

scheme, the Government is now faced with the proposition of embarking on future extensions. On this occasion I would like to make a plea for my own electorate, the water deficiencies of which were exemplified during the drought period. I trust that when the distribution takes effect it will not be as a result of political expediency but rather to give the citizens the opportunity to enjoy this commodity which they so rightly deserve.

**Opposition Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. BROWN:** When talking of water one naturally refers also to electricity and we trust that further extensions will be made to this facility.

We must look to the Commonwealth for extensions to its postal and telecommunications services, including the telephone system. Reference to the P.M.G. must include mention of the television services available. We recognise that in 1975 it is proposed colour television will be introduced into Western Australia. We as a Parliament have a responsibility to make representation to the Commonwealth Government for adequate coverage for those areas which are not already served but which deserve to be; and, furthermore, whilst the Commonwealth is embarking on the expenditure of these millions of dollars it has a responsibility to ensure not only that people receive a television picture but also that an adequate programme is available for them to enjoy.

Our party has always been known for its programme of social reform; this has been the basis of our existence. We are accepting the challenge and will establish a new security facility within the metropolitan area, a fact which recognises that though people in the Fremantle gaol, which is overcrowded, may not be entitled to the opportunities we enjoy, at least they are entitled to be treated as human beings. The Government's intention is, therefore, one to be commended fully. I am sure the people of Fremantle will wish to make representation to the Government to secure the area of land on which the existing gaol stands. I trust the area will be utilised for the benefit of the Port of Fremantle which is equal to any port in Australia. I hope the area will be made available to the people there as, similarly, the wireless hill area was made available to the people of the City of Melville.

I regret time precludes me from continuing further with the Address-in-Reply, but I feel one final matter is worthy of consideration. I refer to people who are responsible to the newspaper media, whether they be cadet reporters, journalists, leader writers, or editors. Their function in the State of Western Australia, for the impact it has on the people, is as great as if not greater than that of the Parliament in which we are assembled. In view of their responsibilities I respectfully suggest to them that they be productive

rather than provocative; that they alert people rather than alarm them; and be purposeful rather than patronising. This attitude would help to make our great State greater and we in Western Australia would lead the way.

**MR. LAPHAM** (Karrinyup) [3.58 p.m.]: I formally second the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Sir David Brand (Leader of the Opposition).

## ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

**MR. J. T. TONKIN** (Melville—Premier) [3.59 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 4.30 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 4.00 p.m.*

---

## Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 15th March, 1972

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

### QUESTIONS (19): ON NOTICE

1.

#### TAXES

##### *Increases*

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH, to the Leader of the House:

Can the people of Western Australia expect 1972-73 to be free from further impost of State taxation?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

It was reported in *The Australian*, Friday, 10th March, 1972, that in the financial year 1970-71 according to figures released by the Commonwealth Statistician, State and Local Government taxes for each person rose in every State except Western Australia in which State there was a fall of \$2.47. The people of Western Australia can expect that the Government will do its utmost to maintain such an excellent record.

2.

#### STATE FINANCE

##### *Additional Commonwealth Grants for Works and Housing*

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS, to the Leader of the House:

(1) What additional moneys for assistance to the State's works and housing programme were granted to Western Australia at the recent Premiers' Conference?

- (2) What amounts will be allocated for—  
 (a) housing;  
 (b) schools; and  
 (c) hospitals?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

(1) \$2,990,000.

(2) Amount allocated to date is \$2,650,000 as follows:—

		\$
Housing	....	50,000
Schools	....	32,280
Hospitals	....	40,000
Other works	....	2,527,720

### 3. DAIRYING

#### *Two-price Quota Scheme*

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

- (1) What are the responsibilities of the Government in regard to the adoption of what is known as a "2 price quota scheme" for the dairying industry in Western Australia?
- (2) Will the Minister detail to the House—  
 (a) the nature of the proposal;  
 (b) the benefits, or otherwise, to the Western Australian industry of the adoption of such a scheme;  
 (c) possible effects on the payment of the Commonwealth subsidy as a result of either adoption or rejection of the proposal; and  
 (d) when is a final decision on the scheme required to be made?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) At the February meeting of Australian Agricultural Council, Commonwealth and State Ministers agreed in principle to the two-price quota scheme subject to detailed discussions at officer level which will take place in Canberra this week. If the proposal is agreed in detail State legislation will be required.
- (2) (a) The proposal provides broadly that an Australian quota for dairy production, excluding whole milk production, will be set annually by Australian Agricultural Council on the advice of the Australian Dairy Industry Council. State quotas will be allocated in relation to the Australian quota on the basis of past production history. Farm quotas will be allocated by the State authority on basis to be determined by the State.

(b) Quota production will receive the benefits of Commonwealth assistance and of equalization. Production by a farmer in excess of his quota will be paid for broadly at export parity.

(c) Returns to Western Australian producers per lb. of butter fat produced, are eroded by increased total Australian production with consequent increase in the exportable surplus and lower equalized price. Limitation of the production covered under Commonwealth assistance and equalization will benefit Western Australian producers.

(d) Commonwealth attitude on payment of subsidy is not known and is a matter for Commonwealth decision. It is not known when a final decision will be reached.

### 4.

#### WATER SUPPLIES

##### *Damming of Gascoyne River*

The Hon. G. W. BERRY, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Has the Government received the report of the feasibility study concerning the damming of the Gascoyne River?
- (2) If so, when will it be released?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The feasibility study is being evaluated by departmental officers and on receipt of their report consideration will be given to its release.

### 5.

#### PRISONS

##### *Authority for Television Programmes*

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS, to the Chief Secretary:

In relation to the filming of the two A.B.C. television programmes *Weekend Magazine* on the 5th March, 1972, and *This Day Tonight* on the 7th March, 1972—

- (a) who gave the authority for the filming to take place inside Fremantle Prison;
- (b) will the Minister ensure that in future prisoners concerned be given the usual protection of anonymity when being filmed?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS replied:

- (a) The Director, Department of Corrections.
- (b) No prisoners are photographed in such a manner as to be identified without their express permission.

8.

**UNEMPLOYMENT***Contributing Factors*

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH, to the Leader of the House:

As reported, of all the States of Australia, Western Australia has the highest unemployment rate—in the opinion of the Government what are the factors attributable to this state of affairs?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) The main reason Western Australia has the highest unemployment rate is because of the structure of the Western Australian economy compared with that of the national economy.

Western Australia has a larger percentage of workers employed in the building and construction and the mining and quarrying industries, than the rest of Australia. Taking the percentage of wage and salary earners in building and construction as against all industries, for Western Australia the percentage is 10.32% compared with 8.38% for Australia as a whole. The percentage of mining and quarrying workers in Western Australia is 4.30% compared with 1.66% for Australia as a whole.

