

Mr. O'Connor: What result did we get?

Mr. T. D. EVANS. If we come back to the exercise about which we have heard so much from the members of the Opposition, as I have indicated, the policy adopted by this Government is that when it is necessary to enter into a joint Commonwealth-State participation on the basis of co-operative federalism then we should try to build bridges between the Australian people and the various Australian Governments. I cannot see that an amendment such as the one we have before us will achieve that aim at all.

I would indicate that our devotion to preserve State rights is unyielding. So, too, is our hope of success in joining with the Commonwealth on this basis when it may be necessary for the benefit of the State. Anyone who wants to protest on either of those counts will find us earnest in both issues. I view the present amendment as nugatory and unnecessary and, therefore, I oppose it.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—22

Mr. Blaikie	Mr. Mensaros
Sir Charles Court	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Coyne	Mr. O'Connor
Dr. Dadour	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Rushton
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Stephens
Mr. A. A. Lewis	Mr. Thompson
Mr. E. H. M. Lewis	Mr. R. L. Young
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. McPharlin	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller)

Noes—23

Mr. Bateman	Mr. Graham
Mr. Bertram	Mr. Hartrey
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Brady	Mr. Jones
Mr. Brown	Mr. May
Mr. Bryce	Mr. McIver
Mr. Burke	Mr. Moller
Mr. Cook	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Davies	Mr. A. R. Tonkin
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. Harman
Mr. Fletcher	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Sir David Brand	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Runciman	Mr. Sewell

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Nalder.

House adjourned at 11.58 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 21st March, 1973

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

QUESTIONS (21): ON NOTICE

1. FLOODING PREVENTION

Carnarvon

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

Referring to the proposed levee bank to tie into Brown's Range to protect Carnarvon from flooding—

- has the route been finalised;
- if not, when is it anticipated it will be?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- No.
- August, 1973.

2. ROAD TRANSPORT

North-West: Costs

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

- Has the permit fee for carting general freight by road from Perth to the North West of this State recently been increased?
- If so—
 - when was the necessity of an increase first discussed by the Transport Commission;
 - when was the decision first reached that the fees would be increased;
 - what date was the increase put into effect;
 - were transport operators who have been carting to the North West advised of the pending increase;
 - when were these operators advised of the actual increase;
 - what was the method used to notify operators of the increase;
 - what is the increase in fees per ton from Perth to the following towns—
 - Dampier;
 - Port Hedland;
 - Goldsworthy;
 - Shay Gap;
 - Broome;
 - Derby; and
 - Wyndham?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- The reduction in fees introduced on 1st January, 1972, was withdrawn on 12th February, 1973, and fees reverted to the previous level.
- The position has been under review for several months.
 - 30th January, 1973.
 - 12th February, 1973.

- (d) The Road Transport Association of W.A. was advised by letter on 6th February, 1973.
- (e) Answered by (d).
- (f) Answered by (d).
- (g) (i) Dampier—60 cents;
- (ii) Port Hedland—60 cents;
- (iii) Goldsworthy—60 cents;
- (iv) Shay Gap—60 cents;
- (v) Broome—70 cents;
- (vi) Derby—70 cents;
- (vii) Wyndham—70 cents.

4.

DOG RACING*Commencement*

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS, to the Chief Secretary:

- (1) On what date does the Minister anticipate the first greyhound race meeting under the 1972 legislation?
- (2) Where is the venue for this meeting?

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

- (1) and (2) The allocation of dates and venues is the responsibility of the Greyhound Racing Control Board who advise that it would not be possible to give anything approaching a concrete date of racing operation or the selection of venue or venues before the 30th June, 1973.

5.

SEWERAGE*Floreat Park Treatment Works*

The Hon. Clive Griffiths for the Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS, to the Leader of the House:

Further to my question on Thursday, the 16th March, 1972—

- (a) has the new plant been installed and in operation at the Floreat Park treatment works;
- (b) if not, why not;
- (c) if the answer to (a) is "Yes", what further steps are to be taken to reduce the still overpowering stench emanating from this plant to the great discomfort of residents in the whole of the Floreat Park area?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

(a) Yes.

(b) Answered by (a).

(c) Chlorine supplies are obtained from the Eastern States and recent industrial unrest in Victoria led to reduction in supplies to Western Australia. In order to conserve existing chlorine stock for water disinfection, the use of chlorine for odour control at the Shenton Park Treatment

3. TAXES AND CHARGES*Increases*

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

Will the Minister lay upon the Table of the House a list of percentage increases in taxation and charges imposed by the State Government, either by Act of Parliament or by administrative action, since the 20th February, 1971?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

Details of increases in taxation and charges from 20th February, 1971 to 8th August, 1972, were supplied in answer to questions in the Legislative Assembly on 12th, 18th and 19th April, 1972 and 8th August, 1972.

Increases since 8th August, 1972 are—

North West Ports: Charges were increased, with effect from 24th November, 1972, as follows—

Wharfage rates—by various amounts ranging from 50% to 100%.

Berthage rate—by approximately 200%.

Haulage rates—by approximately 100%.

Mines Department:

Licence fees under Flammable Liquids Regulations and Explosives Regulations were increased from 1st January, 1973, and should result in revenue from this source being doubled.

Local Court Fees:

A flat scale of fees in place of the previous sliding scale, was introduced from 6th November, 1972 and represented an increase of 20%.

Court of Petty Session Fees:

New charges were introduced from 1st December, 1972 and increases ranged from nil up to 150%.

Works had to be temporarily discontinued. Supplies have now been restored and odour control chlorination has been restarted.

6. ALBANY PRIMARY SCHOOL

Amalgamation and Sports Ground

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Is it the intention of the Government to bring to fruition during the current school year the amalgamation of the Albany Senior primary school and the Albany Junior primary school situated in Albany Highway?
- (2) By this proposed amalgamation, is it envisaged that these alterations will result in the construction of a cluster school building complex?
- (3) Has the Government purchased additional land adjacent to the Albany Junior primary school for the purpose of providing necessary playing area space?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Efforts have been made to acquire additional land adjacent to the Albany Junior Primary School, but short of resumption action, these efforts have been unsuccessful to date.

7. MIDLAND JUNCTION ABATTOIR

Stench from Effluent

The Hon. F. R. WHITE, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Will the Minister please advise whether or not the putrid stench present during the hours of darkness in the vicinity of the Bushmead rifle range emanates from the Ridge Hill Road effluent pond which is utilised by the Midland Abattoirs?
- (2) If the Minister does agree that this is so, would he advise what remedial action is proposed to overcome this undesirable situation?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) It is possible that the smell referred to originates from rendering operations other than that at Midland Abattoir.
- (2) The Government has recognised that an offensive odour problem exists at Midland Abattoir and has approved the installation of a new effluent system. This is currently under construction.

8. CARNARVON HOSPITAL

Location

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

When plans were being prepared for the hospital at Carnarvon—

- (a) was any consideration given to the hospital entrance being approximately opposite the Carnarvon Senior High School;
- (b) was the Education Department or the High School consulted regarding the congestion that will occur by students from the High School, Central Primary School and Convent, using Cleaver Street as a thoroughfare;
- (c) was the Local Authority consulted?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (a) Yes.
- (b) Not by the Medical Department. However, the Town Planning Consultants to the Carnarvon Shire were advised of the Department's intentions at an early date and they raised no objections.
- (c) Yes. The local authority was kept fully informed during the initial planning stages.

9. PROSTITUTION

Convictions

The Hon. Clive Griffiths for the Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) How many convictions for prostitution have there been in the metropolitan area during the last 12 months?
- (2) Of these, how many were recorded under cover of—
 - (a) escort agencies;
 - (b) massage parlours?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) 46.
- (2) (a) 14,
- (b) 16.

10. TRAFFIC

State-wide Control Authority

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

- (1) Has a feasibility study of costs been carried out on the country shires' statutory traffic plan?
- (2) If so, did the Hon. Premier use the figures from this study when he quoted that Western Australian

motorists would be called on to pay an extra \$8.00 each to finance the statutory authority to control traffic?

- (3) If not, where did the Hon. Premier receive factual evidence that the proposed authority would cost Western Australian motorists an average of \$8.00 each, and that the traffic authority as now proposed would involve the spending of millions of dollars?
- (4) Can the figure of \$8.00 per motorist be substantiated?
- (5) If so, can such evidence be Tabled?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) No, unless a cost study has been undertaken by the authors of the Country Shire Councils Traffic Plan.
- (2) No.

- (3) It is reasonable to assume that existing revenue from vehicle license fees, and already committed, will not be interfered with and that the cost of establishing a separate authority would require additional revenue.

The figure of \$8 is based on the New Zealand cost of conducting a separate traffic authority (\$4,500,000 for enforcement, plus \$1,500,000 for vehicle inspection) and a Western Australian vehicle population of 500,000.

The Western Australian Police Force Budget of \$14,500,000 for some 1700 men also provides a guide to the cost. There is no questioning the fact that the establishment of a separate authority of sufficient strength to be an effective traffic controlling body would cost millions of dollars in outlay for accommodation throughout the State, for wages, staff training, a radio network, together with vehicles and other equipment, and costs associated with establishing such a department.

- (4) It was an estimate only.
- (5) No.

11. REGIONAL PRISON *Pilbara*

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS, to the Chief Secretary:

- (1) When is it planned to build a regional prison in the Pilbara?
- (2) Will the prison be sited at—
 - (a) Port Hedland; or
 - (b) Karratha?
- (3) (a) On what land location will the prison be built; and
 - (b) what is the area of the land?

- (4) How many prisoners will be accommodated?
- (5) What will be the boundaries of the region to be served by the Pilbara Prison?

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

- (1) Planning will commence as soon as the planning for the Metropolitan Prison is completed.
- (2) (a) and (b) Port Hedland.
- (3) (a) and (b) A recommended location and area of site are at present under investigation and inspection for a final selection.
- (4) A maximum of 250.
- (5) This will depend on the development of other prisons and sites.

12. HIGH SCHOOLS *Hall-Gymnasiums*

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

- (1) Is it the Government's intention to have the construction of the gymnasium hall at the Cannington Senior high school completed during the 1973-74 financial year?
- (2) If not, would the Minister advise—
 - (a) the reason, bearing in mind the undoubted urgent necessity which has been established by the school and the Parents' and Citizens' Association, through several representations to the Department over the years;
 - (b) when the school can expect the construction to be carried out?
- (3) Which senior high schools have had gymnasium halls provided since 1965?
- (4) At which schools are gymnasium halls to be built during the 1973-74 financial year?
- (5) What criteria are used in deciding a school's priority for the provision of a gymnasium hall?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) (a) At the present time, halls/gymnasias are required in 28 High Schools. In the cases of most High Schools, equally strong representations as those from Cannington have been made on the grounds of urgency. It is thus necessary to consider this problem as an overall Departmental need based on all schools.
 - (b) The rate at which halls/gymnasias can be provided in High Schools must be dependent in

large measure on the extent of the anticipated grants to be made by the Commonwealth Government. Until the Australian Schools Commission determines its policy, it is not possible to announce a date when construction will commence.

- (3) Applecross Senior High
Hollywood Senior High
Belmont Senior High
Tuart Hill Senior High

and a covered area or a hall/gymnasium has been incorporated into the building of new high schools at:—

Rossmoyne,
Como,
Balga,
Morley,
Thornlie,
Kelmscott,
North Lake,
Rockingham.

- (4) John Forrest Senior High,
Scarborough Senior High,
Kent Street Senior High,
Kwinana Senior High,
Melville Senior High,
Churchlands Senior High.

- (5) In general terms, on length of time the school has been in operation without a hall/gymnasium of any type, size of enrolment and general accommodation needs.

13. THIRD PARTY INSURANCE

Premiums

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

In view of the fact that the Labor Party's policy speech, delivered on the 3rd February, 1971, stated that the State would be better served by the institution of an entirely new method of insurance for compensating victims of vehicle accidents, and that such new method was expected to result in much lower premium cost of motor vehicle insurance; on the 20th July, 1971, I asked the Government a question in this House seeking information relating to this matter, and as I was informed that satisfactory progress was being made towards the preparation of requisite legislation, but it was not possible at that time to state definitely when the study would be finalised; nine months later, on the 20th March, 1972, I asked a further question seeking information concerning the promised "new deal for third party insurance" and the progress being made, and was informed in reply that further progress had been made, but the importance of the

proposed change in the law required careful consideration before a Bill could be drafted, and further, every endeavour would be made to submit the legislation as early as possible; and as two years have now elapsed since the original undertaking was given, and I now observe from reading *The West Australian* of the 7th March, 1973, that third party insurance premiums will be cut by 20% from the 1st July, 1973—is this intended reduction the "new deal" which was referred to two years ago?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:
No.

14.

WATER SUPPLIES

Shark Bay

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

- (1) What are the prospects of improving the quality of the water supply at Shark Bay?
- (2) Are any desalination plants or systems available capable of producing potable water at a reasonable cost for this area?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) Installation of a desalination plant is the only solution.
- (2) No.

15.

LAND

Packsaddle Plain and Ord Irrigation Project

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

- (1) In view of my unanswered questions in a letter to the Minister for Lands dated the 23rd January, 1973, will the Minister ascertain from the Minister for Lands, and advise the names of the officers who advised him that—
 - (a) a block applied for on Packsaddle plain would be subjected to the effects of pesticide spraying on new farms;
 - (b) any release of land, at this time, will prejudice the design of farmlets under consideration;
 - (c) isolated release should not be made in the Ord Irrigation project?
- (2) If the officers cannot be named, so I may obtain technical details for advice to my constituents, will the Minister please advise—
 - (a) how will the insecticide affect the economy of the project proposed by the applicant, Mr. R. Lethbridge, for a farmlet on Packsaddle plain;

- (b) what farmlets are under consideration at this time, and what is their crop or livestock potential and size;
- (c) why should isolated releases not be considered on the Ord Irrigation project?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) This matter was considered by the Townsite and Special Land Committee operating as a sub-committee of the Ord Project Committee.
- (2) (a) No advice was given that the economy of the project would be affected. The Ord Project Committee has been counselled by the Public Health Department that residences should desirably be located about 1½ miles from areas subject to spraying.
- (b) The area between the five locations already released and the river is under consideration for subdivision into farmlets of varying sizes. It is not envisaged that a majority will in themselves be economic but Kununurra people are expected to be interested.
- (c) It would be unwise to release single areas in isolation. Existing erosion gullies and the need to provide the best access point to a coordinated subdivision being necessary. When surveyed, public release will be arranged.

16. GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Use of Local Materials

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

- (1) Is it Government policy to request use of local materials where possible in Government contracts?
- (2) If so, was any consideration given to this matter when calling tenders for the hospital at Carnarvon?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes, within the limits of the availability of locally manufactured building materials suitable for the hospital project.

17. COUNTRY HIGH SCHOOL HOSTEL

Albany

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Has the Country High School Hostels Authority called tenders for the erection of a proposed new hostel to replace the present hostel in Vancouver Street, Albany?

- (2) If the answer is "No", can the Minister estimate when tenders will be called?
- (3) Is this proposed new hostel to be entirely for the purpose of housing boys only?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) It is expected that tenders will be called within a few weeks.
- (3) Not necessarily. If the demand for accommodation for boys is in excess of that available, girls will remain in their present accommodation.

18. *This question was postponed.*

19. IRRIGATION

Licence Fees: Carnarvon

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

For what reasons is the \$30.00 licence fee being imposed in the amendment to Regulations, Rights in Water and Irrigation Act, 1914-1971, as published in the *Government Gazette* dated the 2nd February, 1973?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

The following extract from a circular which is being distributed to all Carnarvon growers licensed to pump non-artesian water explains the reasons for the introduction of the \$30 licence fee.

"The development of additional water resources in the bed of the Gascoyne River has been proceeding for over ten years. The drilling of additional bores upstream of the plantation area, and in particular the recent sinking of three large diameter gravel packed bores, has significantly increased the amount of water storage harnessed for distribution to the plantations. This development as well as making available a supplementary supply to about half the plantations has reduced the demand on the limited water supplies in the irrigation area, thus benefiting all properties.

In addition, departmental action in pushing up small banks and digging a channel to divert small river flows adjacent to the properties on the North Bank west of the crossing has also greatly improved the availability of water supplies in the area.

These operations have been conducted at considerable financial loss, and to offset this

to some extent, a licence fee is to be introduced. As from 1st July, 1973, every person who is licensed to pump water for irrigation, or for other than domestic and stock purposes, will be required to pay an annual fee of \$30. One fee is payable for each separate parcel of land which is the subject of a licence and payment is to be made on or before 1st August each year."

20. *This question was postponed.*

21. WATER SUPPLIES

Carnarvon

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

- (1) What was the average weekly water usage in Carnarvon for—
 - (a) irrigation purposes in 1972 for—
 - (i) summer ration;
 - (ii) winter ration;
 - (b) other than irrigation purposes in—
 - (i) 1962;
 - (ii) 1972.
- (2) What quantity of water per week is supplied from the pilot scheme for other than irrigation purposes?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) (a) (i) 29,715,000 gallons,
 (ii) 15,975,000 gallons.
- (b) (i) 970,000 gallons,
 (ii) 5,243,000.
- (2) 3,500,000 gallons.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN MARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by The Hon. J. Dolan (Leader of the House), and read a first time.

SALES BY AUCTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Restoration to Notice Paper: Motion

On motion by The Hon. J. M. Thomson the Sales by Auction Act Amendment Bill was restored to the notice paper at the stage it had reached in the previous session.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: THIRD DAY

Amendment to Motion

Debate resumed, from the 20th March, on the following motion by The Hon. R. F. Cloughton—

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.

To which The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Leader of the Opposition) had moved an amendment—

That the following words be added to the motion—

However, this House is of the opinion that the best interests of the State and the people would be better served if the Government were to concentrate on improving its administration of the affairs of the State, instead of endeavouring to denigrate the Legislative Council (an integral part of the bicameral system of Government in this State) in an effort to cover up its own shortcomings.

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [5.09 p.m.]: Of course, this amendment will be passed irrespective of anything I may say in defence of the Government.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It ought to pass with your support.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: The Government is entitled to be defended against the words uttered by the honourable member, if only for the obvious reason that at no time has the Government associated itself with the type of criticism attributed to certain individuals by Mr. Arthur Griffith.

The honourable member deprecated the brevity of the Governor's speech, and on listening intently and later studying a copy of Mr. Arthur Griffith's contribution to the debate, I came to the conclusion this was the only strong point advanced by the honourable member to support his belief that the speech of His Excellency should be lengthened by the addition of the words which are proposed in the amendment.

I put it to the House that in moving an amendment to the motion an obligation is placed on the member concerned to put before the House some facts, some information of substance, in effect some good reason as to why the House should adopt the amendment. I submit to the House that the honourable member has not done this.

There is plenty of evidence available, and I would point to the publication known as *At the Half Way Mark*, which indicates that the Government and the members of the Government have done an excellent job—a job for which they were elected by the people, and a job which they will continue to do in the future.

As I have already indicated, I listened intently to the honourable member and I took a later opportunity to examine the

official record of the words he uttered. Apart from the admitted brevity of the speech, I can find no facts related by the honourable member which can possibly justify the addition of the words proposed. Mr. Arthur Griffith produced not one whit of evidence—by way of fact or fiction—which would indicate to the House that the Government was not getting on with the job. Accordingly, I can only think that the honourable member may have drawn up this motion on the spur of the moment, at short notice, and in the knowledge of its personal appeal to a good number of the members of the Opposition when the division bells are rung. However, I think that at least Mr. Arthur Griffith should have presented a better case for its adoption.

Personally, I am quite satisfied with the length of the Governor's Speech, the areas and topics touched on, and the manner of their presentation. I believe the Speech was adequate for the occasion and I am quite happy to leave it at that. It requires no such embellishment as the Leader of the Opposition proposes, and I accordingly oppose the amendment.

THE HON. F. D. WILLMOTT (South-West) [5.12 p.m.]: I intend to support the amendment moved by Mr. Arthur Griffith. I believe he had very good reasons for moving it. I say that because of the undoubted organised attack which has been made on the Legislative Council over the last 18 months or even longer. This is not a new attack, Mr. President. Attacks of this nature have occurred before.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: In this House!

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: Most certainly in this House, and I will demonstrate this later. However, I believe that the attacks have now reached a new level of degradation—degrading to the people who use lying and misleading statements in their endeavours to besmirch the Legislative Council.

On many occasions it has been said that the Legislative Council operates only as a House of Review when a Labor Government is in power. Such statements have been made on many occasions, and I am sure members of this House will recall them. An examination of the facts will disclose quite clearly that such statements are without any foundation whatever.

The Leader of the House said that the Leader of the Opposition put forward no evidence to substantiate the amendment. To supply the evidence, I intend to examine the six years of the Hawke administration and then compare this with the first six years of the Brand administration. I feel a comparison of this nature is the fairest way to demonstrate my point. The facts will disclose that the Legislative Council

has operated as a House of Review whatever political party happened to be in power.

In 1953, the first year of the Hawke administration, 107 Bills were introduced. In 1954, the number was 85; and in 1955, 75 Bills were introduced. In 1956 some 103 Bills were introduced; 105 were introduced in 1957; and 83 in 1958.

During the first six years of the Brand Administration the following were the number of Bills introduced each year—

1959—89.

1960—91.

1961—84.

1962—96.

1963—95.

1964—117.

It is interesting to note, firstly, what numbers of Bills were amended by this Council during those terms. In 1953, which was the first year of the Hawke Administration, 30 Bills were amended by this Chamber; in 1954, 33 Bills were amended; in 1955, only 12 were amended; in 1956, 25 were amended; 31 were amended in 1957; and in 1958, 23 were amended.

We should compare that with the number of Bills which were amended in the first six years of the Brand Administration, because it is said by some that this House does not operate as a House of Review. In 1959, which was the first year of the Brand Administration, 17 Bills were amended; in 1960, 22 Bills were amended; in 1961, 21 Bills were amended; in 1962, 18 Bills were amended; in 1963, 22 Bills were amended; and in 1964, 23 Bills were amended. So it is ridiculous to make the statement that this House only acts as a House of Review when Labor Governments are in power. I will carry this demonstration further.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: What about Bills that were rejected by this House?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I was referring to Bills amended.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: What about Bills rejected?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I will deal with that aspect. The honourable member need make no mistake about that.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am sure Miss Elliott will get up and make a long speech on that matter.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: She is entitled to do that. I now turn to the Bills which were defeated at the second reading stage. In the first year of the Hawke Administration, which was 1953, there were 10 Bills defeated at the second reading stage; in 1954 there were three defeated; in 1955 there were also three defeated; in 1956 there were seven Bills defeated; in 1957 there were 10; and in 1958 there were 13 Bills defeated.

I shall now make a comparison with what transpired in the Brand Administration, and on this I will have something more to say. In the first year of the Brand Administration, which was 1959, there were three Bills defeated at the second reading stage; in 1960 there was one; in 1961 there was one defeated; in 1962 there were two Bills defeated; in 1963 there were four; and in 1964 there were two defeated.

In order to get a clear picture of the situation we have to bear in mind that when a Liberal-Country Party Government is in power the members of the Liberal Party and the members of the Country Party of this House have some say in the party rooms on legislation which comes before Parliament. It will be recalled that on many occasions as a result of objections raised either by members of the Country Party or members of the Liberal Party, or members of both parties, in the party rooms intended legislation did not see the light of day. However, when the Labor Party is in power that does not occur. So, it is reasonable to assume there are more Bills rejected by this House when Labor Governments are in office. That is the first aspect, but there is another.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Just tell me this.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I have no time to deal with chicken-twiddling interjections from members opposite. During the Hawke Administration it will be recalled that there was some sort of campaign going on, as there is at the present time. If members look at the Governor's Speech and the proposed legislation they will understand what I mean. I refer to legislation which is introduced in this House for the express purpose of its being rejected, in order to try to blame this House for obstructing the Government.

I am sure members will recall the hardy annual which was introduced by Mrs. Hutchison in the form of a Bill to abolish this Chamber, knowing full well what would be its fate. There were many such Bills. I am sure that during this session we will see a return to that state of affairs; and of that I am quite convinced.

However, let us look a little further. I have up to this stage referred to Bills defeated at the second reading stage; so let me now deal with Bills that were defeated in the third reading stage. It is interesting to note that during the six years of the Hawke Administration there were two Bills defeated at the third reading stage, and that occurred in the one year, 1957. In the six years of the Brand Administration one Bill was lost in the third reading stage. So, there is very little difference.

The Bills which were defeated at the first reading stage present an interesting picture, because in the six years of the Hawke Administration there were only two Bills so defeated, and that occurred in the

year 1956. During the first six years of the Brand Administration no Bill was defeated at the first reading stage.

No doubt some members will recall the Bills that were defeated at the first reading; and one which I recall was the hardy annual introduced by Mrs. Hutchison—a Bill to abolish this Chamber. A similar Bill came up year after year, until finally the members of this House decided to reject it at the first reading stage. That was what occurred; and you, Mr. President, will remember that.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The title of that Bill was a Bill to abolish this House.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: That is correct. It was introduced by Mrs. Hutchison, knowing full well what would happen to it. It was introduced in order to cast aspersions on the decisions of this House, and it was an endeavour to make it appear as though this House did not act as a House of Review during the regime of a Liberal-Country Party Government.

Let us turn our attention to the Bills which were lost in Committee. During the six years of the Hawke Administration there were two Bills defeated in Committee; and during the first six years of the Brand Administration there were also two Bills defeated in Committee. The number was exactly the same.

Here is another interesting point, relating to Bills ruled out of order by Presidents of this House. During the six years of the Hawke Administration no Bills were ruled out of order, but during the first six years of the Brand Administration there were two Bills ruled out of order by Presidents. So, I would say there was no political bias in the rulings of the Presidents.

There is a further interesting aspect, and I refer to Bills lost at conferences of managers. During the Hawke Administration there were two Bills lost at such conferences, and during the first six years of the Brand Administration there was one Bill lost at such a conference. Therefore to say that this House only operates to defeat or to amend Government legislation when a Labor Government is in office is pure poppycock. Under those circumstances I think Mr. Arthur Griffith had every right to move the amendment he did.

I have already referred to the insidious means of trying to discredit this House by introducing legislation solely for the purpose of having it defeated here. As it was done in the past, so it will continue to be done in the future; and of that I am quite sure.

A few moments ago the Leader of the House said that no Minister or member of the Labor Party has indulged in this sort of thing.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I said no such thing.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I understood the Leader of the House to say that.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I said no such thing. What I have said is written down in these notes.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The Minister said no member of the Government indulged in it.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I said at no time has the Government indulged in it.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: That only supports the case for the retention of the Upper House. Let me demonstrate what I think about this matter. I have here a copy of the *South Western Times* of Thursday, the 21st December, 1972. It contains a report of a meeting which the Minister for Agriculture attended at Donnybrook. This was a meeting of fruit growers. The report states—

Replying to a question about why there was not a conference of managers of both houses of parliament to discuss Upper House amendments to the Export Apple Marketing Board, Mr. Evans said it "became something of an impertinence on the part of the council to adopt the attitude it did on a government Bill".

What an absolutely ridiculous statement! Is it impertinent for members of this House to do their jobs, and to review and amend legislation? That is what we have been elected to do. Surely that is the purpose of this House.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: It was an impertinent statement by the Minister.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: Yes, it was. Some person at that meeting was pretty clued up to the state of affairs, because the same report states—

A voice: Thank God for the council. It was good enough for the Bingo Bill to be agreed to by the managers.

"We can blame the minister for the fact that the Bill did not go through."

It is well known to me and my colleague, Mr. Ferry, that the same Minister tried very hard to hoodwink the people throughout the electorate in regard to that Bill, by asserting that the Legislative Council rejected it. That is an untrue statement.

