

We are not alone in this predicament and a short time ago Sir Charles Court met with his fellow Premiers in Melbourne to consider a further approach to the Prime Minister seeking reconsideration of his earlier decision.

It is hoped that a meeting can be arranged for early next month so that the Commonwealth can be informed of action already taken by the States to raise additional revenue and of the revenue gap still confronting us in the light of recent wage increases.

At the same time, we propose to discuss the serious inflation problem which has now assumed the character of a national emergency and will offer to co-operate with the Commonwealth on agreed steps to check the spiral.

I am hopeful that the meeting will be able to reach agreement on measures that can be taken by all Governments in a concerted attack on an evil that is endangering the whole fabric of the nation's economy. Unless inflation is brought under control, no-one will be able to plan ahead with any confidence and Budgets become mere expressions of hope as to what the final outcome for the year will reveal.

Returning now to the year just ended, it is to be noted that although revenue and expenditure both exceeded the Estimates by very substantial sums, the deficit was held within the Budget Estimate.

The final deficit for 1973-74 was \$5 732 000 which was \$1 216 000 lower than the amount allowed for in the Budget.

Expenditure for the year exceeded the Estimate by \$20 041 000 due mainly to outlays on account of wage increases far exceeding the sum provided in the Estimates.

Revenue collections were \$21 256 000 higher than the Budget Estimate.

Commonwealth payments under the Financial Assistance Grant arrangements were \$10 500 000 more than had been forecast mainly because the increase in average wages taken into account in the formula was higher than anticipated when the Budget was framed.

Higher wage rates than were expected in 1973-74, were also reflected in pay-roll tax collections which exceeded the Budget Estimate by \$4 579 000.

Other State taxes which exceeded the Estimate were probate duty by \$2 588 000, stamp duties \$1 641 000 and land tax \$1 035 000.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. R. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition).

House adjourned at 8.32 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 31st July, 1974

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

QUESTIONS (55): ON NOTICE

1. STATE INFORMATION SERVICE

Centralisation and Cost

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Premier:

- (1) What was the cost of the special report to the State Government commissioned and compiled by W. W. Mitchell and Associates relating to a proposal for the establishment of a State information service reported to involve an expenditure exceeding \$1 million?
- (2) Does the plan recommended which provides for the centralisation of the information service in the Premier's Department not conflict with his election undertaking to decentralise administration and decision making into the main regional centres "so that people can talk to Government on the spot, get answers, and get action"?
- (3) Is it still intended to set up a substantial Government centre in the main regional centres, "headed by an officer with a high status in the public service", and "staffed by public servants selected for their dedication to the regional concept of administration and decision making"?
- (4) Will he explain how he can possibly adopt any of the proposals referred to in the above questions and at the same time achieve the "severe cut in the growth of the State Public Service this financial year", which he has been reported to have ordered?
- (5) Is the proposal for the establishment of a State information service at more than a million dollars a first step in his "campaign of getting costs down"?
- (6) If not, when is it expected the first step will be taken?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) \$600.
- (2) No. On the contrary, the proposals submitted to the Government for improved State information services provide for the distribution of information to State Government offices established in regions of Western Australia, and for feed-back of information from the regional offices to a potential State information service headquarters in Perth.

(3) Yes, it is the Government's intention to progressively proceed with the establishment of main regional centres. As previously announced, it is planned to have at least one of these centres established within a year.

(4) By the examination of work loads at present carried by Public Service officers and establishment of organisation and methods to ensure greater productivity, thus requiring the employment of less staff than might otherwise be the case.

(5) and (6) The report compiled by W. W. Mitchell & Associates for the establishment of improved State information services is still under consideration by the Government. A firm cost figure has not yet been established for the suggested service. In any case, there is no certainty the recommendations will be adopted, as the Government is considering alternatives to improve the present position and without serious increases in cost.

2. GOVERNMENT GARAGE

Industrial Agreement

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Premier:

(1) Has an agreement covering remuneration and conditions for employees at the Government garage been completed?

(2) If "No", when is it expected negotiations will be finalised?

(3) Is it intended that when the agreement is finalised any part of it will have retrospective application?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) No.

(2) Details of a claim to vary the existing industrial agreement were not received until yesterday, Tuesday, 30th July, 1974, and it is too early to say when negotiations will be finalised.

(3) The question of retrospectivity has not been raised in the claim.

3. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Security and Planned Expansion

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Premier:

(1) Does he recall saying on 4th April, with reference to the goldfields—

We will examine the whole position as soon as we take office and see if we can, from within the State's meagre finance resources, do something tangible to help the industry to achieve security and plan expansion?

(2) What examination has been undertaken and by whom?

(3) What has been the result?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) I would not know whether the purported statement is verbally correct, although it could well be. If it is, it relates to the fact that we did promise the mining fraternity we would support their aims with the Commonwealth for continuing tax concessions and for their request for a grant or loan for renewing plant and housing.

At the same time, we mentioned we could assist with housing through the State Housing Commission and also through the Industrial and Commercial Employees Housing Act.

Indeed, the State Housing Commission has been helping a company with housing for its Kalgoorlie operations. This help has been acknowledged in an appreciative letter.

(2) Reports and requests from the Chamber of Mines, the Amalgamated Prospectors' and Leaseholders' Association, and other interested people, have been collated, and the Minister for Mines visited the area and interviewed many of them.

(3) See answer to (1).

4.

TRAFFIC CONTROL ORGANISATION

Nature and Cost

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Premier:

(1) Has the Government decided the precise nature of the traffic control organisation it is proposed to establish?

(2) If "Yes", what is the estimated cost of establishment plus running costs for one year?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) and (2) The precise nature of the traffic authority has not been determined, although the broad basis on which the authority is to function has been established.

An estimate of cost could be given. But in view of the misunderstandings and misinterpretations which occur when efforts are made to give information before finality has been reached, the Government intends to get its proposals to final form before making detailed public explanations of the overall scheme and the release of financial figures.

The cost estimates must also be included in Budget considerations.

5. LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Road Works: Expenditure

Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) What percentage of local authority income was used in road works in this State in—
 - (a) rural;
 - (b) metropolitan,
 local authorities during the last three fiscal years?
- (2) Is he aware of the similar percentage used in each of the other States in each of the last three fiscal years?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

| | | % |
|--------------|------------------------------------|------|
| (1) 1971-72: | | |
| Rural | | 38.9 |
| Metropolitan | (Perth statistical division) | 28.2 |
| 1972-73: | | |
| Rural | | 37.3 |
| Metropolitan | (Perth statistical division) | 29.3 |

1973-74:

Information not yet available. These figures do not include road expenditure from loan funds. This information is not readily available.

- (2) No.

6. CROWN LEASES

Kalgoorlie-Boulder: Conversion to Freehold

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Lands:

How many Crown leases in the Kalgoorlie-Boulder area have been the subject of application for conversion of the tenure to freehold during the last 12 months?

Mr RIDGE replied:

Approximately 1300 applications.

7. PERTH-KALGOORLIE RAILWAY SERVICE

Meals: Price Increase

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) When did the increased price—
 - (a) for a meal ticket on the Prospector (25% increase); and
 - (b) morning tea ticket on interstate trains between Perth and Kalgoorlie (66½% increase), commence to operate?

- (2) (a) Was there any public announcement regarding these increases;
- (b) If so, when, and if not, why not?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) General increases in interstate and intrastate passenger fares were implemented as from 1st July, 1974.
Ancillary charges such as morning tea rates on interstate trains were not itemised but form part of an average increase of 13.5% in intersystem arbitrary fares. Interstate rail fares (excluding metropolitan) were increased by 17.5%. However, it was necessary to increase meal fees on *The Prospector* by 50c for adults and 35c for children to off-set rising cost for meals on this service.
- (2) (a) Yes.
(b) Published in *The West Australian* newspaper 19th June and 1st July, *Australian Financial Review* 20th June, *Sunday Times* 29th June, *Daily News* 3rd July. Reports also appeared in several country newspapers.

8. CASLEY, Mr LEONARD

Fines, and Treasury Payments

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Premier:

- (1) Referring to a news item in the *Daily News* of 24th May last, headed "Protest at top level", has the Government received what was in the said item referred to as a "diplomatic" protest from Mr Leonard Casley following fines imposed on him in the Geraldton Court of Petty Sessions on 23rd May, 1974?
- (2) If "Yes" what has been the Government's response to same?
- (3) As the said news item also referred to the State Treasury Department having paid moneys to Mr Casley's so-called "treasury" for goods received, would he please explain,
 - (a) what moneys; and
 - (b) what goods?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) (a) A payment of one dollar was made by the Library Board of Western Australia by cash order drawn upon the Treasurer of Western Australia, payable to "National Treasury, Hutt River Province".

Payment of the cash order has since been stopped and a fresh cash order issued in lieu, in favour of Mr L. G. Casley. I hope that does not create an international incident.

- (b) Payment was made for a publication supplied to the Library Board.

9. ELECTORAL

Joint Commonwealth-State Roll

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Does the Government intend to legislate by amendment of the Electoral Act to facilitate the use of a joint Commonwealth-State electoral roll at the next State general elections?
- (2) If not, why not?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) and (2) The matter is still under consideration.

10. QUEENSLAND FEDERAL ELECTION

Participation by Premier

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Premier:

- (1) Is it true that during the recent Federal election campaign he travelled specifically to Queensland to take part in that campaign?
- (2) If "Yes" to (1), was Government expense involved?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2) in what manner?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Yes, so far as the journey beyond Sydney to Queensland and return to Sydney, was concerned. I had commitments of an official nature in Sydney, quite independent of the Queensland visit.
- (2) No, so far as the Queensland part of the visit was concerned.
- (3) Answered by (2).

11. PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION CENTRES

Number and Enrolments

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many approved pre-school centres were operating as at 30th June, 1974?
- (2) What were the respective number of centres in the metropolitan area and country areas at that date?
- (3) Where and how many additional centres in disadvantaged areas are to be constructed this calendar

year by finance provided by the Australian Government?

- (4) As at 30th June, 1974, what was the total number of children attending approved pre-school centres, and how many of these were Aboriginal children?
- (5) How many children from country areas were in attendance as at the said date?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) 286.
- (2) Country: 169.
Metropolitan: 117.
- (3) Nine centres in the following areas—
Armadale,
Belmont,
Coolbellup,
Langford,
Nollamara,
North Lockridge,
Albany,
Bunbury,
Geraldton.
- (4) 13 315 (metropolitan 7 015;
country 6 300) 949 Aboriginal children.
- (5) 6 300.

12. PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION

Regional Scheme

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

Would he please outline the rationale and operation of the regional scheme adopted by the Pre-School Education Board?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

The regional advisory scheme of the Western Australian Pre-School Education Board was commenced with two pilot schemes in 1971. The aim of the scheme is to provide an advisory service to country pre-school teachers. At present there are eleven regional advisory teachers in the employ of the board.

13. PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Financial Assistance

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Does the Government intend to financially assist the Western Australian Branch of the Australian Pre-School Association?

- (2) If not, would the Minister, having regard for the fact that the Pre-School Education Act 1973 specifically refers to the adoption by pre-school centres of the required standards and recommendations of the APA, seek a review of the decision not to assist, or if no such decision has in fact been made, would the Minister sympathetically consider making some financial assistance available?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) and (2) The Minister for Education will make a decision on the application for funds of the Western Australian branch of the Pre-School Association when he receives the report for which he has called from the Pre-School Education Board.

14. HIGH SCHOOLS

Admission of 11-Year-olds

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has Cabinet made a decision re implementation or otherwise of the Government's pre-election announced policy of providing—
- (a) presumably on a compulsory basis the transfer of children from a primary school to a secondary school at the end of the year in which such children turn eleven years of age;
 - (b) on a voluntary basis, an extension of secondary education from five to six years?
- (2) Will the policy referred to apply to children attending non-Government schools?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) No.
- (2) Non-Government schools are autonomous and thus have freedom to adopt individual policies provided they meet the requirements of the Education Act to be classified as an efficient school.

15. GOVERNMENT EDUCATION POLICY

Cost of Implementation

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Treasurer:

- (1) What are the latest estimates of cost of full implementation of the Government's education policy as announced in the pre-election policy speech—
- (a) lowering the admission age in the primary school;

- (b) transferring children from primary school to secondary school at the end of the year in which a subject child turns eleven years;
- (c) extension of the period of secondary education from five to six years;
- (d) limiting student members at both high and senior high schools?

- (2) When were these standards arrived at, and who made the estimates?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) Priority has been given to implementation of the policy, on a phased basis, for children in their fifth year of age. A final estimate for full development of this policy will depend on the recommendation of the expert committee working in this area. Preliminary discussions have been held in regard to secondary education. It is not possible at the present stage to provide precise estimates for full implementation until further details of buildings, educational requirements and staffing are available.

16. COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Appointment

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) When was the vacancy of Commissioner for Public Health advertised?
- (2) Has an appointment yet been made?
- (3) If so—
- (a) who is the successful applicant;
 - (b) when was the appointment made?
- (4) If not, what is the reason for the delay?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) In the *Government Gazette* on 31st May, 1974 and the Press on 1st June, 1974.
- (2) The appointment has been made and is awaiting formalities before being announced.
- (3) and (4) Answered by (2).

17. *This question was postponed.*

18. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Swan River: Industrial Effluent

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Conservation and Environment:

- (1) What are the details of the discharges into the Swan River made under permit by each of the industries concerned?
- (2) What are the analytical results of sampling made during 1974?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) I request that the answer to part (1) be tabled.

The answer was tabled (see paper No. 125).

- (2) The Swan River Conservation Board samples 50 points in the Swan and Canning Rivers on a regular basis. The results of analyses of such sampling are available for inspection by responsible persons at the offices of the Swan River Conservation Board.

19. GOVERNMENT PRODUCTIVITY

Index for Measuring

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Premier:

What progress has been made in devising an index to measure the productivity of government which was stated as an aim in his Government in his policy speech delivered in March this year?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

The Chairman of the Public Service Board has been asked, as part of the current overall review of the Public Service, to progressively develop the procedures necessary to measure the functions and productivity of each of the many parts of the Government service as distinct from an approach based primarily and only on reducing numbers.

In a service as large and complex, arbitrary application of percentage figures in each department is not good enough.

The objective must be to achieve the overall economies but still maintain the required standards of competence, capacity and productivity.

20. *This question was postponed.*

21. HOME OF PEACE, INGLEWOOD

Charges

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) What is the estimated cost of keeping a patient at the Home of Peace, Inglewood?

- (2) What charges are made to patients who are only in receipt of an aged pension or an invalid pension?
- (3) Is the hospital wholly owned by the State Government?
- (4) What assistance per patient is received from the Commonwealth Government?
- (5) What other assistance is received from any source?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) \$16 per day.
- (2) From \$17.85 per week. Individual assessment based on patient's ability to pay.
- (3) No.
- (4) Standard Commonwealth Government health benefits which currently are—
Ordinary care patients: \$5.10 per day.
Intensive care patients: \$8.10 per day.
- (5) State Government subsidy and donations from the public.

22.

SCHOOL

North-east Morley Area

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has the Minister determined upon a site for the proposed new primary school in the north-east Morley area?
- (2) If "Yes" which site has been chosen and what is the present status of the site?
- (3) If "No" when is it expected that a site will be chosen?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The combined primary and special school site of 6.3 hectares (15.52 acres) forms part of lots 3, 4 and 5, Benara Road, Morley. Action for acquisition is proceeding.
- (3) Not applicable.

23. INTERSTATE COMMISSION

Re-establishment

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Premier:

Is the Government in favour of the re-establishment of the interstate commission in accordance with section 101 of the Australian Constitution and which was abolished by the Menzies Government?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

The Inter-State Commission ceased to exist in 1920 following

a High Court decision in 1915 that the commission had no judicial power.

In view of this, I understand it was considered the commission's effectiveness was virtually nil. The Inter-State Commission Act 1912 was eventually repealed by the Statute Law Revision Act 1950.

The Government has no intention of asking for its re-establishment at the present time—especially in view of the Constitution Convention currently in existence, and considering all aspects of the Constitution.

24. OPEN UNIVERSITIES COMMITTEE

Report

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has he received a preliminary or a final report from the Open Universities Committee of the Australian Universities Commission?
- (2) If "Yes", would he table the report?
- (3) If "No" when does he expect to receive the report, and will he table it upon receipt?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) The Minister for Education has received a copy of the draft report (entitled Open Tertiary Education) of the Committee on Open University of the Australian Universities Commission. It is understood that the committee intends to produce a final report for submission to the Commonwealth Minister for Education, through the Australian Universities Commission, after it has received comments on the draft report.

(2) Yes.

The report was tabled (see paper No. 126).

(3) Not applicable.

25. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Tariff Cuts: Effect

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) What specific Western Australian industries and firms have been adversely affected by the two tariff cuts of the past 18 months?
- (2) To what extent has there been an adverse effect?
- (3) How many employees have been retrenched as a result of the cuts?

- (4) Have the employees so affected been found alternative employment?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) The two Western Australian industries affected by tariff cuts are the clothing and footwear industries.
- (2) Certain sections of the Western Australian clothing industry anticipate loss of production through the tariff cuts. The footwear industry has further declined through tariff cuts.
- (3) One footwear employee is receiving Commonwealth assistance and a further 18 applications have been registered this week.
- (4) In most cases alternative employment has been found. Some employees are being considered for various retraining schemes.

26. POPULATION

Immigration Department Report

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Immigration:

Has he received a report on the future size and distribution of Australia's population from the committee, commissioned by the Commonwealth Department of Immigration and headed by Professor W. D. Borrie?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

No. I have been advised that the report is likely to be completed and issued in late 1974 or early 1975.

27. CRUDE OIL PRICE

Government Policy

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Premier:

Will he indicate his Government's policy with respect to the price of crude oil, considering that the Federal Leader of the Country Party, which latter is a component of the present State Government, stated that the price of crude oil should be increased?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

The Government believes that it is vitally important to stimulate oil exploration in Australia, if we are to maintain even our present level of self-sufficiency of 70% of demand. Unless additional oil is found, self-sufficiency will decline to about 20% by 1985 and Australia will be faced with huge payouts for imported high cost oil to supplement its diminishing production.

With this in mind, the State Government advocates a more realistic attitude by the Commonwealth Government to exploration and development of petroleum resources.

This policy will need to have proper regard for—

Current inflated costs of exploration and development.

World market prices and trends. Conditions of exploration and development (including royalties and prices) which will attract explorers and developers.

The price of Australian crude oil is determined by the Federal Government. That Government has stated, at the Royal Commission on Petroleum on 9th July, 1974, that the indigenous crude oil policy as formulated in 1968 by the then Prime Minister, is confirmed by the present Federal Government in its operation as to allocation and pricing, and continues in force until September, 1980, with a price review in September 1975.

28.

STOCK

Polyunsaturated Feed Supplements

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Are poly-feed supplements being fed to sheep and cattle in an endeavour to obtain polyunsaturated flesh and milk?
- (2) Are there any controls in this State upon that kind of practice?
- (3) Is there any substance in the claim that feeding of such substance to stock will lead to the development by the animals of polyunsaturated fats?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

- (1) This is being carried out on a research basis but not in Western Australia. It is not yet being done commercially.
- (2) At present there are no standards for polyunsaturated dairy products, but the National Health and Medical Research Council has been requested to consider the formulation of standards. The Feeding Stuffs Act would enable the control of such a practice.
- (3) Yes.

29.

CONSERVATION

Water Lands of International Importance

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Conservation and Environment:

Has the Western Australian Government been asked by the Australian Government to co-operate

in the implementation of the Convention on Water Lands of International Importance established as water fowl habitat which was "signed" by Australia on 8th May?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

No.

30.

LANGFORD SCHOOL

Accommodation

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) In view of the increasing number of children attending the Langford primary school, will the present accommodation be sufficient for the 1974 school year?
- (2) If not, what action is anticipated or intended to prevent the inevitable overcrowding?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) There will be adequate accommodation.
- (2) Not applicable.

31.

TRAFFIC PROSECUTIONS

Willetton School Area

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) Is he aware that many traffic prosecutions were made on Friday, 19th July, 1974 at Woodpecker Avenue, Willetton?
- (2) If so, is he aware that the people prosecuted were delivering their small children by car to the Willetton primary school for the sake of safety?
- (3) Was this particular area kept under surveillance by the Police Traffic Branch?
- (4) If "Yes" for how long?
- (5) (a) If "Yes" to (3) and (4), did the traffic branch warn the headmaster of the Willetton primary school that parents delivering their children to school were creating traffic infringements;
(b) if not, why not?
- (6) (a) Did the traffic branch advise the Town of Canning there was a traffic problem at this particular junction;
(b) if not, why not?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No, but I am informed that infringement notices were issued for parking offences.
- (2) No. I believe drivers delivering and waiting for children were creating a dangerous hazard

by parking on the crest of a hill and the approaches, causing congestion and chaos.

- (3) Yes.
- (4) It has been the subject of surveillance for the past two months, during which time many parents were warned concerning the parking offences.
- (5) (a) and (b) The headmaster wrote to the Police Department drawing attention to the congestion and danger and was already aware of the situation.
- (6) The Town of Canning was already aware of the situation and discussions have been held between the Town of Canning and the Main Roads Department on this matter.

32. GOSNELLS SCHOOL

Upgrading

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) In view of the age of the Gosnells primary school and the immediate need to repair many sections of it, is it the department's intention to upgrade and carry out the much needed work at the school this financial year?
- (2) If "Yes" when can it be expected this work will commence?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) An external and internal repairs and renovations programme is listed for classrooms 1 to 11 as a top priority item for 1974-75.
- (2) An actual commencement date cannot be nominated until the details of the 1974-75 finances are available.

33. KWINANA-BALGA POWER LINE

Properties Affected

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) How many properties are affected by the SEC powerline between Kwinana and Balga?
- (2) How many owners have received an offer so far?
- (3) What is the time lapse between valuation of property and mailing of a written offer for the easement?
- (4) How many officers of the SEC are engaged in compensation claims?
- (5) As land on which pylons are erected has been taken away by the SEC would he advise why the land is not purchased by the SEC?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) 343 property owners.
- (2) 210.
- (3) Variable after verbal negotiation.
- (4) 10.
- (5) This is not practical. However the full value of land so occupied is included in the compensation payment for the negotiated easement.

34.

SCHOOLS

Libraries: Finance

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is he aware that over the past 12 years mothers have built up a library system in primary schools with the aid of the Library Services Branch of the Education Department?
- (2) Is he further aware that this voluntary service has been paid for by the local parents and citizens' association in the form of honorarium?
- (3) If (1) and (2) are "Yes" will the Karmel money granted to the Education Department be made available to finance this service?
- (4) (a) If (3) is "Yes" what effect will this have on the future employment of the mothers who have given years of voluntary and devoted service;
(b) will they be allowed to continue and receive payment for their work from the Government or be retained by the parents and citizens' association on an honorarium?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) It is believed that this has occurred in a few cases.
- (3) The schools commission supports the appointment of teacher-librarians and finance is available for their training and employment.
- (4) (a) Not applicable.
(b) The provision of support services for professional teacher-librarians is at present being investigated.

35.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

Operations and Electrocardiographs

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is he aware that patients who have operations or ECG's on the same day as the consultation with their doctor cannot claim hospital benefits on both charges?

- (2) If so, does he intend to take action to overcome this anomaly?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
(2) Action has been initiated with the Commonwealth Government to correct the anomaly.

36. HOUSING

Langford: Adverse Publicity

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Reference is made to an article which appeared in the *Daily News* of Tuesday, 30th July, 1974, condemning the State Housing Commission over what is claimed to be a "slum type" housing development at Langford, and as it is believed that many residents in the Langford estate consider that their personal endeavours to improve their suburb is being seriously affected by these misinformed allegations, will he make a public statement allaying the apprehensions of these people?
(2) What action will he take to ensure that there is no repetition of this unfortunate publicity?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) I have read the article referred to. I am unable to ascertain whether the Member's belief that many residents are concerned about such statements is factual. However, I am aware that many are concerned about some aspects of the commission's proposed development. 570 residents of the Langford area have petitioned the Parliament through Hon. C. E. Griffiths, M.L.C., concerning this matter and I shall be meeting a deputation from the Residents Progress Association arranged through Hon. C. E. Griffiths at 10 a.m. on Friday, 9th August. It is hoped to be able to reach some compromise in the interests of both the State Housing Commission and the residents concerned.
(2) I am sure that on reflection the Member would be the last one to agree that Members of Parliament should be "gagged". There is certainly no action available to me, my party or the Government to prevent members making any statement they deem fit, and I trust there never will be.