Consequently, the reduction of overseas demand for minerals over the last six (6) to eight (8) months, with a resultant postponement of major building and construction projects, has affected Western Australia more than the other States. The Mount Newman expansion project has now been completed, the Alcoa Alumina Refinery project at Pinjarra and the Hamersley Iron Paraburdoo project are both nearing completion, whilst peak levels of employment of building and construction workers on the Robe River iron ore project and the Hamersley Iron expansion project at Dampier have now been reached. Due to the lack of international demand, the number and size of new projects have been insufficient to absorb retrenched workers from these projects.

Furthermore, there has been a flow-on decrease in demand to industries servicing these building and construction projects—such as the structural engineering industry, bricks, timber, etc.

- (2) Another contributing factor is that the over-production in the building of houses, flats and office buildings two years ago is still being worked out.

7.

**EDUCATION***Building and Related Projects Subsidy Fund*

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS, to the Leader of the House:

In view of the recent substantial grants made by the Commonwealth Government to the State Government, and bearing in mind the fact that there are primary schools in Western Australia at which Parents and Citizens' Associations are currently holding large sums of money raised by them for the specific purpose of providing such amenities as canteens and libraries, which projects cannot be implemented because the \$52,000 allocated to the Building and Related Projects Subsidy Fund for the 1971-72 year has been expended—will the Government increase this fund so that those schools concerned can proceed with their projects immediately and thus provide not only the facility for the school, but also employment for building tradesmen?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

The allocation is being increased to \$100,000 for 1971-72.

8.

**TIMBER INDUSTRY***Assistance*

The Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) In regard to the timber industry of this State—
- (a) what concessions by way of freight rates and timber royalties have been made by the Government to assist in marketing timber and timber products—
    - (i) within Australia; and
    - (ii) overseas;
  - (b) what other concessions are at present available to encourage and nurture this important primary industry comprising—
    - (i) hardwoods; and
    - (ii) softwoods;
  - (c) has the Government any plans for further assisting the industry; and
  - (d) if so, what is being planned?
- (2) As the Commonwealth Government has made grants of money available to the States for the relief of unemployment in non-metropolitan areas—
- (a) what amount has been allocated by the State Government to assist the labour intensive timber industry; and
  - (b) how is it proposed to be used?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

(1) (a) (i) Increases in rail freights and royalties have been held to a minimum and special concessional freights have been negotiated by the State Shipping Service for transport to the North West.

(ii) A special concession was offered in respect of rail freights and royalty to assist the industry in quoting for a recent South African sleeper order. This bid was unsuccessful.

(b) (i) The decision to proceed with the standard gauge rail link from Kalgoorlie to Esperance has provided much needed orders.

(ii) Price levels have been fixed below comparable products in the Eastern States.

(c) and (d) Assistance is being given to the industry wherever possible. The continuation of the Darwin shipping link is a case in point. A standing committee consisting of representatives of the timber industry and various Government departments has been set up to consider various ways in which further assistance can be given.

		\$
(2) (a)	1st Allocation	105,265
	2nd Allocation	21,564
	Total	<u>\$126,829</u>

(b) General forestry work in various districts.

## 9. COURT HOUSE

### Carnarvon

The Hon. G. W. BERRY, to the Leader of the House:

As it is understood that loan funds have been made available by the Carnarvon Shire Council in agreement with the Government for the building of a new Court House in Carnarvon—

(a) when were the funds approved;

(b) what was the amount; and

(c) what is the present position of the project?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

(a) May 12th, 1971.

(b) \$150,000 in 1970-71.

(c) Plans in course of preparation —tenders scheduled for July, 1972.

The question refers to the Court House only.

The estimated cost of the Court House is \$237,000. The balance, i.e. \$87,000, to be provided from General Loan Funds.

10. and 11. These questions were postponed.

## 12. TRAFFIC

### Seat Belts

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS, to the Minister for Police:

(1) Is the Minister aware that a Senior Surgeon at the Princess Margaret Hospital is recorded in *The West Australian* on the 31st July, 1971, as having said that many motor vehicle accidents have happened in which only the child passenger had been killed because they were not adequately restrained, and that children under six years of age are particularly vulnerable to serious injury in car accidents?

(2) Was this fact taken into consideration when framing the regulation which specifically excludes children under the age of eight years from the compulsory use of seat belts?

(3) If this fact was not taken into consideration will he have the matter examined?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes. The reason for exempting children under the age of eight years of age from the compulsory requirements of the regulation, is because of difficulty in prescribing a rule that, in practice, would apply to a child wearing a seat belt designed for an adult. While it is not compulsory for children under the age of eight years to wear seat belts, parents are encouraged to ensure they do so where practical.

(3) Answered by (2).

## 13. NEWSPAPER REPORTS

### Accuracy

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH, to the Leader of the House:

Of two newspaper reports appearing in—

(a) the *Weekend News* dated the 5th February, 1972, under the heading "The Tonkin Report"; and

- (b) *The West Australian* dated the 2nd March, 1972, under the heading of "Political Notes by John Tonkin";

which of the two reports does he consider to be the more accurate?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

The long experience of the Hon. Member must surely have enabled him to know that questions as to whether statements in the press are accurate are inadmissible. (See Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice*.)

#### 14. VETERINARY SCIENCE *Undergraduate Courses*

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Is a student able to undertake an undergraduate course in Veterinary Science in Western Australia?
- (2) If not—
  - (a) where in Australia can such student undertake a course of this nature;
  - (b) do any of these existing veterinary schools impose quota systems for out-of-State students; and
  - (c) are there any other conditions imposed that might influence the opportunity for Western Australian students enrolling for a veterinary degree?
- (3) Is it still intended that the veterinary school will be the first professional faculty established at Murdoch University?
- (4) What is the anticipated date that this school will be established?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) (a) Universities of Melbourne, Sydney and Queensland.
- (b) Yes. All of them.
- (c) Yes. There are considerable restrictions on the admission of interstate students.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) The date when the school opens for teaching is dependent on the availability of funds in the 1973-75 triennium for buildings and equipment.

#### 15. FIRE PROTECTION *Position at Pemberton*

The Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Is he aware of the dangerous fire situation in the township of Pemberton occasioned by inadequate water mains and lack of fire hydrants to service the hospital, school and other adjacent buildings?

- (2) If so, what steps are being taken to increase the capacity of the water mains and to provide fire hydrants?
- (3) How long will the people of Pemberton have to wait before property in the vicinity of the hospital and school will have adequate fire protection?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) The nearest existing fire hydrant is four chains from the school site, and eight chains from the hospital site. In addition the Railway Department has given permission to the local fire brigade to use overhead water tanks immediately at the rear of the hospital.
- (2) Provision of domestic water supplies in country towns is given priority in the allocation of funds. However, the position at Pemberton will be re-examined.
- (3) Answered by (1) and (2).