The Council did not reject the Bill. It amended the Bill, and insisted on the amendments. It is true that the Government did not request a conference of managers, and that was the ultimate move which could be made by the Government. Why did it choose to follow the course that it did? In my humble opinion it was to enable the Minister to do what he did; that is, to go around the electorate and besmirch this Council for doing its job. That is the exact situation as I see it and as many other people see it, and as evidenced by the interjector at that meeting.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The Government allowed its own Bill to die.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: That is correct. It allowed the Bill to die. There have been many untruthful and misleading

statements made by what I would term temporary members of the Legislative Assembly. I refer to them as temporary members, because of the degrading tactics they have employed in respect of this House. These tactics are more degrading to the members concerned than to anyone else; and that is why I refer to them as temporary members, because eventually their own degradation will defeat them. I think these are pretty poor tactics to employ in regard to this Chamber.

I have referred to the Governor's Speech. In my mind there is no doubt that we will face a heavy legislative programme, but I am sure some of the Bills to be introduced will be introduced solely for the purpose of having them rejected by this House, so that we can again be besmirched. There is no doubt in my mind about that. I repeat that Mr. Arthur Griffith had every right to move the amendment which he did.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Would you like to name those Bills?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I would name the honourable member if I were in the Chair! Many people in all walks of life are thankful for the protection they receive from this Legislative Council.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Would the honourable member like to name them?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: No, I do not intend to. Many people are thankful for the protection they receive from the excesses of over-exuberant Governments; Governments of every colour. This Legislative Council has a part to play in the running of the State quite regardless of the Government which happens to be in power. I again say that many people are thankful for the protection they receive from this Chamber. It would be a sorry day for Western Australia if this place were ever abolished.

I believe the greatest inhibition to the Legislative Council is the attitude of Labor supporters themselves, and the attitude of Labor members in this House and in another place who are tied to party decisions. No discretion is allowed; none whatever. This Council would operate better as a House of Review if that fear were removed. Of that I am quite sure. I honestly believe that some members in the Labor Administration would like to see that control removed so that they could exercise their own opinions a little more freely.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Labor members can do as they wish when voting on the Mining Bill, but not when voting on a Bill dealing with capital punishment.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Would the Leader of the Opposition like to name those members?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: We are faced with an almost Gilbertian situation in this Chamber, because in the period

between elections members of the Labor Party do everything they possibly can to cast disgrace on this House. And, undoubtedly, they do just that. However, at election time the same members travel around their electorates begging the electors to vote them into this Chamber.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Would the honourable member like to name the electorates concerned?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I would like the member opposite to keep quiet. The situation is absurd and I sometimes wonder whether members of the Labor Party have ever reflected on the effect which their attitudes have on their own votes. Have members of the Labor Party ever stopped to reflect that one of the main reasons they do not do so well at Legislative Council elections is possibly the very attitude they adopt towards the Chamber? As I have said, I think the situation is Gilbertian.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I know of one such member who is working pretty hard in my electorate now.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: In conclusion, and so that I do not leave any doubt as to where I stand on this matter, I quite categorically and wholeheartedly support the amendment moved by The Hon. A. F. Griffith.

THE HON. W. R. WITHERS (North) [5.33 p.m.]: I wish to support the amendment to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply because I consider that the picture painted by the Government, and by Mr. Claughton during his address, could be entitled, "Let's keep the public from the real picture."

I agree with Mr. Arthur Griffith that the interests of the State and the people would be better served if the Government were to concentrate on improving its administration of the affairs of the State instead of trying to denigrate the Legislative Council.

It seems that the denigration of the Legislative Council is a fixation with some members of the Labor Party. It may be a real issue with some Labor members, even though the Leader of the House has said that his Government does not support the views of the individual.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Would the honourable member like to name those members?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Certainly. I refer to The Hon. Lyla Elliott, and to Mr. Bryce and Mr. Arthur Tonkin in another place. Those members have stated their views publicly in the Press so I do not think I have done any harm in naming them.

I agree with my leader when he says that the denigration of the Legislative Council is an attempt to cover Government

deficiencies. I am aware that my colleague, Mr. Willmott, has listed many reasons for the continuance of the bicameral system of Parliament. To those reasons I would like to add one of my own which I think is very important.

I consider that it is necessary for the Legislative Council to study legislation with the broad knowledge of representatives of the various provinces so that legislation passed on party lines in another place may be amended. I refer to legislation passed in haste purely for political reasons and not necessarily for the benefit of the State. Amendments may be necessary to prevent adverse effects on any particular electorate within the provinces. Evidence of this sensible system of government can be seen in the various voting divisions in this House.

I also agree with Mr. Willmott that we have reason to doubt the sincerity of the Labor Party because it is obviously bound to decisions prior to voting in this House. This type of attitude should not be adopted in a House such as this.

It is also very necessary to have an imbalance of votes in the Legislative Council. The fact that we do have an imbalance in the various provinces has been used to denigrate the Legislative Council. In fact, the present system has been objected to by The Hon. Lyla Elliott in a Press release which she gave to *The West Australian* newspaper. I will quote the last paragraph of her letter to the newspaper, and I do not think that the extract will detract from the rest of the subject matter. It reads as follows—

In the Legislative Council the imbalance between country and city votes is far greater. Although two-thirds of all W.A. electors reside in the metropolitan area, they only elect one-third of the members in the Legislative Council. In other words there are only ten metropolitan members as against 20 country members.

The proponents of the unicameral system of Parliament, and those who favour the equal voting system, speak of representing people and not representing trees or acres.

I uphold the system which we have today on the basis of the needs of the people. I would like to point out that if the unicameral system operated under the system of one-man-one-vote of equal value, as advocated by some members, we would find that 90.5 per cent. of the State—in area, not population—would be represented by one man in another place. The remaining 9.5 per cent. of the land area of the State would be represented by 50 members in another place.

I do not deny that such a system would work quite well in a very small country.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: Could the honourable member explain?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: The system could work in a very small country with an even distribution of population, and in a country where there is not a great diversity of industry and interests. However, the system cannot work in this State of almost 1,000,000 square miles with most of the population crammed into the metropolitan area.

Because previous speakers have tied the denigration of this Council to the one-man-one-vote system I feel I should explain the justice of the present system under which we operate. Even in my own province, which represents only 38 per cent. of the State's land area, if I were to travel 3,000 miles every fortnight I could not visit every town or major mission in a year.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: The honourable member does know the meaning of the word, "denigrate"?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Yes, certainly.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: I have been wondering.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: If the honourable member opposite does not know the meaning of the word he should refer to a dictionary.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The word has been switched around considerably tonight.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Because the one-man-one-vote system has been used to denigrate the Legislative Council I am attempting to explain why the system cannot be used in this State. I have pointed out that I cannot properly represent the people who have elected me to represent them. I cannot visit them and they cannot visit me once in each year. Some members on the Government bench have proposed that we increase the area of the electorates and do away with the Legislative Council. However, the people living in country areas need closer representation. Most of the major developments take place in country areas and the people have to face associated problems with that development.

People living in country areas do not have ready access to Government departments and they suffer disadvantages associated with costs, services, welfare, education, and various other chapters in life.

It is important for country members to visit their electorates as often as possible. I hope that The Hon. Lyla Elliott will consider my reasons before she releases another statement to the Press. If a city elector wishes to see his or her member of Parliament he may speak to that member on the telephone for a period of nine minutes and will be involved in a cost of 5c. However, if a person in my home town wished to contact me, or contact Jack Hunt or the member in another place, the same

length of time spent on the telephone would cost \$7.12, or 142 times the cost in the metropolitan area.

I would also point out that if a city constituent wished to see his member of Parliament, and that person was a pensioner, he would have no travelling expenses. However, a pensioner from Kununurra—my home town—would have to pay \$245 in fares, plus accommodation. A city constituent who was not a pensioner would pay approximately 50c in fares, whereas a constituent from Wyndham would have to pay \$255 in fares.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: How long does it take for a letter to come from Wyndham?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: If the letter happens to be bulky and it does not have an airmail sticker it can take anything from seven to eight weeks. If the letter carries an airmail sticker and the correct postage, and contains approximately five duplicated sheets explaining a case, it will cost four times the normal postage of 12c which applies in the city.

I have been pointing out, Mr. President, that the denigration of the Legislative Council has been tied to the one-man-one-vote of equal value system. I have quoted a Press release from The Hon. Lyla Elliott and I am explaining why the one-man-one-vote of equal value could not possibly be applied to this State.

I would like to point out that the State of Western Australia is equivalent in size to the combined areas of West Germany, the United Kingdom, France, South Africa, and Japan. Those countries have a total of 4,372 members of Parliament, and all of those countries have a bicameral system.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: What is the total population of those countries?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Does not France have a three-tier system?

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: According to the book I have read, France has a system which is different from ours but it is called a two-house system. In answer to Miss Elliott, the total population of those countries is 303,400,000.

At times I wish I had a smaller province to represent. I suggest that if any member wishes to denigrate the Legislative Council in any way, he should look at the problems we experience in country areas and the problems that must be faced by every member of the Legislative Council in weighing up legislation for the benefit of all the electorates within his province and not allowing party-political bias to affect his judgment. In the past, together with other members I have objected to a letter written by the Premier in which it was suggested that we have party-political bias. I think most members of this House do not have party-political bias. We are elected into this Chamber on particular party philosophies in which we believe

but we do not let those philosophies adversely affect our judgment of Bills; we endeavour to see that justice is done.

I support the amendment.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West) [5.47 p.m.]: This is a very interesting debate, and it is interesting that it should have arisen at this time. The only thing I am a little sorry about is that I cannot at this stage obtain a copy of the Minister's reply. I consider this an important debate and the Minister's reply indicates to us the underlying philosophy of the Labor Party in regard to a particular question.

The amendment moved by Mr. Arthur Griffith touches on four points; namely, the improved administration which he suggests the Government should effect, the denigration of the Legislative Council which he suggests should cease, the purpose of the Legislative Council as an integral part of the parliamentary system, and the shortcomings of the Government. All those matters are mentioned in the amendment, and they are matters which I have no doubt you, Mr. President, will allow to be discussed.

I picked up another interesting point from Mr. Dolan's speech. I understood him to claim that no member of the Government had ever denigrated the Legislative Council. If that is so—

The Hon. J. Dolan: With your permission, Mr. President, I will repeat exactly what I said. The words are typed in my notes.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Let us have a copy of your speech.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Why should I?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You offer to get up and repeat it but when I ask you for a copy of it you say, "Why should I?"

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order!

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I understood Mr. Dolan to say that no member of the Government had ever denigrated the Legislative Council. Let us pass over that. Let us accept it in the sense that the Government is Mr. Dolan, Mr. Stubbs, Mr. Ron Thompson, and the other members of the Cabinet who are in the other House. They are in fact the Government. There are certainly members of the Government party who have said some extremely harsh things about the Legislative Council; but if it is a fact that no member of the Government has denigrated the Legislative Council I think we are entitled to ask Mr. Dolan whether the Government is in favour of the Legislative Council.

Mr. Dans, who, I thought did not have a jealous bone in his body, is apparently becoming a little envious of the role Mr. Cloughton is playing in this House, and he

is trying to help the Minister by shaking his head before the Minister can make his reply.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I am scratching the back of my head.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: In fact, we are very close associates.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: As you are an expert on Labor Party ideology and very well aware of the Labor Party's platform, you will know that when we have sufficient numbers in this House we will vote the House out of existence.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am very pleased Mr. Dans mentioned this subject because he has given me a starting point from which to discuss the philosophy of this matter. From time immemorial people who are governed have had a desire to ensure that those who do the governing have their power and authority controlled by a system of checks and balances in order to impede the unwarranted use of power and authority.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: We have seen what has happened in those countries that do not have them.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It is peculiar that every socialist party of either the extreme right or the extreme left—and I could name nazism, fascism, socialism, Labor and all parties of that type—invariably wants to get rid of the second chamber and the balance and control of the exercise of power and authority.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: What about the nationalists in New Zealand?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Wherever one looks, this has happened. Miss Elliott is fully aware—because I, myself, have told her—that the situation in New Zealand is that the check and balance have had to be replaced, strangely enough, by the exercise of a very much more powerful barristers' board, to which virtually every policy Bill is referred.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: But there is no upper House in New Zealand.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Certainly there is not but there is a check and balance to control the use of authority.

The Hon. R. Thompson: What happened in Queensland?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: This situation only arises where there are people of an authoritarian turn of mind. Members opposite can argue until they are black in the face, but it will be found this is the case.

Mr. Ron Thompson interjected and asked, "What about Queensland?" He is obviously feeling the effects of overwork already.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Who? Me?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Was it not Mr. Ron Thompson who made that interjection?

The Hon. R. Thompson: Yes, but do not accuse me of being overworked.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will please address his remarks to the Chair.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am constrained to say Mr. Ron Thompson is feeling the effects of overwork because he knows very well it was a Labor Government that got rid of the second Chamber in Queensland, precisely according to the theory I have been expounding; and it had a devil of a job to do so.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: No-one is anxious to bring it back.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Of course not. By whom must it be brought back? It must be brought back by the people governing, not the people governed.

Bloody wars, stretching over long periods, have been fought to incorporate into the systems of government of countries throughout the world the checks and balances necessary to look after the welfare of the people of the community. Kings have been beheaded, dictators have been assassinated, and wars have been fought for this principle. Indeed, whole colonies have been lost for this principle—and the colony I am specifically thinking of is the United States of America. We are now getting back to the divine right of kings, except that it is the divine right of the Executive of the Australian Labor Party, the members of which are not kings. I will not go on to say what they are but they are not kings.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: But they think they are pretty divine.

The Hon. R. Thompson: They are king-makers.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That is what terrifies me. That is why we want the checks and balances. Whether or not the authority is vested in this Chamber, there should be somebody looking at what we do. I believe it is a pity that the need for a second Chamber has been forced on us even more by the necessity for disciplines in the modern political scene. These disciplines vary from party to party. They are in fact less stringent in the party to which I happen to belong than they are in the Australian Labor Party. I am not arguing that this is a good or a bad thing. It is what we have grown up with and if we changed our system it would probably be at some risk. If the Government changed its system it would probably be at some risk. I am not arguing about that. I am saying it means we must have this Chamber.

Let us bear in mind the fact that many decisions are forced upon political parties nowadays, and let us take the matter out of this sphere and into another country. This situation applies throughout the world. Decisions are made at conferences

and the like, and they are to a greater or lesser extent binding upon the members who find themselves in Parliament representing their parties. I think it is agreed even by members of the Australian Labor Party that, because of its constitution, the decisions of the A.L.P. are more binding upon its members than are the decisions, say, of the Country Party on its members. I do not think there is any real argument about that.