37. POLICE

Election Rally: Demonstration Against Prime Minister

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Police:

Pursuant to a report in *The West Australian* newspaper of 18th April, 1974, which stated that the Minister for Police would follow up specific matters arising from the Police Department report on the demonstration against the Prime Minister at the State election rally in March of this year—

- (a) what were the specific matters to which this report referred;
(b) have they, in fact, been followed up;
(c) what conclusions and subsequent action resulted from these further investigations?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (a) Further investigations concerning the throwing of a can at the Prime Minister.
(b) Yes.
(c) Inquiries were carried out by Police officers with a view to apprehending the offender, without success.

38.

LUPINS

Order from Nationalist China

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is it a fact that the authorised representatives of the Central Trust of China in Taipeh called for tenders in the *South China Morning Star* and the *Australian* in February and March of this year for 10 metric tonnes of lupins?
(2) If this is so, did the Western Australian Grain Pool submit a tender to supply such an order?
(3) If the report referred to in (1) above is factual, and the W.A. Grain Pool did not submit a tender, what is the reason for not doing so?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

- (1) I am informed that cuttings of these advertisements were shown to the representative of the successful tenderer when he was in Taipeh.
(2) No.
(3) The Grain Pool in its endeavours to promote lupins throughout the world has to consider the long-term value of any market to Western Australian growers. Therefore, the Grain Pool did not tender to Taiwan at that particular time for that particular quantity but, within the last two or three weeks, has held discussions in Taiwan which were a follow-up to the Grain Pool's contacts over the past years with Mr S. C. Hsieh, of the Trading Department of the Central Trust of China.

It is hoped that these discussions will prove of extreme value to the lupin industry. For information, the Central Trust of China already trades with the Western Australian Barley Marketing Board for many thousands of tons of barley via the Grain Pool, and Grain Pool officers are fully conversant with all marketing procedures.

39. APPLES

Exports and Guaranteed Price

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What was the total quantity of apples exported from Western Australia to—
 - (a) United Kingdom;
 - (b) other markets, during the last export season?
- (2) Are exported apples to both market categories designated in (1) above eligible for State/Commonwealth guarantee to raise the grower return to the BAE support price level?
- (3) What amount of the State and Commonwealth financial guarantee to exporters of apples in this State will be utilised for the intended purpose?
- (4) What amount per bushel will be received by growers from the guaranteed amount?
- (5) What is the prognosis of the apple export industry for the 1974-75 season, with particular reference to the United Kingdom market?
- (6) Does the Western Australian Government contemplate assisting apple growers in the 1974-75 season, and if so, in what way and to what extent?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

- (1) The quantity of apples exported to the 30th June from Western Australia according to destination is as follows—

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|
| | *boxes |
| United Kingdom | 602 779 |
| European Continent | 153 995 |
| Other markets | 385 138 |
| * Equivalent to previous term bushel. | |

- (2) No. Only with respect to United Kingdom and Continent quantities shipped at risk.
- (3) Varietal returns have not yet been received so that average returns have not been calculated. Estimates based on prices received to date indicate that the total amount, viz., \$1 214 600

contributed on a dollar-for-dollar basis by the State and Commonwealth, will be utilised.

- (4) Growers who shipped fruit at risk to the United Kingdom and Continent will be credited with a *pro rata* amount in relation to the total quantity of apples shipped. Estimates based upon returns to date for the quantity of apples shipped indicate the assistance will be in the vicinity of \$1.60. The amount actually received by individual growers will depend upon their balance of account with the shipper.
- (5) General indications have been that the market will be non-viable. However, there has been a significant increase in prices in the last few weeks and the position next year will depend largely upon the supply and demand relationship and costs of export.
- (6) The matter of assistance is being considered by industry at both State and Commonwealth level. The continuation of export stabilisation payments has been referred to the Industries Assistance Commission. The recently-appointed Australian Apple and Pear Corporation has been given trading powers and terms of reference to include promotion and alternative market outlets, including processing and fresh fruit.

40. RAILWAYS *Deraillments*

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Will he list the individual train deraillments for the years 1960 to 30th June, 1974 inclusive?
- (2) How many departmental inquiries were carried out in connection with the deraillments?
- (3) What action does the department intend introducing to minimise the number of deraillments?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

The information requested will take a little time to collate. However, I will arrange for the information to be passed to the Member as soon as it is available.

41. TRAFFIC INSPECTORS

Employment of Redundant Officers

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

As reference has been made in the Press that he has met representatives of the traffic inspec-

tors organisation in connection with the employment of any redundant workers under the highway patrol, would he therefore please advise the outcome of the talks?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

The officers were concerned regarding their position following the establishment of a single traffic authority. They were advised their interests would be looked after.

42. LOTTERIES

Coolibah Tavern: Raffle of Motorcar

Mr T. J. BURKE, to the Chief Secretary:

- (1) Was a raffle for a motor car carried out at the Coolibah Tavern, Morley, prior to the State Elections in March this year for which a permit had not been obtained?
- (2) What is the name of the licensee of the Coolibah Tavern?
- (3) What was the purpose of the raffle and the net amount of the proceeds?
- (4) How many tickets were sold and at what price per ticket?
- (5) Who promoted the raffle?
- (6) What were the names and addresses of the prize winners?
- (7) Was the Member for Mt Lawley and present Minister for Police present at the drawing of the raffle?
- (8) Was the raffle of a kind and purpose for which the Lotteries Commission would grant a permit?
- (9) What action has been taken or is contemplated in connection with the matter?
- (10) Will he table the papers relating to the raffle?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) to (10) A raffle did take place. As the matter is at present under investigation with a view to the possibility of prosecution, I feel it would be improper to say any more at this stage.

43. POWER STATIONS

Fuel Oil Consumption

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Electricity:

What have been the annual tonnes of fuel oil consumed at the South Fremantle, East Perth and Kwinana power stations since they commenced to use fuel oil for power generation?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

Our oil records are maintained in tons.

| | East Perth | South Fremantle | Kwinana |
|------|---------------|--------------------|---------|
| 1959 | | | |
| 1960 | | | |
| 1961 | 6 496 | 65 330 | |
| 1962 | 1 035 | 29 485 | |
| 1963 | 469 | 29 433 | |
| 1964 | 616 | 44 536 | |
| 1965 | 947 | 49 045 | |
| 1966 | 1 461 | 35 690 | |
| 1967 | 1 254 | 54 088 | |
| 1968 | 1 390 | 45 241 | |
| 1969 | 4 861 | 102 046 | |
| 1970 | 19 274 | 123 748 | |
| 1971 | 9 061 | 82 434 | 62 640 |
| 1972 | 5 413 | 52 985 | 113 040 |
| 1973 | 1 207 | 18 402 | 135 566 |
| 1974 | 945 | 10 841 | 277 201 |

44.

POLICE

Election Rally: Demonstration Against Prime Minister

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Premier:

- (1) Will he table in the Legislative Assembly a copy of the report of the Police Department into the demonstration in Forrest Place against the Prime Minister at a State election rally in March of this year?
- (2) If not, what are the reasons for not doing so?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) No. It is not policy to table, or otherwise make public, confidential police reports. The Minister for Police has no objection to the Member viewing the report in his office, if he so desires.
- (2) Answered by (1).

45.

PUBLIC SERVICE AND TEACHERS

Promotion on Ability and Performance

Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the Government proceeded to implement the promise contained in the Premier's policy speech "... to encourage rapid advancement in the public service on the basis of ability and performance as well as length of experience ...?"
- (2) With the implementation of this election promise does the Government propose to include the teaching service of the Education Department?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Yes. As vacancies occur in the more senior positions in the Public Service, appointments are made by the Government on the criteria stated in the policy speech.

In addition, the Public Service Board, when effecting promotions in the service at all levels, has been asked to include these criteria in its considerations.

- (2) The Government is giving consideration to this matter but, at the present time, the Education Act and its Regulations provide for the establishment of promotion lists. A change in the system will involve considerable negotiation.

In the Primary Division there is provision for every third appointment to be a special promotion regardless of the order in which names appear on the promotion list.

46. COMMITTEE ON FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY

Membership

Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

Who has the Government chosen to constitute its proposed "Committee on Freedom and Responsibility"?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

No appointments have been made. The matter is under close examination at the present time.

A number of possible appointments are under consideration.

The proposed committee is regarded as an important one by the Government and calling for special qualities in its members. In the interests of co-opting suitable people, we would prefer to delay constituting the committee for a while, rather than hasten its establishment.

47. PREMIER'S DEPARTMENT

Commonwealth-State Relations Section

Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the Government established the proposed Commonwealth-State relations section within the Premier's Department?
- (2) If so, who are the officers skilled in—
- (a) constitutional affairs;
 - (b) economics;
 - (c) finance;
 - (d) administration,
- who comprise this unit?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) A special section has not been established, but will be set up as soon as suitably qualified and experienced people are available.

We are also considering the practicability of greater co-operation and participation between States in this work.

In the meantime, resources of Crown Law and Treasury Departments are being used to deal with urgent matters.

48.

EMPLOYMENT

Trade Retraining Scheme

Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

What forms of leadership has the Government provided in the industrial and commercial field to get trade training and re-training conversion speeded up?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

Two very recent Commonwealth reports on training and re-training are currently being studied by the Government. The report—"TAFE (Technical and Further Education) in Australia" and the Professor Cockrane "Australian Labour Market Training" report both have financial consideration to the States to further trade training and re-training. Also, adult trade training by Government in the furniture trade and Government and private industry in the bricklaying trade, has placed Western Australia in a leading position in this field throughout Australia.

The Government is currently making inquiries into the feasibility of extending this action to other trades, as well as additional means of achieving our policy in conjunction with any Commonwealth schemes.

49.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Additional Powers and Responsibilities

Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Local Government:

Arising out of the Premier's allegation during the election campaign that the Australian Government has a long term design for the destruction of local authorities, and in view of his election promise—

- (a) to assist local authorities to thwart this alleged plan;
- (b) to strengthen local government,

what additional powers and responsibilities does the State Government propose to give to local governing authorities?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

This Government believes the autonomy of local authorities must

be maintained and it is our intention that local government be based on true delegation of power and money.

The recent referendum rejection of Commonwealth intrusion into local government affairs clearly indicates support for our policy. At my instigation, a local government liaison committee has been formed to provide direct consultation with the Government towards the implementation of our stated policy.

We will take action as necessary to resist erosion of State and Local Government powers by the Commonwealth.

50.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Mining in Wanneroo Lake Area

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Conservation and Environment:

- (1) Has the Department of Environmental Protection investigated the permits recommended by the Warden's Court for mining operations in the Wanneroo Lake area, namely, Lake Joondalup, Lake Jandabup and Lake Gngangara?
- (2) Will he table all papers dealing with the investigation of these applications?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Due to the complex nature of the interactions of various development and mining proposals in the Gngangara area which have been investigated by the Department of Environmental Protection, and considering the confidential nature of some of these development proposals, the relevant files and papers can be made available for the Member's private perusal in the department.

51.

MINING

Ilmenite Upgrading Plant at Capel

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Is it the intention of Western Titanium N.L. to establish an ilmenite upgrading plant at Capel?
- (2) What will be the anticipated yearly tonnage of upgraded ilmenite when the plant is in full production?
- (3) What is the anticipated completion date?
- (4) Because of the demand for ilmenite processing locally will this result in a decrease in export ton-

nages of ilmenite through the port of Bunbury?

- (5) Will coal from Collie be used as fuel for the upgrading plant?
- (6) If so, what is the anticipated yearly tonnage of coal required?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes, the plant is already established.
- (2) The plant has a capacity of approximately 30 000 tonnes per year. A semi-commercial pilot plant with a capacity of 12 000 tonnes per year has been operating for some time and is continuing in production.
- (3) Commissioning of the plant commenced 26th June, and it is working up to full production.
- (4) Initially no. Feed stock is basically ilmenite, unsuitable for pigment production via the sulphate route, and hence in limited export demand.
- (5) Yes.
- (6) Approximately 40 000 to 50 000 tonnes per year.

52.

STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION

Inquiry into Administration

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) As prior to the change of Government on 30th March, 1974 approval was given for a firm of consultants to investigate and inquire into the State Electricity Commission administration, will he advise when the inquiry commenced and the anticipated completion date?
- (2) Would he kindly indicate the terms of reference?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) In January 1974 a firm of consultants was engaged to advise on a management structure appropriate to the role of the State Electricity Commission in the community.
The inquiry commenced: 22nd April, 1974.
Possible completion date: September, 1974.
- (2) "To evaluate the present organisation structure of the commission in light of its present and anticipated size and scope of activity.
To evaluate the existing resources of the commission and to suggest how the recommended structure should be staffed to assure the commission of sound management for the foreseeable future."

53. **ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES***Units Consumed Quarterly*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Electricity:

Will he advise the approximate total number of consumers using the following units of electricity per quarter—

200 units;

800 units;

2 000 units?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

Records of this nature are not kept.

54. **FISHERIES***Rock Lobsters: Licenses*

Mr FLETCHER, to the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

(1) Is the number of craft and pots in the crayfishing industry on the Western Australian coast, or any section of the coast, considered adequate or in excess of requirements to keep the average annual catch at its present level?

(2) If in excess, will he, with a view to maintaining a desirable ratio of craft as to catch, give consideration to buying out of the industry those licensees who are willing and near or in financial difficulty?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

(1) The number of rock lobster boats and pots in the industry has been stable since 1963 when a limited entry policy was adopted. However, since that time the actual fishing effort has increased to the extent that some further restrictions may now be necessary in the interests of maintaining the annual average catch. The method of achieving a reduction in fishing effort, if this is shown to be necessary, is being examined at the present time by the Rock Lobster Industry Advisory Committee.

(2) The withdrawal of fishing vessels from the industry is one of the methods being examined by the Rock Lobster Industry Advisory Committee. If such action is decided upon as being appropriate some form of buy back scheme will need to be considered.

55. **TRAFFIC***Drivers' Licenses: Withdrawal*

Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Police:

(1) Following the action he has taken in withdrawing drivers' licenses from drivers with a bad record of

infringements and convictions, would he advise of any public reaction?

(2) As monetary fines appear to have minimal effect on curbing breaches of traffic laws, does the Government intend to increase fines to a level consistent with current monetary values?

(3) While suspension of motor drivers' licenses will inhibit most, has he considered that where a driver is under suspension and is again convicted for driving a motor vehicle, then the vehicle be impounded for a mandatory period, thereby adding severe deterrent to apparent mockery of laws on occasional instances?

(4) If "No" to (3), would he advise why and whether such a proposal would have merit?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) There has been a tremendous response at my office with numerous letters and phone calls supporting the action of withdrawing these licenses.

(2) The monetary penalties provided by the Traffic Act and various regulations are considered to be sufficient at present and there is no intention to increase these penalties.

Fines are imposed by the courts and it may be noted that the Road Traffic Code and Vehicle Standards Regulations provide for a maximum fine of \$100 for a first offence and \$200 for any subsequent offence.

(3) Section 17 of the Traffic Act provides for cancellation by the court of a vehicle license of a person convicted of an offence against the Traffic Act. However, there is a problem that the person who commits the offence may be driving a vehicle which is the property of his employer or some other person who is not aware of his suspension or disqualification.

(4) Answered by (3).

I might add that drivers under suspension are causing us some concern at the moment.

QUESTIONS (11): WITHOUT NOTICE1. **SMALL BUSINESSES***Government Financial Assistance*

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Premier:

(1) In connection with his undertaking to assist small businessmen by providing financial help in appropriate cases, where the normal

sources of finance are inadequate, have arrangements been made for the plan to operate?

- (2) To whom should application be made?
- (3) If the plan has not yet been put into operation, when is it anticipated it will commence?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) to (3) An investigation is being undertaken to determine the most practical and effective way to assist small businesses in this State and, as soon as this is decided, it will be implemented. In the meantime, small firms are being assisted by the Department of Industrial Development in appropriate cases according to existing policy.

To answer question (2) specifically I would point out that I am sure that if anyone has a case of which the Leader of the Opposition knows and he represents this to the Minister for Industrial Development special attention and consideration would be given to such a case.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Thank you.

2. COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENT

Joint Sitting: Legality

Mr DAVIES, to the Premier:

I gave the Premier some notice of this question this morning and there appears to be some information contained in this evening's paper, but rather than have the Premier spoil a good answer I will ask him the question which is as follows—

- (1) Have any approaches been made to the Government regarding joining with any other State Government or individual in a High Court challenge to the proposed joint sittings of the House of Representatives and the Senate?
- (2) If so, when, and by whom?
- (3) Does the Government propose to join, or initiate any such challenge?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) to (3) I thank the member for Victoria Park for the ample notice. Apparently he was expecting me to give him a very fulsome answer but the answer I propose to give him is as follows—

The answers to these questions are best given by referring to a Press release I made this morning.

For reasons the honourable member will appreciate, I am not prepared to add any more information at this juncture, because of the possibility of litigation which is vital to the State's future.

I should add that I asked for a copy of the Press statement to be sent up with the answer so I could make it available to the honourable member. However, it has not come up with the answer, but I will get a copy for him as soon as possible. I would point out that the State is leaving no stone unturned to challenge the Commonwealth at every stage at which it challenges the State's responsibilities and rights under the Constitution. Mr Wilson (the Solicitor General) is in Canberra and while there he will be keeping in touch with the Minister for Justice. It is a delicate time in Canberra at the moment so far as constitutional matters are concerned and it is felt that Mr Wilson should be available. I would add that this is not an isolated case. There has been close consultation between the Western Australian Government and the other State Governments previously.

Mr Davies: Which ones?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Practically all of them, and including one Labor Government to my knowledge.

Mr T. D. Evans: Which ones?

Sir CHARLES COURT: We view with considerable concern the developments and the trends taking place in Canberra at the moment.

3. SEWERAGE

Metropolitan Connections

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) How many premises in the metropolitan region were sewered in 1961 and in 1973?
- (2) How many premises were there in the metropolitan region in 1961 and in 1973?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) The Metropolitan Water Board has advised as follows—

In 1961 there were 66 664 premises sewered;
in 1965, 69 553; and
in 1973, 93 402.

- (2) Information is not available in the Metropolitan Water Board records as to the actual number of

premises, but the number of improved properties rated for water was—

for 1961 there are no figures available;

in 1965, there were 149 458 properties rated for water; and
in 1973, 219 465.

4. DAYLIGHT SAVING

Legislation

Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Chief Secretary:

- (1) Is it true that the Government has today announced claims to legislate for daylight saving on a trial basis in the coming summer?
- (2) Will Government members be bound to vote on party lines?
- (3) Will the legislation be administered by the Chief Secretary's Department?
- (4) Will the legislation be introduced by the Chief Secretary?
- (5) How many times has the Chief Secretary previously voted against such legislation?
- (6) If the answer to (4) is "Yes", will he please inform the House whether he intends to support a proposition he has previously voted against?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) As this question was only handed to me as I sat down in the Chamber, I have had insufficient time to research it.
- (6) Wait, and it will be unfolded unto the member for Balga.

5. UNIVERSITY OR COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

Pilbara

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Premier:

Yesterday, in answer to question 33 relating to a report which appeared in *The Sunday Times* of the 21st July, reference was made to a tertiary education institution having been promised to be built in the Pilbara within three years. The promise was made by the Premier.

In answer to the question it was claimed that the report was not accurate. Subsequently, when answering a question without notice asked by the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier indicated that he had in fact written to the

Editor of *The Sunday Times* protesting about the inaccurate report. I would like to ask the Premier on what date did he write to *The Sunday Times*; and in particular, was it before or after the last issue of that newspaper?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

If my memory serves me correctly, my letter to the Editor of *The Sunday Times* was sent on Monday of this week, after the last issue; that is, Sunday the 28th July, 1974. There was good reason for it because there has been a number of complaints—and I think the previous Government had some similar experiences—in respect of certain reporting, and I was hoping that we would not have to make a correction every time these reports appear.

However, it appears that any time any anomaly or mistake of any kind occurs one must write in immediately, and I think this will have to be the practice in future. I have sent to the editor concerned full details of the matter and the circumstances, and I have lodged my complaint. If the honourable member would like to see a copy of my letter to the editor I will gladly make one available.

6.

PENSIONERS

Motor Vehicle Licenses

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Was the Minister correctly reported in *The West Australian* of today's date, where he was quoted as saying he is investigating possibilities of pensioner exemption from proposed increases in motor vehicle license fees?
- (2) If the answer is "Yes", will he please explain why he informed me by letter dated the 22nd July, 1974, following a submission I made on behalf of pensioners in connection with the matter, that he cannot extend concessions to aged pensioners?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

I thank the honourable member for notice of his question. The answer is as follows—

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Subsequent to the letter referred to, Cabinet has set up a committee to investigate whether some special action can be taken to assist pensioners with the payment of vehicle license fees.

Mr T. H. Jones: That is a bit weak.

7. SEWERAGE WORKS

Princess Street, Gosnells

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that G. N. Marston Pty. Ltd., plumbing contractors, are installing deep sewerage along Princess Street, Gosnells, for the Metropolitan Water Board?
- (2) Is he also aware that the open sewerage main trench along Princess Street is over 20 feet deep and a serious danger to small children?
- (3) Is he also aware the trench has subsided, leaving two houses in danger of falling into this deep trench, and one is cracking badly at the moment?
- (4) If the answers to (1), (2), and (3) are "Yes", will he take immediate steps to have this matter rectified?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) to (4) I thank the member for Canning for contacting me at 12.30 p.m. today to indicate his intention to ask this question. One of his questions indicates that a house was cracking at 12.30 p.m. I have had some inquiries made from the Metropolitan Water Board, and I am advised that the sewerage is being installed for a private developer under the supervision of a consulting engineer.

I do not doubt what the honourable member has said, but naturally I was not aware of it at the time, and the matter has been referred to the consulting engineer and to the Under-Secretary for Labour and Industry for investigation.

8. FLOTTA LAURO BUILDING

Purchase by Government

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Who are the vendors of the Flotta Lauro building?
- (2) Has the Government made a decision to purchase the building?
- (3) What are the price and conditions of payment?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) to (3) I thank the member for Maylands for some notice of this question. The information required is being obtained, and I will supply him with an answer to his question as soon as possible.

9.

FREEWAYS

Distance Completed

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Transport:

How many kilometres of freeways are completed in the Perth metropolitan region to date?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

I thank the member for Morley for prior notice of this question. The answer is that 7.85 km of freeway has been completed. I felt this was a bit low so I queried it with the Main Roads Department. I was told the figure is correct, but that it does not include controlled access highways.

10. COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Appointment

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

In question 16 on notice I asked whether an appointment had been made to the position of Commissioner of Public Health, and the Minister replied that it had. I also asked when the appointment was made, but that question was not answered. Can the Minister give me that information?

Mr RIDGE replied:

I am sorry I cannot give the member for Victoria Park the exact date. It was in recent weeks, and the formalities are now being complied with. The appointment is subject to Executive Council approval, and once that approval has been obtained an announcement will be made.

Sir Charles Court: It went to Executive Council this afternoon.

11. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Swan River: Industrial Effluent

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Conservation and Environment:

In part (2) of question 18 on notice today I asked what are the analytical results of sampling made during 1974 in respect of the Swan River. The Minister replied that the results of analyses are available for inspection by responsible persons at the office of the Swan River Conservation Board. I would suggest to the Minister that Parliament is a responsible body and, therefore, it should be provided with that information.

Mr Mensaros: That is not a question, it is a suggestion.

The SPEAKER: What is the question?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Will the Minister provide this Parliament with the information, because he is prepared to give it to responsible persons and I suggest that Parliament is a responsible institution?

Sir Charles Court: This is a public place.

Mr O'Neil: It is a public place; it is like Forrest Place.

Mr Jamieson: It is still surely, despite the Premier, a responsible place.