#### 16. THIRD PARTY INSURANCE *New Proposals*

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH, to the Leader of the House:

As the policy speech of the Labor Party delivered on the 3rd February, 1971, foreshadowed changes in the method of insurance for compensation of victims of vehicle accidents, or in other words "a new deal for third party insurance" resulting in a much lower cost in motor vehicle insurance premiums, and on the 20th July, 1971, I was informed in reply to a question that satisfactory progress was being made towards the preparation of the requisite legislation, but that it was not possible to state definitely when the study would be finalised—

- (a) has any further progress been made in this matter since July, 1971;
- (b) would the Minister please advise whether the foreshadowed legislation will be introduced in this session of Parliament; and
- (c) if not, why not?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (a) Further progress is being made, but the importance of this change in the law requires careful consideration before a Bill can be drafted.
- (b) Every endeavour will be made to submit legislation as early as possible.
- (c) Answered by (a) and (b).

## 17. HOUSING

*Land at East Manning*

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Has the final plan for the development of the State Housing Commission land at East Manning been completed?
- (2) If not, and bearing in mind that it had been anticipated that the plan would be completed in 1971, would the Minister advise—
  - (a) what has been the cause of the delay; and
  - (b) when can it be expected that the plan will be completed?
- (3) What is the total area of State Housing Commission owned land in this area?
- (4) When is it anticipated that construction of accommodation in this area will commence?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) (a) Advice from Metropolitan Water Board of limited capacity of sewer mains restricting development to not more than 2,000 persons necessitated re-examination and modification of the proposed subdivisional design plan.
- (b) It is expected the final plan will be ready for submission in May, 1972, for Town Planning Board approval.
- (3) 158 acres, of which approximately 53 acres are reserved for regional open space and not available for residential development.
- (4) March/April, 1973, at the earliest.

## 18. GREYHOUND RACING

*Proposed Meeting*

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH, to the Chief Secretary:

In view of the report which appeared in the *Daily News* on the 10th February, 1972, stating that the public of Western Australia would have its first taste of greyhound racing during the Sheffield Shield cricket match between Western Australia and South Australia at the W.A.C.A. Ground, and that the foreshadowed greyhound meeting was apparently to be a properly organised greyhound meeting with race books, starting traps and about 30 of Australia's top dogs, including some from the Eastern States, participating; and as it was reported that an organisation known as the National Coursing Association had had discussions with the Chief Secretary

who announced that a seven man board would be appointed to control greyhound racing in Western Australia—

- (a) was the projected meeting held;
- (b) if not, was it not held because it could have been found to be illegal;
- (c) if this was not the case, what was the reason for cancelling the intended meeting;
- (d) on what date was the decision to cancel the meeting made; and
- (e) by whom was the decision made?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS replied:

- (a) No.
- (b) and (c) The following Press Statement was issued by the National Coursing Association of W.A.:—

After careful consideration of all relevant factors, the Committee of the National Coursing Association of W.A., reluctantly announces that the Greyhound races which were to have been held at the W.A.C.A. Ground next Saturday, have been cancelled.

This announcement comes after advice received on the matter of legality under the existing act, and although there is divided opinion on interpretation under this act; it was considered wise, in the circumstances to make this decision.

The Committee wishes to express its gratitude to members of all Greyhound organisations, who helped to make last Sunday's trials at the W.A.C.A. and the impending fixture a success and looks forward to their co-operation in the future.

- (d) 22nd February, 1972.
- (e) National Coursing Association of W.A.

## 19. MINISTERIAL VISITS

*Frequency*

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) What Ministers have, since the 3rd March, 1971, visited—
  - (a) Overseas;
  - (b) Eastern States; and
  - (c) North West?
- (2) On how many occasions have such Ministers visited the areas mentioned in (1) (a), (b) and (c)?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied: (1) and (2)

	(a)	(b)	(c)
Premier .....	.....	5	2
Minister for Development and Decentralisation, Town Planning, and the North West .....	.....	.....	.....
Minister for Education, Attorney General and Assistant to the Treasurer .....	3	2	12
Minister for Community Welfare .....	1	7	5
Minister for Police, Transport and Railways .....	.....	2	1
Minister for Mines and Electricity .....	.....	2	.....
Minister for Works and Water Supplies .....	1	3	10
Minister for Lands, Agriculture, Immigration and Forests .....	.....	6	3
Minister for Environmental Protection, Health and Fisheries and Fauna .....	.....	6	2
Minister for Labour, Prices Control, Consumer Protection and Tourism .....	.....	3	1
Minister for Local Government and Chief Secretary .....	2	8	1
Minister for Housing and Fuel .....	.....	3	4
.....	1	4	4

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SECOND DAY

### Motion

Debate resumed, from the 14th March, on the following motion by The Hon. D. K. Dans:—

That the following Address be presented to His Excellency:—

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

**THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH** (North Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [5.09 p.m.]: I would like to commence my remarks this afternoon by offering congratulations to Mr. Dans upon the speech he made to the House yesterday. I think the honourable member was disadvantaged to some extent (a) by the heat of the day, (b) by the fact that many of us perhaps asked more questions than is usual, which absorbed some of the time, and (c) because His Excellency's Speech was, I think, the longest that I can remember. These matters possibly caused Mr. Dans to have less time than he might otherwise have employed. To the extent that I might be responsible for that, I apologise.

I think it is a pity Mr. Dans did not have a little more time because he might have developed the important matter upon which he was speaking—a subject which I know is very dear to his heart and very near to him in experience. He might have developed his theme and told us what he thinks about the right of workers to indicate how they feel about strikes, and what he thinks about secret ballots. On the other hand, perhaps it was fortunate that time did not allow this to take place.

This afternoon I will take perhaps the unusual course of making one or two remarks about the answers I received to questions asked today. These answers were couched in such moderate, persuasive terms, and were so kindly delivered, that

unless I knew otherwise I would almost think the individual Ministers on the front bench had written the answers themselves. I am sure that was not exactly the case. However, the answers were delivered in a very kindly manner, and when I was listening to them I felt the Ministers were almost persuading me not to say anything about the answers.

The first question related to taxes. The answer that was read out will be remembered. It was almost in the form of a platitude, and indicated that the State of Western Australia was better off in the last financial year than was any other State in relation to the rate of tax that was struck, and that the Government would do its utmost to maintain such an excellent record.