Despite that fact, in this Chamber, because of its removal from the day-to-day pressures or at least from the pressure of an election every three years, we have seen a number of members voting against party decisions of the A.L.P. As Mr. Claghon wants us to mention names, I will mention Mr. Heenan, Mr. Stubbs, and Mr. Dolan. They are some members I can think of without going back any great time. There are probably many others. Two of those I mentioned are still in Parliament, so the party did not feel constrained to throw them out on their necks. I think at least one of those members has been endorsed and probably elected following his action. So even in the A.L.P., which I think it must be accepted has a more stringent discipline than the other two parties, there is a degree of flexibility.

There is another reason for the Legislative Council having become of even more vital importance; that is—

The Hon. R. F. Claghon: I am wondering on what part of the motion you are speaking.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I thought I took great care to explain that. If the honourable member wishes to take a point of order, he should address his remarks to the President, and I will argue it with him.

I was about to say that another reason for this Chamber being absolutely essential as an integral part of the whole system of Government—and I hope that phrase satisfies the honourable member—is that nowadays the Government intrudes into virtually every aspect of life. When one goes back to the time of the Stuarts, who were the last of the kings who believed in the divine right of kings, one finds that people were then affected by governments in a minimal way.

Nowadays, of course, they are affected in virtually every way. People seem to think that the war fought over the centuries for the protection and care of the individual is over. It is not. As we have been warned time and time again by famous men, we have won the war against the divine right of kings, but we have still to win the war against the divine right of executives and bureaucrats—and I am not decrying them. The kings who believed they were placed on earth and specially endowed by God to govern the people, believed that with all their hearts and

souls; and in the main they were genuine, hard-working fellows. I think most people who find themselves in executive positions believe they know more than the average person. I believe most civil servants think that.

Nevertheless, in principle the system we have stands as a protective bulwark against dictatorship—and I do not care whether it is benign dictatorship or otherwise; that is the way it stands and the way it should stand. However, I think it is quite dreadful that members—and frequently those with very limited experience—should make all sorts of silly remarks about the matter. They say the boundaries are drawn in such a way that they are loaded against the A.L.P. One could call this a personality-killing cult, because the boundaries are set according to the law by the Chief Justice, the Surveyor-General, and the Chief Electoral Officer: men about whose honesty there is no doubt.

Indeed, four provinces in this State are represented by a member of the Labor Party and a member of the Liberal Party. I refer to Mr. Arthur Griffith and Mr. Cloughton, Mr. Clive Griffiths and Mr. Dolan, Mr. Withers and Mr. Hunt, and Mr. Berry and Mr. Dellar. In those circumstances it is perfectly reasonable to suppose that if either of the parties put up different members it could win or lose four seats.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Surely that is as obvious as the day is long.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It would seem to me to be so; yet we get this backhanded insulting of men of the highest repute. Members of the A.L.P. have stated publicly in newspaper advertisements that the electoral boundaries of this Chamber are deliberately drawn up in such a way as to favour the Country Party and the Liberal Party.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Don't forget that every Labor member agreed on the franchise when the boundaries were drawn up.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Yes, but I think Mr. Griffith's words are too light. Those members welcomed the arrangement with open arms because they thought it would be their salvation. The garbage to which we have been forced to listen since that time has resulted from sheer green-eyed jealousy because they fell flat on their faces.

If those same gentlemen had put as much effort into improving and streamlining their Administration as they put into their efforts on that occasion, I believe they would have done a good job, because no doubt there is room for improvement in any Administration. I have always argued that the overgrowth of red tape is not so much a matter of Government as it is a matter of size. I am sure that large firms are probably just as tied up with red tape

and administrative detail as are Governments. Maybe the problem is a little more exaggerated in the case of Governments because when one is dealing with the money of others one must have a number of checks to ensure there is no robbery.

However, I still think that if those gentlemen had spent a little more time studying administration and the like they would have done more for their cause.

I have dealt with the matter very briefly because this subject goes back over the centuries and, of course, one could speak for many hours on the philosophical basis of the three-part system we have—the Assembly, the Council, and the Governor. I have covered the effect of the improved administration; the denigration of the Legislative Council, which I deplore; and the fact that the Upper House is part of the system. I believe the shortcomings of the present Government are so obvious that I do not need to underline them. I support the amendment.

Sitting suspended from 6.05 to 7.30 p.m.

THE HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan) [7.31 p.m.]: I rise to oppose the amendment. I will be brief with my remarks and I really mean brief, because this debate has not engendered in me a great deal of enthusiasm. I have always been one of those people who are quite happy with the policies enunciated by the Opposition as they are the policies decided upon by those members of the Liberal Party and the Country Party. It is their right to do just that.

It is also the right of the party to which I belong to formulate a policy and act upon it. Our policy in relation to this House is quite clear. In fact, so that we will not deal with a furphy or any imagined Labor Party policy, our State platform, which is available for anyone to peruse, clearly spells out what our policy is in relation not only to the Legislative Council, but also to the Legislative Assembly.

Every member of my party seeking endorsement as a candidate in a State election of both the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly, is bound by this policy. In fact, he signs a pledge to that effect, and I see nothing wrong with that. If anyone does not wish to abide by the rules of the Australian Labor Party he is quite free to go somewhere else and join a party which gives him a greater amount of—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Freedom.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Just a moment. He is quite free to join a party which gives him a greater amount of leeway to wander hither and thither. I do not wish to enter into political history but if anyone wishes to gain information about the political history of the Labor Party from its inception and how some 18 months

later the major political parties of Australia adopted the same system, it can be obtained from the Australian National University. That body will provide to anyone the necessary data in order that a check can be made of that statement.

It has been said that the Caucus of the Labor Party makes the decisions; but, in fact, the majority of Caucus makes the decision, and if the Caucus majority is not in agreement on any policy then, as Mr. Willmott has said, that particular policy is not proceeded with. Again, I make no apologies for this. The programme that we adopt is there for all to see. Our State conferences are open to the public and to the Press in the same way as are the Federal Labor Party conferences, and I am indeed happy to say that the Liberal Party intends to adopt a similar policy. I am sure that party will be applauded for adopting such a policy and will be more highly respected than it has been to date. I am not saying it is not highly respected now. But if such a policy is put into effect, the people will be able to understand how that party is formulating policy and how it is put into effect.

I will now turn to the question of what we believe in as regards the Legislative Council. No. 4 of our State platform in regard to electoral and constitutional matters is clearly stated. It reads as follows—

4. Abolition of the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly for the purpose of establishing a unicameral parliament.

Any member of my party, and indeed any member of the public, would be entitled to engage in free speech for which we are so famous. Yet tonight I heard criticism about certain people because they had the temerity to write to the Press quite openly—not to an underground newspaper—in order to state their opinion. Surely there is nothing wrong with that. Anyone can either agree or disagree with the opinion that is expressed.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: The leader of the Government associates himself with that.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I know the leader of the Government in this State has expressed his views on many matters and, again, anyone can either agree or disagree with his views. I do not intend to debate the pros and cons of how many Bills were defeated and passed during the last session, because that is history. That belongs to yesterday. History, of course, is essential for anyone who wants to understand the present, and I would say that a careful examination of history might bring forth quite a different interpretation from the one Mr. Willmott presented here tonight.

I am not denying that those are the results of his research, but a result of my research might lead to a completely differ-

ent conclusion. However, I have no intention of conducting such a research. The amendment moved by Mr. Arthur Griffith goes on to state—

... the people would be better served if the Government were to concentrate on improving its administration of the affairs of the State, instead of endeavouring to denigrate the Legislative Council . . .

I do not want to debate the question of the administration of this State by the present Government. I am quite sure that in the days to come this Chamber will have ample opportunity to debate that issue, either for or against. I am sure that our Ministers will put before this House ample material for the consideration of not only the members of this Chamber but also the public at large, and they can agree or disagree that the Labor Government is administering this State efficiently.

Of course, in the fragile game of politics in which we engage we will not know until the last hurrah and the last vote is counted whether that administration has been correct in following the policies that have been laid down.

I was rather amazed at the contribution to the debate made by the Leader of the Opposition, because in the short time I have been a member of this House I have heard him make much better speeches. I was amazed that he advanced no argument in support of the amendment he moved. I was also amazed that it was left to Mr. Willmott to come forward with the reasons for moving such an amendment. That, to me—as a comparatively new member of this House—seems a strange thing.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: That is how we work; we work as a team.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I am not arguing with that. I am merely saying that it is a strange way of working.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Did you say that Mr. Willmott was a new member?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: No, I said that I was a new member. If the honourable member waits long enough hearing aids may be placed on the free list.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The honourable member will never wear glasses; he is too one-eyed as it is.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I cannot agree with the amendment for the reasons I have stated. I hope that some of the members who have spoken tonight do not really mean what they have said, because it appears to me that it may become a dangerous thing in this State to express one's opinion through a newspaper. I am fully aware of the democratic processes in this country and I am eager to see them preserved. Furthermore, I earnestly hope they will endure for many a long day.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Except the Legislative Council.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Perhaps I had better restate what I have already said. I have outlined to this Chamber the policy of the Labor Party. I gave the history of the party and how it was formed, and every member of this Chamber knows that the only way we can abolish this Chamber is by a simple process; namely, by the Labor Party winning the majority of the seats in this House.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is so.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Fair enough. We agree on that. I am not so naive as to think that any other method will be adopted. Of course, if we allow the kind of cartoon that appeared in *The West Australian* to circulate maybe the Legislative Council will still be here, but we will not be members of it.

By way of interjection during the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition I said that I could not agree with a state of affairs such as that. It is foreign to our nation and foreign to the principles of our Anglo-Saxon background, of which I am extremely proud.

Let me state briefly that I fully support the policy of my party and I will at all times endeavour, by the democratic process of our country, to put that policy into operation at the earliest opportunity. I will always respect and, in fact, demand, the right of any member of this community to express his opinion on the public platform, through the medium of the Press, in this Chamber, or through any section of the media. I am opposed to the amendment.

THE HON. CLIVE GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [7.42 p.m.]: I think my leader, The Hon. A. F. Griffith, had every justification for moving the amendment to the motion that was moved by Mr. Roy Cloughton. I think he put forward a sound case for our support of the amendment. This case, of course, was amply backed by the remarks made by my colleague Mr. Willmott and others from this side of the House who have spoken in favour of the amendment.

Mr. Dans said that he was amazed at the arguments put forward by my leader. I was just as amazed at the arguments advanced by his leader, bearing in mind that he had 24 hours in which to prepare an answer to the case put forward by the Leader of the Opposition. From what I understand of his answer, which was very short, he failed miserably in refuting the accusations set out in the amendment. Indeed, he failed to give any reasons whatsoever as to why we should not support the amendment moved by Mr. Arthur Griffith.

I have no objection to members of the Labor Party, members of the Liberal Party, members of the Country Party, or

members of any other party supporting the platform of their particular organisation. Indeed they would be hypocrites if they did not do so. However, what appals me in this debate on the accusations made against this House is the allegation that the decisions made by this Chamber are not made in a democratic manner. That is the statement to which I take exception. If it is the policy of the Labor Party to endeavour to abolish the Legislative Council in Western Australia, the implementation of such a policy is perfectly within its rights, and good luck to it if it can implement it.

However, it is entirely wrong to suggest as an argument for the abolition of this House that the decisions reached by the members of this Chamber are reached in an undemocratic manner, and I take strong exception to such a statement. I also take strong exception to the methods adopted by the Government in attempting to implement that particular policy.

Mr. Dans said that he is aware of the democratic processes in this country. I would remind him that each of us has been elected under a democratic system adopted for the first time in 1965 as a result of amendments to the Electoral Act made by the Liberal-Country Parties coalition Government and I would say from memory that it was wholeheartedly supported at the time by members of the Labor Government. In those circumstances I wonder how anyone could believe that we were elected under an undemocratic system.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I did not say that.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I did not say the honourable member did. I mentioned that he said something else.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: He has now left his seat. You got rid of him anyway!

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I have just resumed my seat again to indicate that I am not running away!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I believe that every member in this Chamber was elected by the people in a very democratic manner. The very construction of the House is a clear indication that it is possible for the Labor Party to hold a majority in the Chamber. The question which continues to occur to me is whether the campaign to abolish the Legislative Council would be so intense if that situation prevailed.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is a very good question to pose.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I repeat that the present structure of the Chamber at the moment clearly indicates that, should the people so desire, the A.L.P. could hold a majority in this House. It is very evident, however, that the people of Western Australia did not want that situation to prevail. I will go so far as to

say—and I am not being optimistic—that in 1974 the people of Western Australia will give further evidence to the A.L.P. that they do not want that state of affairs to exist.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is what Mr. Claughton is worrying about.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The Wigs were in power for 40 years and have not been back since.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: That may be so. I believe that this Government-instigated campaign—I emphasise the word "Government-instigated"—to abolish the Legislative Council has reached an all-time low in view of the tactics adopted and unless the Government dissociates itself completely from the pamphlet distributed on opening night I will continue to think it has some association with it.

I have a copy of the pamphlet here. It just amazes me that individuals, or members of organisations, could have the mentality to enable them to go to the length of preparing a pamphlet such as this in order to sustain an argument. This pamphlet uses as its main theme the present tragic road toll in Western Australia. It does this in a last-ditch attempt to draw sympathy to its cause, but its arguments are ill-founded and unwarranted.

This pamphlet is an indication to me that the argument for the abolition of the Legislative Council cannot stand on its own feet, but needs the support of something else in an attempt to convince the general public that the cause has some merit. The tragedy on our roads is being used as a means to entice supporters to the cause.

I referred to the mentality of the individuals or the members of the organisations responsible for this pamphlet. I did so because, of all the subjects which they could have chosen to bolster up the argument, those responsible for the pamphlet have referred to the Bill providing complete police takeover of traffic control in Western Australia. To support their otherwise worthless argument they have referred to the result of the decision taken on that Bill. Among other things the pamphlet states that this is an undemocratic House and the decisions made here are undemocratic. It went on to state that when a vote was taken on this particular Bill two members of the Liberal Party voted with the Government. I ask members: If that is not a clear indication that, as far as the members of the Opposition are concerned, they are prepared and permitted—I repeat, "permitted"—to treat each and every piece of legislation on its merits and to judge it as if they sit in a House of Review, what is? So the choice of that particular Bill in a pamphlet such as the one I have here was very poor indeed, as we all know.