Mr STEPHENS replied:

I do not question that Parliament is a responsible institution; but as has been pointed out it is a public place. I reiterate that the files will be made available to any responsible person. I also indicate that I regard the member for Morley as a responsible person, and he will be able to view the files.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION

Council Personnel

Message from the Council received and read notifying the personnel of sessional committees elected by that House.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SECOND DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 25th July, on the following motion by Mrs Craig—

That the following Address-in-Reply to His Excellency's Speech be agreed to—

May it please Your Excellency: We the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of the State of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to address to Parliament.

MR J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Leader of the Opposition) [5.24 p.m.]: Before I launch myself into the main burden of what I want to say I would like to congratulate the member for Kalamunda on his appointment as Chairman of Committees. In the short period he was in the Chair yesterday he indicated that he will fill this position efficiently, and I am satisfied that he has the capability to do the job well.

I would like also to congratulate all the new members in the Parliament upon being successful at the polls. This is a strange

place to enter. Some of those who entered will be birds of passage; others, of course, will remain here for a considerable time if luck is with them.

Mr Thompson: They are all on this side!

Mr Jamieson: Now you have spoilt your position!

Mr J. T. TONKIN: However, they will all find the going tough at various periods because Parliament, as you well know, Mr Speaker, is very much a place of dog eat dog, and whether one is in Government or in Opposition one is looking for chinks in the armour of those opposed to one. One is continually putting in the rapier and twisting it around at every opportunity.

However, that is the political game. It does not appeal to everybody; there are many aspects of it that do not appeal to me. But I would say without hesitation that if I had my time over again I would seek to enter Parliament because it provides an opportunity for one to do many things for many people that cannot be done by anyone else. I think that is the greatest satisfaction one derives from this career.

Furthermore, it is a tremendous privilege to be a representative of the people in a democracy. It is not possible for everybody to come to Parliament and have a say, so a democratic system of government provides for representatives to go to Parliament to put the case for those whom they represent according to the way they view the position. I have always felt conscious of the very great privilege and tremendous responsibility one has properly to gauge the feeling in the electorate and to make representations in Parliament in accordance with what one believes is the view of one's electors.

I find it difficult to agree entirely with the motion now before us. Whilst I can thank His Excellency the Governor for carrying the burden of the Speech he had to read out, I cannot thank him for the Speech because I think it was the most inappropriate and the worst speech I have ever heard since I have been in this Parliament.

Mr May: And that is saying something.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The major portion of it was devoted to criticising and blaming another Government—the Federal Government.

Mr Bryce: Excusism.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: This is an entirely new departure. Previously the Speeches delivered for the Government by the Governor were Speeches which set out what was going on in the country. They are supposed to be informative to the people and to give an outline of the projected legislation. However, there was only a very limited indication of what legislation is coming forward and, as I have already

said, the major portion of the Speech was devoted to blaming the Australian Government for practically everything that is wrong everywhere.

I have heard on the grapevine that it is the intention of the Government to introduce legislation to try to ensure that a Labor Government will never get back into power.

Sir Charles Court: Who told you that?

Mr Rushton: Do you think we are following the Commonwealth Government?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: We will see as we go along. The Government seeks to achieve this by providing that it would not matter if we won every seat in the metropolitan area, we could still not be the Government.

Sir Charles Court: Who told you this?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Does the Premier expect me to disclose the source of my information?

Sir Charles Court: It is so facetious.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The Premier could allay my anxiety at this stage if he could tell me straightout whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce a redistribution of seats Bill during this Parliament.

Sir Charles Court: As far as I am concerned, I would not know.

Mr Jamieson: Do you know any other fairy stories?

Sir Charles Court: It will be done according to the law and I should imagine the first person who would be pointing the gun at us if we were not doing it on time would be the Leader of the Opposition himself. There is a percentage system laid down.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: An examination of the last State election figures will show that the Labor candidates obtained more than 52 per cent of the valid votes cast in the metropolitan area. So it would not be a long shot to say that the Government has already had a look at this and can see a possibility of a big growth in metropolitan area voting which would not be in its favour and, having regard to past history, I for one would not discount the possibility of the Government attempting to introduce another Electoral Districts Bill to ensure a continuation of the lopsided representation which exists.

Sir Charles Court: Is not the redistribution of seats provided for by the law?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Yes, a law which the Premier's Government introduced. That is what I am saying—I expect history to repeat itself.

Sir Charles Court: And your people supported it. Also, that was the law which gave adult franchise to the Legislative Council.

Mr Jamieson: That was the biggest shock you ever had, and you know it. The late George Cornell told me about that.

Sir Charles Court: It was a shock to your people who accepted the Bill.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The Government and many other people know that irrespective of the growth of population in the metropolitan area, under the existing law the number of seats remains the same, and since the boundaries were drawn under the latest electoral districts legislation the population in the metropolitan area has increased by 50 per cent. We have the usual situation that the seat represented by the Minister for Local Government is regarded as a country seat and with a weighted vote for the electors in that area it is out of all proportion to what it should be.

Mr Rushton: And don't forget that in Rockingham, Jarrahdale, and everywhere else I polled twice as many votes as the member for Perth.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Did the Minister speak?

Mr Rushton: I was commenting.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The sooner this absurd situation is rectified the better because its continuance is not justified. I venture to say that if the boundaries were properly drawn, as they ought to be to give reasonable representation to the people, the Minister would probably lose his seat.

Mr Rushton: Why don't you put in a list of the ones you want changed, such as Geraldton and other similar electorates?

Mr Jamieson: Why don't you drop off?

Mr Rushton: Just nominate them.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: We know that the great problem in Australia today is inflation. The Premier knows, because he keeps on blaming that for every difficulty with which he is confronted.

Mr Rushton: Is there a conflict between you and your deputy?

Mr Jamieson: There probably is.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: If the Minister wants to make this speech instead of me he should say so and I will sit down.

Mr Young: Promise?

Mr May: He did say "speech".

Mr J. T. TONKIN: When I was so rudely interrupted I was trying to indicate that inflation is not limited to Western Australia or to Australia. It is worldwide and it does not seem to have occurred to anybody that instead of trying to gather in Canberra to solve the problem, somebody ought to take the initiative and hold a world conference to determine what has gone wrong so that an adjustment can be made to set all these capitalist countries on the right path again; because this interaction of currencies is responsible for a downturn in production which is one of the reasons for the increases in prices following an increased demand for a lessened quantity of goods.

The Premier is in the position to take the initiative in this matter instead of making carping criticism of the Australian Government all the time and trying to join with other State Premiers to upset the possibility of certain laws being passed in this country. His time would be put to better use if he endeavoured to persuade somebody to take the necessary action to bring the leading nations together at a world conference to consider this question of inflation which is adversely affecting everybody.

Sir Charles Court: We cannot even get the Prime Minister to talk to us.

Mr Bertram: I should not think he would after what you say about him.

Sir Charles Court: All States made an offer to him on the 10th June.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I thought the Premier was to set up, in the Premier's Department, a special section—

Sir Charles Court: So we were.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: —on a warmly personal basis—

Sir Charles Court: So we will, but we intend to be there long after the Whitlam Government has gone.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The Premier should be doing that as soon as possible.

Sir Charles Court: What more can we offer him than what the six Premiers offered him? They offered complete co-operation to deal with the problem of inflation.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I have not yet got through to the Premier with my idea. I am telling him that he will not solve inflation in Australia by any meeting of Premiers, together with the Prime Minister, unless the factors operating in other countries throughout the world are taken into consideration and some concerted action is taken to try to do what he claims he is capable of doing; namely, to put things right.

Sir Charles Court: It would be a good idea to start in Australia.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Of course if that is the level of the Premier's vision he will not get very far, because this will not be solved by action in Australia alone.

Sir Charles Court: It can be.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: However it is very interesting to reflect upon what the Premier told the electors during the last election. He said there was a simple answer to inflation that was within the power of the State. That did not suggest that it was necessary to get together all the State Premiers and the Prime Minister. He said there was a simpler answer—which apparently he has—and I am trying to get him to give that answer to the other nations of the world. He says that the

answer is within the power of the State and in order to emphasise this fully he says inflation can be beaten State by State.

Now, Sir, do you think that? I do not, and I would like to know whether any of the Ministers think that; that is, it is a simple problem and it can be settled State by State. I reiterate that in my belief the problem will not be solved unless it is by all nations collectively endeavouring to give consideration to the very factors which have brought about this inflationary state. In some countries inflation has reached more than 100 per cent. It is 26 per cent in Japan. Obviously it calls for some concerted action on the part of the big nations, and there is no reason, if such a conference could be called, that the various States of Australia should not be represented by their Premiers at such a conference. I will hope that if it is called our Premier, who has the simple answer, will be given a prominent place at the conference.

During the last State election the Premier said he would ask permission to borrow funds outside the Loan Council. I now ask him if he has made any attempt, so far, to do that.

Sir Charles Court: We said that, if necessary, we would use other means available to the Government to borrow.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Is that what the Premier said?

Sir Charles Court: I will get the exact quote if you want it. We said we would raise money by unconventional methods if we did not get what we wanted at the Commonwealth level for capital works.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: And if the Premier gets all he wants from the Commonwealth—

Sir Charles Court: We will get all our capital works. However, we certainly have not got all we wanted. We will get by with our loan funds, but not with all our Consolidated Revenue, and the Leader of the Opposition knows the position.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: If the Premier is to get by with his loan funds he will have to scrap that education proposal.

Sir Charles Court: No we will not; we will get by.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: From the Premier's statement I take it that no approach has been made to the Loan Council to borrow outside it, and no approach is likely and, of course, the real reason is that it would be completely futile to make such an approach.

Sir Charles Court: We were not suggesting taking matters up with the Loan Council. We were suggesting there were other places where we could get finance if we wanted to, but no-one wants to.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Well, the Premier can save himself the time.

Sir Charles Court: You know you used that system of finance yourself.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Oh no, I did not!

Sir Charles Court: How did you finance your capital works?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I never made a single approach to borrow money outside the Loan Council.

Sir Charles Court: No, but you used that system.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: That is not the same thing.

Sir Charles Court: Of course it is.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The Premier said he would seek permission to borrow funds outside the Loan Council.

Sir Charles Court: Of course we would, as a matter of common sense, if we had to. I am telling you that you used this system outside the Loan Council.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: And I remind the Premier that I never sought permission of the Loan Council to borrow money outside of that body.

Sir Charles Court: You are saying that you did not use money obtained outside the Loan Council?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: No, I am not saying that.

Sir Charles Court: As long as we have that clear.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Did the Premier have any doubt that I was not clear on that?

Sir Charles Court: I hope you are clear on it, because you authorised the transaction.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I will now turn to the next thing which the Premier proposed to have done, and I would like to know more about it. The Premier said, "We will invite local authorities to confer to discuss new arrangements immediately after the election, if we become the Government." The election was held four months ago. I now ask: Have the local authorities been invited to confer and, if so, did they accept the invitation? If they did I would like to know when the conference took place for the purpose of discussing the new financial arrangements the Treasurer proposed to put into operation; because from past experience the Treasurer does not hesitate to rush to the Press to make an announcement. However I have not seen any announcement about this proposal. I would have thought he would not be able to resist advising the people about this proposal as soon as possible if it had been put into effect.

Sir Charles Court: The Minister for Local Government can speak for himself; he has been mighty active.

Mr May: No comment from him.

Mr Harman: Silence.

Mr Rushton: I did not hear the first comment.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The Premier has the idea that his proposals for underground power lines will not involve any capital expenditure. He has said that. Now in this policy he undertook not only to provide these underground power lines in the new areas to be opened up, but also to provide them in existing areas. He said he would put the power lines underground in existing areas as well as the new ones. Surely the Premier is not going to try get the House to accept that the State Electricity Commission can put the existing power lines underground at the expense of developers. That will be capital expenditure which the SEC itself will have to meet.

And so it is ridiculous to assert, as the Premier has done, that this promise of underground power lines will not be any burden upon the State expenditure and, of course, it is a big one. I had this proposal costed and I was informed that to put power lines underground in existing built-up areas would cost more than \$150 million. That is an expenditure which the Premier says the State would not have to carry. I would like to know who will face the expenditure if it is to be done. So the possibility is that this promise will be broken.

Sir Charles Court: Well, we will comment in due time when the Leader of the Opposition gives us a chance to reply. We will gladly put that one right for him.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Now the next promise which the Premier found it extremely difficult to handle, in any way whatever, was to curb rates and taxes. This makes very interesting reading, and it is as follows—

We are concerned about the upward trend of rates, taxes and Government charges.

That was before the election. The Premier was concerned about the increases in rates, taxes, and charges. To elaborate, he said—

Some Government charges have risen as much as 300%, and there has been a recent extreme example of a 1400% rise affecting the price of meat.

Inflation, affecting land values, is driving up rates and taxes related to them.

This and other valuation anomalies are causing serious anomalies in taxes and charges levied against individuals.

I pause here to remark that that is jolly good stuff, is it not, when one is electioneering and one is seeking to become the Government? To tickle the ears of the people in this way and to play on the hip pocket nerve, which the Premier did without limit.

Mr Rushton: The biggest problem with rating is the subsidised road funds which the Commonwealth has fiddled with for so long.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The policy goes on—

It is also causing unfair criticism against local authorities which are still in financial trouble despite rising rates.

I will now read what the Premier said his party would do if it became the Government. It reads as follows—

We will remove land tax completely from the land under the family home—up to five acres. This land will not be added to any other land belonging to the same person, for the purpose of total land tax assessment.

We will hold a top-level inquiry into all forms of rates and taxes attached to land valuation, as a matter of urgency.

Sir Charles Court: That is right.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: As a matter of urgency!

Mr Rushton: Do not worry about that one.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The policy continues—

It will apply especially to land tax and water, sewerage, drainage and local authority rates—

The top-level inquiry was to be into all of those things.

Mr Rushton: We are meeting our promises, which the previous Government did not do for three years.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: To continue—

—and will include cases where the initial developers and occupants are unfairly treated.

Mr Rushton: That is right.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: To continue—

We will make a study of Local Government finance—

Mr Rushton: We are doing that.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: To continue—

—and hold discussions with the local authorities about their finance—

Mr Rushton: That has already commenced.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: To continue—

—and special problems—

Mr Rushton: That is happening.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: To continue—

—as well as an expanded role for Local Government.

Mr Rushton: That is so.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: To continue—

We will give local authorities aid above the level they are now receiving—

Mr Rushton: Good; you will need to await the Budget.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: To continue—

—recognising that they are as much a victim of Federal domination of finance as the States themselves.

Mr Rushton: That has been proved.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: And now comes the clincher—

We will review all taxes and charges to see what streamlining is possible to reduce irritation to the public.

Honeyed words!

Sir Charles Court: We are doing all those things.

Mr Rushton: It is not playing on anybody; just carrying out policy.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: In order to carry this out and curb taxes and charges, what have we got? The answer is that taxes and charges are at a level never before reached in this country and the Minister has the effrontery to argue that these undertakings are being carried out.

Mr Rushton: Does the Leader of the Opposition attend Cabinet meetings?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: If the Government can convince those who have to pay increased vehicle license fees that it has curbed the charges, it will be good. The Government would have to mesmerise the people to do that.

Sir Charles Court: I think the people will admit that we have done what we promised.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I repeat: taxes and charges have reached an unprecedented level. If the Opposition, before the election, had attempted to say that increases in taxes and charges were certain, if it became the Government, one can imagine what the result would have been. But, no! These were the honeyed words conveying the impression that if there was a change of Government, despite inflation, taxes and charges would be curbed.

The worst part of this misleading propaganda is that to cap it off the Premier said the improvements which he was promising would be carried out by avoiding the use of taxpayers' money.

Mr Davies: He will "dob" it in himself!

Mr T. D. Evans: That would be the day!

Mr J. T. TONKIN: This was underlined in the policy: that he would not carry out these promises with the people's tax money. Well, if anybody believed that, of course, he would believe anything. But the Premier put it forward as an election bait and kept on reiterating the promise. He now finds himself in a position of having to face very heavy expenditure, so what does he do? In the major part of His Excellency's Speech the blame is placed upon the Australian Government for the situation which exists.

Sir Charles Court: Is it not culpable?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: No, it is not.

Sir Charles Court: Good heavens! The whole of Australia is screaming its head off because the Federal Government is not prepared to face up to the issue.

Mr Jamieson: The Premier said that within six months a Liberal Government would solve all the world's problems. He said that if given an opportunity he would fix it up.

Sir Charles Court: In the face of inactivity in Canberra!

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Last evening we heard some talk about the Lamb Marketing Board and I want to say a word or two about that board because I read in the paper this morning that Mr Eckersley is accusing the Government of procrastination.

Sir Charles Court: Which is not fair.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Have you written to tell him that?

Sir Charles Court: He has been told.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: He has been told that it is not fair?

Sir Charles Court: Two Ministers have acted with commendable speed.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: To knock it out, or leave it?

Sir Charles Court: To study the report not received until the 8th July.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Well, would I be right in saying that because the Meat and Allied Trades Federation has a liberal supply of funds for the Liberal Party there is the greatest difficulty within Cabinet in getting the Country Party to agree to what the Liberals want to do; that is, to do away with the Lamb Marketing Board?

Sir Charles Court: You are on a fishing expedition. That does not happen to be correct at all.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Not much it is not.

Sir Charles Court: What is being done by the Ministers concerned is in the interests of the Lamb Marketing Board; to get rid of some matters which have been the subject of criticism by producers right through to the export trade.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Can we take it that the Lamb Marketing Board is to stay?

Sir Charles Court: We will give you the answer after Monday's meeting, but I object to the Leader of the Opposition saying things which are completely false as far as our Government is concerned. There is no conflict.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: The Premier saying it is false does not establish that it is false.

Sir Charles Court: My colleague will confirm there is no conflict in this matter.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Apparently Mr Eckersley has not yet been convinced.

Sir Charles Court: That is his business.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: It is very much his business, and also the business of the Country Party.

Sir Charles Court: What we are doing is in the interests of the Lamb Marketing Board.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I am not sure that it is in the interests of the Lamb Marketing Board.

Mr McPharlin: I would like to inform the Leader of the Opposition that the Premier and I are working in the greatest harmony at the present time.

Mr Jamieson: The Leader of the Country Party would not be capable.

Sir Charles Court: What we are doing is in the interests of the Lamb Marketing Board.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Now this Government is supposed to be the champion of private enterprise. For so many years we have heard that we, the socialists, are not concerned with private enterprise industry and that the then Opposition would put private enterprise first. Well, I just want to explain a little situation to see whether the Government has got off the track a bit.

The MTT has the right to provide buses when transport is required off the general run. If a headmaster wishes to engage a bus to take children to a certain place, he gets in touch with the MTT and makes the arrangements. The headmaster of the Mt. Pleasant Primary School wanted to take a number of children on a journey at 8.30 a.m. The headmaster was organising the outing, so he got in touch with the MTT. He was told that no bus could be provided before 9.00 a.m. As he required the bus at 8.30 a.m., the headmaster shopped around and he found that the Golden West Bus Service was prepared to supply a bus at 8.30 a.m. However, the proprietor of this bus service, knowing the situation, said to the headmaster, "You will have to tell the MTT that you are going to use my buses." So forthwith the headmaster telephoned the MTT and passed on the good news that he had been able to arrange for buses at 8.30 a.m., whereupon the MTT representative promptly said, "Well look here, we will have to provide the buses at 8.30 a.m." So that was the end of this little arrangement for a private enterprise business.

Mr Rushton: You ought to have checked out this sort of thing during your term of office. You ought to look at my representations.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: But this is a private enterprise Government.

Mr Rushton: I made my representations when we were in Opposition.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: This is not an isolated case. I can quote other instances where the MTT can provide a service when told that the Golden West Bus Service is prepared to do so. My question is this: Is the Government trying to run this small businessman out of business? Is it trying to close him up? The Government cannot put this off by saying, "We will give you the answer at Christmas."

Mr Rushton: Why didn't you try to do something while you were in office?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: This is supposed to be a private enterprise Government.

Mr Rushton: Totally hypocritical.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I knew nothing about a situation like this.

Mr Rushton: Have a look at the representations that came forward from me.

Mr Jamleson: The greatest hypocrite in the place.

Mr O'Connor: You know, of course, that if this fellow is operating and running at a loss, according to the Act we have to take the service over and pay it out.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: This is the way to make him run at a loss; this will stop him running altogether.

Mr O'Connor: Do you think he should compete in the metropolitan area and add to our present losses?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Let us look at the situation: A headmaster applies to the MTT for buses for an outing, and his request is refused. What would anyone do in these circumstances? The headmaster shops around to see whether he can get buses, and when he is successful in making arrangements he tells the MTT of this fact. The MTT then finds that it is able to provide the buses. This has happened not once but several times, and it is not good enough. If the MTT is providing these buses to ensure that Golden West does not get the business, then it is time something was done about it. If the MTT is able to provide buses at 8.30 a.m., its representatives should not say that it is impossible to provide a service before 9 o'clock.

Mr O'Connor: You have the details of this, do you?

Mr J. T. TONKIN: I have the details, and to check this out I rang the headmaster himself to ascertain the correct facts. He confirmed what I was told.

Mr O'Connor: I would appreciate your letting me have the details and I will look into it for you.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: All right.

I shall watch with interest how the Government implements its policies without using the taxpayer's money and how it

finances the very high expenditures involved without having to increase taxes to find the money. Of course it is quite impossible to do this. In order to try to escape the odium which would be heaped upon the Government for these increased taxes and charges, it is blaming the Commonwealth Government all along the line. So the Governor is called upon to deliver a Speech which in the main does nothing but blame the Commonwealth Government for the difficulties of our State. His Excellency should not have been put in the position of having to read a Speech of that kind.

A great many people believe that the Governor writes the Speech which he reads to Parliament. That is the fact, although it may surprise a great many people. To cause the Governor to deliver a Speech of that nature was to put him in a most difficult and unenviable situation, and in my opinion the Government is blameworthy for doing so.

It can find other ways to keep on blaming the Commonwealth Government such as through the Press, which is freely available to it. However, to put a Speech like that in the hands of a Governor, and to ask him to read it to Parliament is an affront to decency.

Sir Charles Court: Everyone knows the Government writes the Speech.

Amendment to Motion

Mr J. T. TONKIN: In order to illustrate what we think of the situation generally, I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the motion—

: however, we very much regret that the Government placed Your Excellency in the position of being obliged to devote most of the Speech to unfair and unwarranted criticism of the Government of the Commonwealth for the purpose of enabling it to escape the wrath of the people of this State for the savage increases in taxes and charges which it has imposed because of its need for money to finance the implementation of its extravagant election promises.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I formally second the amendment.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [6.09 p.m.]: The amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition is not unexpected. It was heralded by the Leader of the Opposition in another place, and of course, his opening remarks made it quite clear that he intended to pin his faith on an allegation that the Speech read by His Excellency was not a fair one to ask him to read. If that is the best that the Opposition can find by way of attack on the Government, it is a poor old situation.

Mr Jamieson: Also very poor to fool the Governor.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am sure the Leader of the Opposition could have looked a little further to find something better than this. Let us get the amendment in perspective. It says—

: however, we very much regret that the Government placed Your Excellency in the position of being obliged to devote most of the Speech to most unfair and unwarranted criticism of the Government of the Commonwealth . . .

Now most of a speech means more than 50 per cent of it.

Mr Jamieson: It was not a bad effort, 15 paragraphs.

Sir CHARLES COURT: In point of fact, if one analyses the Speech, this is completely wrong.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Have you counted the paragraphs?

Sir CHARLES COURT: It is a fact that the Commonwealth Government is referred to, but how can one refer to the national situation today without mentioning the Commonwealth Government?

Mr May: How do you?

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Commonwealth Government has aroused the wrath of the people of this State because it has not the slightest desire or intention to abate inflation; it has no intention of working with the States; it has a Prime Minister who is a declared centralist and who confirmed this fact in the clearest of terms to all the Premiers on the 8th June. He finds it undignified and degrading almost to have to sit there and preside over the Premiers because he has a contempt for the States. How do we deal with the situation when we have a Prime Minister and a Government like that without mentioning this fact in the course of the Governor's Speech?