The document that clings closely to my mind is the 1971 policy speech of the Government, in which the Government promised to do all sorts of things. No doubt it has done its utmost to fulfil some of those promises but in many respects it has not been able to do so. Later on I will come back to that matter, if I can think of it.

The answer given me by the Leader of the House in relation to the fact that Western Australia has the highest unemployment rate was certainly a lengthy argument. It was well considered and I am sure it was intended to convey not only to the members of this House but also perhaps to the Press the reason for Western Australia having the highest unemployment rate.

The answer takes me back to the time when I was on that side of the House and certain other people were over here and this State had about 6,000 people who were unemployed. I recall what was said to me as Leader in this House, of the Government of which I was a member at that time. It also makes me smile a little when I read of the blasts that the Opposition in the Federal Parliament has been giving to the Federal Government as a result of the forecast that there would be about 150,000 people unemployed.

That position did not eventuate, of course, but I am caused to think it is a matter of horses for courses. If one is in Opposition in the Federal Parliament one bashes that subject as hard as one can because an election is coming up. When there is a very high unemployment rate in Western Australia, one gives a platitudinous excuse for the unemployment rate being so high.

I did not get an answer at all to question 10 on the notice paper. I know it is quite common usage and practice for a Minister to delay an answer to a question, but I must say I was a little surprised to hear the Chief Secretary say that the answer to the question had not come to hand. I thought the answer to this question would have been well in his mind, not in someone else's hand, because we all know what took place.

Yesterday when I gave notice of this question I was conscious of the fact that the galleries and the floor of the House were full with people who were perspiring freely to their great inconvenience and that they might feel I was concentrating on and supporting the game of bingo, which was not my intention at all. As I say, I was most conscious of this fact. I was trying to bring to the notice of some people and to the notice of the critics that we had passed a Bill through this Chamber which we had amended to the betterment of the people of the community and in keeping with what the Government says it practises. The Government said it did not encourage gambling and that it was sure gambling would not take place on licensed premises.

The Chief Secretary wholeheartedly agreed with my approach; the House agreed to the Bill, which was returned to the Legislative Assembly where it stopped. Whatever reason I am given tomorrow—and perhaps it is a little unfair to say this—the real reason for what happened is that when the Bill got down to the other House it was received in a manner not acceptable to some members of the Government in that Chamber, and for that reason the Bill stopped there.

Mr. Willesee's reply to me was almost in the nature of a compliment when he said that my long experience must surely enable me to know that questions whether statements made in the Press are accurate are inadmissible. He also referred me to Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice*.

I should have thought that had this question been inadmissible you, Mr. President, would have stopped it at its very source. I do not think the question was inadmissible at all. I did however want to know the facts and I think the person answering the question was a bit worried about my reasoning.

There were two separate articles in two different papers, both of which were ascribed to the Premier. When I read them

they seemed different in their approach and I asked the Minister to tell me which he thought was the more accurate comment by the Premier.

The answer I received was cleverly turned around to the point that members might have been encouraged into thinking the reporting of the statement made by the Premier—one being his column to *The West Australian* newspaper to which I understand he puts his own personal signature—was incorrect. I daresay it is true to some extent to say that I have had long experience in this matter but it is also true to say that I am not as silly as all that.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Perhaps you could ask whether he was misreported in both of them.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I cannot be bothered, because what I have said just goes to show the position that exists. The next question I asked was on the very important matter of third party insurance. Before I go any further, might I also say that to me this is a very important question.

Before the election of 1971 the Labor Party considered this to be a very important matter, because in its policy speech it used up a tremendous amount of space to talk about this very important subject; a subject which touches the household of everybody in the community. I refer, of course, to third party insurance as it relates to the accident rate, and the efforts being made by the Minister for Police to cut down the accident rate; and may I applaud the creditable efforts being made by the Minister for Police in this direction.

In the Labor Party policy speech we find the following:—

We expect a much lower premium cost of motor vehicle insurance to result and a principal factor towards this will be the encouragement of more defensive driving which is expected to result in fewer highway accidents.

That meant that if the Labor Party were elected to the Treasury benches it would come forward with a new deal for the people of Western Australia on the question of third party insurance. I asked two questions last year, and I asked a further question yesterday. The answer which I received today is similar to the one I got several months ago—that progress was being made.

I suppose I must accept that and be content with the fact that progress is being made inch by inch. I venture to suggest that the Government will find this an extremely difficult matter. From his experience in administering this Act, Mr. Logan knows the tremendous efforts the previous Government put into this matter but, in spite of all its efforts, it was not



able to come up with anything satisfactory in the way of a solution; certainly nothing to indicate to the people or the House that premiums would be much lower, which I am sure would have persuaded a number of people to change their political approach during the last election.

I do not propose to say very much on the question of greyhound racing except that once again I feel the subject is a little like daylight saving. People who are in favour of greyhound racing seem to think, at least in my opinion—although the Chief Secretary has tried to warn them to the contrary—that this will be an established fact. In spite of the Chief Secretary's warning, people who belong to certain organisations which may be interested in greyhound racing do, however, continue to feel that it will eventually be an established fact.

They are, in fact, much nearer the truth than they think, because the Government proposes to legislate in this field. I am not sure what sort of answer I would receive now if I were to ask whether or not the Government encouraged gambling.

I was interested in the question asked by Mr. Logan which referred to visits overseas by Ministers of the Crown. Let me make it clear—if it is necessary for me to make it clear—that I think Ministers should go overseas. If a Minister on the front bench of this House has not been overseas, I hope he will take the opportunity to do so as soon as possible so that he might gain some advantage by studying the various fields related to his ministerial responsibility.

During my days as a Minister I was fortunate to have one or two trips overseas and they were of great benefit to me. I am not a critic of the fact that Ministers go abroad and travel to gain some experience. I do not suggest that Mr. Logan's question is intended to be of a critical nature.

We left this House last on the 10th December, and we all remember the last motion moved by the Leader of the House when he said—

I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until a date to be fixed by the President.

I do not know what other members felt but I thought we would resume the sitting in December and that when we came back here at approximately this time we would continue with the business enacted in December.

There were two, if not three, items left on the notice paper on the final day, and the following day Mr. Willesee introduced a couple of Bills and said we would have time to look at these between that date and the next session.

I thought we would do what we had done before; that the session would carry on. I then read a report in the newspaper which said that Parliament would sit in March. The article reads as follows:—

The State Parliament will have its third official opening in nine months on March 14.

However, formalities will be kept to a minimum.

The Governor, Sir Douglas Kendrew, will make the opening speech, but the tea party that usually follows the opening probably will be abandoned.

The Premier, Mr. Tonkin, hopes to meet the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, Mr. D. Norton, and the President of the Legislative Council, Mr. L. C. Diver, to discuss arrangements for the opening.

