Australia, the Federal Parliament has its first session extending from February to June, and the second session from August until

November. New South Wales also has two sessions; that Parliament sits first in February and March, and then from August until December. South Australia, like Western Australia, has only one session ranging from June until November. In Victoria, the Parliament has two sessions. It has a short session first, extending from March until June, and then sits again from August until December. In this State, as we know, we have only the one session of Parliament, usually extending from July until December.

This brings me to the point I wish to raise tonight. I feel sure that there is a growing need for a closer relationship between Parliament, the Executive Government, and the Civil Service. There is no doubt that many of the actions of the Government and Executive Council have stemmed from the Public Service administration, various commissions under Government control, and others not under its control; and unless we achieve closer relationship or have more frequent opportunities to bring before Parliament the grievances of our electors, I think it must be agreed that Parliament will soon go downhill.

The Leader of the Opposition mentioned tonight that there should be some means whereby the members of Her Majesty's Opposition should have access to information concerning the activities of Executive Council, Cabinet Ministers, and the Government generally. At present the Leader of the Opposition is forced to obtain this information by means of question, by approach to various Government departments, and by the publication of articles in the Press. It is only by these means that he is able to get any inkling of the Government's action or intended action. This should not be, because our present involved and complex system of government and the economic movement in the society in which we live today need careful consideration and review.

I consider that during the parliamentary recess the powers of Parliament are weakened because the work that it should perform and which is its responsibility is carried out by the various Government commissions and members of the Public Service. I believe we should hold regular sessions of Parliament to enable us to bring forward and discuss measures similar to that which we are discussing tonight.

It is imperative that this Bill be dealt with as expeditiously as possible so that supply may be granted to enable the Government to continue to function. However, I wonder how much of the money sought has already been spent without the approval or the sanction of this House of Parliament? Actually, this measure is only brought forward to grant to the Government authority to spend money, a great deal of which has already been spent or committed.

This is a most important question and you, Mr. Speaker, in your extremely high

office must feel that you are not sufficiently considered, as Speaker, in regard to exercising control over the destiny of the State, and also in allowing the members of the Opposition to exercise some measure of control over the actions of the Government; that is, exercise some control by way of question, and also by discussion on the various measures which the Government introduces to achieve what it is now achieving by the action of Executive Council, by regulation, and by Government administration.

If we are to continue to allow the Public Service to dictate the policy of the Government—which I am afraid is being done today not only in this State, but in others—then I feel certain that our democratic system will not continue in the way it has done in the past. However, in those places where there are two sessions of Parliament surely this permits of some means of achieving the rectification of an error by Government, or of the various grievances raised by members of Parliament being heard. I can cite one instance myself. This relates to an action by Executive Council. In the *Government Gazette* of the 22nd April, 1966, the following appears:—

Cancellation of Casuarina Townsite.

Department of Lands and Surveys,

Perth, 22nd April, 1966.

It is hereby notified that His Excellency the Governor in Executive Council has been pleased to cancel under section 10 of the Land Act, 1933-1965, Casuarina Townsite, and to declare that such townsite shall cease to exist.

That action by Executive Council virtually wiped out the complete planning of the townsite. The reason for this action, as the Minister for Lands will know, is that the noisy scrub bird resides in this particular area.

Might I read from *The Albany Advertiser* dated the 4th July, 1966. The heading is, "Bird Scrubs Town." Really it was the Executive Council that scrubbed the town, because that is where the original action came from. This action on the part of the Executive Council certainly upset and disturbed the shire council in that area, because it had visualised the planning of the townsite in question. The shire council was not happy with the cancellation of this townsite, and with the area of some 6,000 acres being set aside for the noisy scrub bird. I see no reason, myself, why the scrub bird and the townsite cannot live in harmony. They appear to have done so for many years.

Many of the squatters in this area have been given notice that they will be put off the land by December. A number of the people it affects actually pioneered the area, and constructed roads in the Two People Bay site. They are now virtually

being given no form of compensation, and a great hardship is being placed on these people, who live on a very limited income, and who are now forced to leave the area because of the action of the Executive Council.

This brings me back to the question of the activities of government being interrupted, and its affect on democracy. Might I quote from a work entitled *Planning The Modern State*. Members will see that I have not yet given up the idea of a new State. This publication was written by F. A. Bland, M.A., LL.B., and on page 27 we find the following:—

"We do not think for ourselves because we have elected people to think for us, and the people we have elected to think for us dare not, for that very reason, think for themselves. This is the vicious circle in which we are all engaged."

Nearly thirty years ago, Graham Wallas saw the serious danger in this situation.

Mr. J. Hegney: Who is Graham Wallas?

Mr. HALL: This was nearly 30 years ago. To continue—

He predicted a progressive deterioration "of the human material of our social machinery at just those points where strength is most urgently required. Men whom we are compelled to trust will prefer the smaller to the larger good. The director will sacrifice the interests of his shareholders to his own . . . the statesman will sacrifice his country for his party . . . and the Concert of Europe will remain helpless because each of its constituent nations refuses to work for the good of the whole." It is this, says Sir Arthur Salter, which makes the machine of government, as we know it in countries with free democratic institutions, incompetent for the planning and execution of national economic policy.

The point I wish to make, and I think I have made it, is that without two sessions of Parliament we have little chance to bring forward our grievances. We have heard it said that the Ministers would be subject to too much fatigue. I would say that the Ministers are at the moment in a state of fatigue. At the beginning of this session they do not look half as vigorous as they did when we completed the session last year.

If the officers in the Public Service were carrying out their responsibilities as they should, leaving the final say to the Ministers, the latter would be relieved of considerable pressure. I would not know whether or not the Public Service is working at full capacity, but I do know there is considerable room for improvement in certain departments.

I see no reason at all why we should not hold an earlier session, because this would help us to think a lot more clearly

and be instrumental in bringing about a higher standard of debate. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned the fact that an opportunity should be afforded to view this question in its proper perspective. The Leader and members of Her Majesty's Opposition should be given the opportunity to consider the findings and recommendations made by the officers of the Civil Service. We should be given access to these matters. Greater research facilities should be provided by which members could obtain more knowledge of events which might transpire as a result of Government action, and so enable them to offer an opinion opposite to that possessed by the executive.

It is not my intention to condemn the Civil Service. I do say, however, that the thoughts of civil servants may not be the thoughts of the people in the districts with which they deal. I have already referred to the heading "Bird Scrubs Town." This, in effect, is an example of Executive Council action. If we had some foreknowledge of these actions, or intended actions, we would be better able to voice our thoughts and opinions for or against them. We could do so on behalf of our electorates or, through the Leader of the Opposition, on behalf of the State as a whole.

Accordingly, I ask the Government to reconsider the question of having two sessions of Parliament, because this would enable us to have more sensible hours of debate, and generally we would be in a better position to deal with the affairs of State; and, after all, that is why we are elected. I admit we have many other duties thrust on us, but the real reason for our being here is that we are the elected representatives of our various constituencies. We should be able to come here and voice our grievances and guard against any action which we feel is contrary to the good of the State, whether it be that of a businessman or the executive. The Government would hear our voice as an Opposition, and if we were on the Government benches we could hear the voices of the Liberal Party and the Country Party. I trust the Treasurer will give further consideration to holding two sessions of Parliament.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [7.49 p.m.]: I take this early opportunity to ventilate a few matters with which I am immediately concerned. The first of them concerns answers that are given to questions asked. I had a good deal of amusement this afternoon in listening to the Minister for Lands deputising for the Minister for Traffic on behalf of the Minister for Works. One can be pardoned, I think, for addressing questions to the Minister for Works about a median strip which was constructed by the Main Roads Department, more especially as officers of the Main Roads Department were present at the scene to which I refer making an investigation.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You will wake up.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister will also wake up before I have finished. If the Minister for Works is prepared to allow some other department to use the employees of a department under his control, that is all right with me; but I cannot be expected to know that. I simply ascertained that the men with whom I was concerned were employees of the Main Roads Department, and my questions related to something which had been constructed by that department.

I noticed that the Minister for Lands was smiling when he read the answers to the questions. No doubt he was being influenced by the same, or similar, thoughts as I was.

Mr. Bovell: That is my general attitude. I like to look on the bright side.

Mr. TONKIN: I asked a question as to whether the investigation which was taking place was related to the fact that a "Keep Left" sign on the recently constructed median strip had been demolished by a vehicle mounting the strip, and the reply of the Minister to that question was, "No." But further down he said that one accident had been reported to the Hilton Park police station on Saturday last and that it concerned a vehicle which skidded on the wet road and mounted the median strip, damaging the "Keep Left" sign. That is the year's under-statement—damaging the "Keep Left" sign! This "Keep Left" sign has been flattened completely, and the portion of the median strip where it is located has been dislodged, but the reference to that is that it has been damaged.