I should imagine that 80 per cent if not more of the public know that the Governor reads a Speech prepared for him by the Government of the day. I remind the Leader of the Opposition of the Speeches which the Whitlam Government prepared for Sir Paul Hasluck to read when he was Governor-General. The Whitlam Government presented the first and second Governor's Speeches in its lifetime through Sir Paul Hasluck. If the Leader of the Opposition has taken exception to our Governor's Speech, he must have spat chips and been thoroughly disgusted with his counterpart in Canberra—the Leader of the Labor Party there, the Prime Minister. Not only did that Government use the Speech to get across a great deal of party political propaganda, but also it used the Speech to denigrate its predecessors by innuendo. It was a shocking example.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Did it lay the blame with the State Governments?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Again the public understood that the Governor-General was mouthing the words given to him by the Government of the day, as required by a constitutional monarchy, the system under which we work. The Leader of the Opposition knows that we come here on opening day and we assert our undoubted rights and privileges by moving without notice for leave to introduce a Bill. This tradition goes back many hundreds of years because of the fact that we are a constitutional monarchy. I have heard some of the comments that the Queen herself has had to make when various Governments have been in power in Britain. The public do not think that she is out campaigning for the Labor Party because she reads a Speech prepared by it. The public know that she is a constitutional monarch, and they know that the Governor-General and our Governor are Vice-Regal representatives of a constitutional monarch. So to say that any embarrassment was afforded to the Governor is quite fallacious. We would have been quite within our right to prepare and present a much stronger Speech than this in condemnation of the Commonwealth Government. I must say quite frankly that we broke the Speech down tremendously.

Mr Bertram: Why was that?

Sir CHARLES COURT: We could have made quite factual comments with much stronger criticism of the Commonwealth Government than appears in the Speech now. We could have done this with propriety because it was factual and when His Excellency, the Governor, presents a Speech he is presenting a Speech prepared for him by the elected Government of the day. It is as simple as that.

Mr T. H. Jones: He felt embarrassed.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am sure he was not embarrassed. He knows when he accepts the position that it is a Vice-Regal appointment in a constitutional monarchy. For instance, when he goes to Executive Council he knows that he is acting as the head of the Council appointed by Her Majesty, the Queen. He is acting on the advice of the Ministers, and if the Government of the day is a Labor Government, he acts on the Ministers' advice without question. The same thing applies with a Liberal-Country Party Government. So it is quite fallacious to try to make the public believe that the Speech was unfair to His Excellency and would have caused him any embarrassment. It was not unfair to the Governor, and the Speech was not presented to escape the wrath of the people by any means.

Mr Bertram: Why did you do it?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Because we had a duty to do it.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Mr Speaker, prior to the suspension of the sitting for tea I was commenting on the first part of the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition which seeks to add words to the Address-in-Reply. I was dealing with the part which states—

However, we very much regret that the Government placed Your Excellency in the position of being obliged to devote most of the Speech to unfair and unwarranted criticism of the Government of the Commonwealth . . .

I was explaining that under our system of a constitutional monarchy, of course, the representative of the Queen presents a Speech that is written by the Government. We make no apology for that Speech. We believe it was mild in terms of the present circumstances because we could have made it infinitely stronger. I point out that the original draft of the Speech was much stronger in its condemnation of the Commonwealth Government than was the Speech His Excellency presented to the Parliament. Circumstances change very considerably. I want to give just one simple illustration of why we had the undoubted right—the undisputed right, in my opinion—to express criticism of the Commonwealth Government; because after all it is our duty on behalf of the citizens of this State to point out those things that are serious from the State's point of view. I point out that in the Speech presented by the Governor on the 14th day of March, 1972, because of an entirely different situation in Canberra under a Liberal-Country Party Government, the then Labor Government in this State moved to express appreciation of the very generous assistance it had received. I mention just one or two of the highlights of that Speech—

Additional revenue grants from the Commonwealth, however, permit expectation of a 1971-72 deficit within the Budget estimate.

Another quotation is—

Having made special grants in December, 1971, to stimulate rural employment, and having increased them in February, 1972, the Commonwealth also agreed to a lift in the State's works and semi-governmental programme for 1971-72.

Another reference is—

As a result, the Government is pleased to announce that the Commonwealth has agreed to provide a \$2.5 million capital grant for purchase of a fourth unit-load ship to be used on the Darwin service.

A further quotation is—

The Government notes with satisfaction that its representations to the Commonwealth to increase the maximum subsidy on gold have been successful.

Yet another quotation is—

Increased Commonwealth fund allocations are available to facilitate the anticipated major increase of technical students, and the record intake of the Teachers' Colleges.

Mr T. D. Evans: This is pure courtesy that should exist between Governments. You are lacking in such courtesy.

Sir CHARLES COURT: So, Mr Speaker, I point out that the atmosphere in which the business of the State was conducted in relation to Canberra was completely different from the situation today. What happened to the Premiers—not only me—when we went to the Premiers' Conference and the Loan Council on the 8th June? The Prime Minister was adamant. He adopted perhaps the same attitude adopted by Prime Minister Gorton. He said, "There is nothing for you. You can go home and fix up your own affairs." He even took away the \$25 million supplementary grant that was given the previous year. He even took away a further \$3.5 million that the previous State Government had enjoyed for two consecutive years as a special addition to the grant received from the Commonwealth.

Mr T. D. Evans: His attitude was no different from that of John Gorton. I think the member for Greenough thought otherwise.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Well, we all know what happened to Mr John Gorton. He was not Prime Minister for long after that. We had another Prime Minister in McMahon who came to the aid of the States and was responsible for the Government of the day in Western Australia being able to say these things by way of appreciation to a Liberal-Country Party Government. So, the whole situation is so much different.

Mr T. D. Evans: McMahon was not Prime Minister for long after that, either.

Sir CHARLES COURT: So, the whole situation is completely reversed from what it was during the time of the Liberal-Country Party Government in Canberra and during the time of the Tonkin Government in Western Australia. We believe we had a responsibility to point out not only the financial limitations and disabilities that the Commonwealth had imposed on us but also its inflationary policies which I believe are deliberate. Certainly, if they are not deliberate they are just plain incompetent. I do not accept that we in Australia, because of our peculiar geographic situation and our resources position, must accept all the ills of the rest of the world. We heard a senior union leader in Australia say that this was not necessary. On top of this, we have a Commonwealth Government that is determined to do all it can to wreck

the States and bring about their demise. And, of course, we have a Labor Party that is committed to their demise.

Mr Jamieson: Nonsense! You read all sorts of things into the Constitution which do not exist.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We move on to the situation that is presented by the second part of the amendment which claims that this Government wrote this Speech "for the purpose of enabling it to escape the wrath of the people of this State for the savage increases in taxes and charges which it has imposed because of its need for money to finance implementation of its extravagant election promises". That is completely untrue. This Government is not screaming about the problems inflicted on it by the Commonwealth Government because it requires extra money to implement its policies. What it is screaming about is enough money—a fair and reasonable amount of money—to enable it to finance a Budget which flowed on from the deficit that was left us by the previous Administration. Let us look at this situation.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: What deficit is that?

Sir CHARLES COURT: When the Leader of the Opposition went out of office.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: The cash position was in balance.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Mr Speaker, I know the Leader of the Opposition does not like it, but when he—

Mr J. T. Tonkin: What I like is the truth.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am going to give it to you now; just listen. One of the last documents that he signed was one which set out that there was going to be for 1974-75—that is, the current year—a deficit of \$77.6 million from which the Treasury hoped by pruning and prudence and care to cut \$30 million and to bring it down to \$48 million.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: We left office in March this year with three months remaining in the financial year in which we left the cash in balance. What you are saying is irrelevant.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It is not irrelevant.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Of course it is.

Sir CHARLES COURT: If the Premier of the day in March before the election had done what he thinks other people should have done and what he claims other people should have done he would have come out and said to the people, "You are going to have a rough time in 1974-75. We will have a deficit of \$77.6 million."

Mr J. T. Tonkin: I said it. It will surprise you to know that I said just that.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Leader of the Opposition did not put it in the words that I will say now he should have put it.

He did not come out and say, "We are facing a deficit of something like \$77.6 million." It suited him to quote a document left in his office when Sir David Brand went out of office as Premier.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: I quoted the document that was delivered to me a few days before the election.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I have studied the Press comments in vain to find a reference to the figure of \$77.6 million or the \$48 million which was given to him by the Treasury on the 22nd March, 1974, and on which he endorsed the document, "This is a matter of the greatest possible concern."

Mr J. T. Tonkin: That is right.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I will say it was. If this was not an understatement I will eat my hat. This was the situation when our Government came in on the 8th April. This was the first document I received, just like the Leader of the Opposition received one the day he took over from Sir David Brand, to bring him up to date with the latest position.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: There is a difference, but you refuse to see it. The difference was that the document I received from Sir David Brand referred to the situation as it was then, the day I took over. You are referring to a document which refers to a period some four months after I left office. That is the difference.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Mr Speaker, I have been here a long time by comparison with some members in this Chamber and the Leader of the Opposition, of course, has been here about twice as long as that. In the entire time I have been here I have heard him say some incredible things, and this is one of them. He cannot get away from this document. He knows that he had a deficit of \$77.6 million staring him in the face.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: For what financial year?

Sir CHARLES COURT: For the 1974-75 financial year—the period we are in now.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: We left office in 1973-74. Surely you are not going to hold me responsible for what happens in 1974-75.

Sir CHARLES COURT: This is the situation that would have obtained, had the Leader of the Opposition continued as Premier. He would have had that piece of paper to work on. He would have had to go to Mr Whitlam, like I did, and say, "For goodness sake, acknowledge the situation that you have created."

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Yes, but with this difference: I would not have had to find the hundreds of millions of dollars that you must find to finance your election promises.

Sir CHARLES COURT: This is the kind of false statement the Leader of the Opposition is perpetrating. He keeps on saying it until I think he starts to believe it. When we come to bring down our Budget later in this session of Parliament, we will have to explain its contents and, no doubt, there will be arguments, discussion, and questions on its proposals.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Will not the same officers be framing it as those you accused of falsifying the accounts?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I did not accuse them of falsifying accounts. What I accused the honourable member of was not going to the people and telling them the problems so that they could understand what they would face in times ahead. It was quite unfair to expect accurate estimates of our election promises to be made by officers who were not given the proper premises on which to make their calculations. They were not given a chance to talk to the people who were putting forward the proposals.

I want to come back to the point of the 22nd March, 1974, minute again and again. We came into office and, with all the talk of the then Premier and with his challenge to the then member for Wembley, now the member for Scarborough, about his statement relating to financial affairs, we found ourselves confronted with a projected deficit of \$48 million, even after \$30 million had been pruned. But the situation today is even worse because inflation, instead of remaining at the level the Prime Minister predicted on the 8th June, has galloped away even further. So, the \$30 million overrun we put forward as an estimate of the amount we needed to find additional to the known salaries and wages increases as at the 30th June, and the amount we expected to incur progressively during this current financial year, has increased: it is already up to \$48 million and rising. So, this is the situation.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Of course it is rising. You have to pay for your promises.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It has nothing to do with promises because I remind the Leader of the Opposition of one thing: In the document upon which he wrote his famous note, the Under-Treasurer very properly said that it represented an estimate of the deficit without any regard for the election promises of either of the major parties. That was a wise attitude for him to adopt.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: You just said that inflation is still rising, four months after I left office.

Sir CHARLES COURT: This man says the most incredible things. What I said were rising were the wages and salary costs to the Government.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Yes, the costs to the Government to implement your promises.

Sir CHARLES COURT: No, these are the rises in salaries and wages based on the State Government work force as at the 30th June or, to put it another way, as at the day the Leader of the Opposition went out of office.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: No!

Sir CHARLES COURT: Yes.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: No!

Sir CHARLES COURT: It is, and if the Leader of the Opposition disputes the point I am sure the Under-Treasurer will be only too pleased to oblige by explaining that what I say is correct; because this estimate is not based upon any so-called extravagant promises or the implementation of them.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: I told you deliberately that the rate of taxation you have imposed is higher than it would otherwise be, because of the cost of implementing the promises you made.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I can tell the Leader of the Opposition that that is not so because at this point we had to go to the Commonwealth at the Premiers' Conference and say, "We are effecting economies. We are going to be frugal. We are going to be cautious in our budgeting and we are going to prune spending. We expect you to help, to save us imposing inflationary taxes and charges."

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Where are you effecting any economies—in having a highway patrol, for example?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Does the Leader of the Opposition not think that we are implementing some economies?

Mr J. T. Tonkin: No.

Sir CHARLES COURT: What about what we are doing in the Public Service in the way of increasing its efficiency and by making sure that we curtail growth through the very considerable wastage element so that we can bring its growth under control without any sacking, and so on, it hit nearly 9 per cent in the financial year just ended.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: It will be interesting at this time next year.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It will be interesting; and it will not be through any lack of effort on our part if the growth is not kept down to the figure for which we are budgeting at the present time. And this is the instruction which has gone out. Members opposite will see, when the Budget is presented, that effect will be given to this and, as I said before, it will not be on a basis of sackings. In the Public Service there is a large wastage due to age, and also to retirement for various reasons; that is, marriage, and the like. Because of that factor, just as we managed to adjust the situation in the railways without any hardship, we will do likewise in this regard. Some heartburnings will

occur in some departments, but on the other hand most people realise these situations must be reviewed from time to time.

So I reject completely the statement that the Speech presented to the Parliament by His Excellency on opening day was intended to be either an embarrassment to him or a means of covering up for the Government. The simple fact is that we have a Commonwealth Government which is in an awful mess. Look at the Prime Minister tonight fighting for his very political life within his own party. He has said that whether they like it or not the members of that party must support him over the withdrawal of the petrol subsidies in the rural areas because he gave an undertaking to the Premiers. He gave no undertaking to us that he would do this to help our budgetary position. In fact it has embarrassed us no end because it is a further impost on those in rural areas who are already slugged enough and forced to pay more freights and charges because of the actions of the Federal Government. For instance, those in country areas must pay more for superphosphate.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Here you go again. You started your speech by blaming the Federal Government and now you are concluding it in the same way the Governor's Speech commenced and concluded.

Sir CHARLES COURT: What else can we do when we must debunk the substance of the amendment? That is what the amendment is all about. It is our right and responsibility to demonstrate to the Parliament and the public that anything we said was quite mild compared with what we should have said or could have said.

The simple fact is that we have a Government with this fantastic amount of inflation and it does not seem to care. In fact it wants to take over the States and make them completely impotent. It does not want to co-operate.

I do not want to transgress. I wish to stick to the substance of the amendment because I know, Mr Speaker, that will assist you in your duties. Other members may try to transgress and deal with other matters, but I will apply my remarks entirely to the two points in the amendment.

I repeat that, when we came into office, the first document which confronted us was the one dealing with the huge deficit, for 1974-75, and with an unco-operative Commonwealth Government, I consider that the remarks made in the Speech were temperate, accurate, and thoroughly justified. I therefore oppose the amendment.

MR T. H. JONES (Collie) [7.48 p.m.]: I rise to support the amendment moved by my leader and I do so for a number of reasons. I completely disagree with the propositions the Premier has advanced in his effort to answer the argument raised in the speech made by my leader when he moved the amendment.

We must be quite clear concerning the provisions of the amendment and so, for the sake of the record, I will read it again and then give my reasons for supporting it. The amendment is quite clear and reads as follows—

However, we very much regret that the Government placed Your Excellency in the position of being obliged to devote most of the Speech to unfair and unwarranted criticism of the Government of the Commonwealth for the purpose of enabling it to escape the wrath of the people of this State for the savage increases in taxes and charges which it has imposed because of its need for money to finance the implementation of its extravagant election promises.

That is quite clear. We on this side of the House completely disagree with the arguments advanced by the members of the Government. Of course I also completely disagree with the remarks made by the Premier before he resumed his seat. He then indicated quite clearly to us that in his opinion the Speech made by His Excellency was a very mild one. As I mentioned by way of interjection prior to the tea suspension, I feel that His Excellency the Governor was placed in a very embarrassing position, to say the least.

Reference to his Speech will reveal clearly that in a number of paragraphs the blame was placed squarely on the shoulders of the Australian or Commonwealth Government for the position in which the present State Government finds itself. Of course, this is the easy way out. This will be the policy from here on as time will prove. I can envisage that at every opportunity the Premier and other members on that side of the House will try to get out from under by embarrassing the Commonwealth Government and laying the blame on it instead of accepting the responsibility themselves.

I hope that during my small contribution to this debate I will prove that the State Government had no alternative but to impose additional taxes on the people of Western Australia in order to implement its pre-election promises. It is no good the Premier saying he was not warned. We heard in the debate last night that he was warned in relation to his pre-election promises, particularly in regard to the establishment of a highway patrol, the estimated cost for which is not yet available. It will be very interesting when the Bill is before us to ascertain what the cost will be. We have already seen a variation of the policy announced by the Premier.

Mr O'Connor: No you have not.

Mr T. H. JONES: Time will reveal the true situation. The Minister indicated some time ago that a traffic authority would be established and would be divorced from the Police Department. The Minister can correct me if I am wrong,

but that is my understanding of the situation. After discussions with me in Donnybrook and Collie the Minister made it quite clear that, for reasons best known to himself as the Minister in charge of the portfolio, there would be a new highway patrol. But he then told us that it will be associated with and attached to the Police Force. Am I wrong in that statement?

Mr O'Connor: You will find out when the Bill comes before us.

Mr T. H. JONES: The Minister is not prepared either to deny or confirm the statement. The Press reports led me to the conclusion that the new authority will be attached in some way to the Police Department.

Mr O'Connor: Some of the Press statements are completely inaccurate, including the one in yesterday's paper which, strangely enough, was written by a newspaper reporter who was not even present during the whole of the debate.

Mr T. H. JONES: Let me refresh the Minister's memory because apparently he cannot remember. Can he recall that when he discussed this matter in Collie and with the Donnybrook Shire he said that there would be some reversion clause to cover transfers from the highway patrol to the Police Force itself. Can he recall having said that?

Mr O'Connor: Wait until the Bill is before us.

Mr T. H. JONES: Will the Minister deny what I have said or agree with me? Did he or did he not make that statement?

Sir Charles Court: What does it matter?

Mr O'Connor: Wait until the Bill is before us.

Mr T. H. JONES: The Minister is baiting me. Did he or did he not make that statement?

Mr O'Neill: I thought you were talking to the Speaker.

Mr T. H. JONES: I apologise to you, Mr Speaker. I am answering the interjector who was not called to order. I was invited by the Minister to speak so I took the opportunity available to me, as undoubtedly he would have done had he been placed in a similar position, to answer the allegations made. If my memory serves me correctly—and when the legislation is before the House we will see who is right, the Minister or I—the Minister told the Donnybrook Shire and also the Collie Shire that there would be reversion clauses in the legislation provided the approval of the Commissioner of Police was obtained. If the Minister says I am wrong I will check with the local authority and the Donnybrook Shire to see whether their representatives recall that the Minister made a statement along those lines.

Mr O'Connor: I am not saying you are wrong. I am asking you to wait until the Bill is before us.

Mr T. H. JONES: Now the Minister is changing his attitude.

Mr O'Connor: No I am not.

Mr T. H. JONES: In his remarks the Premier indicated that the Commonwealth Government was setting out on a policy to embarrass the State Government. I think that is a lot of nonsense to say the least.

Sir Charles Court: To get rid of the States altogether!

Mr T. H. JONES: During the last session what did we hear in this House? We heard repeated over and over again the two words "centralism" and "socialism". Members on the other side of the House who were then on this side were like parrots. The present Premier had them so regimented that each of his supporters who spoke referred to nothing else but centralism and socialism. That is all I heard. I am sure the *Hansard* reporters became sick of writing the words because they heard them so often.

All we heard about was centralism, socialism, and that big bogey in the eastern parts of Australia. That statement cannot be denied by any member on the other side of the House, even the member for Scarborough who I see is laughing. He also referred to centralism and socialism.

Mr Young: That is all we were getting in those days.

Mr T. H. JONES: I suggest that the member for Scarborough should look at *Hansard*; if he does he will clearly ascertain what the situation was.

Mr Sibson: At least you have admitted that the big bogey exists.

Mr T. H. JONES: We have livened up the members opposite. They have been very quiet until now but we are drawing a little fire at last. Members opposite have been so regimented that we have not heard a whisper until now.

Mr McPharlin: What about your back-benchers?

Mr Jamieson: Go back to Mt. Marshall you great pooh-bah!

Mr T. H. JONES: The then member for Mt. Marshall stated that he would invite me to a wedding.

Mr McPharlin: You were very quiet when you were on the back bench.

Mr T. H. JONES: If the member for Mt. Marshall will look at *Hansard* he will see that he invited me to a wedding.

Mr McPharlin: We never heard the back-benchers when you were over here.

Mr T. H. JONES: The Minister did not even invite me to the divorce proceedings. How honest is he? Firstly he invited me to a wedding and then when the divorce occurred he did not even invite me to that.

Mr Jamieson: They only lived de facto.

Mr McPharlin: There was no wedding, so how could there be a divorce?

Mr Jamieson: No! You lived de facto for a while.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Collie is making the contribution.

Mr T. H. JONES: We did not know whether the wedding took place.

Mr Jamieson: They were living in sin.

Mr T. H. JONES: Some people were working for the cause of the National Alliance and some for the cause of the Country Party.

Mr McPharlin: It was a fact that the DLP divorced the Labor Party.

Mr T. H. JONES: The Minister cannot get away with that one.

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the honourable member resume his speech.

Mr T. H. JONES: Yes, Sir. These interjections cannot go unanswered as you will appreciate.

Sir Charles Court: It would not be a bad idea if you talked to the amendment for a change.

Mr T. H. JONES: I accept your suggestion, Mr Speaker. I think you were very easy with me and I will be co-operative to the utmost. I have said what I wanted to say.

Getting back to the amendment and the position in which His Excellency found himself, it cannot be denied that many impositions have been placed on taxpayers, and especially pensioners. The reason, of course, is that the Government now finds that it cannot honour its pre-election promises.

Sir Charles Court: Who said that?

Mr T. H. JONES: It had no—

Mr Young: That is what the Leader of the Opposition said when he became Premier; not the present Premier.

Mr T. H. JONES: The member for Scarborough can make his own speech and should let me make mine. The Premier has clearly indicated that the Government has found itself in this very embarrassing position.

Sir Charles Court: That is not because of our promises. It is because of the situation in which the Labor Government left the Treasury.

Mr T. H. JONES: Now the Government is blaming the Australian or Commonwealth Government for the position in which it finds itself. Time will tell who is to blame. I am looking forward to the Budget and I am wondering how many more times we will hear the same question raised during the session.

Sir Charles Court: Have you heard Mr Dunstan in action lately?

Mr T. H. JONES: I heard him about three weeks ago.

Sir Charles Court: Have you heard him speak about the actions of the Federal Government concerning Consolidated Revenue and road funds?

Mr Davies: I think he said that Gough Whitlam was the greatest Prime Minister Australia has ever had.

Mr Coyne: That was three weeks ago. He has changed his mind since then.

Mr Sibson: That is not what Caucus said.

Mr T. H. JONES: Members opposite are very vocal. What did they do during the tea suspension?

Mr Blaikie: We are giving some padding to your speech.

Mr T. H. JONES: Before all the interjections, I was about to indicate the impositions on pensioners and people generally by the Court Government in a very short space of time.

For the sake of the record I want to mention briefly some of the taxes that have been imposed. They are quoted in the amendment moved by my leader. First of all, on the 19th June, a short time after the Government was elected, it was announced that fares and freights would cost more—a 30 per cent increase. The Premier said a moment ago that many of these impositions were brought about by increased wages. We hear that so often. The increased freights to the northern part of the State are not brought about as a result of increased wages; they are simply increased freight charges to people living in the northern areas of the State.

I quote briefly from an article which appeared in this evening's issue of the *Daily News*—

Freight skyrockets prices in north.

People were being penalised for living in the North, the secretary of the Port Hedland Chamber of Commerce, Mr Pat Richardson, said yesterday.

He said: "Decentralisation has virtually become a dead word."