That is all we heard until not so many days ago. I was surprised when I found we were going to have a formal opening together with all the formalities attendant upon such opening, including the tea party and the rest. I do not know what happened. It appears that some advice must have been given to the Government for this to have been advertised, but we only knew about the change a few days ago.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: The tea was particularly nice.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I will let that interjection pass and will content myself by saying I am glad the honourable gentleman enjoyed his afternoon tea. I want to make two things perfectly clear. What I am about to say is not to be interpreted in any way to give people the idea I do not think members of Parliament should be here to carry out their task of attending Parliament and to do their duty. We all accept that. Nor do I wish it to be felt that any words of mine were intended to deprive the public from attending the opening—I refer, of course, to those invited to this Chamber by the President and those invited to attend in the other House by the Speaker. It was not my intention to deny these people the opportunity to attend the opening of Parliament; but how can we have a formal opening in an informal way? The answer is of course that we can; we did it last year when the Government hurriedly prorogued Parliament, and when the Governor came up to reopen Parliament. But the people accepted that because His Excellency had received the strongest recommendation that Parliament should be prorogued; that if it were not, dire consequences could result.

I notice that the parties in the Tasmanian Parliament are divided 17 to 17 as a result of the Central Party man resigning from the Ministry. I do not know what has happened there since we received this morning's paper.

The Hon. J. Dolan: He is a member of the Government.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: He was, but when he resigned he was no longer a member of the Government, and the Government is left in the situation in which the Government of this State found itself.

The Hon. J. Dolan: The circumstances were different.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Of course the circumstances were different, but I do not wish to enlarge on that aspect. My criticism is of the fact that we should have a formal opening in March. It is bad enough to have to sit here all day and listen to me!

Having witnessed the discomfort experienced by the members of the public who sat here yesterday afternoon, surely the Government will have some further thoughts of repeating this practice on any other such occasion. I really do hope this will be the case.

The Governor in his Speech said that the opening of Parliament in March would link the sessions of Parliament with the calendar year rather than with the financial year. I do not quite understand that. To me it is a lot of nonsense. The calendar year starts from the 1st January and ends on the 31st December, whereas the fiscal or financial year commences on the 1st July and ends on the 30th June the following year. Let us stop to examine this position. This will mean that if we introduce a Bill in June and complete its passage in August we will travel over a financial year and will still be in the same calendar year.

We have done this before and I am sure that we will do it again. The only small inconvenience I can see is that the Statutes and the *Hansard* reports will possibly not tie up as readily as would otherwise be the case, because the Statutes, having been passed in 1972, regardless of whether it is in the financial year or the calendar year, will bear the year 1972. So I cannot see any sense in this proposed change and therefore, to put it forward as a reason for the official opening of Parliament in March is unacceptable to me. I presume, in view of the fact that we had a formal opening yesterday, we can look forward to another official opening in March, 1973. I do not intend to go into the pitfalls of political life and the sort of thing that could interrupt this experience, but for the moment let us say that the Government will carry on for its full term.

Unless the Government alters its mind—and I hope it does—another March session will commence in 1973 and, of course, in about March, 1974, we will have a general election. The whole idea of the parliamentary session fitting in with the

calendar year instead of the financial year is, therefore, completely unjustified. I may be totally wrong in my approach to this matter, but I do not think I am. Nevertheless, I am grateful to whoever it was who said to the Government of the day, "You should not invite the Governor to attend Parliament in an informal way to open the Parliamentary session purely for convenience without observing the traditional formalities that are followed with the opening of Parliament." As hot as it was yesterday, I am glad His Excellency, the Governor, read his Speech to the kind of audience to whom he is usually accustomed.

As you know, Mr. President, the judges were not present here yesterday, because no doubt they have their court lists full and were unable to interrupt their court proceedings so that they might attend the opening of Parliament, such as it was. Therefore I hope the Government will have another look at this matter and, in fact, I think the Government might be glad to return to the previous system of having only one session of Parliament. If that were done, it would have my complete support.

I now turn my attention to one or two matters mentioned in the Governor's Speech. I notice that high priority was given to the fact that applications were being called for the position of Parliamentary Commissioner in this State. The Government was elected 12 months ago, and since the first session of this Parliament, Parliament has been prorogued twice and we have had the opportunity to address ourselves three times to the Address-in-Reply debate. We therefore cannot growl at the lack of opportunity to speak on general matters and, who knows, we may have further opportunities as time goes on.

In March, 1971, the Government was elected as a result of many promises it made to the electorate. It has been unable to fulfil those promises. It has blamed the Commonwealth Government, or the non-Labor members of the Legislative Council for not being able to keep its promises, but despite this the Commonwealth Government has treated the present State Government very generously indeed. In fact, it enabled the Governor to sit where you are now sitting, Mr. President, and to deliver these words—

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

If members look at that statement and ally it to the first question on the notice paper concerning taxation which I asked this afternoon, I feel sure they will find it will not be long before we are discussing some

sort of taxing measure or other, because the people of Western Australia cannot be assured there will not be another impost of taxation in the present year.

The Commonwealth Government has been very generous indeed to the State Government. I have forgotten for the moment the amount of special assistance that was granted by the Commonwealth to the State, but it runs into some \$7,000,000 or more. So the Treasurer finds himself in a fortunate position. After having made many promises—I have already referred to this Government as being the "most promising" Government yet—to the electors before the Government was elected to the Treasury Benches, he now finds he is unable to fulfil those promises, and for this he has blamed the non-Labor members of the Legislative Council.

As I started to say, the Commonwealth Government has placed the Treasurer in a fortunate position because it has helped the Government a great deal in its difficulties to the point of the State being placed in its present situation, as was revealed in the Governor's Speech. When I heard the Governor refer to the fact that the value of minerals for 1971, at \$645,000,000, was 11 per cent. above the 1970 figure, the first thing that went through my mind, of course, was: How fortunate we are in Western Australia to have minerals, and what sort of situation might we be in if we did not have those minerals and the income to be derived from them, together with the job-giving opportunities that minerals have provided for our people, particularly in the last decade!

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I think you can give yourself a pat on the back for that result.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I will not do that, but I thank the Leader of the House for the remark anyway. This afternoon being the first opportunity I have to speak in this new session of Parliament, I feel I must say something about the Legislative Council. Certain people have availed themselves of the opportunity to castigate and criticise the Legislative Council, and at one stage it struck me that I should say something on the matter. So I sat down at my desk and I scribbled these words—

A person either believes in a bicameral system of Government or he does not, and in common with people in many other countries of the world I believe in the two-House system. The Federal Parliament, elected by the people, has a two-House system.