Mr. Brand: This is not the first sign I have seen flattened. I have seen many of them.

Mr. TONKIN: The officers who were sent down, and who did not observe that a number of vehicles had mounted the median strip, must have been suffering from myopia; because there is visual evidence that five vehicles, at least, had mounted the median strip, on one side of it within 10 yards of the northern end, and that four vehicles had done so on the other side. The evidence is to be seen from the tyre marks, and the direction of those marks, which are still on the median strip.

Apparently the officers did not see that, because the answer to the question was "No. Observations by Main Roads Department officers did not indicate any turning problem at this junction." I spent an hour at this spot on one occasion watching what was happening. I saw two heavily laden vehicles—the drivers of which apparently did not like the idea of trying to turn into Carrington Street—go across the opening and travel north against the traffic, thus committing a traffic offence, in order to enter a gateway some 10 to 15 yards beyond the end of the median strip. I saw two other semi-trailers endeavouring to make a U-turn on

the northern end of the median strip, finding it impossible to do so on the first or second look, and holding up the traffic whilst they finally got round by going over the top of the median strip. But the officers of the Main Roads Department did not observe any turning difficulty!

Mr. Bickerton: Why did not the Minister go down himself to have a look?

Mr. TONKIN: Either the officers are incapable, or else they are reporting exactly what is occurring but their superiors are not stating the situation truthfully. A few days ago I attended a function, which a number of Ministers also attended, at the meatworks. One very wealthy gentleman present who, I believe, has never supported the party to which I have the honour to belong, came up and said, "I do not agree with you very often, but I agree with you absolutely in connection with this matter. This median strip is a mistake." He is a big businessman with a great number of large vehicles, and these have to negotiate the turns on the median strip to which I am referring.

The result of putting this median strip on a road which is not wide enough is, in my view, the creation of increased traffic hazards, because, whereas people could previously enter Barr's garage by making an ordinary righthand turn at some distance from a rise in the road, and so improve their vision, they are now obliged to increase the danger by moving closer to the rise in the road and making a U-turn.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: The Minister for Traffic might well appoint you to be his consultant on these matters.

Mr. TONKIN: All that the Minister for Traffic need do is to take a look for himself and make up his mind; he should not make up his mind and then have a look. That is what is required to be done. I venture to suggest that something will eventually be done to improve this situation. I do not accept the statement that this "Keep Left" sign was knocked down because a vehicle skidded on the wet road. I do not accept that at all.

This is interesting: The Main Roads Act provides that where the Main Roads Department reconstructs a road and—these are the words used in the Act—"prejudicially affects the access" to a property fronting the road, the Main Roads Department at its own expense has to provide an alternative access. No one in his right senses would say that the construction of the median strip in the road is not prejudicially affecting the access to Barr's garage.

Mr. Bickerton: Not if the Minister owned the garage.

Mr. TONKIN: The Act does not require that the access has to be closed before the department takes action. The words were selected carefully at the time and they are, "prejudicially affects the access." I would like to see the person who would stand up and say that the construction of

this median strip has not prejudicially affected the access to Barr's garage.

The member for Claremont would probably have some knowledge of this, because I remember the time when the median strip was put down in Stirling Highway, but it did not remain there long.

Mr. Jamieson: He got snaky about that one!

Mr. TONKIN: The lawyer who was engaged at the time brought this very point to the notice of the Main Roads Department: That the access to a number of properties was being prejudicially affected by the construction of the median strip.

So this matter is not by any means finished and will require to be looked at very carefully from the point of view of the legal decision as well as the traffic danger which, in my mind, obviously exists at that spot at the present time.

I now want to make reference to some answers given by the Minister for Works. This afternoon I asked him when Plan 3034 T.B. 3324 was first prepared. His answer was "In July, 1964." I also asked—

When was the plan made available to the Swan River Conservation Board and some local government authorities respectively?

His answer was that it was not made available to the Swan River Conservation Board, or to local government authorities, but it was tabled during discussion with representatives of the Perth City Council.

I want to inform the Minister that I have discussed with several members of the Swan River Conservation Board the existence of this plan and they have told me it was at the office of the Swan River Conservation Board that they personally observed it, and they were asked to keep quiet about it. I am also informed that the members of the Nedlands local authority have seen this plan.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Not to my knowledge. My answer was given as is.

Mr. TONKIN: There is an obligation on the Minister to give the correct answer and to make sure the information he is supplying is guaranteed as correct by the officer supplying it.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Do you want a statutory declaration, too?

Mr. TONKIN: I do not accept the answer that this plan was not available to the members of the Swan River Conservation Board, nor to members of other local authorities besides the Perth City Council. But that is the answer the Minister gave me this afternoon. Although the Government refuses to table this plan, I want to inform the Premier I have seen it.

Mr. Brand: I have not the slightest doubts.

Mr. Graham: What is the secrecy?

Mr. TONKIN: The plan provides for the filling in of the river between Heirisson Island and the shore in order to turn Heirisson Island into a promontory.

Mr. Brand: Which has never been recommended, nor has a decision been made on it.

Mr. TONKIN: It also provides for the filling in of a strip 300 feet wide from Heirisson Island down to the Narrows Bridge.

Mr. Brand: Was that in the plan?

Mr. TONKIN: That was shown to a reporter of *The West Australian* whose name I could mention.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You knew that when you built the Narrows Bridge.

Mr. Brand: And agreed to the plan.

Mr. TONKIN: What relation has that to the question I asked?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is how long ago you knew about it.

Mr. TONKIN: Why does the Government refuse to table this plan?

Mr. Brand: It is not a final plan so what is the use of tabling a plan which is not recommended to the Government or agreed upon?

Mr. TONKIN: This is in accordance with the Government's policy of keeping things as long as possible so that eventually when the people find out, it is a *fait accompli* and it is too late to do anything about it.

Mr. Brand: You talk rubbish.

Mr. TONKIN: That is the reason which is actuating the Government in this matter. I make the very deliberate statement that this plan, which the Premier refuses to let me see and which he refuses to table, has been seen by members of the Swan River Conservation Board and by representatives of local authorities other than the Perth City Council. Have they a greater right to see this preliminary plan—which the Premier and the Minister for Works keep calling it—than members of Parliament? I do not think they have a prior right; and if members of the Government were on this side of the House they would not accept that situation either.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You refused to table files when you were a Minister, don't worry about that.

Mr. TONKIN: I am talking about a plan of river reclamation, not a file. I never asked to see a file; I asked that the plan showing these proposals, which the Government has every intention of putting into operation, shall be placed on the table. Why was it that *The West Australian* shortly after its reporter was shown this plan, wrote a leading article saying that in view of what had already happened in connection with the Freeway, there should be no opposition to the filling-in of this 300-foot strip? Which 300-foot strip? The one the paper's reporter had seen the day before. But the Premier has no knowledge of his having seen it.

Mr. Graham: Who asked that nothing be published?



Mr. TONKIN: I want to make short reference to some answers given by the Minister for Industrial Development. Members will recall that Parliament was asked to give permission for the Broken Hill Pty. Co. Ltd. to export iron-ore from Yampi ahead of the time which had previously been agreed upon in view of the fact that this company was going to spend substantial sums in connection with the production of pellets. This was to be done in conjunction with Cleveland Cliffs; and we were told that the company would have to observe all the terms of the several agreements.

One of these agreements requires that the company will submit plans for the Deepdale project by June, 1969. I do not think the company, under these changed circumstances, has any intention of submitting plans in accordance with that agreement and I make this assertion: I believe the Government knows it at this stage; knows that there is no chance of this company proceeding with this project for some years, if at all. In the light of that listen to this answer—

The Government is satisfied that the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited has every intention of meeting its obligations under the agreement.

Would you think so, Mr. Speaker, in view of what is transpiring with regard to Mt. Whaleback? Just ponder on these words—

The Government is satisfied that the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited has every intention of meeting its obligations under the agreement on the Deepdale project . . . .

My opinion is that it has no intention. But then, to qualify that, the crafty Minister goes on—

. . . . unless, of course, this agreement is varied in a mutually satisfactory way, in which case another set of obligations will be agreed.

And, in due course, if the company does not want to meet those, still another set of obligations will be agreed; and, in due course, if the company has no intention of meeting those, then another set of obligations will be agreed. Does that not make a farce of the whole thing?

I am saying this because I want it recorded in *Hansard* that I do not accept a single word of this statement that the Government is satisfied this company will meet its obligations under the Deepdale agreement, and I hope to be in a position later on to be able to quote what I am saying now in proof of the point of view which I hold.

Mr. Court: But you have always lived in hopes that none of these things would come true, but to your amazement they are coming true.

Mr. TONKIN: Oh yes? I have not seen many of them yet.

Mr. Court: Are you not impressed with what is going on up in the north?

Mr. TONKIN: I certainly was, and I am going to refer to those things in a moment or two.