I emphasise that the pamphlet indicates that two members of the Liberal Party voted with the Government, but in the next breath it states that this is an undemocratic House. I think that clearly disposes of an otherwise very unsavoury piece of literature which I understand was distributed throughout the Legislative Assembly.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You are not blaming the Labor Party for that, though?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am saying that the campaign is Government-inspired. I am not suggesting the Government necessarily produced the pamphlet, but I am saying it was inspired by the sudden intense desire on the part of the Labor Party to abolish the Legislative Council.

I did wish to raise other matters to give a clear indication that the Government should start to do something about administering the State instead of wasting its time on its venomous desire to abolish the Legislative Council. However I will not do so until another time. I simply want to conclude by confirming my support for the amendment moved by my leader and by saying I think he had every right and justification to move such an amendment which I trust the House will pass.

THE HON. L. D. ELLIOTT (North-East Metropolitan) [7.55 p.m.]: I oppose the amendment and I am surprised at the two major issues which have been raised by members during the debate. The two appear to have been confused—firstly, the question of the imbalance of votes for Legislative Council provinces, and, secondly, the question of whether we should have a unicameral Parliament in this State, and whether the Legislative Council is a genuine House of Review.

I firstly wish to deal with the question of the imbalance of voting for the Legislative Council provinces and to defend my right to write to the Press at any time in support of my party's policy on a matter I think is very important. I might add that in the letter referred to by Mr. Withers I did not attack the Legislative Council. I merely indicated the factual position. I do not think anyone can challenge me on what I said; that is, that two-thirds of the electors of this State elect only one-third of the members of this Council. Government concerns people and if we are interested in democracy does it not mean government of the people by representatives elected by the majority of the people?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You base democracy on numbers.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You must consider people and not just numbers.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: I am considering people and I am not referring to acres, sheep, trees, and so on as have other people.

In my letter to *The West Australian* I referred to a decision of the United States Supreme Court in 1964. I think I have already quoted this in the Chamber on a previous occasion, but I wish to repeat it in case members have forgotten. I do not think Mr. Withers quoted this.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Only in parts.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: Referring to the United State Supreme Court I said in my letter—

In a case before that Court in 1964, the Chief Justice Earl Warren said "Legislatures represent people, not trees or acres . . . To the extent that a citizen's right to vote is debased he is that much less a citizen."

In this case the court ruled that as nearly as practicable one man's vote is to be worth as much as another's. Surely the United States Supreme Court would have had regard for all the factors involved, including distances and areas to be covered by the members elected to the Legislature in that country.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Are you sure it did?

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: Can the Leader of the Opposition imagine a judge of the Supreme Court of the United States arriving at a decision without doing so?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am not imagining anything, but if you make a provocative statement like that you should have proof of it.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: I am asking the Leader of the Opposition whether he would doubt the integrity of a judge of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am asking you whether you are sure the court did what you said it did.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: The letter I wrote to the Press was not published in its entirety, probably because of lack of space. Therefore I would like to quote the part which was not published. It reads—

In the horse and buggy days there may have been some validity in the argument about the difficulties of communication in country areas. However, this is the age of the automobile, the aircraft, radio, telephone, daily newspapers and an efficient postal service, all of which have to a large extent mitigated the problems of distance.

There is no longer any justification for telling an elector in the metropolitan area that he is only entitled to a vote one-third in value of his country cousin.

Surely one of the fundamentals of democracy is government of the people by representatives elected by a majority of the people whose votes carry equal weight.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Are you implying that this is not a democratically elected House?

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: That is what they have advocated all along.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: I am saying that.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: This is exactly what I said.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: It is not possible to say a democratic situation exists when a minority of the people elect a majority of the members. Surely democracy means majority rule. It means decisions taken by the majority in terms of numbers of people.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I find that democracy means whatever one wants it to mean. It depends on the country.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: Mr. Withers mentioned the problems of distance and I can well imagine that there would be problems. I wonder whether he, in turn, appreciates the problems of a metropolitan member in trying to deal with 80,000 electors. Mr. Withers has approximately 5,000 electors in his province.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Of the electors in a metropolitan province 70,000 would not know their member.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: Until the redistribution last year there were 80,000 electors on the roll in the North-East Metropolitan Province which returns two members to this Chamber. A similar situation, in terms of numbers, applied in one or two other metropolitan provinces.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I have 42 per cent. of the disadvantaged people in this State.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: Nevertheless, 5,000 people in the honourable member's electorate return two members to this Chamber.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Mr. Withers would have over 650,000 square miles of the State if he were to represent 80,000 people.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: I cannot follow the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: He would have a much larger area than he now has and a much larger number of people.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: Electorates could be drawn up in a way which would eliminate many of these problems. A Bill was brought down in another place to provide, as I understood it, for the State to be divided into electorates of 7,000 people if a unicameral Parliament were introduced. I cannot see the point the Leader of the Opposition is trying to make if a situation such as I have described were to come into existence.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Would you agree that disadvantaged people need more representation?

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: I agree that disadvantageded people need more discrimination in their favour in the way of benefits and taxation concessions.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: And representation?

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: They are not entitled to a more important say in affairs of State. For example, a labourer in Broome should not have more say in the Parliament than a labourer in the metropolitan area. I agree people in remote areas should be given concessions and special privileges to ameliorate some of the problems of living in an area such as that. We do not have democracy with the kind of electoral set-up which exists at the moment.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Who will attend to the needs of electors?

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: In addition, an electorate with 80,000 people on the roll has approximately 50 schools, not to mention youth organisations, scouts, progress associations, and so on. Does the honourable member not think that metropolitan members have their problems too?

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I wish I had a few more carpeted schools in my area.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: Many members have tried to make something of the fact that the Labor Party wants to abolish the Upper House only because it has always been controlled by Conservative parties since its inception.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Is there any other reason?

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: I base my argument—as does the Labor Party—on the principle which I have already enunciated. Whether seats in the country are represented by Labor, Liberal, or Country Party members the same principle of equal representation should apply.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is a smoke screen to cover your real reasons.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: Mr. MacKinnon may think that if he wishes but I have stated what I believe to be a fact. After all, the Labor Party does have principles.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The first-past-the-post system would help your situation.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: The second question raised during the debate is whether this Chamber is a genuine House of Review. I have never in all my life heard so much nonsense. Can any member tell me he was elected to this Chamber as an independent person to sit in a House of Review? Every member has been elected on a party platform and subscribes to the platform of his party.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Why were Mr. Hunt and I elected on the same day in the same year by the same people?

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: The honourable member has not appreciated my point. I challenge any member in this Chamber to tell me whether he has been elected as an independent and is completely free of any party discipline, restriction, or platform. I am sure no member could say this.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: How many Bills come into this place with anything to do with party platforms?

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: The whole question of Government is concerned with party platforms.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: "Review" means "look at again".

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: I will come to that in a moment. I express the Labor Party's beliefs as well as my own in saying that a Government of any colour should be able to govern in its own right without having the restriction of an Upper House.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Like a dictator.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: I say this because Governments are answerable to the people at the next election.

Mr. MacKinnon returned to his old tack and tried to say that totalitarian regimes or people such as the fascists, nazis, and communists are the ones who believe in unicameral Parliaments. However, he omitted to tell us about other democratic Parliaments around the world which operate on a unicameral system. I challenge Mr. MacKinnon to tell me whether we will find totalitarian regimes in any of the countries I will mention.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I thought we had already had our debate, Miss Elliott.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: In New Zealand the Upper House was abolished by a Nationalist Government in 1950. Further, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Norway, Israel, Queensland, Nebraska, and nine provinces in Canada have unicameral or one-House Parliaments.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Why do you think that many other countries have bicameral systems?

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: I would like any member to tell me whether we could find dangerous or totalitarian regimes in the countries I have mentioned.

In addition, I would like to quote something which was said by the Speaker of the Queensland Parliament (Sir David Nicholson) to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Presiding Officers' Conference in Fiji in 1971. Amongst other things, he said—

It was because of the frustrations occasioned by the Upper House that Queensland abolished its Legislative Council in 1922 and it is interesting to

note that since that time there has been no move to re-establish an Upper Chamber there. The State has progressed very well and I do not think that the Queensland legislation or Queensland people have suffered in any way because of the lack of an Upper Chamber. New Zealand in 1950 also abolished its Upper House, and to my knowledge there has been no move there to re-establish the second Chamber.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Would you tell us what happened in New South Wales?

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: Mr. Willmott—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Silence is the stern reply!

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: The Leader of the Opposition had his turn.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: Mr. Willmott quoted some figures on the number of Bills amended in the six years of the Hawke Government and the first six years of the Brand Government. It sounded interesting until one examined the amount of legislation actually rejected. It is all very well to talk of amendments, but many amendments are trivial and mean nothing at all. Let us look at the number of Bills rejected by this Chamber. These figures are extremely interesting if members continue to insist that this is a House of Review and is not based on party lines.

The worst year of the Brand Government for rejection of legislation in this Chamber was 1966. In that year 1.6 per cent. of legislation was rejected. The worst year of the Hawke Government for rejection of legislation in this Chamber was 1958. In that year 20 per cent. of the legislation was rejected.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: The Hawke Government lost the election the following year because of it.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: That is a poor observation.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Mr. Willmott explained the position.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: I tried to do so but some people do not absorb it.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: It is interesting to look at the legislation rejected by this Chamber in 1958 when the Hawke Government was in office, particularly since we are told that the Legislative Council is a democratic House and its decisions are not based on party ideology. In that year the Bank Holidays Act Amendment Bill was rejected. The purpose of the Bill was to give bank employees a five-day working week; in other words, the banks would be closed on Saturdays. The Constitution Act Amendment Bill was also defeated. Its purpose was to introduce adult franchise for the Legislative Council. What was so terrible about that? It was subsequently introduced by a Liberal Government.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: So was the Bank Holidays Act Amendment Bill.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: The Upper House defeated the Electoral Act Amendment Bill which also had the purpose of introducing adult franchise for the Legislative Council.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: This was introduced by the Liberal Government.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: As I have said, both the Constitution Act Amendment Bill and the Electoral Act Amendment Bill intended to introduce adult franchise for the Legislative Council but both were defeated by the Legislative Council.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: They did not do the job thoroughly like the following Government.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: The Factories and Shops Act Amendment Bill was also defeated. The purpose of that Bill was twofold; firstly, to promote safety and industrial accident prevention and, secondly, to deal with warehouse trading hours. The Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Bill (No. 2) was also defeated. Its purpose was to give the court power to determine whether a worker was an employee or a subcontractor. It was concerned with the building industry. The Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Bill (No. 3) was introduced in that year to give the court jurisdiction to determine whether persons employed in the taxi industry were to be deemed workers. This, too, was rejected. The Local Government Bill intended to give adult franchise in local government elections but it was rejected. The Natives (Status as Citizens) Bill was introduced to amend offending Statutes, 11 in all, by removing discriminatory legislation. That, too, was defeated by the Legislative Council. In 1958 the State Government Insurance Office Act Amendment Bill was introduced for the sixth time. Its purpose was to enable the S.G.I.O. to engage in all forms of insurance. For the sixth time, it was defeated. The Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill intended to improve certain provisions of the Act in favour of the workers, but this met with the same fate and was defeated by the Legislative Council.

I challenge any member to tell me of any dangerous principle embodied in the 10 Bills I have mentioned. All of the legislation was designed to help the working people of Western Australia—or, at least, most of it was. I cannot see any dangerous principle or any reason for rejection of the legislation by this Chamber except that the vote was based on party lines and the legislation did not concur with Liberal and Country Party ideology.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: That is all very well, but it would be necessary to see the wording of the Bills.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: Mr. Withers can read for himself the wording of the Bills.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: A moment ago you said people ought to vote on party lines.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: I did not say that. I believe that members of this Chamber do vote on party lines. Before leaving the question of the amount of legislation rejected by the Legislative Council I shall refer to two Bills which were defeated on the first reading in 1956. I do not know how the Legislative Council can be described as a House of Review when it refuses to hear a Minister's second reading speech and the reasons for the introduction of the measure. Such action is possible only when members have preconceived ideas or prejudices. The two Bills in question were the Constitution Act Amendment Bill and the Electoral Act Amendment Bill, both of which were to provide adult franchise for the Legislative Council.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We saved a great deal of time. It was real efficiency.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: Do not try to tell me the Legislative Council is a House of Review.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Every Labor member breathed a sigh of relief, as I remember.

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: Before I resume my seat, I wish to make one other point and refer to the continuous talk we hear about the policy-making body of the Labor Party. I have heard no end of criticism in this Chamber of the Labor Party Executive, the conference set-up, and the constitution of the party.

It is extremely interesting to see that the Liberal Party in the Federal sphere is beginning to adopt some of the procedures set up by the Labor Party which the Liberal Party has condemned for so long. First of all it has adopted the Labor Party's policy of electing the Cabinet at a Caucus meeting. In this morning's *The West Australian* we see that the Liberal Party will open the doors to the Press. This was done by the Labor Party in 1967!

If we care to undertake the research, I am sure we would find that the Liberal Party is now adopting many of the policies of the Labor Party.

I wish to conclude on this note—I have said this before and I will say it again—an Upper House elected on party lines is a farce. The best ingredients for democratic and effective government are regular elections in which disciplined parties offer a clear choice to the electorate; an education system that produces thinking citizens who are able to evaluate, know their rights and question government policies; and an impartial and vigilant Press.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [8.16 p.m.]: I have listened carefully to the speeches supporting the amendment moved by Mr. Arthur Griffith in the hope that somewhere in those speeches we would find the evidence to support the amendment. As did the Leader of the House, I carefully perused the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition in an attempt to discover the reasons for the amendment. I ended up in a quandary.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is not surprising in your case.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I did not know which part of his speech was in support of the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply moved by me and which part related to his amendment. Since it is traditional for the Leader of the House to take the adjournment to such a debate, I felt that Mr. Dolan was left in an extremely difficult position. In fact, Mr. Dolan was not able to discover the precise charges involved in the amendment, and indeed, none of the speakers who have followed the Leader of the Opposition have outlined evidence in support of the motion.