It is absurd to try to compare the House of Lords with the Legislative Council in this State. The House of Lords is a "hereditary" House where members either inherit their seats or are appointed. They are not elected on a universal franchise as is the case

in Western Australia. Every person over the age of 18 is eligible to vote for the Legislative Council in this State.

The results of the last general election held in 1971 returned Liberal and Country Party members in some Council seats, and the poll in the Legislative Assembly elections resulted in Labor members being elected to the Legislative Assembly seats within those provinces. In fact, this was so in my province, where my colleague at the present time is a member of the Labor Party, and the five seats held in the Legislative Assembly which go to make up my province are held by two Liberal and three Labor members.

When I was Minister for Justice I introduced legislation into Parliament which resulted in the granting of adult franchise for both Houses.

The Legislative Council in this State is a safeguard for the people and, over the years, has proved itself to be so. I admit there are occasions when the two Houses of Parliament differ upon certain matters, but on most occasions the processes which exist for sorting out these differences work satisfactorily.

The Legislative Council takes an active part in the parliamentary affairs of the State. Sight must not be lost of the fact that legislation introduced by Liberal Party, Country Party, and Labor Party Ministers is introduced through the two Houses, making it absolutely essential that the Council debates this legislation before it is passed by the Assembly.

The quality of some of the criticism I have read of the Legislative Council leads me to the conclusion that some of these critics are not very well informed.

Mr. President, I want you to know that I telephoned *The West Australian* newspaper, and over the telephone I dictated that short statement to a reporter on the other end of the line, but that newspaper did not see fit to make any mention of the statement in its columns.

To say the least, I thought that was extremely impolite of the newspaper. If it considered the statement to be not worth tuppence, at least it could have said, "We do not think that statement worth anything and we have decided not to print it." So today I decided to take the matter a little further. I thought that I should revive my memory a little in regard to what happened in former years.

In 1963 you, Sir, sat in the Chair you now occupy and I sat where Mr. Willesee now sits. That was a year that I have good cause to remember for reasons that I need not explain this afternoon.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Do you think it is equally as hot now?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, it is fairly hot, but I do not intend to stop. I intend to relate what happened in this Chamber in that year despite the rise in temperature. I went outside the Chamber and obtained a 1963 volume of the *Parliamentary Debates*. It was in that year that Dr. Gordon Hislop sat where Mr. Dellar now sits and he introduced a motion into this Chamber, if members will recollect, calling upon the Government to introduce adult franchise for the Legislative Council election, provided, firstly, that the Council provinces were redistributed in order to rectify the imbalance of the provinces that existed at that time. I had no trouble in finding the report of the debate I was looking for, because when I examined this volume of the *Parliamentary Debates* for 1963 I found that somebody had been there before me and had marked, with two or three slips of paper, the report of the debate that had taken place at that time.

The critics of the Legislative Council had appointed a meeting somewhere in Parliament House and about 50 or 60 people had attended. I am not sure of the exact number. I thought to myself, "This is very interesting, indeed; I am glad to think that somebody has taken the bother to look at the report of this debate." I then began to wonder who it might be. I thought of all the new members, and considered that it might be Miss Elliott, Mr. Dans, or Mr. Leeson, who is very frustrated in his present position in the Legislative Council. I also thought it might have been one or two of my own colleagues, and as I have not drawn any comment yet as to who it was, I can only suggest that very few have bothered to look at the report of the debate, to see what took place in 1963. I know that you, Mr. President, did not have to look up that report, because you were required to listen to the debate all the way through.

Then I began to think that perhaps we do not realise that, this afternoon, in this House, there are 16 members present who were not here in 1963 when the legislation I am about to mention was brought down. In that year we amended the Electoral Districts Act and put through amendments to the Constitution Acts. I might mention, also, that in the following year we passed amendments to the Electoral Act.

If the new members—and I repeat there are 16 of them who were not here then—have not read the report of that debate, let me commend it to them and recommend very strongly that they do. They will find it commencing on page 3043 of the 1963 *Hansard*. They will find that

the motion, which was moved by Dr. Hislop, reads—

That this House expresses the opinion that there should be a redistribution of the provinces of the Legislative Council of Western Australia, which would involve amendment to the Electoral Districts Act of 1947 which should be introduced into the Parliament of Western Australia, such amendment or amendments to provide that the Electoral Commissioners . . .

I will not read it all because members can find it in *Hansard*. That was the basis of Dr. Hislop's motion.

I introduced the Bill on Thursday, the 21st November, 1963. I do not think I should read all that was said on that occasion, but I should read one or two of the comments made by the older, experienced members of the Chamber at that time, not forgetting that in those days the franchise of the Upper House was a property franchise. A person could not serve as a member of the Chamber unless he or she was 30 years of age and no-one could vote unless he or she owned some property.

We amended that to provide for adult franchise. Anyone over the age of 21 years can vote for the election of members to both Houses in exactly the same way as the votes for the election of members to the House of Representatives and the Senate; and anyone who is 21 years of age or over can become a member of the Upper House.

The Leader of the Opposition of the day (The Hon. F. J. S. Wise) was a man whom we all know very well, and he said—

I think if this Bill becomes law, it will be regarded in the years to come as a milestone in our legislative history. It will bring about a change, or different sorts of changes, some of which have been contemplated and some of which have been advocated by different people through the years, but which have not been acceptable separately when considered by this Parliament. The changes now presented to us and in this Bill will bring about alterations of different kinds, and, at the same time, preserve—although on the same sort of franchise—a difference in the composition and constitution of two Houses of Parliament elected under the one franchise.

If members look through the debates they will find that one of the causes for the concern of Mr. Wise and other members was what might happen to some members of the Council.

Members are aware that we then had 10 provinces with three members each but this was to be altered to 15 provinces with two members each, and the machinery necessary to bring this about was very

complicated. While I am not looking for any praise, I must say that I suffered many sleepless nights on that occasion in an endeavour to ensure that the legislation which was presented to the Chamber would be fair to the political parties, the members of Parliament and the people of the State; and that was the manner in which that legislation was accepted at that time. I repeat that all through the debate there was a feeling that some members might lose their seats. One member said—

Well, be that as it may. This is a change for which we stand and if some members lose their seats, that is going to happen.

As a result of that legislation one member lost his seat although I am not so sure that that absolutely had to occur. A way could have been found to avoid it; but that is nothing but history now.