Mr. Hawke: Why does the Minister keep putting his foot in it?

Mr. Court: They exist.

Mr. TONKIN: Before I proceed to deal with this matter—and I will tell the Minister now it has to do with the port of King Bay and the Dampier Archipelago—I want to say a word or two about Wundowie, with which the Leader of the Opposition dealt this afternoon.

I was very interested in an interjection made by the member for Perth, and I invite him to put his reputation as a lawyer on the line on this question and get up and defend the Government's attitude on this.

Mr. Court: He happens to be right.

Mr. TONKIN: I make the prediction that he dare not do so. That is how right he is.

Mr. Court: You go on putting your foot in it.

Mr. TONKIN: He dare not get up and put his reputation as a lawyer on the line and say that what the Government is doing is legal; and I will give my reasons for saying that.

Mr. May: Fair enough!

Mr. TONKIN: Section 3 of the Act of last session gave the Government this power—

The execution by the Premier and Treasurer of the State, on behalf of the State and any public authority, of any Agreement for all or any of the following purposes, namely—

(a) the sale and purchase of the Wundowie works;

We need not worry about the rest because this agreement to which the Leader of the Opposition refers is an agreement for the sale and purchase, and the proof of this is that it was stated in the announcement by the Premier that this agreement had been signed and would be taken before Parliament for ratification. If it were not an agreement for the sale and purchase, there would be no need to take it before Parliament because it would operate immediately.

Mr. Court: Don't you think it would be wise to—

Mr. TONKIN: I am wise enough to know what I want to do myself—

Mr. Court: What suits you!

Mr. TONKIN: —and wise enough to make up my mind to do it; and that is what I am doing, and the Minister would be wise to keep quiet.

Mr. Court: You might be wise to wait until you see the agreement because you will get a shock when you do.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister will, too.

Mr. Court: You will know how far you are putting your foot in it.

Mr. Hawke: You are the one who misleads the public.

Mr. Court: Oh no!

Mr. Hawke: We will see about that.

Mr. TONKIN: The newspaper announcement said this—

A.N.I. managing director J. Debenham signed the agreement for the company. It will be presented to Parliament for ratification this year.

Mr. Court: That is right.

Mr. TONKIN: That fixes that. This is an agreement for the sale and purchase, otherwise it would not need to be ratified. Subsection (2) of section 3 reads—

Subject to subsection (3) of this section, the Agreement so executed before the date of the expiration of this Act shall be deemed to have been approved by Parliament, and shall subject to the provisions of the Agreement be carried out . . .

This particular agreement cannot be deemed to be approved by Parliament because it is specifically excluded, and subsection (3) reads—

(3) Where the agreement is for the sale and purchase of the Wundowie works pursuant to paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of this section the Agreement shall be subject to the approval of Parliament.

Now I put this proposition to members: If Parliament provided that an agreement for the sale and purchase had to be approved by it, would it accept a situation that, such an agreement having been made, it could become operative before Parliament had an opportunity of saying whether or not it agreed? Such a proposition would be preposterous, because under it a company which was given the power of managing, and did not have to say for 10 years whether it would purchase, could do pounds' worth of damage, or incur pounds' worth of loss for which it would not be responsible.

Is this Government, or any Government, entitled to anticipate the approval of Parliament to an agreement which it enters into? It may be that under party government, the Government could be reasonably certain that it could force its supporters to vote for such an agreement, and so eventually Parliament would ratify it; but even admitting that, it does not give the Government the right to anticipate that Parliament will approve of any agreement which it sees fit to put into operation. So to do would turn Parliament into nothing more than a rubber stamp.

I want to hear the member for Perth get up and argue, if he dare, that a provision in a law which says that an agreement to sell must be approved by Parliament permits a party to the agreement to enter into control of the works to be purchased, and

to operate them in anticipation of parliamentary agreement.

Mr. Court: I do not want to spoil your story, but with respect—

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister cannot spoil my story.

Mr. Court: I want to tell you that when you see the agreement you will see it is a sensible way of handling the transitional period, as well as—

Mr. TONKIN: It might be sensible in the view of the Minister but I am concerned with its legality. I know this Government is never concerned with the legality of its actions, and I could give many examples of that.

Mr. Court: I think you had better read section 3 of last year's Act again.

Mr. TONKIN: I could give many examples, especially some involving the Minister for Industrial Development, who seems the least concerned about the legality of anything he wants to do. Whether it is a simple matter, an attractive matter, or a profitable one, does not enter into it. It is a question of whether the law permits it to be done or not, and I say most emphatically the law does not permit it to be done.

Mr. Court: You do not know what is in the agreement.

Mr. TONKIN: Agreements made *ultra vires* the law are not worth anything.

Mr. Court: You are only assuming.

Mr. TONKIN: This agreement cannot be operative and cannot confer any rights or benefits upon anybody until approved by Parliament, and any other situation would make the thing a farce.

So I say that my leader was absolutely correct when he charged the Government with entering into this agreement and permitting things to be done under it contrary to the law of this State.

Mr. Court: I can assure you it is right within the powers given by this Parliament.

Mr. TONKIN: Your assurance does not mean a snap of the fingers to me.

Mr. Hawke: When will we see the agreement?

Mr. Court: When the Bill is introduced.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister is not justified in taking that action if this agreement is subject to the approval of Parliament. It should have been tabled on the first day of the parliamentary session.

Mr. Court: The agreement will be presented with the Bill in the normal way.

Mr. TONKIN: It should be tabled now, if it is subject to parliamentary approval; and it is. This Government has no justification whatever for withholding the contents of the agreement from the Parliament that has to approve of it.

Now I want to say something about a matter to which the Minister earlier referred. It is with regard to what I happened to see in the north. I saw much of great interest and much that will be to the great advantage of the State of Western Australia. But I saw one thing which worried me greatly and so I made further inquiries into it.

Mr. May: Did you see the pink house?

Mr. TONKIN: I started to wonder what the arrangements were in connection with the control of the port at King Bay. Ordinarily, the State retains control of its land and territorial waters. It retains sovereignty over those; and even when it was necessary to hold out very strong inducements to British Petroleum to establish a refinery in Western Australia, and to give it substantial concessions in the way of freedom from pilotage and harbour dues, it was never at any stage considered necessary or desirable to give that company absolute and supreme control of the harbour so that it could determine who could enter and who would have to stop out.

Our Harbour and Light Department today has control over the harbours in Cockburn Sound, and over the shipping that enters and leaves the port. But that is not to be the position at the port of King Bay where the Harbour and Light Department has been told to keep out; where the complete sovereignty of what belongs to Western Australia has been taken away from the control of the Government of Western Australia and given to a private company.

Mr. Court: You have not read the agreement properly.

Mr. TONKIN: I protest very strongly. Let us deal with the facts of the matter.

Mr. Court: It is a legal agreement ratified by this Parliament. Have you read it?

Mr. TONKIN: Yes, I have read that.

Mr. Court: Not very well.

Mr. TONKIN: I will read something from the regulations: not issued by the State department, but regulations issued by Hamersley Iron Pty. Limited. They are regulations for the port of King Bay which enable the company to say to the master of a State ship, "You stay outside. You do what we say"; and to say to the State Harbour and Light Department, "You have no jurisdiction here. Get about your business elsewhere. This is our show." That is what this State has done. I quote from the regulations—

"port" means the port of King Bay, Dampier Archipelago, Western Australia, delineated as follows:—

Now all this territory is handed over to the control of this company and taken from the State. To continue—

commencing at the north-western extremity of Legendre Island in Lat. 20°

20.9'S., Long. 116° 49.5'E., thence by a line bearing 145° for approximately 5.5 miles to the northern extremity of Dolphin Island, thence south-westerly along the western shore of Dolphin Island at high water mark to its south-western extremity, thence on a bearing of 209° for approximately 9 cables to the mainland, thence south-westerly along the western shore of the mainland at high water mark to a point in Lat. 20° 41'S., Long. 116° 40'E., thence on a bearing of 285° for approximately two miles to the northern extremity of West Intercourse Island, thence on a bearing of 330° for approximately 4.7 miles to the western extremity of West Lewis Island, thence on a bearing of 023° for approximately 10.3 miles to the westernmost of the Nelson Rocks and thence on a bearing of 059° for approximately 11 miles to the point of commencement.

A very substantial area of the country and the water which belongs to Western Australia.

Mr. Hawke: Or belonged.

Mr. TONKIN: Now complete control has been handed over to this company which can determine the charges to be levied on any and every ship, and the conditions under which these shall be operated. Now listen to this, and I quote—

The company shall be under no obligation to supply a work boat, but if a work boat is requested and unavailable the Company will so notify the Master. The Company shall not be liable for any damage to or inconvenience suffered by a vessel due to failure or refusal to provide a work boat, delay in providing a work boat, the inadequacy of the work boat for the purpose required, or for any damage, injury, expense or loss caused in any way by the action or default of the work boat, its master or crew.