He commented on the 30 per cent freight rise which would result in spiralling costs. He said a loaf of bread had increased from 39c to 42c and was expected to rise to 50c. A cucumber now costs 45c. I will not read the entire article but reference to it will indicate the plight in which the people in the north of the State find themselves. The Whitlam Government cannot be blamed for these increases; they are increases directly imposed by the Court Government.

Sir Charles Court: Why did we have to put up the freights?

Mr T. H. JONES: It is quite obvious. The Premier knows the answer. It was necessary in order to meet his election promises.

On the 20th June it was announced that cartage rates would increase, and the biggest increase would be for furniture removal, amounting to 34.9 per cent. That announcement was made by the Western Australian Road Transport Association. The increase which will make the biggest impact on the taxpayers of Western Australia was mentioned in *The West Australian* on the 21st June, when it was stated—

SGIO car insurance up 25 per cent.

It must be remembered that was on the 21st June. Another blow to the taxpayers in Western Australia, generally, was a big increase in sewerage and water rates announced in *The West Australian* on the 22nd June, 1974, in the following terms—

The new rates and charges announced yesterday show that residential water rates will rise by 11.1 per cent and sewerage rates by 25.8 per cent.

That clearly shows what the people can expect from the Court Administration. *The West Australian* on the 1st July stated—

New year—on the up and up

The new financial year starts today with a series of price rises. They include:

Dentists' fees (eight per cent increase).

Bricks (nine per cent).

Water and sewerage rates (37 per cent average).

Interstate rail fares (13½ per cent average).

Gun licence fees (50 per cent—from \$2 to \$3).

That is a clear indication of the burden being placed on the working people of Western Australia.

As a result of the additional charges, costs have soared in other directions. Panel beaters have been forced to increase their charges from \$2.50 to \$7.50 an hour. People in the low wage brackets were stunned by a figure which appeared in *The West Australian* on the 10th July, this year, when it was stated—

SHC rents, interest up

Rents will rise by between \$1 and \$3.45 a week but will not apply to all SHC tenants.

Increased rents for pensioners will be met by the allowance made by the Australian or Commonwealth Government.

Mr O'Neill: There is no allowance at all by the Australian or Commonwealth Government.

Mr T. H. JONES: I am speaking about allowances. The Minister knows the provisions of the Pensions Act as well as I do.

Mr O'Neill: It does not subsidise any rents at all. Subsidies are carried by the State Housing Commission and nobody else—not even the State Treasury.

Mr T. H. JONES: It might apply indirectly.

Mr O'Neill: You are talking through your hat.

Mr T. H. JONES: I am glad the Minister is so vocal. He has been so quiet that I did not know he was here. I do not know what I am saying to upset everyone but I have to take on everyone at once. Members on the Government side have been very vocal since the tea suspension.

I have yet to make my main point, in relation to a matter for which I charge the Liberal Government with full responsibility over the years. I refer to the increase in State Electricity Commission charges. It cannot be denied that successive Liberal Governments are responsible for the increase in the price of electricity in this State. The policy of the Liberal Government in relation to Kwinana has been proved to be wrong, and I challenge anyone on the other side of the House to refute what I said when I moved in 1970 for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the State Electricity Commission. Everything I said has been proved to be correct; the chickens have come home to roost. I wonder whether any member on the other side of the House who was a member of the Liberal Government at the time can tell me why the Kwinana power station was ever built. Why was the Kwinana power station built? Can anyone tell me?

It is quite clear to me that the Government entered into an agreement with the oil companies without knowing what the future position would be, not only in relation to supply but also in relation to price. This has been proved, and the member for Bunbury can try to deny it. He knows the story. He was once a coal miner at Collie and he knows how we struggled. If he is honest he will admit the Opposition at that time was justified in opposing with the Brand Government in 1967 not to double the size of the oil-burning power station at Kwinana.

Our pleas fell on deaf ears, and today the State Electricity Commission is forced to change back to coal; it has no alternative. If my information is correct the price of fuel oil today is \$54 a tonne. The Minister for Electricity, Fuel and Energy will be concerned when he renegotiates the oil agreement this year. I want to know why the Brand Government ever agreed to build the Kwinana power station when it had no guarantee in relation to the supply or price of oil. It placed itself in the hands of the oil combines, and that cannot be denied.

Sir Charles Court: It reduced the price of power three times in its existence.

Mr T. H. JONES: I will come to that.

Mr Mensaros: You did not tell us at that time that there would be a crisis with the Arabs. We might have listened to you.

Mr T. H. JONES: I cannot hear what the Minister is saying. It cannot be denied that this is the situation. The Minister has made public statements that he finds himself in the position that there is no alternative. The present Leader of the Opposition warned that this would happen. On the 14th June, 1967, he is quoted as saying—

Tonkin asks Government to delay decision over fuel.

Of course, the Miners' Union, when I was secretary of it, pleaded with the Brand Government not to double the capacity of the oil-burning power station at Kwinana for the reasons stated when I moved for the appointment of a Royal Commission. Somebody should be reprimanded. Either the Government misinformed somebody or somebody in the State Electricity Commission misinformed the Government.

Stupid theories were held about the reserves of coal at Collie. In November, 1964, the then Minister for Electricity said there were 30 years left for coal at Collie. What a stupid statement that has proved to be! I recall that the Manager of the State Electricity Commission at that time (Mr Jukes) said there would not be enough water in Collie. That is another statement which has been disproved.

Sir Charles Court: Are you telling us we overstated the Collie reserves?

Mr T. H. JONES: I am telling the Premier what his Government said. I was not running the State Electricity Commission at that time. Had I been doing so, we might not be in the mess we are in today. The Premier well knows that in 1964 the Minister (Mr Crawford Nalder) said there were 30 years left for Collie. What happened? The South-West Conference, the unions, and the townspeople in Collie asked the Government to introduce a comprehensive boring programme, and all the pleas fell on deaf ears. The programme initiated by the Tonkin Government, in conjunction with Peabody Coal of America and Western Collieries Ltd., revealed that the extractable reserves of coal at Collie were in excess of 282 million tonnes. It will therefore be clearly seen that the increased charges are brought about by the short-sighted policies of the Ministers on the other side of the House. The blame cannot be attached to the Australian Government. An inquiry should be conducted to find out who was responsible. The Kwinana refinery was not required to pay any wharfage charges.

Sir Charles Court: What has that to do with it?

Mr T. H. JONES: Had the State received the revenue which other organisations and businesses were paying into

State coffers, we might not be in the position we are in today. On the 8th August, 1972, in a question directed to the Treasurer, I asked whether BP was paying wharfage charges from 1955 to 1972, and what amount it had paid to the State, and the answer was "No". The figure up to that time was \$94 930 932.30. That is not a bad whack. How would that look in the coffers of the State today? That is only the figure up to 1972, and it is now outdated; but between 1955 and 1972 the State would have had access to an additional \$94 million if BP had been required to pay wharfage charges. I do not wish to say any more about coal tonight.

Sir Charles Court: The State would not have had that because there would not have been a refinery.

Mr T. H. JONES: We have only the Premier's word for that.

Sir Charles Court: They would not have entered into it under any circumstances.

Mr Jamieson: You were conned into that.

Mr T. H. JONES: The Government entered into an agreement not to disclose the price of fuel oil. I hope the present Minister will not fall for that when new contracts are being negotiated, because it amounts to unfair competition. Oil companies know the price of coal but coal companies cannot find out the price of oil. Is that competition? The Government prides itself on its free-enterprise policy, but it entered into an agreement with the oil companies that no Government would reveal the price of oil. It tied its own hands and the hands of our Government. A great deal of secrecy surrounded this deal.

Mr McPharlin: Do you know the price of oil?

Mr T. H. JONES: I understand from reliable sources that it is \$54 a tonne. I am glad the Deputy Premier reminded me of that. We have recently had a calculation made by the experts in the mining industry, and the situation today is that, on heating value, coal delivered into the Muja power station at Collie is one-third of the price which the SEC is paying for oil.

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member is allowing the interjections to lead him too far astray.

Mr T. H. JONES: It was a good interjection. Mr Speaker, because it brought me back to what I wanted to say. I was very glad the Deputy Premier interjected and brought me back into line. The Minister can try to refute these figures, but this is the position in which the State now finds itself. For this reason we are now turning back to "Old King Coal".

The State will have to rely on "Old King Coal" for many years to come. We were a forgotten race in Collie, but now we are expecting large tonnages of coal to be

produced, there has been a change of policy back to the usage of coal and no doubt someone is responsible for this. I wish someone would own up to the mess in which the power authorities in this State have been placed. The whole thing is a shambles and someone ought to be condemned.

Hundreds of workers have been put out of work, and hundreds have lost their homes in Collie; it has been necessary for them to accept lower paid jobs. Now, however, the situation is returning to its true perspective. What has happened should never have occurred and I am glad to say that coal is now being used instead of oil.

Mr Sibson: The reason for this was the uncertainty of the supply of coal out of Collie.

Mr T. H. JONES: The member for Bunbury knows very well that he was responsible for stop-work meetings when the transport association was attempting to have coverage in the coal mining industry—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask members to keep to the amendment.

Point of Order

Mr SIBSON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I ask that the member for Collie withdraw his statement that I led stop-work meetings in Collie.

The SPEAKER: I would like the member for Bunbury to restate what he takes exception to.

Mr T. H. Jones: I did not say that.

Mr SIBSON: As I understand it the member for Collie said, "The member for Bunbury would remember having led stop-work meetings on Collie coal."

The SPEAKER: Perhaps the member for Collie will explain what he did say.

Mr T. H. JONES: Certainly, Mr Speaker. I am sure *Hansard* will prove what I said. I am not a betting man but I will bet that I did not say what the member for Bunbury has taken exception to. I mentioned the transport association and certain stoppages.

Mr. Sibson: I asked for that statement to be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: I find it hard to adjudicate whether there should be a withdrawal. However, the member for Bunbury finds the words offensive and perhaps the member for Collie might consider either withdrawing them or saying he had no intention of offending the honourable member.

Mr T. H. JONES: May I explain the situation. I did not say it deliberately against the member for Bunbury. However, he would know as well as I that a group was formed on the Collie coalfield which was an owner-driver association and the member

for Bunbury was one of the instigators of this association. There were a number of stoppages on the coalfields as a result of the coalmining award in which the member for Bunbury took a prominent part on behalf of the transport association. I withdraw the former statement if the member for Bunbury wishes me to do so but the matter is recorded and the situation is known; and the honourable member cannot deny it.

Mr SIBSON: I asked for that statement to be withdrawn. There is nowhere on record that this can be proven. The only time I was involved in such a situation was once or twice when we appealed for better roads in the Muja open cut.

The SPEAKER: I feel the explanation made by the member for Collie that he is prepared to withdraw the former statement has been misunderstood and I accept this.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

Mr T. H. JONES: I do not wish to take up any more of the time of the House in relation to this matter. In conclusion I say the amendment moved by my leader has my full support. Time alone will tell how many of the present Government's policies will be implemented. It is no good the Government continuing to blame the Whitlam Government for the steps it has taken and for the policies it has implemented to combat inflation.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [8.20 p.m.]: I, too, would like to support the amendment moved by my leader. Before doing so, however, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the 15 new members who were elected to the Assembly Chamber. It would be insincere of me if I wished their stay was a long one, but I am sincere when I say that I hope it will be a happy one.

In supporting my leader's remarks I stress that I join with him in stating that the criticism the Government made was unfair and in fact unwarranted. The Leader of the Opposition has explained the reasons for inflation as he saw them. I do not think he went far enough, however, and I would like to elaborate on his statements. He did go into the intricacies of international finance and the complexities that result from the reactions and inter-reactions of the monetary systems throughout the world.

I do think we should have looked at the Whitlam Government's inheritance, because it is from this that many of his actions have stemmed, together with the effect that these have had on all the States, including our own.

It is, however, also important to try to gauge the level of consequences from these causes. In the first instance there was the

neglect of previous Governments over a period of 23 years which allowed inflationary pressures to build up.

Sir Charles Court: Over 23 years they averaged 2½ per cent. They never went to their present level.

Mr. H. D. EVANS: If I could proceed a little further, I would point out that these pressures had steadily built up, and now I refer to the mineral boom, to the rural boom as it occurred, and also to the investments from overseas—the tremendous amounts of finance which affected the liquidity of this country to a marked degree. Foreign capital of a speculative kind was poured into Australia at various levels making control difficult. Variations in foreign investment of \$500 million and \$1 900 million in successive years made it impossible to maintain stability in the economy of this State.

There was no effort on the part of Governments to take the necessary action and so the stability of the economy was jeopardised in this way.

Sir Charles Court: What was the rate of inflation during the mineral boom?

Mr H. D. EVANS: Some of this investment was caused by the need to revalue; and speculators sought the appreciation of money this would bring; even this was left for a considerable length of time after action should have been taken; and, as a consequence, when revaluation did take place it was too late for it to have the desired effect. Revaluation was not done early enough to achieve the desired effect in the economy.

I point also to the movement of the American economy which did have a fringe or peripheral effect on the Australian economy; and though it was minor in its impact it was nevertheless a contributing factor to some of the other circumstances which justified and demanded reorientation to some degree.

I refer to the major imbalance and problems of the overpopulous areas of Australia which represented commitments with Governments which had been neglected for years before the Whitlam Government came into office. Might I point to the Henderson report on poverty; it is an interim report which came out on the 1st March. This in itself is sufficient to indicate the degree and magnitude of poverty which exists in Australia at a level which is intolerable in an affluent country such as ours.

The Henderson Commission was ordered to investigate poverty in Australia. It got the Bureau of Statistics to undertake a survey to examine income and poverty levels throughout the nation. The results of the bureau's survey are illuminating to say the least. The commission adopted a very severe standard when judging poverty, and the standard followed the principle of income in relation to the family that income had to support.

It is obvious that an income of \$60 a week while being adequate for a single man is certainly not adequate when a large family becomes involved.

The poverty line in August, 1973, for a couple with two children, but with the wife not working, was set at \$62.70. That is for a wife, husband, and two children. Those below this austere amount contained in the report were termed "very poor", and those less than 20 per cent above it were considered "rather poor". Other incomes were graded comparably to this yardstick.

It is interesting to note that the highest levels of poverty did not exist in the major cities as we might expect; they existed in the country areas, and it was shown that 14 per cent of rural dwellers—and this excludes farmers—fell below the poverty line, and 10.8 per cent were categorised as "rather poor".

The total percentage of income units below the poverty line throughout Australia was 12.5 per cent, with a further 8.1 per cent in the "rather poor" class.

So we have the astonishing situation of one-fifth of the total income units in Australia being categorised as "very poor" or "rather poor".

The Western Australian figure is above the Australian average. I would point out that 14 per cent of the wage-earner units are below the poverty line and an additional 6.9 per cent in the "rather poor" category and this raises the total in the two groupings to 20.9 per cent, as distinct from the Australian average of 20.6 per cent; and we are still talking about one-fifth of the community.

The commission of inquiry recognised that many far-reaching reforms would be required to eradicate poverty completely. The commission did bring down a series of 12 recommendations which could be implemented rather rapidly and which would bring the greatest amount of relief to the areas where the need was greatest. These recommendations were brought down and acted upon to a fairly large degree. They involved quite a number of increased payments. The recommendations include an increase in the weekly child endowment payments; the removal of taxation deduction for dependent children; an increase in basic pensions and allowances; increased benefits to fatherless families; increased supplementary assistance, and matters of that kind.

The essential realisation of the report to which I have referred is of course the magnitude and extent of poverty as it does exist, and the need that it should be acted upon, together with the fact that it had not been acted upon until the Whitlam Government came into office.

The major problem, however, which faced and is still facing the Government of Australia is that of large cities. It is

the problem of large cities, not the problems in the cities, and this probably needs some elaboration.

It is incongruous that we should tend to look upon ourselves as having grown up with a mythical national identity based on our traditions of the skies, the seas, far distant brown lands, and the comparable sort of individual, while at the same time finding ourselves in the situation of being, in fact, the most highly urbanised country in the world.

For example, in 1911 some 58 per cent of Australians lived in centres of more than 1 000 people. By 1961 this had increased to 82 per cent; by 1966 there was a further increase to 83.5 per cent who lived in such centres; and the census in 1971 showed that 85 per cent of Australians were urban dwellers. In 1980 it will presumably be somewhere in the vicinity of 90 per cent. Comparable figures for other countries are as follows—

| | Per cent |
|----------------------|----------|
| Britain | 82 |
| USA and Canada | 75 |
| Japan | 65 |

Further, 76 per cent of all Australians live in cities of more than 10 000 people, and 72 per cent live in cities of more than 20 000 people. It can be readily presumed that Australian cities are no different from, and have no exemption from the problems which beset the major cities in North America, Europe, and Asia. Our cities face all the worst problems of those metropolises, with the exception perhaps of the overt racial problems. But if we talk about the problems of cities, of course, we miss the point. Cities are the problem, because there is not one aspect of our national life that can be discussed in political, economic, or social terms without referring to it in this urban context.

Education, health, transport, social welfare, immigration, Commonwealth-State relations—in fact, the whole gamut of problems—are of course essentially part of the urban problem, and no problem can be resolved without seeing it in this light and looking at it as part of the overall difficulty.

The interlocking nature of our national problems can be readily demonstrated, in the first instance, if we turn to the question of transport and the matter of farm costs in relation to transport. It must be remembered here that our great cities are also our great ports, and it has been calculated that 30 per cent of rural transport costs are incurred in the last few miles of their journey to the port. This is what cities mean to the rural producer.

Sir Charles Court: Has this anything to do with the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr H. D. EVANS: It has everything to do with the amendment.

Mr O'Neil: Have you read the amendment?

Mr H. D. EVANS: Let us have a look at it.

Mr O'Neil: It is about time you did.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The exact wording refers to the unwarranted criticism of the Government of the Commonwealth. I am demonstrating that that criticism is unfair and unjust, because although the actions which have been forced upon the Commonwealth by the neglect of 23 years must have brought about some reactions, those reactions in this State are not responsible for our difficulties to the extent that the State Government is trying to claim they are. I am demonstrating the problems and the actions that had to be taken; and I will go on to show how the actions of the State Government in raising charges so vigorously cannot be justified.

Mr McPharlin: Are you justifying the actions of the Federal Government?

Mr H. D. EVANS: I am indicating the problems in respect of which the Commonwealth Government was forced to act as a result of the neglect of the previous Government and of the morass of the cities which had to be resolved for a start. This is just one aspect; and I will proceed from that to the economy and other matters.

Mr McPharlin: It had to penalise country people.

Mr H. D. EVANS: If I may proceed: I was referring to the interlocking nature of the problems of the economy, and I cited the fact that 30 per cent of rural transport costs are incurred in the last few miles to the port.

Now, it can also be shown that the congestion of traffic has increased costs to a marked degree. We hear anguished cries against suggestions that the hours of transport workers should be reduced; but we hear nothing at all in relation to the fact that the rate of travel in a city like Sydney has been reduced by half in a decade. So we have this tremendous capitalisation of machinery—of wheeled vehicles which have had their performance reduced by half; and the effectiveness of the manpower which operates them has been reduced. The cost of this to the nation must be rather staggering. So the effective hours which machines and men can work are being reduced not by legislation or by arbitration, but by the sheer physical compulsion of our great cities. This indicates the need for something to be done to alleviate the problem.

The urban problems of Perth which accompanied the mineral boom were directly attributable to that boom which was, of course, beneficial to the whole of Australia; yet it was Perth which, in many cases, had to foot the costs of development. I point out one further instance of the interlocking nature of the problems of our economy; that is, the shortages at the

present time particularly in regard to steel and allied products, of which capital was made politically. It can be shown that at the time of the great rural depression three years ago BHP found it had to seek markets by way of contracts outside Australia. Today it must still honour those contracts and so steel is being exported. As a consequence, with the improved conditions in rural areas there is now a shortage of fence posts and wire. BHP is manufacturing greater quantities of wire than it did previously, but it still cannot achieve maximum production of such lines because it must honour contracts it entered into during the rural depression, and so it cannot meet completely the demand on the home market.

This is the sort of interrelationship of factors regarding the economy with which we are faced, and it demonstrates clearly how the rural dweller cannot exist without his city counterpart, and how the city dweller cannot exist without the rural population. The economy of the country is so closely interwoven that the destinies of all sections are tied up in the one economic basket.

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member's generalisations should be related specifically to the amendment.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Yes, Mr Speaker. I appreciate your tolerance, and I will come back to the specifics.

The SPEAKER: I hope you will do so fairly quickly because we must keep to the amendment.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Thank you, Mr Speaker; I will do so immediately. However, I think it should be pointed out that there comes a point where it is just not economical to continue with a city once it reaches a certain size.

The SPEAKER: I cannot see how this applies to the unfair and unwarranted criticisms as made in the Governor's Speech. Anyway, develop your theme first. I just want to point out that you are getting somewhat tenuous in your comparisons.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I appreciate that, Sir, and I certainly will not transgress. However, the essential point of the criticism is that the problems which have been forced upon the Australian Government have resulted in the necessity to take action in many ways. The social injustice which was caused by the problems of the cities and the morass the Australian Government inherited had to be acted upon; and the need to clean up the major cities of Australia for economic reasons if for no other reason, of course, involves the Government in a great deal of cost and a redirection of resources. That is the essential point I make.

The Australian Government was forced to move in this regard, and yet it is criticised by the present State Government, which is trying to blame the increased

charges it is levying on the action of the Commonwealth Government. To say the least, that is grossly unfair. It will be many years before the problem of the great cities is resolved, so vast is its magnitude. This is the point we must realise. We must realise that we cannot afford the cost of great cities. We reach the stage where it is just not economical to increase the size of cities.

The cost of installing a telephone in Perth is something of the order of \$1 300. In Melbourne it is \$1 100, whilst in Canberra it is \$650. The basic cost of running a car in the city has increased tremendously, and economists have established that traffic congestion generated by one additional resident—this is staggering—means an added expenditure of \$63 in Sydney, \$4 in Wollongong, and 20c in Wagga. This is the extra cost generated by only one additional resident to a city.

When we are considering a city of the size of Sydney or Melbourne the cost of providing public services to one single resident costs in the order of \$10 000. Therefore in the long run it is inevitable that we must have smaller cities established in developing centres. So it must be recognised that the programme the Commonwealth Government embarked upon is indeed a most worthy one, though regional growth centres will cost many millions of dollars.

It may be considered devious to outline other costs in adding one single resident to a large city in terms of national health, community welfare, and happiness, but in doing so I am sure I would be testing your patience too far, Mr Speaker. Nevertheless this is something that has to be realised and considered when making an overall approach to solving the problem.

I would also point to the tremendous progress that is being made with our system of education and the steps that have already been taken as a result of the recommendations of the Karmel committee which involve the expenditure of many millions of dollars. Already \$11.4 million has been allocated to non-Government schools that are eligible for the provision of school buildings. This is another indication of the neglect that was shown by the previous Commonwealth Government, the results of which were inherited by the Whitlam Government and which brought about a need for the redirection of resources by that Government. These results, of course, were coupled to the inflationary pressures that had been allowed to build up without any action being taken to solve the problem.

Sir Charles Court: You are not on that again, are you? What was the rate of inflation when the Whitlam Government went into office?

Mr H. D. EVANS: The figures will show—

Sir Charles Court: You have got your base completely over apex. What was the rate of inflation before the Whitlam Government went into power?

Mr H. D. EVANS: The fact was that inflation was allowed to manifest itself and the Whitlam Government reaped the harvest of wild oats it did not deserve. The seeds of inflation were nurtured for 23 years.

On the subject of education the programme that was recommended by the Karmel committee will cost hundreds of millions of dollars, but this is one area in which progress has already been made.

I reiterate the point made by the Leader of the Opposition; namely, that the charges introduced by the present State Government will be a terrific burden on the taxpayers of this State and, as a consequence, there will be an inevitable, tremendous rise in the cost of living, especially to the people residing in the north when they have to bear the large freight increases. In saying this we must bear in mind that the members of the present Government could not have been surpassed by any strong critic of the Tonkin Government when it sought to make increases in charges of any kind. I would add further that the increases in freight rates will affect other rural dwellers and other industries and the effects of such increases will be alarming, to say the least.