Because members were concerned about the representation, I made this comment on page 3099 when replying to the debate—

With great respect, we could not continue to have a situation where about less than 9,000 people have a large number of members of Parliament representing them as they do at present. In respect of the three districts in the North Province there are about 5,000 people on the roll represented by three members of the Legislative Assembly and three members of the Legislative Council. In the North-East Province there are about 10,000 people on the roll represented by two members of the Legislative Assembly and three members of the Legislative Council. In the South-East Province there is a similar number represented by two members of the Legislative Assembly and three members of the Legislative Council, making a total, in all, of 16 members of Parliament—nine members of the Legislative Council and seven members of the Legislative Assembly. A situation of that nature could not fairly be expected to prevail.

The new members who are interested enough should read through the history of this change which took place from 1963 onwards. One honourable member in the Chamber, who had introduced legislation to bring about adult franchise, did not trust me in the matter at all. These comments were made—

I did not question anything. But having had sober thoughts on the measure, I began to see what might happen to Labor members from the goldfields areas; and I began to wonder if there was a hidden meaning.

I will not bother to indicate who said that; but there was no hidden meaning whatever. Those members present at the time will recall that 29 members of the Legislative Council voted for that Bill. Because

it was necessary that the Bill be passed with a constitutional majority you, Sir, divided the House on two occasions and 29 of us voted in favour of the legislation. Mr. George Bennetts drew your attention to the fact that no-one had voted against the Bill and he said he believed that fact ought to be recorded in *Hansard* and so you mentioned the fact that you could not appoint a teller for the noes because there were no noes.

The point I make is that the members in this House on that occasion—Liberal Party, Country Party, and Labor Party—were all united in their belief that the Legislative Council should be elected on an adult franchise.

The Bill then went to the Legislative Assembly and I believe it is worth repeating in this Chamber a little of what was said there. The Leader of the Opposition at that time was another man whom we all know very well indeed (The Hon. A. R. G. Hawke) who at page 3354 said—

We of the Labor Party are prepared to take such risks as might be involved, especially in regard to the two provinces I mentioned on the goldfields and the associated farming areas, because we feel that any such risk as might be involved is not too great a price to pay to achieve the objective to which we have been dedicated over a long period of years—that objective, as I say, being the right of every citizen over 21 years of age in this State to have a vote for the Legislative Council as well as for the election of members to the Legislative Assembly and to both Houses of the Federal Parliament.

When the voting took place in the Legislative Assembly the result was the same. No-one voted against the Bill.

I am recalling these facts because, as I have said before, we have 16 members in this Chamber who were not here in 1963. I have been here a long time now and so have you, Sir. Mr. Les Logan has been here for many years also. In fact, I think he is the father of the House at present because he has been here longer than any of us. I recall that Mr. Eric Heenan, who was here for a long time—something like 32 or 33 years—addressed himself to that legislation.

I am not going to bore members by dealing with the history of the Legislative Council. I am sure we all know it. We all know when it was first appointed, how it was first changed, and when the changes took place. The little book which Mr. Roberts kindly compiled assists the public in these matters, so I will not bother giving any further information.

I come back to the very simple statement I made to the Press but which no-one in the Press saw fit to mention; that is, that a person either believes in a bicameral

system of Government or he does not; he either believes in a two-House system or he will fight like mad to get rid of one of them. I do not subscribe to that view and neither does the party of which I am a member.

I have already said, but repeat, that to all intents and purposes we are exactly the same in composition as is the Federal Parliament of Australia; that is, we have a two-House system. I never hear members of the Labor Party making loud protests about what takes place in the Senate when the Labor Party and the D.L.P. unite to vote some of the Government's legislation out in that Chamber. Have you ever heard of such protests, Mr. President? Have you ever heard members of the Labor Party say, "It should not have taken place"? I do not know how many times that has been done over there, but I have heard of no loud protests when it has occurred.

Some people find it very convenient to say, "Well, we would have done this if it had not been for the Legislative Council. Get rid of the Legislative Council." I saw Mr. Leeson was terribly frustrated when he was in Kalgoorlie.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: He will continue to remark about it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Whether he was frustrated in Kalgoorlie or was frustrated here and took his frustration to Kalgoorlie, I do not know; but it is enlightening for me to know that while some people in the Labor Party—and outside the Labor Party, I suppose—criticise the construction of the Legislative Council which is elected in the manner I have outlined, it is amusing to know that other members of the Labor Party are saying to one of their Ministers whose seat looks as if it might be eliminated, "Look, you seek the safety, security, and tranquility of the Legislative Council. Mr. Dolan will not be a Minister in 1974. You take that seat."

The Hon. J. Dolan: How do you know?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I thank the Minister for putting the doubt in my mind.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I thought I would get a little 'inside information from you.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Now I know what sort of candidate my party may be up against.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: You would not beat Jerry with an axe.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I will not answer that interjection because I have no desire to be personal.

As I said, it is amusing to note a comment of this nature. It is also amusing to hear what was said to Labor Party members concerning the new Mining Bill which is to be introduced by the Government. I am referring to the rewrite of the Mining Bill which is no doubt the legislation

which has been compiled as a result of the committee I appointed to look into the Act. The Labor Party members have been told, "There will be a free vote on the Mining Bill, boys. You can vote according to your conscience." I think Mr. Leeson might feel less frustrated when the Mining Bill is dealt with than he felt in his first year in Parliament. I can appreciate his frustration.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: You cannot.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I think I can. If I cannot, then the honourable member will have an opportunity during the course of the debate to tell me I am wrong.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: That is possible.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No it is not. Obviously the honourable member has had very little experience as he does not even know men. He will come to know that if I say something to him he can regard it as being what I believe and the truth.

The honourable member may feel a little less frustrated because he will be free to vote as he wishes on the Mining Bill. I am somewhat suspicious about the reasons for allowing a free vote. Perhaps the Bill may contain some measures of an embarrassing nature to certain members who represent the Goldfields. Please do not look at me like that, Mr. Stubbs!

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: I was not listening to what you were saying but simply admiring your good looks.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The quiet and unobtrusive Chief Secretary becomes better every day! When I read through *Hansard* for the last session I found he was very rude to me one day but I had not realised what he had said. I will not worry about that, because many people in this House have been rude to me.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: You are still a mile in front.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If I were to say I do not have an answer to that remark, I would not be doing myself justice. In my view a free vote is an excellent idea. The last occasion on which members of the Labor Party were given a free vote was on the Liquor Bill, as has been reported. I am sure all members will agree the resulting legislation was very good. There were many divisions on the measure.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It finished up very well, but it did not start off that way.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Why, Mr. Thompson? It finished up well because the honourable member was not tied to doing what his party told him. Make no mistake; we always know where Mr. Ron Thompson will be when the division bells ring.

The Hon. R. Thompson: My party has never tied me to anything.

**The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH:** The honourable member is obedient then, without being tied.

**The Hon. R. Thompson:** That is right.

**The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH:** Mr. Ron Thompson knows what I mean by the expression "being tied"; namely, to follow the party line. All I am trying to say is that the Legislative Council would be a better place if all members, irrespective of parties, were more free to act according to their consciences.