And another quotation reads—

Without prejudice to the generality of Regulation 25 hereof, neither the Company nor the pilot shall be liable for neglect or want of skill on the part of the pilot.

I know that the seafaring men in this State are very concerned about this radical departure from established practice. There may be another port in Australia where these conditions obtain; I do not know. But I do not think so. I do not think that absolute control of this kind has been given to Broken Hill Pty. anywhere—at Newcastle or Whyalla. I do not know that it was ever sought. I am pretty sure that if it were, it would never have been given. Only a supine Government such as we have would give away the sovereignty of what belongs to us to a company to operate the port as it sees fit.

Mr. Court: There has been no sovereignty given away at all.

Mr. TONKIN: Absolutely. The Harbour and Light Department is not permitted to put a foot in the place, and it has no control over any of it.

I would be very surprised indeed if strong protests have not already come to the Government from several quarters in connection with this matter. If they have not, the people responsible have been recreant to their trust. It is a complete sell-out. There was no need to have gone to this length in order to have these industries established in the State. Surely, they are getting enough already—the right to do what they like with the industrial resources. What need was there to say to them, "Take the port; we are no longer interested; as a Government we do not want any control; you set up your own rules; you use it according to your own desires, and we will keep out."

Mr. COURT: You are just romancing. You are not even being fair in your statement of the total position.

Mr. TONKIN: I am stating the facts. Is the Minister suggesting that this is a fake copy of the regulations?

Mr. COURT: You are saying that we have surrendered sovereignty over this port. We have done nothing of the sort because under the agreements we can make these normal ports whenever we want to. There is a construction period during which it is good sense to handle it the way we are doing it.

Mr. TONKIN: Under the legislation to which the Minister refers the power was given to the company to make these regulations.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

MR. GRAYDEN (South Perth) 18.33 p.m.: I had not intended to speak on this Bill. However, earlier on, the Leader of the Opposition made some reference to the archway of the Old Barracks and, in view of his comments, there are a few points I would like to make. Last year, our Premier gave assurances that the public would be given a specified time to form an opinion on this archway and that the archway would not be demolished until public opinion had been assessed. Subsequently the Premier has reported on numerous occasions—even as late as today when he made it quite clear that he would confer with the Leader of the Opposition—that he would determine some way of assessing public opinion on this particular matter.

Mr. GRAHAM: Perhaps, combined, they could give it a decent push.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I think the task of assessing public opinion is going to be extremely difficult and, in the circumstances, I want to suggest to the Premier that he give some thought to a method which has been tried before in Perth. That is to say, would he give consideration to

setting up a number of points at which people can record whether they are for, or against, this proposal? The problem is that it will obviously not be practical to assess public opinion throughout Western Australia—or, I should imagine it would not be—and, in the circumstances, it should be sufficient if we can determine the public opinion in Perth and Fremantle.

What I am suggesting is relatively simple, and that is to put up a few tables in Perth which could be manned by officers of the Public Service, and to which people could go to record their names either in favour of the proposal or against it. If there is any fear that there may be a duplication of voting, the Government could centralise voting at one structure in Perth—perhaps under the colonnading of the Perth Town Hall—and instead of keeping this open for a day, it could perhaps be kept open for, say, a fortnight. If it were in full view of the public, they would only have to step a few yards in order to record their opinion. If the Government did this, I think it would be astonished at the result. A number of people have suggested that the poll which was conducted by *The West Australian* some time ago was not a fair one because one side was well organised.

Mr. JAMIESON: Even *The West Australian* said that.

Mr. GRAYDEN: At the same time there were literally thousands of people in Western Australia who were in favour of the original proposal to retain the archway, and who did not send in the coupon which was provided by *The West Australian*. It could be found that after the Government had conducted a poll—or some other method of assessing public opinion—there were 50,000 people in the metropolitan area who were in favour of allowing the archway to stand.

Mr. GRAHAM: Surely not.

Mr. GRAYDEN: If there were this number of people in favour of its retention—and it could very well be that this would be the case—I suggest this: On an issue of this kind, defer to that minority. I do not think it matters one iota what the consensus of opinion is in this House on the question of the Narrows archway. The question is that the Government has given an undertaking to the people of Western Australia, and the Premier has assured us that, of course, this undertaking will be honoured. We have to keep faith with the public; we have to determine a satisfactory way of assessing public opinion, and move accordingly.

Mr. BICKERTON: I hope your system does not apply at the next parliamentary conferences.

Mr. O'NEIL: Minority wins!

Mr. BRAND: I was wondering whether to include the reclamation of the river.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Mr. Speaker, I want to urge the Government to go to any lengths that may be necessary satisfactorily to determine public opinion on this particular matter.

MR. MAY (Collie) [8.37 p.m.]: I have no desire to delay the passage of the Supply Bill but I feel I am entitled to say a few words on this debate. My remarks have nothing to do with the Narrows Bridge, or the archway, or anything else of that nature.

Mr. Guthrie: We thought you might want the Barracks rebuilt at Collie!

Mr. MAY: I wish to speak on the very important question of the coal contracts in this State which are due for renewal at the present time.

Mr. Graham: We had better not suggest a referendum on that!

Mr. MAY: For as long ago as I can remember, the arrangement in regard to the coal contracts has been that every three years they should be renewed, and the same system is still operating. Most honourable members will remember the outcome in December, 1960 when 500 people were put out of the industry because of the new tenders for the coal contracts. The anxiety which has been caused to the people of Collie in connection with the present contracts, which are under consideration, should never be allowed to exist, or continue. Any Government—I do not care what Government it is—should have more consideration for a section of the community, such as the coalmining community, than is displayed by this Government. For years now I have stood up in this Chamber and spoken about the coalmining industry; and never has anyone in the Chamber stood up either to support me, or oppose me, in regard to what I have said.

In connection with the present tenders that have been called, the companies have been before the Cabinet subcommittee on coal where they have put their views forward. Similarly, all the unions engaged in the coalmining industry at the present time have been before the Cabinet subcommittee where they, too, have put their views forward. In spite of this, no announcement has been made in regard to the tenders.

Why should that be? Why should the Government, or any Government department, allow the people in Collie to continue living in a state of anxiety as they do at present? These people have a perfect right to know the outcome of these new coal contracts, and yet any approach that has been made to the Government to date on this matter has been fruitless. The only reply that can be obtained is that the contracts are still under consideration. I do not think it is fair to ask the people of Collie to continue to put up with this

kind of treatment. I know I will not put up with it, and every opportunity I get I will express my opposition in the House to the Government's action.

Surely the problem associated with finalising the contract is not as great as to occasion the delay that has been created up to now! As far as I can see there is nobody on the Government side in this Chamber who can offer any suggestion as to when these contracts are to be finalised and the results announced.

A member: It is the oil companies that are holding them up.

Mr. MAY: I am not concerned with the oil companies at present. I will have something to say about them during the debate on the Address-in-Reply, because I learned a great deal during the trip I was able to take to the north-west. At the moment I am concerned with the anxiety that is being experienced by the people of Collie—especially the womenfolk—over the drawn-out negotiations on the Collie coal tenders. Surely someone on the Government side can tell me when these contracts will be concluded and whether an announcement on them will be made in the near future. In fact, I intended to ask the Premier earlier this evening if any decision had been arrived at, and, if so, the nature of the decision.

Are the mine-workers at Collie to be given notice that their employment will cease? If so, those men will lose everything in exactly the same way as the men lost everything in 1960. They will lose their houses and all that goes with them. I ask the Government seriously to consider that group of people who work at Collie in the coalmining industry and give them some definite information on the Government's intention concerning the future of the coalfields.

MR. DAVIES (Victoria Park) [8.42 p.m.]: I would be remiss in my duty if I did not take the first opportunity to criticise the Government on its tardiness in taking action to bring about a greater measure of safety at the Rivervale railway crossing. The Government seems to take some pride in the fact that the boom gates now in operation were installed some nine days ahead of schedule. In my opinion they were installed nine years too late. This would be about the only railway crossing in the metropolitan area that was not protected by special measures up until recently, and even now I hope the boom gates are only a temporary measure until a tunnel is built.

However, it does not appear that any real construction work will be done on the tunnel for at least 18 months. I do not know what excuse the Government has for not taking action in regard to this crossing much earlier than it has done. I wonder whether it will put forward the excuse that it did not know the danger that existed at this crossing, because if it

does so it is completely wrong. My predecessor, the ratepayers' associations both in Carlisle and in Victoria Park, various other civic bodies, and myself, have constantly brought before the Government the need to do something about this dangerous spot which has existed for as long as I can remember.