The charge is that the Government is not attending to its administration but is devoting its time to denigrating this Chamber. When we attempted to discover the particular members of the Government who were allegedly expending their energies in this way, we were finally given three names—The Hon. Lyla Elliott, and two members of the Legislative Assembly. Of course, the members of the Legislative Assembly are not members of Cabinet although they are members of the Government party. We were not given specific instances or examples of the manner in which these three people had denigrated this Chamber. In fact, no case has been made at all.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Were you asleep?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Mr. Willmott said there had been an organised attack. Having heard him say that I expected him to demonstrate specific instances of some form of organisation. He did not tell us anything about this. Mr. Willmott proceeded to give us details of Bills which were amended or rejected in the years from the commencement of the Hawke Government. This has nothing to do with the charges set out in the amendment.

Mr. Willmott did refer to a remark made by the Minister for Agriculture who used the term "impertinence" in reference to actions in this Chamber. However, the honourable member did not quote the whole context in which the statement was made and so we are not really conversant with the incident and unable to decide whether it is a specific example of the

way this House has been denigrated. He went on to state that the charge was that the Legislative Council operates only as a House of Review when a Labor Government is in office. Again no specific examples were given and he quoted no names so that we are left in the position of being unable to assess his case. He did not say that a particular person made a particular statement on such-and-such a date and it is recorded. He gave no facts of this type.

It is on such insubstantial evidence that we are asked to form an opinion. When the amendment is put to the vote, we have to decide whether or not to support it. The honourable member is asking us to act as an impartial independent House of Review and yet he has given us no facts upon which to make a decision.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You will burst a blood vessel in a minute!

The Hon. J. Heitman: Were you not listening?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Perhaps the honourable member would like to rise when I sit down and enlighten me as to where the charges in the amendment are substantiated in his leader's speech. I do not want innuendoes, but specific and well-documented examples. Indeed, I would be quite happy to hear evidence to support the charges.

This debate has taken place on unspecified, unsubstantiated assertions.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: When we were presenting facts, where were you?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I believe it is action taken by the Opposition which is denigrating this House. Mr. Withers said we should have an independent, impartial point of view.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I did not use those words.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I would like to quote from *Hansard*. I refer to Mr. MacKinnon's remarks because I remember his statements on this subject. I quote from page 4795 of Tuesday, the 7th November, 1972, as follows—

Knowing my philosophy I am sure members will be aware as to how I will vote—I will vote against the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Which Bill?

The Hon. F. R. White: What is wrong with that?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Is that an impartial, independent attitude?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Which Bill?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Leader of the Opposition may look it up himself if he desires.

The Hon. F. R. White: Tell us what is wrong with such a statement?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am not disagreeing with the statement; however, it illustrates my remarks that the members of this House are members of particular parties. This was the Prevention of Excessive Prices Bill.

The Hon. F. R. White: He referred to his personal philosophy.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What would you say if it were a Bill supporting your party's philosophy?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I would also like to refer to page 3087 of *Hansard* of Thursday, the 7th September, 1972. Mr. MacKinnon said—

Without doubt, a number of matters will be taken up by other speakers. They will be expressing their points of view with little or no hope of persuading those on the opposite side because, despite what Mr. Taylor may say, this is fundamentally a matter of party ideology, belief, and conviction in which there is little or no chance of persuasion.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What is wrong with that?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: So much for the point of view put forward by Mr. Withers!

The amendment provided an excellent opportunity for members of the Opposition to develop their thoughts in regard to any fault on the part of the Government in administering the State. However, we heard nothing of the kind.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: That will come later.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Portion of the amendment reads as follows—

...the Legislative Council (an integral part of the bicameral system of Government in this State)...

If we do not have a Legislative Council or a similar Chamber, then we do not have a bicameral system of Parliament. This is simply a redundant statement. Of course we have a bicameral system of Parliament—we have two Houses. If we operated under a unicameral system of Parliament we would have one House. There is nothing to debate about that statement.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Would you say you are being pedantic?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The charge is that the Government denigrated the Legislative Council in an effort to cover up its shortcomings. Only three people have been referred to, and not one is a member of the Government or involved in the administration of the State. The charge falls down in that way. It has simply not been proved.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: The Government means the Government. We do not have to detail names.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: We have heard members of the Opposition tell us the difference between the Government and the Government party.

Mr. Clive Griffiths stated that it was a Government-inspired attack on the Legislative Council. When I was listening to him I expected him to substantiate that statement, but I did not hear any evidence adduced to show there is a Government-inspired attack on this Chamber.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: A Bill was introduced.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Mr. Clive Griffiths produced no evidence. He could have stated that the Bill he was talking about was evidence of a concerted attack, but he did not. He had his chance to speak. By way of interjection when Miss Elliott was speaking, the Leader of the Opposition said that a statement—whether or not it be provocative—should be substantiated; and with that I agree. However, in regard to the amendment to the motion none of the statements that have been made by the Opposition have been substantiated, so the amendment should be unanimously rejected by this Chamber.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West) [8.31 p.m.]: Despite Mr. Claughton's lack of memory, despite his lack of knowledge of what some members of this party have said over the last 12 to 18 months, and despite the fact it was a statement made by the Premier on this Chamber which prompted the amendment, I doubt whether the amendment would have been moved by Mr. Arthur Griffith if it were not for the recent statement made by the Premier in Bunbury. If what he said is not an attack on the Legislative Council, then what is it?

I will refer to the newspaper report containing the Premier's statement. The report states—

A Labor win in the by-election for Bunbury would serve as a lesson to the Legislative Council, the Premier, Mr. Tonkin, said tonight.

The only matter on which he was trying to justify his remarks was in relation to price control, but in this regard I could argue with him on this subject for as long as he likes.

That is the reason the amendment is before the House, and the newspaper report provides us with evidence of what the Government has done in its attempt to belittle the Legislative Council. There is nothing wrong with the philosophy of Mr. Dans who suggests that the Labor Party wants to get rid of the Legislative Council, but I object to the snide and untruthful remarks made by some members who are trying to achieve that objective.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You provide the evidence. You are making the charge.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Miss Elliott wrote to the Press, but she did not tell the full story. She mentioned only her own thoughts.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: Tell me what was untruthful about it.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I said the honourable member only gave her own thoughts on the matter.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: That is not untruthful.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I did not say it was untruthful. I made a statement in this House last year that a report which appeared in the Press was untruthful. I wrote to the Press pointing out the truth, but the Press would not publish the truth. Members might recall that two other members of the Labor Party wrote letters to the Press, appeared on television, and spoke over the radio; and they made untruthful remarks.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It is only your opinion that they are untruthful.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Of course, they are untruthful. One only has to read the remarks.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Will you quote them?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If the honourable member does not know what members of his own party have said that is his fault.

Point of Order

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: On a point of order, is the honourable member saying that two members of another Chamber and I have told lies?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I did not say that.

The PRESIDENT: In reply to the point of order raised by Miss Elliott I would point out that Mr. Logan has not mentioned any names at all.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: He has implied it.

The PRESIDENT: Unless he does it is left to the imagination.

The Hon. J. Dolan: His imagination or ours?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Imagination on one side, and knowledge on the other!

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Miss Elliott spoke tonight in regard to democracy, and she admitted that the basis of democracy concerned the number of people. What a strange philosophy! Apparently she only wants to apply that philosophy to one aspect of life, and that is at elections. What would happen to Western Australia

if the Federal Government had applied this philosophy of taking into account only the number of people when it was considering the reimbursement of taxes to the States? Is the kind of democracy which takes into consideration only the number of people the kind to be advocated?

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: That is a different question altogether.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It is not. The honourable member was talking about democracy, but she should not pick only one part of life to which to apply that philosophy.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What is your definition of "demos" and "democracy"?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: My definition of "democracy" is a fair go to everybody.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That is a pretty good definition.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: That is all I want.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: Do you know that "demos" means the people?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I could deal with the principle of one-vote, one-value, but I shall do that in the debate on the Address-in-Reply itself. I shall show the House just what the principle of one-vote one-value means not only to the people of Western Australia but also to the people of Australia; and I shall show how insular this attempt is to bring about one-vote, one-value.

Mention has been made of the abolition of the Legislative Council, but nobody can tell me of an instance where a Legislative Council elected on a compulsory voting and adult franchise basis has been abolished. Nowhere in the world has that happened. In regard to New Zealand it never had an elected Legislative Council, and neither did Queensland.

Some members did not tell the whole story when they talked about the abolition of Legislative Councils. What concerns me are the snide attempts that are made to discredit our Legislative Council, and we have a very good example of this in this morning's *The West Australian*. In the report the following appears—

The chairman of TAA, Sir Frederick Scherger, said yesterday that the introduction of a TAA intrastate service in W.A. would probably cause a drop in air fares.

This report refers to air fares being made cheaper in Western Australia. The report further states—

The main snag that he could see arising was the two-airline legislation introduced by the W.A. Government being blocked by the Legislative Council.

Point of Order

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I would ask your opinion, Mr. President, as to what cheaper air fares, TAA, and MMA have to do with the amendment before us.

The PRESIDENT: I rule that the honourable member should connect his remarks to the words proposed to be added to the Address-in-Reply.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: We are dealing with snide remarks which denigrate the Legislative Council. If what I have just quoted from the newspaper report is not denigration of the Council then I do not know what is.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Not by the Government.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The report mentions the main snag Sir Frederick Scherger could see was that the legislation would be blocked by the Legislative Council. Who passed this information on to him? He comes from the Eastern States and would not have a clue about the set-up of this Parliament.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I think your remarks are connected to the amendment.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: These are some of the comments which have built up this attitude towards the Legislative Council. I would point out that we met the representatives of MMA and they presented a case. We are to meet the representatives of TAA tomorrow to hear them present their case. Despite that we see the report which I have just quoted. What sort of attitude is that for a responsible man to take?

The Hon. R. Thompson: You will have a good chance to challenge him on whether or not this is a truthful statement.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I do not know whether or not the newspaper report is correct. It has appeared in the Press and the Press is supposed to print the truth. If it is fair for the Premier to go to Bunbury and make statements like those which appeared in *The West Australian*, then it is good enough for Mr. Arthur Griffith to move the amendment to the Address-in-Reply.

THE HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [8.41 p.m.]: I rise to support the amendment. For the benefit of people who are likely to read the debate on the Address-in-Reply in *Hansard* I want to quote the amendment in full. It is—

However, this House is of the opinion that the best interests of the State and the people would be better served if the Government were to concentrate on improving its administration of the affairs of the State, instead of endeavouring to denigrate the Legislative Council (an integral part of the

bicameral system of Government in this State) in an effort to cover up its own shortcomings.

I do that in order to bring it in line with what is intended in this debate; and that is to relate our remarks to the actual amendment.

It is quite obvious when one moves around the State and talks to the people from many walks of life that they are of the opinion the image of this Government is growing dimmer day by day.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Who said that?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: Many people throughout the length and breadth of Western Australia, and they will continue to do so in increasing numbers between now and the election next year. The Government is aware of its poor showing, because it has expressed publicly concern on its image. I believe it has engaged a private consultant to help it to better performances.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Whom did we engage?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: This has appeared in the Press; it was indicated the Government intended to engage a consultant. If it was not the Government, then it was the A.L.P. which is backing the Government.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The A.L.P. is the Government.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You have said a mouthful there.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That is very true. I make no excuses.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: What the honourable member has said is ever so true; the A.L.P. is the Government and its members of Parliament are puppets on a string dancing to the tune of the A.L.P.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Would you not like to think that is true?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: The Government has to place the blame somewhere for its lack of performance, and in more recent times it has laid the blame at the doors of the Legislative Council. I believe this is misplaced, because I intend in the course of my remarks in the next few minutes to show it is not so, and to indicate that the Government itself is indulging in a sort of byplay; that is, to discredit this House wherever it can.

The Governor's Speech contains a long list of legislation to be introduced. It suggests that certain measures will be introduced in the expectation that they will be rejected by this House. I do not know whether or not they will be, but on past performances this could well be the case.

Figures were quoted earlier in this debate relating to the 1958 period which was the last full year of the Hawke Labor Government, when quite a number of Bills

were rejected, and apparently rejected for very good reason, because at that time the socialist Government legislation was coming up thick and fast.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You say workers' compensation legislation is socialistic?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: Socialistic legislation.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You said that, not I.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: It was felt this was not in the best interests of Western Australia.

At the very next election early in 1959 the A.L.P. was defeated at the polls and the Brand Government took office. That is now history. However, that change demonstrates that the A.L.P. policy did not meet with the desires of the electors throughout Western Australia and there was justification for the rejection of some of the measures introduced into Parliament at that time.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The bank officers' Bill?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: Any true Government should, in fact, be careful with its legislation in the Legislative Council. This is a matter of fact because on many occasions Bills have been introduced into this House by the Labor Government and those Bills have been undoubtedly improved by amendments. Those amendments have been accepted by the Legislative Assembly. I suggest that if the legislation had not been improved the Labor Government would have been at fault in accepting the amendments. However, the amendments have been accepted on many occasions; too numerous to mention. For that reason the Government should be fairly pleased with the House of Review, irrespective of its political colour.

The Hon. R. Thompson: In 12 years of Liberal Government I did not see one Labor Party suggestion accepted in this Chamber.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I think that statement is open to some research and challenge.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: The suggestions could not have been very sound. We have heard the Labor Party in this Parliament refer to the Brand Government as a compass Government. It was claimed that everything was pointing to the north to the detriment of the south, the south-west, and the south-east. I did not agree with that at all but it was the catch-cry of the day. I would like to suggest that the present Government could be called a boomerang Government because it throws its ideas into the air where they circle for a while and then crash at the feet of the Government.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: They always return home.

The Hon. R. Thompson: We will be returned in 1974.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: The Government has need to be worried about its image. I desire to refer to two instances which are quite topical and indeed very recent. I will first of all refer to a newspaper report which appeared in *The West Australian* on Wednesday, the 21st March. This happens to be very recent. The article which appeared on page 34 was headed, "Tonkin says new plan is far-sighted." I will quote part of the article as follows—

... the South-West was a rich region with an economy already diversified between primary and secondary production.