It is difficult to define how many of these increases are justified and how many of the increases have simply been made to meet the cost of the promises that were made by members of the Government during the last election. To define this specifically would be most difficult, but undoubtedly there is a large element of doubt in regard to this question. I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [8.45 p.m.]: You would not blame me, Mr Speaker, if I read again the precise wording of the amendment, but instead I will create a datum peg by bovrilising the essential parts of it. I commence by saying that having analysed the amendment I find myself in complete agreement with the Leader of the Opposition as he has analysed it and I have come down on the side which believes that there are two parts to it.

Firstly, the Government of the day stands to be criticised for subjecting His Excellency the Governor to reading a Speech much of which was devoted to unfair and unwarranted criticism of the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia in order to create a smokescreen behind which the present State Government seeks to hide. In fact, it seeks to avoid the continued criticism that should be levelled against it for the extravagant election promises that were made and which the Government feels obliged it must honour in at least some form.

As you know, Mr Speaker, this is my nineteenth year in this Parliament. Including yourself, there are some members in this House who have a few grey hairs who will support what I am about to say. In fact, some of them were members of this House before I entered it, but there are not too many of them.

For the greater part of the 19 years I sat in Opposition on this side of the House, the Government of the day was led by the respected member for Greenough, and for 12 years I followed my colleagues to another place on opening day to hear various Speeches prepared by the Leader of the Government at that time—that is, the member for Greenough—and delivered by two separate Governors other than the present incumbent. During all that time I can honestly say that on not one of those occasions did I hear a Speech that was so diabolical and so full of political diatribe as that which I was subjected to listen to last week.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Hear, hear!

Mr T. D. EVANS: I feel that this was an imposition on the representative of Her Majesty the Queen and, in fact, I think it was an insult. I consider I would not do justice to the person responsible for the preparation of previous Speeches if I did not refer to him again, and that person is the member for Greenough. During the 12 years he served as Leader of the Government he followed the fine principles of tradition when preparing the Governor's Speech.

With the present Government, with the same political complexion as that of the member for Greenough, we have seen shattered those fine principles that were followed in the past. The references that were made in the Governor's Speech on the opening of this Parliament by the representative of Her Majesty the Queen were not only an insult to the Governor himself, but also to the Leader of the Opposition.

I am sure the member for Greenough would not feel proud of the fact that the Governor was subjected to read a Speech of the calibre of the one that I now hold in my hand.

The other portion of the amendment points out the rationale behind the Speech, apart from the political hatred of the Australian Government. It is designed to set up a smokescreen behind which this Government can hide from the chickens which should come home to roost from its expensive, extravagant, and—I dare to say—ill-conceived policies, some of which I am sure—and I refer to the education policies—had no real thought behind them. I refer to that part of the education policy—I know you will not let me go too far on this, Mr Speaker—which states

that the Government would, on a compulsory basis, bring into the secondary school the primary school child who had reached the end of his 11th year.

I point out that in 1959 the former Director-General of Education (Mr Dettman) delivered a report into the hands of the then Minister for Education in the Brand Government (Mr Lewis). In that report the Dettman committee strongly recommended the retention of 12-year-olds in the primary school and not their transfer to secondary school level. However, I must come back to the amendment and to the point I was making concerning the education policies. They are not only extravagant and ill-conceived, but they also have no educational merit in any respect.

As I have said, these unwarranted, unjust, and untrue attacks on the Australian Government—and I can refer to at least two paragraphs on page 2 of the printed copy of the Speech which meet those qualifications—are designed deliberately to set up a smokescreen.

I can recall that during each of the three years of the Tonkin Government it was trenchantly criticised by the then Opposition members who now comprise the Government, for increasing the charges and also for the manner in which they were increased, and the timing. I emphasise the criticism concerning the timing of the increased charges. We were told it was wrong for us to make the increases outside the climate created by the introduction of the Budget. We were told that all the increases should have been announced within the Budget and discussed within the totality of it. As I have said, we were thoroughly criticised, but what is the position now?

We find that we are faced with increased water charges; increased rail fares and freights some of which are already applying and some of which will apply as from tomorrow; motor vehicle registration fees are to be increased; and tomorrow the State Battery charges will be increased by 200 per cent. I am glad you did not fall from your Chair, Mr Speaker, although I thought you might when you heard that figure. Those charges are to operate from tomorrow, and yet I can recall the present Premier going to the goldfields last year in some form of masquerade. He could not get there quickly enough to take the mining fraternity by the hand and say, "I am here as your friend. I will treat you with kid gloves. We will befriend you against this unkind Commonwealth Government."

Mr McPharlin: We were forced to do it.

Mr T. D. EVANS: I make the point, and the Premier might be quick to make a note of it, that I agree that at the present time the goldmining industry is heavily dependent on the prospectors who face uncertain times. They still do not know,

outside the climate of the Budget to be introduced by the Australian Government, whether, in fact, profits made by mining ventures are to be taxed. Yet, in this climate of uncertainty, against the promise made by the Leader of the Opposition as he was then—he is now the Premier—that their need was a delicate one and that they had to be treated with kid gloves, we find that tomorrow prospectors are to be subjected to a 200 per cent increase in charges made by State Batteries.

Sir Charles Court: Can you remember the way your Government increased, was it inspection fees, by 1 000 per cent?

Mr T. D. EVANS: I am sure you will allow me to answer that interjection Mr Speaker, although it is not covered by the context of the amendment. I used that very point as an illustration at a meeting I recently attended in Kalgoorlie when prospectors were protesting about the action taken by the Government and the inconsistency demonstrated by it. I made the point that when I had the brief but great honour of being the Treasurer of the State the task fell to me to introduce a Budget in which mineral claims and charges for other mining tenements were increased; and the present Minister for Labour will recall this.

However, that was at a time when speculation in such mineral claims and other mining tenements was at a high pitch and when those involved were producing, in fact, very little except large bundles of transfers at the Mines Department. History shows that since the mining boom very few mining transactions have blossomed into mines. I can refer to Poseidon, Scotia, and Widgeemooltha where there is a promise of a mine; but very little else. Consequently the Government of the day imposed the burden upon those who could best afford to bear it; that is, those who were making large profits out of speculation.

We balked at imposing a charge on those who were producing something constructive; that is, the prospectors. From tomorrow when they produce ore and take it to a State Battery they will have to bear the burden of increases in the range of 200 per cent. That is the result of action taken by the present Premier whose query I hope I have answered.

I believe that with other increased charges—water rates, motor vehicle registration fees, and so on—the Government has thrown the baby out with the bath water. Why do I say that? I say that the Government has panicked. I say that if by this action towards economic recovery the Government hopes only to bridge the budgetary deficit expected in 1974-75 then it must surely scrap all those expensive election promises.

Last night our leader gave figures which were honestly and objectively arrived at by officers of the Treasury Department

of Western Australia. The figures revealed that the election promises in the field of education alone would require something like \$277 million. In reply, the Premier referred to a minute, I assume written by the Under-Treasurer, dated the 22nd March, 1974, and addressed to the then Premier. I am relying on my memory now, but I think the minute indicated that the State in this financial year faced a budgetary deficit of something like \$76 million which might well, with careful pruning and prudent husbandry of funds, be reduced by \$30 million leaving still a startling budgetary deficit of \$46 million.

In that minute the Under-Treasurer clearly indicated to the Premier of the day—and the Premier of today has also been made aware of the situation—that his estimate did not make any reference to the carrying out of any of the election promises of either of the two major parties.

The Premier cannot have it both ways: If Western Australia is to face a Budget deficit this financial year amounting to \$76 million which might, with careful pruning and prudent husbandry, be brought down to \$46 million, how can this Government try to carry out its ill-conceived, highly extravagant, and unjustified policies in terms of some of the promises referred to under the heading of "Education" in the speech delivered by the Premier?

The Premier indicated—and I refer to the estimate of \$272 million, which was framed by respected Treasury Department officers who now serve the Government of the day, as being the cost of implementing the educational programme—that if the Treasury officers had only been permitted to discuss the proposal with him, or with officers of the Liberal Party to find out their *modus operandi* and how they intended to implement this policy, they would have come up with a different estimate. I presume it would have been a reduced estimate.

Let us look at that in perspective. Yesterday one of my colleagues asked certain questions of the Government as to how and when that part of the educational policy relating to the entry of five-year-olds into the primary school system was to be implemented, and what the cost would be, and we were told that the Minister for Education had set up an expert committee. That was four months after the election and until the committee brings down a report the Government will not know what it will cost. If the Government does not know now how could it have known prior to the election? The Premier said the Treasury officers should have been given an opportunity to discuss the matter with him so that he would be in a better position to state the cost.

Sir Charles Court: Do not distort the position; this committee will work out the technical details.

Mr T. D. EVANS: I am not distorting the position. If the Premier does not like the heat he should get out of the kitchen!

Sir Charles Court: This is different from the estimate you are talking about.

Mr T. D. EVANS: I consider the amendment speaks for itself. It has the support of my colleagues and I join with them in that support.

MR MOILER (Mundaring) [9.04 p.m.]: In supporting the amendment I take this opportunity, firstly, to congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your election to your office. I also congratulate those new members who have come into the Chamber.

While speaking to the amendment I will try to stick to it. The Government is charged with having used so much of the Governor's Speech to waffle on and blame the present Federal Government for every issue which the State Government considered was its fault.

I have selected a few paragraphs from His Excellency's Speech where the Federal Government has been mentioned and I shall speak to these particular points. On page 2 of the Governor's Speech the following appears—

While some of our economic difficulties are due to international pressures—

With which members of this House would agree, undoubtedly. To continue—

—they have been greatly aggravated by the inflationary policies pursued by the Commonwealth Government since 1972.

The following paragraph reads—

The State is doing all it can to retrieve this situation, both by constantly urging—

And this is where I want to make the emphasis. To continue—

—changed policies at the Commonwealth level, and by tighter controls within the State sphere.

Another paragraph of the Speech, appearing on page 3, reads as follows—

State development has been restricted due to the economic situation already described, and the resource development policies of the Commonwealth Government, which are at variance with the policies and objectives of the Western Australian Government.

That is the point to which I wish to give some attention tonight—the difference between the policies of the Australian Government and the policies of the present State Government. I am pleased to say that for my part—and I am sure I speak for members on this side of the House—I am happy that the policies of the Federal Government do vary from those of the present State Government, not only for the benefit of the people in this State, but for the people within Australia as a whole.

Let us look at the policies regarding resources development within Western Australia and the policies of this Government. I refer members to the evening of the 15th August, 1973, when the present Premier was interviewed with Professor Geoffrey Bolton, Professor Crowley, and Mr John Roberts of the Royal Military College, Duntroon, on an ABC broadcast session. I think the extract I am about to quote indicates the policy of the present Premier and, obviously, the policy of the party he represents in this House.

Sir Charles Court: I am interested to know what this has to do with the amendment now before us.

Mr MOILER: It has a lot to do with it as I will show if I am allowed to proceed. I am trying to indicate how it is to our advantage that the policy of the Australian Government differs from that of the present State Government. The variance is to the benefit of Western Australians.

The interview on the ABC last year was in connection with secession. When asked a question Sir Charles Court said, in part—

If you want to be just a cold-blooded realist in the matter. If we were on our own there'd be so many people in the world wanting to invest here if we had the right type of political climate.

I can only imagine that the right political climate would be the magnificent Liberal-Country Party coalition we have at present. So, we now have the right political climate. To continue—

There'd be so many people wanting to develop industry here, so much sophisticated type of development taking place in Western Australia if we had the right type of drive at Government level. That you would be almost be able to write your own ticket on a free defence force.

At a later stage it continues—

But if we are on our own and we had such huge investment and became such a reservoir for food, fibre and metals and minerals and so on—there'd be so many people falling over backwards to make sure we were safe that we'd be much better off than we'd ever be as part of the Australian nation.

Mr Hartrey: The Japanese would defend us.

Mr MOILER: Of course they would.

Sir Charles Court: Before you become too involved you should read the whole context.

Mr MOILER: I have read it. It indicates the Premier's thinking and the Government's policies. The Premier would allow foreign companies to come in, which was the Federal policy before the change

in the Australian Government, when there was wholesale takeover of our industries and development in the north, leaving us with nothing but holes in the ground and quarries. The recent Fitzgerald report—which the Premier was quick to criticise and challenge as being ridiculous, before he had even read it—

Sir Charles Court: It was a scandalous document.

Mr MOILER: The Premier said that before he had even read it, because it contravened his policy of an open slather for foreign companies.

Sir Charles Court: You should read the Fitzgerald report.

Mr MOILER: Has the Premier read it?

Sir Charles Court: I have read it.

Mr MOILER: The Premier states he has now read the document.

Who are the people who would come to defend us? Professor Crowley suggested one or two who might be interested in doing so—Peking and Jakarta. If we were to open our doors and continue the policies of the previous Federal and State Liberal-Country Party Governments, we would have foreign companies falling over each other to come to Western Australia, develop our resources, and defend them for us. Defend them against whom? If we had some control over and interest in our own resources, they would be defending their investments in Western Australia against us—the very people for whom the present Australian Government is trying to provide some interest.

Sir Charles Court: To be fair, you should make the observation that in the course of those remarks I was making it clear I did not advocate secession. If you say those things without making that preamble, you are being dishonest.

Mr MOILER: The Premier said it was virtually an open go for foreign interests.

Sir Charles Court: I did not say that. I said that would be so if we seceded, but I made it clear I was not advocating secession. If you do not say that, you distort the whole matter.

Mr MOILER: I am not worried about whether or not the Premier is in favour of secession. In the article, he claimed he was not in favour of it.

Sir Charles Court: It was a supposition I worked on if we seceded, but I said we would not.

Mr MOILER: It is clear from past actions that Liberal-Country Party Governments are in favour of allowing the takeover not only of our resources but also of the established industries in Australia, to the detriment of future generations of Australians.

Back in September, 1971, many members of Parliament received correspondence from a Mr R. N. Hughes-Jones, who wrote—

I write as a Director of Woodside Oil NL.

He went on to say that possibly the greatest resource in this country—the offshore gas fields in the north-west—was literally being given away to foreign interests, and he called on all members of the various Parliaments to take whatever action they could to counter this. The first paragraph of his letter reads—

The attached is lengthy, but gives all relevant facts concerning a move that would involve the erosion of the last vestige of Australian control of the immensely prospective oil and gas tenements on the North-West Shelf, held by a consortium of companies of which Woodside is a member.

I repeat that Mr R. N. Hughes-Jones was a director of Woodside Oil NL. He continues—

To give you a very quick understanding of the importance to Australia of this area—two structures, Rankin North and Scott's Reef, have been proved to be gas and condensate reservoirs of a size that is huge even by world standards. Rankin North, alone, has been conservatively estimated to hold reservoirs of recoverable gas totalling 4 000 000 000 000 cubic feet. Step-out wells could prove this figure to be considerably greater.

On the 31st March, 1973, *Petroleum Search in Australia*, which is a publication of the Petroleum Information Bureau (Australia), published certain information, and I will read a small paragraph from it to indicate that Mr R. N. Hughes-Jones certainly knew what he was talking about in 1971. The article, which was published in 1973, states—

North Rankin alone contains proved and probable recoverable reserves estimated at 7.9 trillion (million million) cubic feet, making it by far the largest gas field in Australia and one of the world's giant fields.

Is it not reasonable that an Australian Government should want to derive as much benefit as possible from these fields for the people of Australia?

Sir Charles Court: Cannot the State Government do that?

Mr MOILER: It was not doing it under the previous Liberal-Country Party Government, and of course it cannot do it to the same degree that an Australian Government can.

Mr Mensaros: What is the Australian Government—as you call it—doing? I will be interested to know, because I have been asking everyone. You might know what it is doing.

Mr MOILER: I will come to that later. I now wish to deal with the National Pipeline Authority. The reserves on the north-west shelf which are being developed at the present time by Woodside Burmah and so on will come under the National Pipeline Authority so that the Australian Government will have some control of these resources for the benefit of Australia, and we, as Australians, should support such proposals.

Mr Mensaros: They are being controlled for the next 100 years, so it will remain with the Government and nothing will happen.

Mr MOILER: The Australian Government should have control of these resources for the next 1 000 years. I do not see why we should give them away now and forsake future generations. Mr Hughes-Jones went on to say—

Without energy, the industry of the world would grind to an instant halt. I think that has been proven.

Mr Mensaros: That is why we want to get it out, not leave it there.

Mr MOILER: Mr Hughes-Jones continued—

The two major agencies of energy in the world today are oil and gas.

Apparently the Minister agrees with that. He is suggesting that the Australian people should not have, through the Australian Government, a major say and influence on what is done and how the reserves are used. The present Australian Government is trying to ensure the Australian people derive the greatest benefit from these resources and, even though it might cause a minor delay at the present time, surely this can be accepted for the benefit of future generations. It should be heralded by us as a very worth-while move to prevent the selling of the farm and the giving away of our country to foreign interests, to the advantage of a few individuals in this State.

I will continue with Mr Hughes-Jones' letter; he wrote three letters of which I am aware. I believe he would be very happy with the steps being taken by the Federal Government at present. Mr Hughes-Jones knows what he is talking about and he has clearly outlined the problems. He says—

But I do wish to raise my voice in protest at the fact that this great conglomerate, so heavily weighted with overseas companies—

He is referring to the foreign interests. To continue—

—will necessarily wish to derive the maximum profit in the quickest possible time for the investment they will make in the areas concerned. This, of course, is what business is all about.

The result of it, however, will be that we will see one of the world's greatest fleets of giant oil and liquified

gas tankers carrying to far away lands that which should rightly be safeguarded for Australian posterity.

The needs of our children and children's children seem to be of very little account in our thinking.

I would just like to finish with one brief paragraph which I think will interest the Premier.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could I ask the honourable member how this relates to the amendment before the Chair?

Mr MOILER: I am trying to show that the Governor's Speech, prepared by the State Government, blames the Australian Government for many things. The paragraphs I have read from these letters refer to the difference in the policies of the Australian and the State Governments. The Australian Government is attempting to expedite development on the north-west shelf for the benefit of Australia. I say this is to our advantage and that the Australian Government should be complimented and not blamed for many of its actions.

Mr Hughes-Jones says—

As hateful and offensive as such an idea would be to my political beliefs—One can only assume that he is a Liberal. It continues—

—I am firmly of the opinion that falling all else it would be better far to nationalise our industry than to drop it so lightly into overseas hands.

This is what the previous Australian Government was permitting. These tremendous resources were being dropped lightly into the hands of foreign interests. The Australian Government is to be commended.

Mr Carr: Hear, hear!

Mr MOILER: Its policies are quite different from those of the present State Government, and I, for one, am very happy that they are different.

The Premier has already interjected about our resources, and I think it was quite noticeable from the report prepared by Mr Fitzgerald for the Minister for Minerals and Energy (the Hon. R. F. X. Connor)—

Mr A. R. Tonkin: An excellent report.

Sir Charles Court: No wonder you people are no longer the Government.

Mr MOILER: All Australians would do well to read the Fitzgerald report.

Sir Charles Court: It has been completely debunked by better brains than Mr Fitzgerald's.

Mr MOILER: What did the Premier do? Before he even had time to read the report he made some ridiculous statements.

Sir Charles Court: Don't you know that this was published in instalments in the Press before it was published as a report?

Mr MOILER: In his usual manner the Premier rushed to the defence of those for whom he seems to have such high regard—the foreign companies. However, *The Nation Review* was quick to point out that the Premier was rushing to the defence of the foreign companies before he had a chance to read the report. So in that regard I am particularly happy that the policies of the Australian Government are so different from those of the present State Government.

In another section of his Speech the Governor said—

The important role of Local Government in meeting the needs of the community and generally assisting in the development of the State is recognised by the Government.

Big stuff! It continues—

Particular attention will be given to the financial problems of Local Government, with a view to further strengthening its role as a vital and valuable partner in the government of this State.

It is interesting to note that whilst we have this statement by the Government that it is concerned about local government, just prior to the Tonkin Government's leaving office, at the request of a number of country local authorities, we increased the branding charges levied at abattoirs within these shires. Branding charges on sheep, beef, and pigs, were increased to enable the local authorities to cover the cost of meat inspection services carried out by officers under their jurisdiction. The Tonkin Government took this step to offset the losses incurred by the country local authorities. One in particular, the Northam Shire Council, suffered a loss of something like \$10 000 in the previous year.

Mr McIver: They are still suffering a loss.

Mr MOILER: Yes, but this would not be so if the policy of the previous Government had not been altered. The Northam Shire Council incurred a loss of something like \$50 000 over the period of time that these abattoirs had been operating. This loss was incurred because the meat inspection fees which may be charged under the Health Act do not cover the cost of the inspection services provided. So, quite rightly, the Tonkin Government said, "Well, the services provided will have to be covered by the necessary charge for the particular work done." After considerable study by the department concerned, these charges were increased.

No sooner had the Liberal-Country Party Government taken office than a Country Party member, as Minister for Health, saw to it that the charges were brought down to a ridiculously low level. I imagine it is for the reasons expressed earlier tonight by the Leader of the

Opposition when he drew attention to the influence exerted by representatives of the meat employers' industry on the present Government that such action was taken to reverse the decision of the previous Government. This action means that the Northam Shire Council and other country local authorities continue to provide these services at a loss. I imagine that the biggest abattoir in the Northam Shire is the Tip Top abattoir which supplies many butchers' shops within the metropolitan area. The present Government is forcing the people living in the Northam Shire and other country areas to subsidise those living in the metropolitan area. These are the very people whom the Deputy Premier represents—I must be excused for almost forgetting his title, but perhaps I am getting like the Premier who forgets who his deputy leader is.

However, the Deputy Premier, who leads the members of the Country Party and who claims to support the country people, is allowing the people of the Northam Shire to suffer this loss and to subsidise the cost of meat consumed by people in the metropolitan area. It was not a case of the charges having to be raised, because they had already been raised by the previous Government after a very exacting study of the matter. Now the members of the Country Party allow their Liberal Party masters to disregard completely the country people whom they claim to represent and the charge has been reduced to the extent that in the Northam Shire alone, with which I have had some dealing, the annual amount lost will be not less than \$10 000.

Mr McPharlin: You will get your answer later on.

Mr MOILER: Give it to me now; or, as with other matters will we have to wait and see what the Premier says?

Mr Bertram: Is it a one-man band?

Mr MOILER: If it is it has gone fairly quiet. The Deputy Premier says we will have to wait and obtain an answer later. He has made many statements not the least of which was in connection with the amalgamation of the Country Party and the DLP. Those parties renounced their separate identities and merged, and the Deputy Premier said the merger was certain to be regarded as one of the historic events in politics in Western Australia. Four months later the merger is crumbling in a heap, and its handful of representatives in this Parliament do not want to have anything to do with their previous friends.

Mr O'Connor: You are wandering wide of the amendment.

The SPEAKER: Yes, you must relate this to the amendment.

Mr O'Neill: The amendment is not worth speaking to, and the honourable member knows it.

Mr MOILER: Yes, Mr Speaker. The only other point to which I wish to draw attention at this stage concerns another statement by the Premier which indicates that this State would be far better off than it is at present if the Premier and his party had been more reasonable and had paid more consideration to the population of Western Australia during the term of the Tonkin Labor Government, instead of adopting a dog-in-the-manger attitude and preventing anything worth while from developing. I refer to the legislation introduced by the previous Government in respect of land control, the establishment of a land commission, and the Salvado area.

The Premier made a statement in the *Sunday Independent* of the 12th May—almost three months ago—in which it was reported that the Victorian State Government had signed an agreement with the Australian Government under which it would receive some \$28.5 million to enable it to purchase land and subdivide and develop it for sale at half the present prices to people on low incomes. That article appeared some three months ago, and I am anxious to ascertain during the course of the next couple of weeks whether the State Government has done anything about finding out the details of the agreement signed by the Victorian Government.

Mr Rushton: You will most probably be asking some questions tomorrow.

Mr MOILER: I have some on the notice paper.

Mr Rushton: Why don't you wait until tomorrow?

Mr MOILER: I am merely highlighting the fact that a considerable amount of finance could be utilised now in this State.

Mr Rushton: Victoria has not got anything yet.

Mr MOILER: Western Australia could be well on the way to obtaining a similar grant so that Western Australians could buy blocks much cheaper than they can at present.