Indeed, the *Daily News* conducted a campaign some time ago highlighting the various danger spots and traffic hazards throughout the metropolitan area, and the Rivervale railway crossing was one of the first to be selected. Since that time, apart from the crossing being widened by a few feet, nothing has been done to achieve a greater measure of safety. Yet we had the tragedy of three young people being killed at the crossing towards the end of May which, I feel sure, shocked everybody. Following this, I am certain that all of us must have been appalled when two other young people were killed in an accident at this crossing only some three weeks later. In a short space of a few weeks five young lives were lost at this spot. The Government has been told on countless occasions of the danger that exists at this crossing.

I am wondering whether it is of any use for members to complain to Government departments or in this House. Another danger point in this vicinity, of which I have spoken on many occasions, is the crosswalk outside the Rivervale hotel. That crosswalk was put down several years ago and many accidents and near accidents have occurred there.

I have submitted many official complaints to the Government. I have raised them in this House and have brought the matter to the attention of the Main Roads Department, but nothing has been done in an endeavour to improve safety on that crosswalk. I have been a member of this House for nearly five years and during that time I have asked if some special lighting could be provided for crosswalks. However, it was only last December that action was taken to test the lighting and to improve that which previously existed. I understand it is now the Government's policy to install sodium lighting at all crosswalks in the metropolitan area. When I received this information from the Minister for Police he said it could only be a gradual process; that there would be some delay because of the need to confer with various local authorities, and because equipment was not readily available.

Surely, in dealing with such an important matter there should be no need of any delay. Regarding the Rivervale railway crossing, we now have the spectacle of everyone being concerned about the situation after five lives have been lost, following which action was taken to improve safety measures at that point by installing boom gates. But are we to have the same tardiness shown by the Government in providing additional safety measures at pedestrian crosswalks? One has

only to go to the Main Roads Department to ascertain that there are more accidents at crosswalks, as a general rule, than at other points in the metropolitan area. This is only natural because of the greater concentration of people at crosswalks. The fact is that people do cross at these points and therefore more accidents occur on them, and it cannot be too soon before something is done to ensure that every possible safety measure is provided.

The crosswalk outside the Rivervale hotel is one that demands immediate attention. In my opinion, it is as important as any crosswalk on Stirling Highway. Another pedestrian crossing that needs urgent attention is the one outside the post office in Victoria Park. A fatality occurred there in May last and the coroner said that the accident was due to the crosswalk being poorly lit. Therefore, this is another crosswalk that may receive early attention by the Government provided, of course, that no-one stakes a prior claim.

If we are to aim at achieving the utmost safety for pedestrians—and surely everybody in the Chamber is concerned with the frightful road toll—then we must spare no expense and no time on the installation of such safety measures, and I think everyone will agree that this is one of the greatest needs in the metropolitan area. There is no doubt that sodium lighting at crosswalks would effect great improvement, but if it is to be installed at a few selected points in the metropolitan area we will not achieve the full purpose.

I will also take this opportunity to point out the danger that exists at the Victoria Park and Lathlain stations. On the days when football matches are held the flashing lights are on almost continuously because trains are stationary at those stations waiting for passengers to come from the football ground. As a result, the road traffic banks up on both sides of the railway line. There is no opportunity for it to clear and, of course, the traffic hazard continues to mount and remains for a longer period than is necessary. Surely a railway officer could be stationed at the crossing to direct the traffic across the railway line by hand signals and so keep it flowing freely. I understand that Mr. Wayne, the Railways Commissioner, has recommended in his recent report that no level crossings be constructed in the metropolitan area. I heartily agree with him. Surely if we are to achieve greater road safety we must get rid of all these traffic hazards!

Last Sunday night, when the traffic booms at the Rivervale crossing had been in operation for only 12 hours a car passed me and went right through the booms while they were being lowered. I was appalled to see this, as was the witness I had in the car with me. This goes to show that we must protect the public from themselves, because the public will not take enough care and responsibility.

There is no doubt that a tunnel is required at that point. This must be one

of the busiest points where a railway crosses a highway, and one where every possible action must be taken to expedite the provision of a tunnel. I hope the Government will not take the credit for the suggestion that a tunnel should be provided, because this has been advanced by many people over a great number of years. The Government took credit for the fact that the boom gates were completed nine days ahead of schedule; in fact they came into operation nine years too late.

**MR. JAMIESON** (Beeloo) (8.52 p.m.): I, too, would like to comment on the Rivervale crossing, because I feel there are a few points that have been missed by the Government. Being one who uses this facility twice a day I feel that before very long there will be an additional tragedy mainly because of the congestion that has been caused as a result of lack of thought on the part of officialdom.

The Government has endeavoured to avoid the right hand turn into Rutland Avenue, but there is no such prohibition at Streatley Road. Apart from this there is a bus stop right opposite Streatley Road, and quite often in the peak hour traffic at night there is a bank-up in both lanes across the railway line. This is so because there is nowhere else for the traffic to go because it is prohibited from turning into Rutland Avenue. I do not know what would happen if a person were under the boom. I dare say it would be a question of the last one getting his head chopped off.

The bus stop must go, or, alternatively, the buses must be re-routed because a number of them turn around into Streatley Road further down the highway to prevent their causing a hazard.

**Mr. O'Connor:** This is receiving consideration.

**Mr. JAMIESON:** That may be so, but the point is that these roads will all run back into a main road eventually. The buses might have to make an additional circuit of the block, but eventually it would achieve the same purpose.

If it is too late to do this tonight the bus stop should be shifted tomorrow, because it will cause a great deal of trouble before very long. As the member for Victoria Park has said, the real remedy is to put a tunnel there. I might not know much about installing tunnels, but given a plan I feel I could put one there in two or three days without much trouble to traffic. It is one of the easiest places in the metropolitan area in which to provide tunnel facilities, due to the layout of the land. I realise that ultimately the roads will be re-routed because of the run-off from the Causeway. That should not cause much delay, because once the filling is provided, and the road surface is completed, surely within a few months a move could be made to put in a tunnel to serve the traffic there.

There is one other matter which received some attention from the House, and to which I wish to refer. I speak now of the unfortunate monstrosity that exists east of Parliament House. As we see it from here it really looks terrible. I think the member for South Perth called it the Narrows Archway, but it is in fact the old Barracks Archway. As we view it from Parliament House we see a variety of pastel hues depending on the colour of the room at the time. It reminds me very forcibly of David's coat of many colours. I think it would not be a bad idea if we placed a table between the archway and Parliament House and allowed the people to vote while they were looking at it from this angle.

**Mr. Hawke:** Did David have a multi-coloured coat? I thought it was Joseph.

**Mr. JAMIESON:** The honourable member is probably more correct in his biblical knowledge. I know that a coat of many colours played a very prominent part in one of the biblical stories. My great concern is as to where we will stop in regard to the cost to maintain the archway in its present position. I represent a metropolitan electorate, and I have only received one letter of protest. This does not mean that I want to encourage the writing of thousands of letters. I received this letter from an elector in my constituency who signed it rather venomously "registered voter." You could see the venom in the signature. The letter happened to be written by a doctor's wife. She had her own opinions on the matter and she berated me for not having voiced my objection to the taking down of such a nice old building.

A member to whom I mentioned this said he would not reply to such a letter; that he would let it go. However, I gave it a go, and I said there has been a considerable amount of money already spent on this building, and that while the need for hospitals and schools existed in the community there was no justification for further money being spent on this archway—at least not from my point of view.

If I were told by a Minister of the Government that the Treasurer was able to provide money either for the archway or for a schoolroom at Beeloo, but not for both, then for me it would have to be the schoolroom at Beeloo. It is, of course, possible to convert some of the money made available from Commonwealth Government funds for such ancillary matters as walkways and the like; but I doubt whether anybody could wangle finance from that source ultimately to preserve the archway in such a manner as to make it acceptable aesthetically, particularly as it is seen from Parliament House.

A proposition was put forward which envisaged the spending of £60,000 or £70,000 with a view to making it a museum and repeating the easterly appearance on the western side. But this too would be a gross waste of public funds; and surely

it would not be making the best use of moneys which are available.

I think it was last year that the Minister for Works indicated to me that at that stage concrete was being poured into the foundations to stabilise the structures so that they could be kept standing for the people to see. The cost was in fact in excess of \$4,000. To that would have to be added the cost of the work of the contractor to enable the archway to be left there. It would have been much cheaper to have the whole building pulled down. Instead of being able to proceed straight on at the end of St. George's Terrace and along Malcolm Street, the road engineers have to curve the road around the archway to provide a temporary deviation road. All this must have cost well in excess of \$20,000 up to this stage.

To what extent can this expenditure be justified? It is all very well for people to become excited about old buildings. I am not one of those in favour of pulling down buildings because they are old; I am of the opinion that some of these buildings have old-world charm, and it is desirable to retain a number of them. But it was suggested the whole of the Barracks should remain. In my opinion none of it should remain, because the situation would become impossible. We would be pouring money into this building for a long time, and this expense would be with us for ever and a day. We are expected to spend the taxpayers' money on far more tangible things than the retention of the archway, just because some people like the look of it.