Its growth so far was enough to ensure much greater expansion eventually, even if nothing more was done to stimulate it.

The Government had no intention of reducing the support it was already giving the Bunbury area, but it was time to think about encouraging similar expansion in the almost untouched region between Perth and Geraldton.

I want to carry that point a little further because on the 15th March, 1973—which happened to be last Thursday—a question was asked in another place. The question was asked of the Premier, and the first part of it was as follows—

- (1) (a) Will he table a plan and reports showing details of the Government's proposal to develop 80,000 acres as a northward extension of the metropolitan region, and announced on the 17th January, 1973;

The Premier replied—

- (1) (a) I seek leave to table the plan requested. It must be stressed that this is only a preliminary outline plan. A comprehensive report is not available. The general concept arises from a number of discussions emanating from several departments and concerning such issues as port development, a site for power stations, and the development of major housing areas and employment centres. Further impetus to the discussions was given by Commonwealth entry into the field of urban and regional development.

Point of Order

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: On a point of Order, Mr. President, are we discussing the Address-in-Reply or an amendment to the Address-in-Reply?

President's Ruling

The PRESIDENT: I would rule that we are on the amendment, and I would ask the honourable member to associate his remarks with the words that appear in the amendment.

Debate (on amendment to Motion) Resumed

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: With due respect I feel I was referring directly to the latter part of the amendment dealing with the efforts of the Government to cover up its own shortcomings. I was relating my remarks to the areas north of Perth and in the south-west as they affect the Legislative Council. With due respect, I believe that what I will have to say will have relevance to the points mentioned. To continue the remarks of the Premier—
and the likelihood of financial assistance. It is not expected that a comprehensive report will be available for several months.

Here is an example of a major development announced by the Government. In my view it is ill-founded and is an endeavour to cover up shortcomings.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What shortcomings? Tell us!

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: The plan officially tabled by the Premier on the 15th March, 1973, concerns an area of 80,000 acres but there has apparently been very little consultation or investigation.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I do not think the honourable member would know a shortcoming if he ran into one.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: It is certainly a shortcoming for the Government to neglect the south-west portion of the State. The Government has said that it does not intend to do any more than is being done at the moment, but that it will concentrate on another portion of the State.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: How does the honourable member substantiate his claim that it has not been investigated?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I can go further and quote a reply given by the Premier only last week in answer to a question. The question related to this very matter, and was as follows—

- (c) will the legislation be in the first or second part of the session?

The Premier replied—

- (c) This will depend on the completion of studies relating to development and finance. However, it is hoped that legislation will be introduced in the autumn session.

So, the Premier has not done his homework.

The Hon. R. Thompson: We are not going off half-cocked.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I stress that that answer was supplied by the Premier and in answer to a further question he went on to say—

- (4) The presidents of the Wanneroo and Gingin shires were acquainted with the proposals immediately before the public announcement was made. There have since been consultations with the Wanneroo shire, and further telephone contact with the Gingin shire.

What sort of a consultation is that? These are shortcomings and that is why the people of this State are very alarmed that the Government is administering the State in this manner.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: When did the people tell you this?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: Very recently; it is a gathering storm.

The Hon. G. W. Berry: In a teacup.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: It has been suggested that the Government is not associated with the denigration of this Chamber. If I remember correctly the Leader of the House, when he replied to the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, said he did not believe the Government had at any time associated itself with the criticism of this House by individuals as suggested by Mr. Arthur Griffith. Who is the Government? It has been suggested that private members are not part of the Government. I do not intend to argue that point but private members are supporters of the Government. If they do not comprise the Government then it can only be the Ministers of the Crown who form the Government.

Therefore, the Ministers are associated with the words of the motion now before us; that the Government has, indeed, added to the denigration of this Chamber. I will support my remarks by quoting from the *Warren-Blackwood Times* of the 29th November, 1972.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Is that a Western Australian newspaper?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: The honourable member shows a surprising lack of knowledge of newspapers in this State. The *Warren-Blackwood Times* is published in the south-west and circulates in the Manjimup-Bridgetown area. An article on the front page of the paper is headed, "Evans disappointed at rejection of board". The article goes on—

Agriculture Minister H. D. Evans has expressed his disappointment at the rejection by the Legislative Council of the State Government's Bill to establish an Export Apple Marketing Board.

At a later stage the article continues—

The Bill, which was rejected, intended to set up an Export Apple Marketing Board for the purpose of selling the West Australian crop.

Firstly, the Bill was not, in fact, rejected. The Government just allowed the Bill to lapse so the report is inaccurate. I have not seen any denial by Mr. H. D. Evans regarding what he apparently said in relation to that Bill.

I will now refer to the *Warren-Blackwood Times* of Wednesday, the 6th December, 1972, and quote from a letter addressed to the editor. It is from a private citizen and, in part, reads as follows—

The Government made no effort to invoke the procedures that the constitution provides to reconcile differences between the two Houses, as is always done in cases where the Legislative Council has amended a Bill in the Legislative Assembly.

The Government has a perfect right to allow this or any other Bill to lapse in this manner.

It is cowardly, however, to suggest that the blame and responsibility for the lapse of this Bill rest with the Council when, in fact, they rest solely with the Government.

It might be asked: What has this to do with the Ministers of the Crown? The simple answer is that in this case the Minister, Mr. H. D. Evans, chose to reply. The reply appeared in the same publication on Wednesday, the 13th December, 1972, under the heading, "Minister comments on 'Apples' Bill". The reply, in part, was as follows—

The legislation passed in the form sought by the industry in the Assembly was rejected by the Council for political reasons.

By his approbation and approval of the council's action, Mr. Hearman suggests that the Legislative Council has the right to change legislation to the extent it feels fit, disregarding Government and industry.

This action must highlight the need to consider the abolition of the Upper Chamber.

The letter is signed "H. D. Evans, Minister for Agriculture, Lands, Forests and Immigration." Those remarks tie in very neatly with the words contained in the amendment now before us. The Minister for Agriculture chose to make a statement to the Press above his signature and malign this Chamber for what he believes happened to the export apple marketing Bill. It is not correct to say that this Chamber rejected the legislation, as we all know.

The Hon. N. McNeill: As Mr. H. D. Evans also knew.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: As did every member of the Government. However, Government members chose to spread the rumour throughout the electorate that this Chamber rejected the legislation. The Government did not take the Bill to a conference of managers and for that reason the action of the Government does tie in with the words of the amendment now before us.

I believe the Government is indeed at fault in stooping to this sort of thing and not conveying to the public the true position in respect of the handling of legislation in this Parliament, and particularly in this House. I believe I have supplied proof that the Government is very much at fault in the handling of its administration and in its attitude towards this House. I support the motion.

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF: (Metropolitan) [9.01 p.m.]: I support the amendment. As I see it, the amendment is really saying that the Government is diverting attention from its deficiencies by attacking the Legislative Council. I believe it is a very poor tactic to attack the Legislative Council but it is a very common way of diverting attention from some other major problem. There are many historical examples of this sort of thing. Miss Elliott has been quoting examples in other parts of the world. One could also quote cases where a Government has had problems at home and has therefore launched an attack on a particular group, body, or organisation and blamed it for all the ills the community was suffering. We all know this tactic is frequently employed. It is not a very good tactic because in the long run we cannot fool the people by putting across things which are not true in fact. We may sometimes do so for a short time but such a tactic will not carry weight indefinitely.

As I see it, the Government has really been complaining that the Legislative Council has thwarted its policies. Yet, as Mr. Dolan said, the Government has produced a paper—which is called “a half-way paper” or something similar—in which it has outlined the policies it has carried out. More or less quoting Mr. Dolan, he said the paper has demonstrated that the Government has done a good job. I do not know how it was able to do such a good job and have so many Bills passed if the Legislative Council was thwarting its policies. The Governor's Speech mentioned how many Bills had been passed, and it was a substantial number. There is therefore no cause for complaint about the Legislative Council on that score.

However, the Government continually harks back to some Bills as having been thwarted. One deals with country traffic and another with prices control. Reference has also been made to the S.G.I.O. Bill and daylight saving. On most of those subjects, if not all of them, there has

been an ample demonstration in this House of members of the Liberal and Country Parties—that is the Opposition—voting according to their consciences. I believe most members try to vote according to their consciences but some are unable to do so because they have signed some sort of statement or made a vow or affirmation—

The Hon. J. Dolan: The word is “pledge”.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: Before they were elected to Parliament Labor members signed a pledge to the effect that they would carry out the policy laid down by previous generations of people in the same party. I am not saying there is anything wrong with that. We have all signed pledges in our time. When one goes into the services one takes an oath of allegiance and accepts principles which have been laid down by Governments and organisations in former times. If one is an adherent of a particular church one will probably accept, as an act of faith, the tenets of that church. I am not criticising that—it is probably a very good thing—but it is not correct to say, as I believe Miss Elliott implied, that all the members of this House have signed the same kind of pledge, taken the same kind of oath, or made the same kind of affirmation or declaration with their respective parties. They have not done so.

I am not aware that I was ever asked to take an oath or sign an affirmation that I would support every word and line in the Liberal Party's platform, and I think the same applies to most of the other Liberal Party members and the Country Party members. There is a fair degree of freedom of action and it is quite clearly recognised. I know that is so because I have tested it out, and so have other members. One may say one's piece. One does not have to say it only in the party room; one can say one's piece in Parliament.

This is the basic reason—and I hope I am being factual and not political—for seats which could swing either way being retained by Liberal or Country Party representatives. I believe the message has got home to some people that in the last analysis, if one has a particular point of view, one can take the opposite line to the party line. This has been demonstrated many times. I have only to quote my predecessor in the Metropolitan Province—the late Hon. Sir Keith Watson. Members who were in the House when he was here have told me—and I do believe they would substantiate this—that he frequently took a line against the Government of the day, which was a Liberal-Country Party Government of which he was a member.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: How many Liberal Party members in the Assembly vote against the party?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I have read in *Hansard* that on a particular occasion he amended one of the Government's

money Bills and gained the support of the majority in the House, as a result of which there was a conference of managers. This was a precedent in relation to the respective rights of the two Houses.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: How many people in the Assembly vote against their party?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I am speaking about this House. I will not be diverted into talking about the Assembly. I am dealing with the Legislative Council. The amendment does not deal with the Assembly and I refuse to be diverted into a matter which I believe is not part of the amendment.

I feel it is proper that members in this House should be able to state their mind. I do not believe a member should remain silent if he has a particular view, and I am sorry for those members who feel they cannot express their views. I am sorry for them because I believe it belittles them in their own eyes. I do not say it belittles them in anyone else's eyes. If they uphold a pledge of loyalty which they have taken, they gain a certain amount of respect, but it muzzles them in this House because they cannot vote according to their consciences on many issues on which they may have consciences.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Are there not some people in the professions who can plead for or against?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: Yes, there are. Members of the Labor Party can say their piece in the party room but unfortunately they cannot say their piece when they come in here. I do not say that applies to Mr. Willesee, but it applies to many people in his party. I am sorry about it, but that is the situation. I believe it would do a great service to the bicameral system if we were able to hear the real views of some of the members of the Labor Party, who, if they were able to do so, I am sure would on some occasions have a great deal to contribute.

On the question of legislation, we have amended many Bills, in the time of both the previous Government and the present Government. During the time of the previous Government I moved many amendments, and Ministers of that Government are well aware of that fact. I did my best, at any rate. The draftsman does not know everything, any more than I or any other member of Parliament knows everything. We all make mistakes. Draftsmen make mistakes. They are only technicians, when all is said and done. This being a democracy, when we are representing the people we look at things rather differently from the way a draftsman, a planner, or a technical officer looks at things. That is the advantage we have and it is our duty in this Parliament.

I therefore believe that if we are able to do so we are entitled to overrule any Government on any point which we be-

lieve to be wrong. If we believe legislation is bad or stupid, as it sometimes is, I regret to say, we should be entitled to say so and do our best to have it amended. On many occasions I have endeavoured to persuade the Labor Party to support me but, alas, it would never do so except when it was in opposition.

No-one is happy about being criticised or overruled. I can understand the feelings of the Labor Government. It thinks it is being overruled by a gigantic conservative Council. Of course, that is not so. I believe in most cases when it has been overruled it has been because of the conscientious views of the members concerned. Admittedly, some of the members may be a little more conservative than some members of the Labor Party, even though they come from the same electorates, but that illustrates that they are voting conscientiously and in accordance with what they believe to be the proper attitude.

I therefore believe it is wrong to denigrate the Legislative Council and that many of the reasons given for opposition to the Legislative Council are quite fallacious. It is no good quoting Queensland and other parts of the world. We must look at the actual circumstances and we must look at the situation in depth before we can bring in a precedent from somewhere else. People mention precedents in argument but when they are looked at in depth it is often found there are significant differences. As a result, we cannot hang our hats on this or that precedent. We must look at the particular situation.

We have heard much about one-vote, one-value, and the fact that most of the people in this State live in the metropolitan area, therefore they should have most of the representation. I think that is the general theme of the argument. I believe that system would be absolutely wrong in a State such as this. The one essential point about a democracy is that it must be capable of looking after its minorities. It will become more and more important in the future for the minorities to be adequately represented. It is no good saying a labourer in Broome will receive the same degree of attention as a labourer in the metropolitan area if he is counted only as one against one in the metropolitan area. He will be swamped. We would have two members for the whole of the State outside the metropolitan area—from the north-west, the Kimberley, and the Murchison.

If we had that system, that would be the end, because when it comes to protecting those people they must have some compensatory arrangement. How would they get by if we did not give them some form of compensation for their isolation? There are many disadvantages in living in remote areas, and those people must have some form of protection. It is all very

well to say, "We will write something into the Constitution; we will give them an ombudsman or some special attention", but basically it comes back to this Parliament and a question whether they are able to be represented when the time comes to give them the protection they need.

Minorities everywhere will be swamped and forgotten if we do not provide them with special means of representation and special means of being looked after. There are many examples of this. When people are placed in such a position they become quite desperate. This does not apply so much if there is a homogeneous population in a small country where everyone is in much the same position. Perhaps that could even apply to some of our States. Tasmania is an obvious example.