Mr Rushton: Victoria has not received anything under that agreement. Didn't you see the article the other day which said that State has appointed an investigator to find the cheque?

Mr MOILER: We will see when the Minister answers the questions. The point is that the previous Government was anxious to do something about this problem, and we could have done something about it.

Mr Rushton: You were prepared to sell our souls and to do away with freehold titles.

Mr MOILER: There was no intention of that at all. An emotional attitude was adopted by the then Opposition, which

claimed that ridiculous things would occur. The proposal of the previous Government would have resulted in people being able to obtain blocks at a fair and reasonable price—

Mr Rushton: You want to have another look at it.

Mr MOILER: —and that is all it would have done. So, like other speakers from this side, I believe that since the 30th March Western Australians have been subjected to a continual flow of abuse and unwarranted criticism of the Australian Government. I hope that in the ensuing period which this Government may spend in office the Premier and his colleagues will get down to the job, with the co-operation of the Opposition—and he will receive our co-operation—to ensure that the standard of living in this State will continue to be at the level which was commenced during the term of office of the Tonkin Government.

MR HARTREY (Boulder-Dundas) [9.37 p.m.]: Mr Speaker, in the first place may I take the opportunity to congratulate you on your elevation to the office you now occupy, which I am sure you will honour with your presence. Secondly, I would like as a fairly new member of the club myself, to offer my congratulations to other new members.

The SPEAKER: Whilst I do appreciate the sentiment, I think it would be more appropriate to deal with this during the debate on the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply.

Mr HARTREY: That is very probably so, Sir. Bowing to your direction, I would say that the amendment to which I now address myself is, of course, a vote of no confidence, and it is based essentially on the proposition that the Governor's Speech contained nothing of substance apart from vituperation of another Government. I think that is a reasonable and proper ground upon which to protest against the Governor's Speech which we are rather sarcastically told His Excellency was pleased to deliver to this Parliament.

I feel quite confident that although the Governor may be pleased to occupy the high office he now has, and be pleased to have the opportunity to read the Speech he must have been bitterly disappointed at the contents of it. We do not expect in this House a great degree of impartiality, with the exception of the remarks made from the Chair. This is a political arena in which both parties contend fairly fiercely at times and with a certain amount of disregard for impartiality.

However, elementary and basic fairness is generally required, and the attack that was repeatedly made in the Speech in respect of which we are demonstrating our discontent was directed against the Government of the Commonwealth. I regret

that the Premier is not present because I am going to approve of one remark he made. He said he could see no reason that it would not be proper for this House on occasions to express condemnation of Commonwealth Governments. That may very well be true.

I am quite prepared to accept that challenge because the principal reproach that has been expressed in the Governor's Speech against the present Commonwealth Government is that it has been responsible for inflation. We have had a very learned and able exposition of the causes of inflation from the member for Warren. He has, I think, covered practically every factor in the production over 23 years of the epidemic of inflation from which we are now suffering, except one, and that is the only one to which I propose to refer and which I lay right at the feet of a Commonwealth Government. I blame not the Commonwealth Government which is now in power but a series of Commonwealth Governments masquerading under the name of Liberal or Liberal-Country Party or National Alliance—whatever we are short of. I refer to the horrible military adventure into which a series of those Governments plunged Australia for the past 10 years or so.

I expected to receive chuckles from the other side and I am not the least bit surprised to hear them now. If members opposite want to know the prime cause of inflation, it is of course that there are insufficient consumable goods to satisfy the demands of a community at any given level of civilisation. And how do we best produce that situation? We produce it by taking the ablest, the most energetic and vigorous of the work force out of the community and sending them away to destroy their own property. They are not destroying other people's property, but their own. I refer to the munitions with which they are provided, the uniforms they wear, and the food they consume. Those things are not provided by the enemy; they are provided out of the wealth heap of Australia. How can we better deplete the wealth divisible among the people of Australia and better encourage galloping inflation, which is the result of doing just that, than by engaging in a frantic, stupid, degrading, and despicable military adventure such as the Vietnam war?

Mr McPharlin: The rate of inflation was kept down by the previous Liberal-Country Party Governments.

Mr May: It was not.

Mr McPharlin: It was kept down to a manageable level.

Mr HARTREY: Listen, my friend, prevalent amongst the goldminers who form the largest proportion of the wage earners in my constituency is a disease known as pneumoconiosis.

Mr O'Neill: There is a new disease in the mining industry now: it is called "Connorhoea"!

Mr HARTREY: I will use it as a symbol of inflation. There are three inherent factors in this disease. It is irreversible, incurable, and progressive. When it reaches a certain stage, even if the sufferer is removed from the irritant cause—exposure to silicon dioxide—it will continue to progress until it finally kills him. In this context, inflation is the same thing. People start it, they encourage it and work on it for 10 years and give it a lift off and then they cannot stop it.

Mr McPharlin: That is what the Federal Government is doing now.

Mr HARTREY: The Federal Government is doing its best to stop it, but it is not succeeding. I doubt whether it will succeed. I think it will succeed only after a worse catastrophe overtakes us; when all the banks call in their overdrafts and when we have a depression such as the one which occurred in the United States in 1929 and in Victoria, Western Australia and various other places in 1930. I remember that very well. That is the sort of Federal Government we have had for such a long time and it is well that we should remind our opponents of that fact. I am no great friend of Federal Governments. Certainly, I am no friend of Federal Governments of their political persuasion. They have inflicted on this country for 23 years every kind of encouragement to inflation, particularly as I said earlier, with this despicable and dishonourable war.

Mr McPharlin: Any Government that stays in for 23 years must have the confidence of the people.

Mr HARTREY: Twice in the history of Australia in my lifetime Australian soldiers fought for their country with great honour, success, and victory. But on this occasion, they were compelled by a brutal and unscrupulous conscription which took the very best of our workers and young rising generation, to squander the very cream of our wealth. The true wealth of a community is its brave young men.

I would remind members of a Roman simile which is to be found in Book 9 of Livy's so-called *Histories* which in fact were Roman myths. It is the tale of one Quintus Curtius, a brave young Roman soldier who lived at the particular time when a great chasm was said to have opened in the Roman Forum and to have continued widening. The Romans, being at the time a superstitious people, called upon their soothsayers to tell them what to do. The soothsayers announced that the chasm would close only when the Romans cast into it their most precious

possessions. So, the Roman matrons took off their gold wedding rings and the senators took off their gold rings—the mark of their office—and they all threw their rings into the chasm, but with no result.

Then through the crowd burst Quintus Curtius in the full accoutrements of war and leapt into the chasm, which immediately closed after him. The moral of course is that the most priceless possession of the Roman Republic was its brave young manhood. I still think our young manhood is the most priceless possession of the Australian Commonwealth. The previous Federal Governments took that brave young manhood away from where it was growing wheat, mining ore, building houses or doing something to increase the wealth and happiness of the Australian people and sent it to take part in the defoliation of Asiatic crops and the destruction of poor Asiatic people by napalm raids and the other atrocities which were committed; and to assist corrupt, rotten, Asiatic politicians, the tools of corrupt, rotten American politicians, who are now on their way to impeachment. This was done in the name of Australia and for the glory of Australia but it was to the external shame of Australia. God knows, no man loves Australia more than I. That is the thing for which past Liberal Federal Governments have to answer to the people of Australia.

Now, members opposite think they can save themselves from their State responsibilities by insulting the present Federal Government in Canberra. The present Federal Government is not responsible for inflation. It was the vile war which, more than anything else, produced the very conditions that create and expand inflation. Having done that over a long and dishonourable period of poor and dishonourable government at home and abroad, the Liberals now have the nerve to say that their shortcomings can be removed by throwing mud at the present Federal Government. I say that this amendment has everything to commend it because it condemns precisely what I have mentioned. It condemns the efforts of the present Western Australian State Government to shirk its responsibilities and answer for its shortcomings by insulting the Federal Government of Australia for a thing which members of its own party in the Federal Parliament were responsible for creating. They were responsible for inflaming and expanding inflation and finally were shot out of office altogether because people could stand their efforts no longer. I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment to the Address-in-Reply, which amounts to a motion of no confidence in the State Government, on the basis that it is trying to squib its own responsibilities by unjustly and quite unfairly insulting the Commonwealth Government.

MR BRYCE (Ascot) [9.49 p.m.]: I rise to support the amendment to the Address-in-Reply moved by the Leader of the Opposition because I believe that, in its amended form, the Address-in-Reply would be improved.

The Governor's Speech which was delivered only a few days ago is actually an insurance policy of excuses and political fine print to enable the Government to avoid the fundamental responsibilities it should honour if it is to fulfil the promises that were made during the election. The Speech represents a carefully well-worded basis which the Government will use to "get out from under". The Speech itself contains about 15 paragraphs written by the Premier for the purpose of condemning the Commonwealth Government which the Governor was required to read. Further, in at least 10 of those paragraphs there was carping or, to say the least, implied criticism.

To adhere specifically to the terms of the amendment before us I draw the attention of members—particularly the attention of Government back-benchers who may not have had the time or the opportunity to acquaint themselves fully with the contents of the Governor's Speech—

Mr O'Neill: They were all present in another place listening to its being read.

Mr BRYCE: On page 3 of the Governor's Speech the first paragraph relates specifically to a rather unique "grizzle" in regard to the economic climate. It is unique because it constitutes such a change of ground on the part of the Premier. I referred to this when speaking yesterday evening. I quote a specific example of a contradiction of the criticism of the present Premier on a previous occasion when sitting on this side of the House. This contradiction appears in the Speech as follows—

While some of our economic difficulties are due to international pressures, they have been greatly aggravated by the inflationary policies pursued by the Commonwealth since 1972.

In my opinion an interesting aspect of this, which I now draw to the attention of members, is that it is only 12 months ago that the present Premier suggested that no matter what happened in any other part of the world, irrespective of the economic climate of the day, and no matter what policies were pursued by the Commonwealth Government, every economic and social ill in Western Australia was the complete and entire responsibility of the State Government.

We now have the instance of the first excuse being made. Now that the Premier is the Leader of the Government he has changed his tune completely and this is expressed in the form of an excuse.

The last paragraph on page 2 represents a basic criticism of the increases in payroll tax, freights, fares, hospitals, and

water charges, but it also states that they had to be increased. It is argued that these increases were made because the Commonwealth Government forced them on the State Government.

The first paragraph on page 3 of the Governor's Speech constitutes a clear warning. This is another example of a well laid foundation to prepare the people for what may happen in the future. This paragraph contains a warning that the increase in freight rates, fares, hospital, and water charges may go even higher in the future. The catch phrase is: If the Commonwealth Government does not change its policies, further increases will be made. It is absurd for a State Premier to argue that the Commonwealth Government should be adopting policies that suit him. This merely represents a very good excuse for making further increases in these charges which we must expect.

Mr McPharlin: Other Premiers have made similar statements.

Mr BRYCE: The third paragraph on page 3 relates to housing, and it is merely expressing a "grizzling" attitude that is shown by the present Government in regard to the high interest rates for housing. I notice that the Premier made no reference whatsoever to the complete neglect of housing shown by the previous Commonwealth Government when it was in office for 23 years. In the opinion of a very large group of respected economists at that time there was a need to control the fringe-banking institutions. However there is no reference to this whatsoever in the Governor's Speech, but rather a specific attack on the Commonwealth Government because of the existing high interest rates on housing finance. The present Government blames the Commonwealth Government exclusively for this situation.

The sixth paragraph on page 3 of the Governor's Speech, to which I draw the attention of members, relates to the policies of the Commonwealth Government on resource development. It is puzzling to note that the Premier has chosen this particular item to "grizzle" about, because I think it is one of the most laudable features in the economic policy of the present Australian Government. It is a policy, of course, which enunciates that Australia should be owned by Australians. This paragraph in the Speech represents a "grizzle", because that particular part of the Australian Government's policy may in some way impair the rate of economic growth which the Premier sees as most desirable for this State, having no regard for those who will ultimately own such developments.

I am sure we will all sit back with bated breath to see how the particular policy set out in two paragraphs further down on

page 2 of the Speech will be implemented. This is called a new policy. One of these paragraphs reads as follows—

There is a widely diversified list of industries under study. In many cases, overseas capital is involved. Its introduction so far is inhibited by Commonwealth Government policies, even though the Western Australian Government's policy is for a majority Australian ownership and complete Australian management where practicable.

This is referring to new industrial development projects.

At the outset of this Parliament I now suggest that the most operative phrase relating to this aspect of economic policy will be "where practicable". We have seen a Government similar to the present one in operation before and the policies it puts into effect. The next complaint or "grizzle" in the Governor's Speech appears in paragraph five on page 5. This relates to the Commonwealth Government's decision on a superphosphate bounty. Immediately one reads this one cannot help thinking of the recent charges that were publicised and were levelled at the Premier and his Government by the former Federal Country Party member for Canning. I think he alleged complete outright hypocrisy on the part of the Liberal Party Government in this State for adopting the policy it had in respect of this issue.

On page 6 of the Governor's Speech appears another half-hearted "grizzle" in that the State has had to hand over the control of Aboriginal affairs to the Australian Government. This is a "grizzle" about the clear-cut decision that has been made by the Australian people. If my memory serves me correctly, the performance of the Liberal Party in Western Australia in the area of Aboriginal affairs would not seem to suggest that the Premier would feel deprived by not being able to administer that part of the policy contained in the Governor's Speech.

The eighth paragraph on page 6 of the Governor's Speech refers to what may happen to the development of the north-west shelf gasfield. This is a complete insurance policy whereby, if the Premier does not get his way he will, once again, be able to blame the Commonwealth Government because he could not have this gasfield developed in his own way.

On page 7 of the Speech the second paragraph constitutes a criticism in respect of money offered by the Commonwealth Government for the development of roads.

Mr Rushton: Are you not worried about that?

Mr BRYCE: I understand the Commonwealth Government has imposed some conditions on the basis that in some

States there is reason to believe that taxpayers' money has been shamefully wasted.

I have no objection to this kind of approach and I am completely disappointed to find that the Premier would say, at the opening of Parliament, in a half-hearted "grizzling" fashion, that it was necessary to pass through this Parliament a Bill if in fact the State Government was to secure its necessary share of funds that are available for road development.

Also, on page 7, appears the tenth reference to the Liberal Party policy speech which I think is probably the most distasteful. The fact is that the Premier wrote into the Governor's Speech a paragraph which required the Governor of Western Australia to repeat his own party political propaganda that he used on the election hustings.

The paragraph to which I refer is the sixth on page 7. It constitutes the essence of the fear syndrome which was evolved and then beaten like a drum from one end of Western Australia to the other during the course of the campaign. Long gone was the red can to be kicked. This time, of course, the fear syndrome was to be based almost exclusively on some octopus-like monster some 2 000 miles away which was supposedly trying to squeeze the life blood out of Western Australia and the other States. The way in which it was presented to the electors on a purely partisan basis was plugged straight into the Governor's Speech and he was expected to repeat the Liberal Party's fundamental policy and the sloganising was used in the campaign some four months previously.

The other most significant aspect of the amendment relates to the rather savage increase in freight rates and other charges and taxes the Government has foreshadowed. I would like to make some very brief comment now about the effect these increases will have, and particularly the effect of the 30 per cent across-the-board increase in the State Shipping Service freight rates to the north-west.

Mr Rushton: Do you think the Commonwealth Government should take over our railways?

Mr BRYCE: The Minister for Local Government is an expert in irrelevancies. I wish to goodness he would improve now he has reached the exalted status of Minister. I was expecting some change in his behaviour.

I would like to draw attention to the very adverse effect which the 30 per cent across-the-board increase in shipping freight rates to the north-west will have on the living standards generally of everyone in the north-west. I am particularly sorry that the Minister for the North-West is not here at the moment. I appreciate that the new member for Pilbara, and the new

member for Gascoyne, for that matter, have a very close interest in this subject, and I will make some specific suggestions to them a little later on. At election time the Premier campaigned very hard in the north-west of Western Australia—

Mr Blaikie: And the south-west.

Mr BRYCE: —expressing his alleged heartfelt concern for the people of the north-west.

Sir Charles Court: That is a concern of long standing.

Mr BRYCE: Then, within 12 weeks of the election of his Government, he announced a 30 per cent across-the-board increase in freight rates for the State Shipping Service which caters for so many of the people in the northern parts of the State.

Mr O'Connor: Have you a reasonable alternative?

Mr BRYCE: I ask the Premier to at least face up to the inconsistency. I suggest that if he were to go to Port Hedland tomorrow he would probably have to hide from lynching mobs.

Sir Charles Court: I will be there on Friday and Saturday.

Mr BRYCE: If the article in the *Daily News* is a real indication of the feeling of some of the people, then he may well have to hide from lynching mobs.

Sir Charles Court: I know the people up there better than you do.

Mr Blaikie: If you made remarks like this in Forrest Place, no wonder you incited the farmers.

Mr BRYCE: I will acquaint the Premier with one of the interesting comments in today's *Daily News* made by the Secretary of the Port Hedland Chamber of Commerce (Mr Pat Richardson). He said, "Decentralisation has virtually become a dead word". It is dead all right.

Mr Rushton: It died in the last three years.

Mr BRYCE: How could any Premier go to the people in the north-west during a campaign and express his concern for their opportunities and for their living standards and then, within 12 weeks of the election of his Government, increase by 30 per cent the freight rates of the State Shipping Service which is the very life blood of the people of the north-west? I ask him to be consistent.

Mr Ridge: I wager that more will be done for decentralisation in the next three years than was done in the course of the last three years.

Mr BRYCE: I want to see proof of real compassion for the people in the remote areas instead of simply words. If the Premier was sincere and genuine, then when the State Shipping Service was faced with

a deficit, bearing in mind that the Tonkin Government revamped the State Shipping Service—

Sir Charles Court: Don't be so stupid. Who arranged for the ships?

Mr Blaikie: The Tonkin Government—

Mr BRYCE: The member for Vasse knows practically nothing about it.

Mr O'Neil: The electors of the north showed what they thought of the Tonkin Labor Government. Have a look at the election results for the seats in the north.

Mr BRYCE: Mr Speaker, I wish you would point out to Government members that interjections are out of order.

Mr O'Neil: For which you should be extremely grateful.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is quite correct and what he said applies to those on each side of the House. I am being somewhat tolerant and I hope to continue to be tolerant throughout the session. However, members can overstep the mark, but I hope this will not be so.

Mr BRYCE: Your tolerance is appreciated very much, Mr Speaker.

What I would like to emphasise is that if the Premier was, in fact, genuine in his concern for the people of the north-west, then when the State Shipping Service was faced with a deficit, regardless of the reason—

Mr O'Connor: Do you know how much the deficit was?

Mr BRYCE: —he would have sustained the deficit and rearranged the priorities in his accounting. The present Government would have done what Labor Governments have done.

Mr Ridge: Not the Tonkin Government.

Mr BRYCE: It would have—

Mr Ridge: But it did not.

Mr BRYCE: —sustained the loss and in this way assisted one of the main factors leading to the savage increases in the cost of living for those people.

Sir Charles Court: Do you know that the freight increases do not take care of the wage increases?

Mr BRYCE: Every time the Government is forced to make a decision concerning an instrumentality such as the State Shipping Service, the one griping thought in the back of the minds of its members is that whatever happens, that instrumentality must run at a profit.

Sir Charles Court: The State Shipping Service does not run at a profit.

Mr O'Connor: Never will do.

Mr BRYCE: At whatever cost, the Government must juggle things so that the loss is not sustained. It is almost unacceptable to the Government that the

State Shipping Service should be allowed to run at a loss, even if it is necessary—

Mr O'Connor: Do you know how much the loss is?

Mr O'Neill: It is still running at a loss.

Sir Charles Court: A heavy loss.

Mr BRYCE: Members opposite know as well—

Sir Charles Court: You silly man.

Mr BRYCE: —as I do—

Mr O'Neill: You silly boy!

Mr BRYCE: —that to keep decentralisation alive the Government must be prepared to cop and to accept a very substantial loss.

Sir Charles Court: It runs at a heavy loss. Don't you know this?

Mr BRYCE: It may run at a significant loss, but the Government of the day should be prepared to cop that loss.

Sir Charles Court: It is still carrying a heavy loss.

Mr O'Neill: It still will.

Mr O'Connor: Do you know the extent of the loss?

Mr BRYCE: This is a philosophical weakness the present Government displays in regard to this situation. The previous Labor Government and many other Labor Governments in the past adopted a very different attitude.

Mr Ridge: That is a lot of rubbish. You do not know the facts of the case, because the Labor Government put the charges up not 18 months ago.

Mr BRYCE: I would like to conclude by challenging the Minister for the North-West and his colleagues—

Mr O'Neill: You are concluding in embarrassment.

Mr BRYCE: —to make an approach to the Premier on behalf of the people of the north-west—

Mr Ridge: How long have you stayed in Port Hedland?

Mr BRYCE: —In connection with the deleterious effect this increase will have on the living standards. I would like them to show they are worthy of representing the people of the north by submitting a case to the Premier to see whether the savage rate of increase cannot, in fact, be reduced.

Mr Ridge: You would not have any idea of what is being done.

Mr O'Neill: Would you make an approach to Mr Whitlam at the same time?

MR B. T. BURKE (Balga) [10.10 p.m.]: I rise to make one or two points about the debate on this amendment, and to support the amendment. It seems to me that no question has been raised about the fact that the Governor was used as a

vehicle to make certain criticisms of the Australian Government. That has not been denied by the Government in this House and so the question then becomes whether the statements which were made by the Governor were justified and whether the meanings he conveyed to the people of this State are acceptable.

While in normal circumstances it might not be acceptable to use the Governor as a vehicle, I concede that in times of crisis and in severely troubled economic circumstances it might be necessary to use him as a channel or a voice through which certain points must be made and through which the people must be made aware of certain facts.

Mr Rushton: In the same way that the member opposite has been using the City of Stirling as a vehicle for so long.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The member for Dale is a thesplan and is well suited to playing the part of the 40 empty vessels in All Baba and the 40 thieves. We are constantly subjected to astounding statements of rubbish.

I again say that in certain circumstances it becomes necessary to make a point in a significant fashion and, perhaps, to give to the Governor certain statements for him to make. That brings us to the question of whether or not the things which the Governor attributed to the Federal Government or the Australian Government, hold up under close scrutiny. After a period of 23 years of Conservative rule the perfect foundation was laid for a cost-push inflation situation. That cost-push situation had reached an undesirable level when, in December, 1972, the first Labor Government in 23 years was elected.

Mr Laurance: But the Federal Government says we have demand inflation.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The member's point is well taken and I will deal with it in a moment.

Mr Jamieson: I should recommend that a maiden speaker should keep quiet.

Mr B. T. BURKE: I was guilty of the same offence so I will not object. On election the Labor Government to which I have referred faced the situation of fulfilling its philosophical view by increasing Government spending in welfare areas. It needed to attract the country's resources but found it could not control the neo-banking area which existed. There was no scope for attracting the liquidity of the country to the areas where it should go. This cost-push situation was overlaid by a demand-pull one, producing the combination capable of producing what is known as galloping inflation.

The controls which the Chifley Government introduced in 1945 with its banking legislation proved adequate until people got around them by setting up finance institutions outside those controls.

Those institutions decided deliberately to take on the economic decisions which should have been the decisions of the Government.

When the Australian Labor Government was elected in 1972 the situation was beyond its control. I believe the Prime Minister made a mistake when he introduced his referendum to take control of incomes and prices. If that referendum had been introduced now the result would have been drastically different.

Sir Charles Court: It would have been exactly the same. People will not give any more power to Canberra.

Mr B. T. BURKE: I do not believe that opinion. The Premier has been wrong in the past and he will be wrong in the future. Building society rates are affecting thousands of young people.

Sir Charles Court: That was a decision from Canberra.

Mr O'Neill: Have you not read Mr Crean's address?

Sir Charles Court: He wants money to be scarce.

Mr O'Neill: And interest rates higher.

Mr B. T. BURKE: If this Government is genuinely interested—

Mr O'Neill: And we are.

Mr B. T. BURKE: —then will this Government introduce legislation to control the rates charged by building societies?

Mr O'Neill: Quite clearly, no.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Then do not pretend to be interested in relieving the positions of those young people.