Some of the interviews which were shown on television were interesting. I think the numbers of those in favour and those against the retention of the archway were about even among the group that was interviewed. One lady who spoke with an English accent was asked what she thought about the retention. She said the archway should remain. She was asked how long she had been living here, and her reply was, "Two days." I suppose it impressed her, and I suppose she had seen old archways in England; but I do not know whether she had been able to assess the cost of the retention of the archway to a relatively poor State such as Western Australia is financially.

I suggest the sooner the archway is done away with the better. I suggested to a former Minister for Works how he could get rid of the Barracks, but he did not take any notice at the time. I am sure if he could have been aware of the repercussions he would have got rid of it. All he had to do was to cover the building with a resin-based paint of pale green or pale pink; everybody would then have been glad to get rid of it. It seems that the bare brickwork has an unusual attraction to lovers of old buildings. If my suggestion had been adopted we would have got rid of the Barracks a long time ago.

I have another criticism to make. At the concluding stages of the last session of Parliament several members, including the leaders of this House, spoke in farewell to the retiring Clerk of the House (Mr. Fred Islip), wished him well, and hoped he would have a long and happy retirement. I take this my first opportunity to also express those sentiments.

One aspect I found fault with was the way in which he was farewelled. As far as I know Mr. Islip had not complained about anything while he was in the service of this Parliament; probably he has not complained after his retirement, nor will he. As his employers, the people of Western Australia should have given him a more tangible send-off than that given. It is true the Joint House Committee gave him an afternoon tea party, but a retiring doorman is also given an afternoon tea party. Contributions were made by members and staff to provide suitable gifts for his send-off.

This officer, as is obvious from the remarks of the Premier and of yourself, Mr. Speaker, during the closing stages of the last session, had spent a lifetime as a servant of the State. I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, would not be aware of any instance where an employer did not, at the final stages of the service of an employee who had spent a lifetime with the company, give that servant more tangible recognition than was given to Mr. Islip. If you can refer to one such instance I would be surprised. Indeed such an employer would be very low in his appreciation of human beings.

We could have farewelled him at some small State function, or at least a parliamentary function, because he was a servant of this Parliament, and had served under many Speakers and Premiers to whom he gave advice. At this stage it appears to be too late for something along those lines to be done. I think he has been awarded the C.B.E. or the M.B.E., but that is not all that should have been accorded him.

At the end of his service he should have been accorded suitable recognition by the Government by way of an inscribed address or something similar—a little out of the ordinary, and something different from a function which is put on for a retiring attendant. It seems that this matter was overlooked. I sensed from the words of you, Mr. Speaker, that when you accepted the tributes which were paid to Mr. Islip at the end of last session you expected something along the lines I have advocated would be done. I was amazed to find that it was left to the Joint House Committee to put on an afternoon tea party, and to the members themselves to make arrangements for some suitable gift to be presented to Mr. Islip on his retirement. He deserved greater consideration.

He was a person who had no peers in giving advice on parliamentary matters.



This was indicated by yourself and others who spoke at the time. Possibly never again will this Parliament have the opportunity of farewelling a person who spent as much of his life in continuous service to this Parliament. There are others who now hold office in this Parliament, and who have been here since they were very young, but for various reasons, including war service, their service has been broken. I repeat that it will be a very long time indeed—certainly not in the time of the present members—before a similar occurrence takes place.

I take this opportunity of wishing Mr. Islip, his wife and family all the best in the years to come. I hope he enjoys the happiness and long years which he desires, no doubt, to spend in the Murray electorate where I know he has a little hideout. Anything we failed to do to honour him at the time of his retirement was an oversight. Unfortunately I feel we must record what I have said, so that if at any time in the future a similar position arises, we will make sure that some suitable function is held, in accord with the status of the person being farewelled.

**MR. FLETCHER** (Fremantle) [9.10 p.m.]: As I will be absent attending the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference in Canada as from the end of this month for a month or more during this session I have to ensure that the voice of Fremantle is heard when opportunity and you, Sir, permit it. Having this in mind I will refer to a subject that was dealt with briefly by the member for Beeloo—the retention or otherwise of the Barracks entrance.

I feel there is an obligation on the part of members to express an opinion on this matter in order to give some sort of a lead, as it were. I promise to be brief, and will be to this extent: Either what remains of the Barracks is the focal point at the top of St. George's Terrace, or this building is. I admit the Barracks building was there before this building, so the alternative is either to shift that building or to shift this one, and I come down on the side of shifting the entrance to the Old Barracks. I do so even at the risk of offending such a notable citizen as His Worship, the Mayor of Fremantle, who treasures old things. I respect his opinion and attitude and hope that he and other electors within my electorate who may share his views about the Barracks will also respect mine.

To revert to the matter which I mentioned when I first rose; that is, my selection through a ballot to represent this Parliament at Canada at the pending Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference, I thank members of my own party who have congratulated me on my success in this respect, and I also thank Government members for the many congratulations and good wishes they have bestowed upon me for having been chosen.

I give an undertaking to you, Mr. Speaker, and to members in another place, that I will, both at the conference and at allied social functions, represent this Parliament to the best of my ability. I also hope that I do not take my responsibilities so seriously that I will not enjoy my sojourn in Canada.

I am conscious of the value of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association as it is the only effective link between the Parliaments of the Commonwealth of Nations. It has continued to develop as an association, influencing and furthering the well-being of the people of the Commonwealth.

Our parliamentary system has stood the test of time for many hundreds of years, and it is spreading. The number of branches represented at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference in 1950 was 32, while at the 1965 conference there were 68 branches represented. I think this was the conference in New Zealand which was attended by the member for Claremont.

We have this in common: We change Governments through the ballot box and not with the use of the tommy gun or by purge as many other less fortunate countries frequently do. Our system of Government has its imperfections as under it Governments do not change often enough to Labor's advantage. I admit that; and I have mentioned before how difficult it is for one party to defeat three parties, plus vested interests which condition the public mind to the detriment of the Labor Party and the majority of the public.

Our State and Federal elections are democratic to the extent that people have a vote, but we do not have a Labor Government as often or for as long as is good for the voter and, certainly, the State.

We have sales of iron ore, but we also have inflation. This causes me concern just as it does the Premier. I feel we know the answer. I also feel that he does, too, but does not do anything about it because he is not allowed to. We have no control of prices, and that is the sum and substance of it. However, we have control of wages and salaries. The last quarter again shows an upward trend and consideration is currently being given as to whether or not there should be an increase in the State basic wage. But there is never any investigation when those who have anything to sell decide to increase prices.

Wages and margins are still blamed for rises in prices, but wages and margins are increased only when an increase is long overdue, and it is subsequent to price increases. That is the important thing. Increased prices exist previous to any increase in wages. Another situation I deplore—and it is one I have mentioned before—is that the prices of houses and land are beyond the reach of the average citizen; and this situation has arisen during the lifetime of this Government, and

the lifetime of the Federal Government, which is of a similar political colour. This is something to be deplored and something for which this Government is responsible. It is not the Opposition; and I wish to make that point clear.

Alarm is felt in certain quarters, and tonight the Premier expressed concern regarding the effects that will arise in respect of the recent increases in margins. He knows the increases were justified and that they were given belatedly. As I said earlier, the Premier must feel alarmed about price increases, but he does nothing even when he has the opportunity, even to the extent of meeting a deputation at my request. I promised to give this example and will do so now by briefly reading from correspondence.

I received this correspondence from the Union of Australian Women. It was addressed to The Hon. H. Fletcher, M.L.A., 28 Minilya Avenue, Hilton Park. They assumed I had been a Minister and gave me an "honourable." The letter reads as follows:—

Having collected almost 2,500 signatures on our prices petitions asking for price control, we would now like to present them to Premier Brand and at the same time outline to him our reasons for the petition.

Your assistance in arranging for a date for this purpose and in introducing a deputation from our organisation to the Premier, would be very much appreciated.

Thanking you for your interest,

Yours faithfully,

(Mrs.) M. Thorp,

Hon. Secretary.

I forwarded that letter to the Premier with the following covering letter:—

Please find attached a request that I endeavour to arrange a deputation regarding the need for Price Control and the presentation of a petition in support of such control.

I shall be pleased to forward your reply to the Union of Australian Women.

Yours faithfully,

Harry A. Fletcher.

In due course I received from the Premier the following letter, dated the 15th July:—

Dear Mr. Fletcher,

I have for acknowledgement your letter of the 12th July and attached communication in which the Secretary of the Union of Australian Women has requested that you arrange a deputation to me for the purpose of presenting a petition in support of price control.