**The Hon. R. Thompson:** The Leader of the Opposition is talking as if members of his party are never tied, but he forgets I have been here a long while now.

**The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH:** The honourable member well knows, but I will tell him definitely, there is much less rope about the members of my party than about the members of his.

**The Hon. R. Thompson:** Then they must be as obedient as I am.

**The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH:** The honourable member does not know whether they are obedient or otherwise.

**The Hon. R. Thompson:** Let us prove it.

**The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH:** If I could be as sure of future action as his leader is, I would be much surer than I am now. I will not develop that theme either.

**The Hon. J. Dolan:** I think we must wait to read that in *Hansard*.

**The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH:** I shall conclude my remarks upon a very serious note. I fervently believe it would be much better if we—all of us, if members like—were able to follow the dictates of our own consciences. I understand political parties must stand for certain principles. The Labor Party stands for socialism and the Liberal Party for something else. If we do what we think right and proper, within those principles, this place and the Parliament will be a better place. I want the Ministers on the front bench, as well as the Government, to know my views on this matter which are shared by many other members in this Chamber and were certainly shared by old members who voted for the reforms that took place in 1963-64. I believe we are part of the parliamentary system of Western Australia and we have a responsibility to the people of this State. I would not be fit to be a member of Parliament if I did not feel, within the dictates of my own conscience, that I was doing the right and proper thing for the people I represent and for the people of Western Australia. For this reason I shall continue to follow my own ideas and conscience in moving amendments to Bills, in making speeches in which I express my

views, and in voting. As long as I am a member of this House I propose to continue to do this. I have done it in the past and I shall do it in the future.

I say to the Government in all sincerity: Let us get on with the business of Parliament. I hope we will not re-experience similar publicity. The Lotteries Control Bill was a measure which originated in the Legislative Council but was stopped in another place. Similarly a Bill which originated in the Legislative Assembly was tossed out by this Chamber; at once the flares went up because the Legislative Council did something or other to the measure.

If I were to ask Ministers on the front bench whether they believe members on this side of the Chamber are really antagonistic to their Government I do not think they could answer me in the affirmative. Certainly they could not unless they are hypocritical, which I am sure they are not. I take seriously the words that are said to me, and which I say myself, at the end of each parliamentary session—words of thanks to the President, the Leader of the Opposition, and the Chairman of Committees for the mutual co-operation that has been extended in the conduct of the business of the Government of the day. We should continue in this spirit of co-operation, and people who think they can gain publicity by shouting out about the Legislative Council ought to carry on with the business of looking after their own affairs. I am sure that, deep down, every member in this place shares my views; whether or not any other member is prepared to get up and say so is of little significance to me. I regard it as a fair approach.

We are part of the parliamentary system of this country and are elected on exactly the same franchise as members are elected to another place. Therefore, we are entitled, expected, and should take an active part in the parliamentary affairs of the State. As one member standing here that is exactly what I intend to do.

In view of the publicity which some have tried to beat into underserving proportions, I felt I should say something about this and remind newer members, 16 in all, who have come into this House since 1964 that, before then, we were elected in a different way. We are now elected on the basis of adult franchise in the same way as members are elected to another place. They should take seriously the words expressed by the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly when adult franchise was being debated. He accepted the proposition fully and was glad to see the measure come forward. The Opposition of the day voted unanimously for the Bill, along with the rest of the members of both Chambers. Bearing this in mind, we should accept the situation and get on with the job.

The only alteration we have not yet made concerns the age of a member eligible to be elected to this place. If I remember correctly the age, according to the Constitution, is still 21. This is something that has not yet been altered. We have altered the voting age but not the age for entering this Chamber. The age limit previously was lowered from 30 to 21 years but it has not been changed since then. I have an open mind as to whether or not it should be changed. I do not think one can necessarily put old heads on young shoulders; maybe some seniority in age of a person who is a representative in this Chamber could be a good thing.

I sincerely hope what I have said will be accepted in the spirit in which it is intended and we will get on with the affairs of Parliament. It may be asked what the Legislative Council actually did to the Government's legislation last session. I know it was the first time for 12 years that the Labor Party had been in office. I say quite seriously that whilst we rejected some of the Government's legislation we certainly improved much of it. In fact we rejected a couple of Bills, but how many did we pass? The number was 79, 80, or even more. Of these, we amended some and improved them. It is our task to have a second look at legislation which is introduced into the Legislative Assembly. When legislation originates here it is the task of the Legislative Assembly to have a second look at it and, if members there do not like it or have some reservations, to send it back to us.

I hope what I have said may have a quietening effect on people who would like to be rabble rousers over the approach of the Legislative Council to a Labor Government. For that matter it can be said that in my time here the Legislative Council has also amended or rejected legislation introduced by a Liberal Government, but I do not think that is terribly important. The current attack is simply because the Legislative Council took some action; it does not matter what happened in another place—every time it is what the Council does. I content myself with those remarks and I hope they will be accepted in the spirit in which they are intended.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. G. W. Berry.

## COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION

### *Assembly Personnel*

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying the personnel of sessional committees appointed by that House.

*House adjourned at 6.12 p.m.*

# Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 15th March, 1972

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

## DEPUTY CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES

### *Appointment*

**THE SPEAKER** (Mr. Norton): I wish to announce that I have appointed the member for Mirrabooka (Mr. A. R. Tonkin), the member for Bunbury (Mr. Williams), and the member for Roe (Mr. W. G. Young) to be Deputy Chairmen of Committees during the present session.

## PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

### *Report: Receipt*

On motion by Mr. Harman, the second report of the Public Accounts Committee was received.

## QUESTIONS (31): ON NOTICE

### 1. SYNTHETIC MEAT

#### *Use of Term*

Mr. W. A. MANNING, to the Minister for Agriculture:

With respect to the new synthetic food reported as "synthetic meat" can he say—

- (a) What is the position regarding the use of such a name for a substance which is not "meat" as we know it?
- (b) May such words as "steak", "lamb chops", "pork", be used for any imitation which might be manufactured?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (a) In relation to foods, legislation under the Health Act provides for control over inadequate, misleading or incorrect labelling.
- (b) No.

### 2. FIREARMS AND GUNS ACT

#### *Anomalies*

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

- (1) Has he received complaints regarding what has been termed "the restrictive and overbearing attitudes" of the Western Australian Police Department in both their interpretation and administration of the Firearms and Guns Act, 1931, and further that in fact anomalies or differences exist in the matter of the requirements of the Act and the actions of the Department?
- (2) If these anomalies do exist, will he list them?