Mr O'Neill: Do you think that is the answer?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir Charles Court: If the Federal Labor Party were to bring down the bond rate the rest would follow.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: What rot!

Mr B. T. BURKE: The Labor Party increased the bond rate because its control was being challenged by fringe banking institutions which did not want money to be directed into social welfare areas. When the Government increased the bond rate the finance companies automatically increased the interest rates offered on debentures.

Sir Charles Court: That was intended.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Why was it forced to do so?

Mr O'Neill: Totally incompetent.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: I venture to say that not one member opposite understands what the bond rate is.

Mr O'Neill: Cut it out!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr J. T. Tonkin: What is it then?

Mr O'Neill: You should not need to ask.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr O'Neill: I cannot educate the members of the Opposition.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The bond rate is the interest rate necessary to raise the money necessary to finance work proposed by the Government.

Sir Charles Court: And it sets the pace for all interest rates.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: No, it does not.

Mr O'Neill: Well, why raise it?

Mr J. T. Tonkin: To get money so that the Government can carry on.

The SPEAKER: Order! Would the member for Balga resume his seat? I have called "Order" on a number of occasions. I do not mind having interjections during debate; I think frequently they give life to a debate. Members who wish to try to avoid too many interjections should not bandy remarks back and forth beyond the reply, polite or impolite, as the case may be.

Members should endeavour to speak through the Speaker and I know that most members try to do this. However, I object to cross debate between members other than the member speaking. I ask members to observe that request. When I call "Order" I expect a better response than I have had this evening. I call on the member for Balga.

Mr B. T. BURKE: To continue, my contention is that the interest rates that have spiralled were the direct result of competition between the Government, properly trying to make economic decisions, and fringe banking institutions—the neo-banking area which also sought money. This competition forced up the bond rate and also forced up rates of interest in many areas.

My only sorrow is that in 1947 when the then Prime Minister (Mr Chifley) passed legislation to nationalise banking it was ruled to be outside the Constitution. An interesting aspect of the summary by those who sat on the Privy Council when the appeal was taken by the then Attorney General (Dr Evatt) was that times and circumstances might change and that efforts to nationalise banking in the future might not necessarily be ruled to be outside the Constitution. I would very much like to see the Australian Government introduce legislation that would nationalise banking to end, once and for all, the despicable practice in which the private profit motive forces people to take advantage of those least able to defend themselves.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool) [10.19 p.m.]: One can only speculate why the Government wrote the Governor's Speech as it did in a somewhat provocative way, to say the least. It was somewhat humiliating so far as the Governor was concerned.

I do not know what was the motive of the Premier and others who were associated with the writing of the Speech. One can only speculate. Is it because the present Governor of the State is the only one who has been appointed by a Labor Government and this Government was determined to humiliate him?

Sir Charles Court: We have a great admiration for the Governor.

Mr JAMIESON: Then why try to humiliate him?

Sir Charles Court: We did not at all. He showed no embarrassment, and in fact he read the Speech better than any Governor has ever done.

Mr JAMIESON: There was no word like "Gnowangerup" in it, of course. We find ourselves in the situation that an appointed Governor is being used by the powers of the day and the Premier is trying to defend such action by saying something similar was done before. However, when he reads the other Speech he will find it was not similar. It was merely a comment on the satisfaction expressed by the people of the State.

Sir Charles Court: That is the point I was making.

Mr JAMIESON: It was not at all similar; it was quite different. The recent Governor's Speech was a positive attack on the Federal Government by the State Government of the day. I know that right from the start the Premier has been very annoyed that the Labor Government was returned in the Federal sphere. That must irk him. In his "bible" he states on a number of occasions that the aim must be to get rid of the Federal Labor Government at the first opportunity after the people of Western Australia have got rid of the socialist Government in this State.

I took some trouble tonight—because I am sure the Premier has not done so—to make a review of the Constitution and Rules of the Australian Labor Party. I know the Premier will not accept my advice because he is rather headstrong. Earlier in the piece I tendered some advice to the incoming Government, which was not heeded. I mentioned what would happen if the Government did not take the advice, and it was forced to take corrective action later on.

I suggest that the Premier obtain a copy of the Constitution and Rules of the Australian Labor Party and carry it in his portmanteau when he goes to the Premiers' Conference. In it he will find some gems he can use in his argument with the Prime Minister. I always carried a copy of it when attending ministerial conferences and found it of great advantage because Federal Ministers and others are liable to run off the rails and when one brings them back onto the rails with a statement from their own constitution and rules they

are not so keen to continue their argument. I also have a copy of the Liberal Party platform. I cannot get a copy of the platform of the Country Party because it does not have one; it might be too damning. However, when I conferred with Federal Ministers I always made sure I had a copy of the platform of the Australian Labor Party so I would know what I was talking about.

I looked at the two platforms tonight and it is interesting to note that the platform of the Federal Liberal Party gives no credence to the existence of the States. They are not even mentioned. They are not acknowledged as being part of Australia. Australia is regarded as being a whole and the States are disregarded.

Mr Hartrey: That has always been in the Liberal Party's platform.

Mr JAMIESON: This is an amazing situation for a party which is supposed to be protecting the States. Surely it would have something in writing. Surely it is not kept in a dozen and one cranlums and interpreted differently each time it needs to be interpreted. Chaos would result.

When one compares the two platforms and gets down to the nitty-gritty of them, there is an amazing similarity between the platforms of the Australian Labor Party and the Liberal Party—to such an extent that the Liberal Party's Federal platform contradicts the State platform in that the Federal platform agrees to nationalisation. This might surprise some members here but it is stated very clearly in objective (g)—

In which there shall be no nationalisation of any Australian industry without the approval of the people.

What does that mean? Does it mean when someone says to the Government, "We intend to nationalise an industry", the Government has the approval of the people?

Sir Charles Court: No.

Mr JAMIESON: Of course it means that. It is extremely badly written, to say the least. I do not know why the Liberal Party cannot spend a few bob to put out some decent publications. It seems to have funds available to print glossy pamphlets when elections are in the offing, but its other publications are terrible.

The SPEAKER: Is the member relating this to his argument?

Mr JAMIESON: Yes, because the claim has been made by the Premier that, because of the attitude of the Australian Labor Government in wanting to force the States to their knees, he took action to criticise the Federal Government in the course of the Governor's Speech. Very clearly, the two platforms must be examined in order to indicate just how wrong his claim is.

I refer again to the Liberal Party's election platform according to the Premier. This document would probably be more

rightly named "the Gospel according to St Charles". He sees the July decision of the 30th ALP Federal Conference as going against an August declaration of the Federal Parliamentary Liberal Party. That declaration could have been anything and could have been changed the next day because it is evidently not a written one. Because the other declaration is fortunately a written one, I intend to advise the House of this diabolical decision.

It is interesting to note that while the Liberal Party does not acknowledge in its Federal platform the existence of the States, right throughout the platform of the Australian Labor Party references are repeatedly made to the States. Here are some of them—

The Australian Labor Party in the Commonwealth and States is democratic, national and constitutional.

That means each has its rightful place. No such declaration appears in any Liberal Party manifesto. Another reference is—

It is democratic in that it believes that politics should be conducted within the framework of free elections on the basis of universal adult suffrage; that Governments may be freely elected and freely dismissed by the electorate; that the right of constitutional opposition to a Government is essential—

The SPEAKER: Frankly, I cannot see—

Mr JAMIESON: Mr Speaker, I draw attention to the motion before us, which reads—

However, we very much regret that the Government placed Your Excellency in the position of being obliged to devote most of the Speech to unfair and unwarranted criticism of the Government of the Commonwealth for the purpose of enabling it to escape the wrath of the people of this State for the savage increases in taxes and charges which it has imposed because of its need for money to finance the implementation of its extravagant election promises.

The Premier stated that the reason for the references in the Governor's Speech was the centralist ideas of the Federal Government.

If members read the Governor's Speech they will see this stated very clearly. Surely I must be allowed to expand this point to show that this is not as has been indicated by the Premier.

Right throughout its various writings, the Labor Party indicates clearly that it accepts the States as being part of the scheme of things. Surely the Premier cannot show me anything that states otherwise. I do not know to which manifesto he referred. However, I would like to read to the House the passage in

the platform of the Australian Labor Party to which he is objecting. I believe it is paragraph (d) of the constitutional matters which is bugging him, but obviously he has not read it. When he does so he will change his mind. Paragraph (d) reads as follows—

reference by the States to the Australian Parliament of such legislative powers as will assist to achieve the party's objectives, e.g., power over corporations, family law, defamation, shipping and navigation. Such legislative powers will be held concurrently by the Australian Parliament and the States.

Sir Charles Court: What did you decide at your Surfers Paradise conference?

Mr JAMIESON: That is the decision of the conference.

Sir Charles Court: You agreed to hand over whatever you were told to.

Mr JAMIESON: I have just read out our resolution.

Sir Charles Court: In other words the Press was incorrect?

Mr JAMIESON: It would not be the first time. These resolutions were approved by the 30th Federal Conference, 1973, at Surfers Paradise. I have warned the Premier of his failing—our platform is readily available. He should get one.

Sir Charles Court: I have one in the office.

Mr JAMIESON: Then why does not the Premier read it? It is not of much use having it there if he does not read it.

Sir Charles Court: It is not very interesting.

Mr JAMIESON: The Premier gives the impression that he is very hard-working and that everyone else is loafing by comparison. However, all he does is to create such a barrage of paper that he does not know how to go about working. He should get off his seat and do something. That is the whole problem; he is not prepared to endeavour to do anything himself—he wants to put the blame on someone else all the time. He wants to blame the Federal Government in respect of the road funds. If he wants to do that, he should use the book again and hold the Federal Government to its obligations.

Sir Charles Court: This will be interesting.

Mr JAMIESON: I am sure this reference will excite the Premier, if I can find it.

Sir Charles Court: We thought we had a friend in respect of road funds after your very noble outburst.

Mr JAMIESON: What noble outburst?

Sir Charles Court: When you were a Minister, you criticised the Federal Government about the Bureau of Roads.

Mr JAMIESON: Again this is a situation where the Premier does not see as far as his nose, because he does not want to see that far. The Bureau of Roads, which is a Commonwealth-sponsored department, brought out a report in the same way that any State Government department might do. Of course, it is a matter for the Administration of the day whether or not the Government lives up to all the things contained in an annual report. I was most critical of this particular report, because obviously its authors did not know what they were talking about, and I said so. I would do the same thing again. I was very critical of the previous reports put out by Mr Loxton. His findings were not justified and he knew it. My argument was never with Mr Jones because he had made a determination. I criticised the report put out by the Bureau of Roads and I was quite entitled to do so.

Sir Charles Court: You know they are taking worse actions than those contained in the report.

The SPEAKER: Order! It would be very helpful if the honourable member, in comparing the platforms to make the point, would keep to the amendment and refer to the appropriate part of the Governor's Speech.

Mr JAMIESON: I can do that because there is a reference here to the road funds.

The SPEAKER: Is that on page 10 of the Votes and Proceedings?

Mr JAMIESON: The Governor said—

The road funds offered by the Commonwealth Government are grossly inadequate and subject to conditions the Government has objected to.

Mr Speaker, with due deference to you, I ask you to look at this paragraph. I did not want to indulge in an airy-fairy chase all over the world, and it was for this reason that I looked at the platforms in respect of this matter. If the Premier is interested, and he does not seem to be very interested at present—

Sir Charles Court: I am listening intently.

Mr JAMIESON: —I would like to draw his attention to this part of our platform—

The Australian Government in co-operation with the States, to maintain the highest standards in road construction and maintenance.

Labor will:—

- (a) take the initiative to actively promote research into Road Safety, in co-operation with the States;
- (b) provide the States with adequate finance to promote effective road safety education campaigns;

- (c) co-operate with the States to standardise road laws and regulations.

Mr Mensaros: None of these refers to finance for building the roads we need.

Mr JAMIESON: Of course, the Minister whom I very rarely understand, mumbles something about this. But he cannot show me anything in the platform of the Liberal Party which gives us any lead as to what could be expected by the people of Australia in the way of assistance from a Commonwealth Liberal Government. Therefore, his criticism is quite void, quite unnecessary, and quite fallacious, as it usually is.

The SPEAKER: That has no bearing, however, on the amendment.

Mr JAMIESON: The amendment states, "unfair and unwarranted criticism of the Government of the Commonwealth". This was one of the criticisms.

The SPEAKER: However, the honourable member must relate it to these matters about which I am speaking. I would not say this to a new member, Mr Deputy Leader of the Opposition, but I believe that with your experience you should be able to relate the matter to the amendment. I ask you to do this more effectively than you have done so far.

Mr JAMIESON: Mr Speaker, despite the fact that it has been read two or three times already, I would like to read the amendment again. It says—

However, we very much regret that the Government placed Your Excellency in the position of being obliged to devote most of the Speech to unfair and unwarranted criticism of the Government of the Commonwealth for the purpose of enabling it to escape the wrath of the people of this State, for the savage increases in taxes and charges which it has imposed because of its need for money to finance the implementation of its extravagant election promises.

The SPEAKER: If you speak to that it is perfectly legitimate.

Mr JAMIESON: With due deference, Sir, I am speaking to it. I am building up to show that all the matters claimed in the various criticisms of the Commonwealth which we say are quite unjustified, are unjustified. Finally, because of the lack of justification for these criticisms, the State Government is attempting to throw a veneer over the issue so that it may continue to increase charges. Certainly many increases have been made; they have gone on *ad nauseam* since the Government has taken office. There have been so many increases that they are very hard to keep track of.

I know that when the previous Government was forced to increase some charges the then Opposition made great play of the fact that five or six items had been increased; it was as though it was the result of some sort of magic that we had to increase so many charges at once. On the other hand, in the case of the present Government there is no limit to the number of charges which are to be increased, and the Premier has smugly proceeded with the idea of increasing them. We argued for weeks in Cabinet at various times when a Minister presented proposals to increase a certain charge; but the present Government could not have argued for weeks because weeks have just not elapsed. It has simply said, "We will increase them."

Sir Charles Court: No Government likes to put up charges.

Mr JAMIESON: Well, the present Government seems to have found a great deal of solace in putting them up. As a result of that, I think the amendment to the Address-in-Reply motion is quite justified. The other comparisons I wish to draw between the party platforms, in deference to you, Mr Speaker, I will leave to a later stage when we are debating the main motion.

The SPEAKER: I would appreciate that.

Mr JAMIESON: However, Sir, I would ask you to refresh your memory by referring to the debate earlier this evening to see just how far some members went when dealing with this amendment.

The SPEAKER: It is because of your experience that I have ruled this way.

Mr JAMIESON: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I will deal with the other aspects later, and I am sure I will be able to show the Premier where he is wrong, although he will not take any notice.

Sir Charles Court: I always listen to you; I have a great respect for your dedication to your cause.

Mr JAMIESON: The Premier has not listened very intently, otherwise he would not have made some of the mistakes he has made. One of those mistakes—if you will allow me to mention it Mr Speaker—was the result of not taking notice of me when I told him through his deputy that it would be necessary to include the words "and Traffic Safety" in the designation of the Minister for Traffic. I gave that information to the Premier two days before the Ministers were sworn in, because I did not want the Administration to be inconvenienced; but the Premier merely said, "Oh, don't take any notice of Jamieson, he doesn't know what he is talking about."

Sir Charles Court: I did not. This is news to me.

Mr JAMIESON: Of course, three weeks later he had to do just that. This proves that he does not listen.

The SPEAKER: I think this is beyond the scope of the amendment.

Mr JAMIESON: I think it is too, Mr Speaker, and that is why I will come back to the gospel according to St Charles because I think what he had to say is most important: "We believe we understand where Western Australia wants to go and we are more than ready once again to lead the way to additional charges in all rates, fees, and other matters that we can possibly lay our hands to." I support the amendment.

MR HARMAN (Maylands) [10.43 p.m.]: I wish to support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. It refers to the unfair criticisms of the Government of the Commonwealth contained in the Governor's Speech, and there is no doubt that since the Premier has been in office in respect of almost every action he has taken or not taken he has used the occasion to blame the Australian Government for the commission or omission of his action. I think we must spare a thought for the Commonwealth Government, because the subject of inflation which we are discussing tonight seems to be a problem which concerns the Premier. He provided an answer to this problem when he said some months ago that the simple answer to inflation is to beat the shortages that are driving up prices.

Well, that may be an answer as far as he is concerned, but there are more important decisions which should be made in order that we may overcome the rate of inflation. The Australian Government tried last year to do something about inflation when it endeavoured to obtain the approval of the States to its having the power of prices control, but that was not accepted. The only way that we will be able to moderate prices is to have a form of prices justification, with the necessary legislation to enforce it. Once we have a measure of prices justification and prices control, then the consumer price index will be affected; and once the consumer price index is affected there will be a moderation in the demands for wage increases.

I am wondering—and I have been for some time—what the Premiers decided to do at their last meeting. What was their plan of action? What did they suggest to the Commonwealth? The Premier said tonight that the State Government would co-operate, and I asked him in an interjection, "Co-operate in what?" but he failed to answer.

Sir Charles Court: In the whole range that is necessary to cope with national prices.

Mr HARMAN: What attempt has he made as the Premier of one of the States of Australia—

Sir Charles Court: We are not talking about only one Premier; we are talking about all of the Premiers, including the Labor Premiers. We agreed unanimously to co-operate with the Commonwealth in the co-operative use of combined powers. But now the Prime Minister will not see us; he says he will see us in his own good time.

Mr HARMAN: I do not know specifically what that means; but I hope it means that the Premier is prepared to hand over power to the Australian Government in respect of prices control.

Sir Charles Court: No, not to hand over power, but the co-operative use of powers. We will not give any powers to the Commonwealth because the people have decided against it.

Mr Jamieson: Now you are in line with the Surfers Paradise decision.

Mr HARMAN: The Liberal Premiers have a plan, and that plan is to frustrate the Australian Government—

Sir Charles Court: All the Premiers have a plan to co-operate with the Australian Government.

Mr HARMAN: —for purely political purposes. They want to bring the Australian Government into disrepute in order that their Governments may survive. That might be a very good tactic electorally, but the people who will suffer as a result of that plan are the people who live in the States—virtually all of the people in Australia. I suggest to the Premier that when he attends the next meeting he should consider handing over to the Australian Government the power of prices control for the benefit of the people of Australia.

Sir Charles Court: There will be no handing over; it will be the co-operative use of that power.

Mr HARMAN: As I have explained, that is the only way to moderate prices. All members know that when one goes to a supermarket one can pick up an item which has three or four price tags on it. In fact, I have been told that in some cases the assistants working in some supermarkets spend most of the day running around fixing higher price tags to commodities after they have been placed on the shelves. I tried to point out to the Minister for Labour and Industry the other day the excessive mark-ups which are being made by some retailers of imported goods which are the subject of a reduced tariff.

I do not think any member will deny that prices are excessive at present; and, of course, we cannot blame those people on wages or salaries for endeavouring to have their wages or salaries increased

so that they regain the purchasing power they had 12 months previously. If no action is taken by the Premiers to hand over the power of prices control to the Australian Government I cannot see any hope at all of the present rate of inflation being moderated. So I suggest to the Premier that he carefully consider the power that he has. He is not prepared to exercise that power in Western Australia in isolation as compared with the other States.

I will explain that, but I think I should explain that the other Premiers did not have this power of price control so that the Government could get down to tin-tacks and do something about halting price rises, thereby reducing consumer price index increases, thus having some bearing on demands for wage increases.

Sir Charles Court: You must work in together. You cannot do one thing in isolation.

Mr HARMAN: No, but it could be done collectively, as I said, so really, I do not think that the Premier has any sort of plan.

Sir Charles Court: I told you that we have agreed with the States to work in concert and to use our powers on a co-operative basis. What more could we do? You are selecting just one item. Price fixation by itself will not solve anything.

Mr O'Neil: The Prime Minister will not call the States together.

Mr HARMAN: Mr Speaker, I do not know whether you will allow me to say what I am about to say, but probably I will not have another opportunity to speak. In the Speech written for him by the Government, the Governor said—

The Government is concerned that immigration was permitted to run down, resulting in the present serious shortage of skilled workers in many categories.

That is untrue.

Mr Grayden: It is not untrue.

Mr HARMAN: It is untrue. We did not allow the immigration programme to run down.

Sir Charles Court: It was a deliberate policy decision.

Mr HARMAN: I can recall when I became Minister for Immigration that Western Australia was advertising for only six classifications of skilled workers and we increased it to 26 classifications. That does not represent a running down of our immigration programme.

Sir Charles Court: Did you say 26 classifications?

Mr HARMAN: Yes and, as a result of the advertising campaign we undertook in Great Britain, the number of replies received increased dramatically. These

were handled by the officers in London. So, to say that our immigration programme was permitted to run down is not true.

Mr Grayden: In three years, your Government brought as many migrants to this State as the previous Government attracted in one year. If that is not a run-down, what is?

Mr HARMAN: The Minister seems to forget that when he conducts an immigration programme, he must compete.

Mr. Grayden: Yes; you had a Federal Labor Government diverting migrants to the Eastern States.

Mr HARMAN: We had to compete with the European Economic Community. People from England were able to go across to European Economic Community countries and receive better wages and standards of work than they could obtain in this State. That is the point I make now. We did not run down our immigration programme; we increased it.

Mr O'Neill: It is an indictment of your Government that conditions were so bad when you were in office.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—19

| | |
|----------------|-----------------|
| Mr Barnett | Mr Jamieson |
| Mr Bertram | Mr T. H. Jones |
| Mr Bryce | Mr May |
| Mr B. T. Burke | Mr McIver |
| Mr T. J. Burke | Mr Skidmore |
| Mr Carr | Mr Taylor |
| Mr H. D. Evans | Mr A. R. Tonkin |
| Mr T. D. Evans | Mr J. T. Tonkin |
| Mr Harman | Mr Moller |
| Mr Hartrey | (Teller) |

Noes—25

| | |
|-------------------|-------------|
| Mr Blaikle | Mr Nanovich |
| Mr Clarko | Mr O'Connor |
| Sir Charles Court | Mr Old |
| Mr Cowan | Mr O'Neill |
| Mr Coyne | Mr Ridge |
| Mr Crane | Mr Rushton |
| Dr Dadour | Mr Sibson |
| Mr Grayden | Mr Sodeman |
| Mr Grewar | Mr Stephens |
| Mr P. V. Jones | Mr Thompson |
| Mr Laurance | Mr Watt |
| Mr McPharlin | Mr Young |
| Mr Mensaros | (Teller) |

Pairs

| Ayes | Noes |
|-------------|-----------------|
| Mr Bateman | Mr Shalders |
| Mr Fletcher | Mrs Craig |
| Mr Davies | Sir David Brand |

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr A. R. Tonkin.

House adjourned at 10.59 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 1st August, 1974

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

QUESTIONS (13): ON NOTICE

1. ROAD TRANSPORT

Perth-Carnarvon: Bell Bros. License

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR, to the Minister for Health:

In view of the report published in *The West Australian* newspaper dated the 31st July, 1974, in which the Chairman of the Carnarvon Transport Advisory Committee is reported as having confirmed that Bell Bros. Pty. Ltd., one of the two haulier companies licensed by the State Government to operate between Perth and Carnarvon, will withdraw its service from the 1st September, will the Minister advise—

- (1) When tenders were called for this service—
 - (a) did Bell Bros. Pty. Ltd. submit a separate tender;
 - (b) if not, what was the basis of their tender?
- (2) (a) How many other tenders were received; and
 - (b) from whom?
- (3) What effect will the withdrawal of Bell Bros. have on the transport situation as it applies to Carnarvon and the surrounding area?
- (4) Will the Government recall tenders for the cartage of goods to and from Carnarvon?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) In respect of tenders called in March, 1974, a joint tender was submitted by Gascoyne Trading Pty. Ltd. and Bell Bros. Pty. Ltd.
- (2) Three other tenders were received, these being from J. Wilson (Perth) Pty. Ltd., Thomas Cannington Transport and Carnarvon Consolidated Carriers Pty. Ltd.
- (3) It will be necessary to arrange for another carrier to replace Bell Bros. and negotiations are now in progress to that end.
- (4) It is not proposed to call new tenders at this stage.