In reply, I feel it is necessary for me to advise that, whilst it is appreciated that rising prices and costs create difficult problems, experience both in Western Australia and elsewhere has shown that price control

is not the means of securing improved conditions. For that reason, the Government cannot agree to any request for the re-introduction of price control.

Since the Union of Australian Women has been advised in the past as to the attitude of the Government on this question—an attitude which is well known to the community generally, it is not considered that any good purpose could be achieved by my receiving the deputation suggested.

I forwarded a copy of the Premier's reply to those who sought my help in this respect, and received a reply from them. I hope the Premier is listening to this.

The reply reads as follows:—

Dear Mr. Fletcher,

We are very grateful for your efforts to arrange for us a deputation to the Premier and are in receipt of his letter of refusal.

We will do all we can to publicise his views on price control and hope the Western Sun will give space to our story. I have agreed to write it up and present it to Mr. Cooley.

When our members meet next Tuesday, the Executive will suggest that we bring out a leaflet on the subject of price control and Premier Brand's dismissal of our request. It is hoped we can link it up with the forthcoming elections and use it as another reason for the return of a Labour Government.

Mr. Graham: Hear, hear!

Mr. FLETCHER: To continue—

Once again our sincere thanks and very best wishes,

Yours faithfully,

(Mrs.) M. Thorp,

Hon. Secretary.

I know it is Government policy and I did anticipate that reply. I asked the Premier to look at the situation that policy has landed us in in this State. I very much regret that many are suffering as a result of no price control, and as a result of what has happened to our economy during this Government's term of office. It is not only my concern, either. It is the concern of members of the Perth Chamber of Commerce, of all people. The following article appeared in *The West Australian* on Tuesday, the 28th June:—

#### "SOFT SPOTS" IN ECONOMY

The executive of the Perth Chamber of Commerce has pointed to three principal "soft spots" in the W.A. economy in its annual submissions to the Associated Chambers of Commerce of Australia.

The executive has also deplored the reluctance of the Federal government to make a decision on the final stage of the Ord River project.

The submissions were approved by the executive in Perth yesterday and will be presented soon by the A.C.C.A. to Federal Treasurer McMahon before he brings down the 1966 budget.

The chamber said the three spots were migration, housing and taxation. I have mentioned them all. I desire to quote another article to support my contention that I am not the only one alarmed about our economy. I do not want to weary the House with many Press references, but I must quote authorities. The following article appeared in *The West Australian* on Tuesday the 22nd June:—

Australians paid \$4,284,300,000 in Federal and State taxes . . .

I hope the Premier heard that figure. Australians paid \$4,284,300,000 in taxes, according to the Commonwealth Statistics Bureau, and the Premier, as Treasurer, receives a very disproportionate share of that amount, and later I will tell him one reason why. The amount we do get is depreciated—

Mr. Brand: Mr. Calwell said the taxes will have to go up anyway.

Mr. FLETCHER: Inflation has resulted—

Mr. Brand: Did you hear what I said?

Mr. FLETCHER: You are trying to ensure that *Hansard* does not catch what I am saying.

Mr. Brand: Please listen carefully *Hansard*.

Mr. FLETCHER: I am saying that the money we do receive has less value as a consequence of the policy we in this State follow. With the indulgence of the House I will read a few more figures which are usually not popular, but which are very revealing. The article to which I referred earlier reads—

Canberra, Tuesday: Australians paid \$4,284,300,000 in Federal and State taxes last financial year—\$380.86 a head of population.

This was a rise of \$48 a head on the previous year.

And the Premier contributed towards those increases. I have heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Opposition remind him frequently of the various taxes that have been imposed during his term of office.

Mr. Brand: We carried on where you left off.

Mr. FLETCHER: The article continues—

Figures issued by the Commonwealth Statistics Bureau showed the main increase was in Federal taxes, which were up \$44.75.

Federal taxes averaged \$336.66 a head and State taxes \$44.20.

The average State taxes paid per head of population by West Australians was \$37.11.

That is our taxation. I have mentioned that the inflation created on a State and Federal basis depreciates the value of money. I have mentioned also that land and houses are priced beyond the reach of the average wage earner. Let me point out by illustration where a huge proportion of this taxation goes. All I have to do is turn to the next page of the newspaper from which I have just quoted. The following is the heading:—

Aust. to Pay \$71m. More for U.S. Jets.

Fortunately this Bill lets me deviate to some extent. Members and others might ask what the Federal defence Budget has to do with this State. I say that such extortion by America in relation to the price we pay for planes makes less money available for the worth-while projects the Premier and others on that side would like to complete.

Mr. Rushton: What price do you think should be paid for the planes?

Mr. FLETCHER: They are not worth a penny in comparison with hospitals and schools and other worth-while things this Government would like to have. The article reads as follows:—

The cost of the 24 F111A bombers and other defence equipment ordered by Australia in the United States has risen by \$89,680,000 since February last year.

While we are under the thumb of America we will dance to the tune it plays. Not only will we pay with dollars, but with Australian lives on foreign soil because we are bound hand and foot. Those who control the purse strings control the economy of Australia, and not only the economy, but also our foreign policy. These planes are inflicted on us at such an expenditure of the taxpayers' money. The following is another paragraph from this article:—

When the decision to buy the F111As was announced in 1963, the then Defence Minister said the cost to Australia would be about \$112,000,000 for the aircraft and other items. In February it was announced that the U.S. Government had increased the price by 64 per cent. to \$184,000,000. That is the price to pay for freedom. Members on the other side of the House do not believe in controls. We do, and for that we are called socialists. I still believe in our parliamentary system but, I repeat, I do not believe that one party should have to defeat three parties to become the Government. I have mentioned that before. We, the Labor Party, get more primary votes than the Liberal Party, the Country Party, and the D.L.P. However, the parties mentioned get more votes collectively at elections and in consequence we are in opposition in both the State and Federal spheres. Strangely enough, I still believe in our parliamentary system.

Mr. W. Hegney: In the Legislative Council too?

**Mr. FLETCHER:** Until such time as a larger percentage of the people wake up to what is happening to them. If I said that I did not believe in our parliamentary system my ability properly to represent this Parliament at the forthcoming conference might be questioned. I would not be above saying there what I say here, and I know that the Premier would not mind that because I firmly believe in what I say. I suspect that many other members opposite do also.

That is my contribution to the debate on the Bill before us and I will now resume my seat to allow the member for Darling Range an opportunity to make the speech he has been trying to make simultaneously with mine.

**MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara) [9.32 p.m.]:** I have missed the jump so often tonight I thought members might be denied the opportunity to hear me. Like previous speakers, I certainly do not wish to delay the passage of this Supply Bill for very obvious reasons, and a couple of personal reasons. There are only two matters with which I wish to deal briefly.

There has been much publicity in the newspapers recently concerning Mt. Whaleback iron ore. Mt. Whaleback is in the area which we sometimes refer to as Mt. Newman because that was the name of the company which received the first agreement which was ratified for that area by this Parliament.

It now appears that the two other companies, Cleveland Cliffs and B.H.P., which have agreements ratified by this House to enable them to work the limonite deposits in the Deepdale and Robe River areas, are more concerned at this stage with coming to an arrangement with the Mr. Newman company to fulfil all of their contracts from the Mt. Whaleback area. The Minister for the North-West has given us to understand that an agreement is in preparation to enable this to take place.

I do not know that I am so very concerned where the iron ore actually comes from to fulfil the present contracts, but I am very concerned that this Parliament gave its sanction last year to two agreements to enable two of these companies to work the deposits at Robe River and Deepdale.

This appeared to me at the time—and it probably also appeared to many who voted on the Bill—to have the iron ore projects spread out pretty well right throughout the Pilbara area. And this was most desirable. However, this present concentration of the operations at Mt. Whaleback will mean, or could mean, that there will be little, if any, progress in the Ashburton area where it was originally intended to have progress.

When the agreement comes to this House for ratification—if in fact the agreement is brought down; and the Minister gives us to understand it will be—whilst no doubt we will have our say on the matter, it will be too late once that agreement has been signed by the Premier on behalf of West-

ern Australia for anything to be done in connection with it. Hence, the reason I wish to make a few comments on it now.

We all know that the agreement cannot be amended in this House. All that can happen is for it to be accepted or rejected, so that by the time we hear about what is going to happen at Mt. Whaleback it cannot be amended. Members on the other side of the House might hear something earlier but I venture to say they will not have much more say than I would have. Perhaps that makes it more undemocratic than the member for Fremantle gave us to understand a while back.

Once this agreement comes before us it will already have been agreed to by Cabinet and I would say the opportunity of doing anything about it would be very remote indeed. What I am concerned about is what is going to happen to those deposits at Robe River and Deepdale. They are already the subject of an agreement ratified by this House.

If the companies find through investigations that have been carried out since—and I would have thought the investigations would have been carried out before the agreements were ratified—that it is not a proposition from their point of view to utilise these deposits, there is nothing to say that some other company is not going to find it a proposition. I would be very much against the two companies moving to Mt. Whaleback to carry out their contractual obligations, already signed with Japanese companies, and at the same time hold the iron ore deposits at Robe River and Deepdale, so that the progress of the area can be held up for almost an unlimited length of time or at least until the companies have satisfied their present requirements from the hematite deposits at Mt. Whaleback.

I believe if this agreement is changed the one previously ratified by Parliament should also be withdrawn under the agreement between the Government and the companies. The area of Ashburton should have another opportunity to be placed on the world market with the object that an agreement suitable to the people of Western Australia be drawn up so that progress is allowed to proceed in that area as well as in the Mt. Whaleback area.

Also, the attraction of having these areas spread out along the coast would save much of the congestion that must take place at Port Hedland if all of these companies choose that centre as their port.

When discussing the agreement concerning the Mt. Goldsworthy and Mt. Newman deposits, I mentioned that a big town planning problem would exist at Port Hedland if both companies decided that it was a suitable port. But I was assured by people on the other side of the House that this was under control. However, I now find that there is a problem, a big problem, which will present itself when all the companies are concentrated at this one point.

The Government seems anxious to have all the companies using Port Hedland. I do not know the real reason for that. I could understand it if the Government said that it wanted Port Hedland to get a good share of the iron ore trade. It already has a fair share with the Mt. Newman company without the whole of the Mt. Whaleback area and Mt. Goldsworthy, and, if what we hear is correct, Leslie Salt. With those companies I think the problems would be many, but not as great as if the whole consortium which is now looking at Mt. Whaleback comes to Port Hedland.

However, I have no doubt that the port facilities are the main factors that govern that. Through no fault of mine, I do not have at my disposal the same information that the Government has so it is not easy for me to make up my mind as to whether this agreement which will come forward is a satisfactory one or not.

I would like to emphasise that I believe the companies should not be allowed to have the Mt. Whaleback deposits for their present contractual obligations and, at the same time, maintain a hold on the Robe River and Deepdale deposits unless they are prepared to carry on with those at the same time, or in conjunction with the Whaleback deposits. They are obviously not prepared to do the latter, otherwise they would not have gone to Whaleback in the first instance.

Concerning one particular company, I wish to say that Mt. Newman may have many reasons for the delays which have been occasioned by it in connection with its agreement which was ratified by this House, but I cannot help but feel that the public would be entitled to think that Mt. Newman had had preferential treatment over the other companies where iron-ore was concerned.

The Mt. Goldsworthy company, and Conzinc Riotinto, went ahead with their projects. In some instances these latter companies are ahead of their obligations under their respective agreements. If it was good enough for Mt. Goldsworthy and Conzinc Riotinto to do this, I think Mt. Newman should have done the same or, at least, have come back to the Government and said, "We are unable to carry out our agreement." Had this been done, the whole area should have been thrown open again to someone who could carry it out.

To my way of thinking Mt. Newman has caused a considerable amount of inconvenience to individuals in the area, to planners of the area, and to business people in the area.

I extend an invitation to anyone in this House to ring the Lands Department tomorrow to inquire for a block of land for residential purposes; for a business site; or for an industrial site, and I think I would be safe in betting 10 to 1 that the Lands Department would have to tell him, quite truthfully, that until such time as the Mt. Newman company makes up its mind where it is going to establish a

port, the Lands Department is unable to release any land for other purposes. This is because the Lands Department is not sure what "Mr. Mt. Newman" may require. Obviously, there is some agreement by which the company has preference in regard to choosing the area which it requires.

You can understand, Mr. Speaker, that this does cause many problems from the individual's point of view as far as planning his future is concerned. I certainly, will be very grateful—and I hope the Government will be, too—when Mt. Newman makes up its mind whether or not it is going to Port Hedland; and, if not there, where else it intends to establish its port. I do not think it is fair on the people of this State that the matter should be held in abeyance for any much greater period of time.

The only other matter I wish to raise is one concerning a question which was asked tonight by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition of the Minister for Works. The last question—No. 9—was amongst a series of questions concerning certain plans within the Department of Main Roads. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition inquired if the Minister would lay upon the Table of the House a certain plan. The Minister did not waste any words in answer to that question; he simply said "No."

I would hope that we are not going to experience what we have recently experienced in past Parliaments when it has been almost impossible to get a file tabled. There was much discussion on this matter last session. I can understand files being withheld for certain reasons, such as those containing something that may do some personal damage to an innocent individual who happens to be named in the file. None of us would like that sort of thing to happen. However, many of the files that we requested last session were departmental files dealing with public matters and these are the ones which I believe it is wrong to withhold and to deny the Opposition the opportunity of perusing.

Many of the arguments put up—and I have read some of them in old *Hansards*—as to the reasons why Parliamentary committees were not necessary in Western Australia—as we know, these Parliamentary committees do exist in other Parliaments—revolved around the fact that Western Australia had a democratic type of Parliament; that, at any time, a member could ask for files to be tabled, and he would be given every assistance to have them tabled. By this means, the public was kept aware of the situation. However, we find ourselves now in a position where not only do we not have the protection of those committees which other democratic Parliaments have, but where, more and more often the situation arises where Ministers are refusing to table papers for the flimsiest of reasons.

One instance of this comes to my mind at this moment and I think I should mention it. Three or four times last session I asked for the file dealing with a proposed water supply scheme between Roebourne and Point Samson, and the Minister, on all occasions, refused to table the file. He said that I could see it at the department. One of the difficulties is that if one sees a file at the department, and it is not public property, one feels that one is viewing it in a confidential manner. This precludes any criticism of the file and, of course, one is not supposed to use the information obtained because one has been done a favour by the Minister in seeing it in a confidential manner. This, of course, is quite useless.

I will conclude this matter by reading from *The West Australian* of Tuesday the 17th May, 1966. The article was headed, and I think we may well heed this, "Weakness Seen in Parliament".

Melbourne, Mon: There was a growing need for more effective relations between parliament and the executive government, Sir John Crawford said today.

Sir John, who is director of the Research School of Pacific Studies at the Australian National University, was secretary of the Department of Trade from 1956 to 1960.

He was addressing the annual meeting of the Australian Industries Development Association.

He said that in Australia's complex economic society, parliament seemed weak against the combined forces of cabinet and the public service.

"To a large extent, the sovereignty of parliament disappears when a strong executive presents its policies," he said.

"This makes it more vital to ensure that the executive respects and even fears the restraining hand of parliament."

Sir John said there were three ways, under the existing system of government, that the relative weakness of parliament could be lessened:

Sir John Crawford then set these out:—

A Parliamentary committee system to enable members of parliament to quiz the executive, including civil servants, and outside interests.

Better research facilities for members of parliament and provision of objective research by universities.

The third point he mentioned is that:—

The existing party committees should be able to question civil servants about the meaning and implications of departmental publications.

Sir John said that private industry organisations should improve their machinery for making their voices effective. "Not to do so is to leave the role of advising both ministers and parliament almost wholly to the civil service, whose competence is undoubted but whose views are not as a rule

open to public examination and who too often lack adequate experience of the economic world at large," Sir John said.

Personally, I think he had three very good points. As mentioned by earlier speakers, this again should be something in favour of having two sessions of Parliament.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

*Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Brand (Premier), and transmitted to the Council.

House adjourned at 9.54 p.m.

## Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 3rd August, 1966

### CONTENTS

	Page
<b>ADDRESS-IN-REPLY : THIRD DAY—</b>	
Speakers on Motion—	
The Hon. J. Dolan .....	64
The Hon. N. McNeill .....	61
<b>BILL—</b>	
Supply Bill—	
Receipt ; 1r. ....	68
<b>COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION—</b>	
Election .....	61
<b>DEPUTY CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES—</b>	
Election .....	61
<b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—</b>	
Cannington, Cannling Vale, and Kinloch Schools ;	
Enrolments and Accommodation .....	60
Deceased Persons' Estates : Value, and Probate Duty	58
Land—Salmon Gums Area : Applications and Re-	
leases .....	60
Perth-Kalgoorlie Train Services : Safety Precautions	
against Fires .....	59
Roads—	
Kimberley Districts : Expenditure .....	59
Kwinana Freeway—Manning Road : Inclusion	
as Link, and Improvement .....	60
Lower South-West : Expenditure, and Pro-	
gramme of Work .....	58
<b>QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE—</b>	
Transport in Western Australia—Report by Com-	
missioner Wayne : Additional Copies .....	57

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

### QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

#### TRANSPORT IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA

*Report by Commissioner Wayne : Additional Copies*

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE asked the Minister for Justice:

In view of the importance of Commissioner Wayne's report which was tabled by the Minister