However, I believe we have a special problem in the State of Western Australia and for that reason we are entitled to weighted representation. No doubt from time to time there may be changes made, but the principle is right and I subscribe to it. It is not possible or reasonable to go over all the points that have been made during the debate—and some very good points have been made. I believe the amendment should be supported.

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West) [9.16 p.m.]: I wish to support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. In doing so I think I should draw attention initially to the fact that very little argument on my part is necessary to substantiate and vindicate his action, which has been supported already by so many members during the debate. The reason for my saying it is unnecessary for me to embark on any wide and penetrating argument is simply that emphasis was placed by Government members on their own shortcomings; that is, the lack of attention by the Government to the administration of the State in preference to the alternative which, as is stated in the amendment, is the denigration of the Legislative Council.

Not one speaker on the Government side of the House made any real attempt to adopt the attitude, on a defensive basis or even on an adventurous basis, that the Government has no shortcomings; or, alternatively, that the Government is in fact giving its full attention to the administration of the affairs of State. Members of the Government party merely defended themselves against accusations that they have denigrated the Legislative Council. Surely that is a clear indication of insecurity and knowledge on their part that they are most vulnerable in this matter. Why else would all the Government speakers devote so much of their time—in fact, exclusively devote their time—to the defence of the charge of denigration, as against advancing their own cause

and illustrating the great virtues of their Government which, presumably, were professed in the terms of the Governor's Speech? In my opinion that is what they should have done. Therefore, I will certainly not launch into that area and speak on their behalf.

However, whilst avoiding needless repetition I would like to refer to some matters which have been raised during the debate. Firstly, I make a quick reference to the rather remarkable reply of the Leader of the House when he said, in effect—I cannot recall his exact words—that the denigration of the Council cannot be attributed to members of the Government.

I do not know whether members happened to see a television interview one night last week which followed a meeting of local authorities in the Perth Town Hall. It was an interview during which the Premier—in respect of a resolution passed at the meeting—was asked what he would do if the Legislative Council rejected his legislation once more as it did last year. The Premier's reply was given with that smile which, of course, is so well known throughout the country, and I am sure all those who watched that interview will recall that he said—"I am sure that sanity will prevail."

If that is not a reflection on this House and its members that at other times something less than sanity has been displayed—bearing in mind the reference made by Mr. Logan to a debate which took place in this House last year on a motion which resulted from certain statements made by the Premier—I do not know what is. This bears out the fact that denigration of this House is coming from the leader of the Government. Mr. Medcalf has already stated the reason for this—that it is to cover up the deficiencies of the Government and to divert attention away from the real issues.

It could well be claimed with great justification that during the course of the business of this House numerous amendments have been made to legislation. If Mr. Cloughton were in the Chamber—and it is notable that he is not, although he challenged members to produce instances—I would remind him of a couple of instances during the last session of Parliament when I was responsible for amending certain clauses in Bills. Those amendments were accepted by him and by the Leader of the House. Therefore, I disagree with the comment of Mr. Medcalf when he wondered whether the Government had ever accepted amendments made by this House. In all charitableness the Leader of the House, in his capacity as Minister in charge of a certain Bill last year, was good enough to acknowledge the fact that the amendments I moved actually improved the legislation. I do not want to enlarge upon that; I simply make the point.

So the purpose of this House—so often called a House of Review—is to look again at legislation and to tidy it up. I have been a member of this Chamber for only seven or eight years but during that time I have seen many instances of legislation which required tidying up—legislation which has deserved a second look and has been far better off for it.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You might ask Mr. Cloughton how the Bill he introduced got through this Chamber. It got through with a mixed vote from the non-Labor members.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: That is quite right. However, the honourable member is not in the House at the moment, so I cannot ask him. Let me now pass to the question of representation; a question which is absolutely vital to the issue. Again, members of the Government, in defence of their stand supported our contention firstly by quoting from the Labor Party platform the policy in regard to the bicameral system and, secondly, by proceeding to support it. Surely by their actions they have provided for those in the population who support their philosophies and ideologies encouragement to promote the campaign of denigration.

Probably I am the only member in this Chamber who has had the opportunity to represent a large country electorate in the House of Representatives—a country electorate which included a large part of the metropolitan area although, admittedly, the outer metropolitan area. I refer to this for the benefit of those who would argue, as Miss Elliott did, that trees and grass should not have votes. It is not a question of whether trees, grass, or cattle are entitled to votes; it is a question of the representation of the people in the areas in question. In my experience, short though it was—and I am sure members will recall the circumstances which resulted in my losing my seat in the Federal House—I found that without any fear of contradiction 75 to 80 per cent. of my work involved country areas and not the metropolitan area. Why? Because of the difficulties imposed by distance and space. Do not tell me those people are not entitled to that representation.

They are entitled to representation on the basis of the conditions under which they live. Nobody is arguing that a tree or a beast should have a vote. Perhaps one should look at the Federal Constitution and study the bicameral system. We have the House of Representatives and the Senate. We know there is proportional representation in the Senate. Before anyone argues the point whether we should have proportional representation in the Legislative Council—and I will not enter into that discussion—I would make the point that under the Constitution proportional representation enables an equal number of Senators to be elected from

each State, irrespective of the size of the State or its population. Does anyone challenge that?

We are well aware of all sorts of stories that the new Prime Minister might be contemplating a double dissolution. That is his prerogative as Prime Minister and leader of the Government. If he is able to create a situation under the existing procedures and franchise whereby he can gain a majority in the Senate, he is quite entitled to do so. I say the same thing could well apply so far as the Legislative Council is concerned. As Mr. Dans emphasised, there is nothing to stop any of the parties from obtaining a majority representation in this House.

However, to embark a little further upon the matter of representation and the question of whether areas should be represented by votes—something which is and has been constantly overlooked—in the electoral provinces of this House each elector has an equal choice. It is claimed, of course, that under the system of one-man-one-vote-one-value the electors do not have the same voting power once the members are elected; but they do in the province. In the province everybody has an equal vote; that is why, as has been pointed out, we have in this Chamber four instances of provinces being represented by members of two different parties elected in exactly the same circumstances.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: In fact, three different parties are involved.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: That is quite right. I stand corrected.

Let me return to the point of the real intention of the amendment. It seeks to highlight the feelings of the Opposition and to indicate to the Government that it should give a little more attention to its administration. Do not let members opposite claim that the Government is not falling down. We have had a very good illustration in the Parliament in the last couple of years of the incapacity and inability of the Government to handle some of the legislation it has produced.

We know that. One of the reasons, if not the major reason, is that it has been badly prepared. I make that statement here, because it has been referred to several times in regard to the apple and pear legislation. That legislation was badly prepared, because the public relations were not the best. The same applies to the Bill introduced for the establishment of a single authority to handle dairy products.

There were other matters which were also the subject of inefficient administration. The fact is that the administrative work that should have preceded the introduction of such legislation was at fault. Even on the subject of traffic control, I still believe the administration has been bad, because there should have been no occasion whatsoever for the feuding and

the fighting that took place in regard to this question. There is provision in the law as it stands at present for traffic within all local authorities in Western Australia to be under police control. However, people who have been elected democratically to these local authorities have decided that traffic control should not be in the hands of the police. As a result the Government has decided to get to grips with this question to establish the feeling in these decentralised and remote areas controlled by local authorities that police control is necessary. This boils down to the true question of representation, because if any party in power is not fully aware of the position existing at present, how on earth can it possibly legislate for such people?

If, as it is claimed, the representation of this House should be based simply either on the first-past-the-post system or on the one-vote-one-value system it will mean that the people in the remote areas will never be properly represented.

The Hon. R. Thompson: If we follow your argument to its logical conclusion, the Commonwealth Liberal Party Government should have divided the Kalgoorlie electorate into three seats.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: The honourable member is drawing that conclusion.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member will not take any notice of interjections.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Very well, Mr. President. I will not labour the point. The amendment has been well and truly argued and I think the case has been soundly proved, and I am, of course, pleased to give it my complete support.

THE HON. J. HEITMAN (Upper West) [9.33 p.m.]: Perhaps there is very little to say on the amendment to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply, but I rise to support the amendment without any apologies for the Legislative Council or any of its members. When one considers many of the arguments advanced tonight it would be interesting to hear if the same people would agree to those arguments being applied to the C.R.A. grants, to other grants from the Commonwealth, or to the moneys obtained from the Loan Council; especially if it is merely a question of considering the number of people in this State. If the C.R.A. grant was based on the number of people in Western Australia we would not be receiving anywhere near the amount of money we receive today, because the grants are based on not only population and the number of vehicles but also on area. As a result, we obtain a much larger grant than Victoria which has a smaller area.

Therefore, do not let us fool ourselves into thinking that when it comes to a question of voting for the Legislative Council

we should have the majority of votes in the metropolitan area and let the rest of the State look after itself in some other way. This is a poor argument. All Governments have propounded the policy of decentralisation and if we wish to put this policy into effect we must have something that will look after the people living in remote areas instead of looking after only the metropolitan area in this State.

I am not sorry for anything I have done whilst I have been a member of this House. I have certainly voted on occasions against some of the policies of my own party, and I am not sorry for doing that. I have acted in opposition to my own Government and the issue has been referred to a conference at which a compromise had to be made in order to get the legislation through. So for my part I am not the least sorry for anything I have done whilst I have been a member of the Legislative Council. I have not stood up in my place tonight to apologise for any of the things the Liberal Party has done or anything I have done since I have been a member of this House.

I feel sure that if the Government of the day or some of its supporters held the same views as we hold there would not be any need for this desire to do away with the Legislative Council, or doing away with any part of the present system of Government in Western Australia. I support the amendment and I can only hope that all members of this House will ensure that it is carried.

THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [9.36 p.m.]: It was not my intention to speak on the amendment because I feel that the ground has been fairly well covered, but there is one point which I think has not been mentioned. I refer to the role of the Legislative Council in perhaps dampening down some of the fluctuations that can occur in the elections for the Lower House. I think it is proper to point out that only half the members of the Legislative Council go to the polls at any one time. This gives the public a chance to ascertain what took place during the previous three years before they re-elect the remaining half of the members of the Legislative Council.

Therefore if the Labor Party finds that it has a hostile Upper House, I think it has a chance, after three years' time, of showing the people of Western Australia it has governed well, and if it is successful in doing this it would have a chance of gaining control of the Legislative Council.

We have only to look at some of the seats held in the north, and also at some of the metropolitan seats, one-half of which is held by members of the Opposition and the other half is held by members of the Government. The Labor Party has a great opening to show its worth in those provinces. The present position obtains not only in the State Parliament

but also in the Senate of the Commonwealth Parliament and we must recognise that both the Liberal Party and the Labor Party have found the Commonwealth Upper House to be hostile. This is real proof in reminding the Labor Party that it gained control of the Legislative Assembly in this State by only one seat and then only by a few votes.

The Hon. R. Thompson: What was the percentage of votes cast for the Liberal Party and the Labor Party in that election?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: In the Assembly the Government won by only one seat, and it only just won that. The counting of votes overall is of little consequence.

In his Speech the Governor referred to the number of Bills that had been dealt with by the Parliament, which shows that we are not actually a very hostile Upper House. If we examine the figures, even the Governor's Speech hardly paints a true picture. He mentioned that Parliament passed 180 of the 228 Bills presented during the Labor Party Administration which represented a heavy legislative programme. When we look closely at the number of Bills that were rejected it is even smaller than the number mentioned. Of all the Bills that were introduced in this House in 1972 only three were defeated, and of all the Bills received from the Assembly only five were defeated. It is interesting to note how many Bills lapsed, and it is interesting to note that one Bill was defeated in the Legislative Assembly.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: There is a brutal majority down there; that is what it is.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Yes, that is so. As has been pointed out by various speakers, the object behind the amendment to the Address-in-Reply is that instead of endeavouring to denigrate the Legislative Council the Government should concentrate on the affairs of administration, and members of the Government have pointed out that we in Opposition have not provided very much proof that the Government has endeavoured to denigrate this House.

I rose to my feet at this late hour only to refer to one particular case in my own electorate. The particulars have appeared in the local Press for everyone to read. I have in front of me a copy of *The Albany Advertiser* dated Monday, the 27th November, 1972. The headline is—

Legislative council rejects apple bill

The article then goes on to report—

The State Government's Bill to establish an Export Apple Marketing Board, which passed through the Legislative Assembly on November 21, has not been passed by the Legislative Council.

Agriculture Minister H. D. Evans expressed his disappointment at the rejection on Friday night.

If that is not proof of the Government denigrating the Legislative Council I do not know what is.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: We are not denigrating the Upper House in saying that.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Do I have to quote from *Hansard* to show that the third reading was passed? Of course the Bill was not rejected.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: That was a statement made by the Press; not by the Minister.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: This is a very interesting point. I will ask a question tomorrow as to whether the Minister made a Press release on this question. It is very strange that this article appeared in *The Albany Advertiser* and other country newspapers; perhaps they are in error in quoting word for word what Mr. H. D. Evans, the Minister for Agriculture, had to say on this matter. Is it only by chance that this article appeared in all the country newspapers?

The Hon. R. Thompson: Do you think the apple and pear Bill was worth putting on the Statute book?

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan—Minister for Community Welfare) [9.43 p.m.]: Over a number of years I have had the opportunity to get up and speak on amendments to various Bills and to motions for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply. I am a member of the Labor Party and I have signed the pledge that I will abide by the platform of that party, but the pledge only directs that I shall vote for the constitution and platform of the party and nothing else. I have had the pleasure of attacking the previous Government for its shortcomings, but I have always had something on which to base my attack. It has been based on unemployment, housing, and other matters that seriously affect the people.

I listened very intently to the Leader of the Opposition when he spoke last night and I thought he was giving us some sort of indication—

THE PRESIDENT: Order! I would ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the amendment and not to the general speech made by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Most certainly, Mr. President. I was merely outlining the preamble of what I am going to say. I was rather disappointed when, in that speech, the Leader of the Opposition moved the amendment because he did not give any indication that he had prepared a case in any shape or form to substantiate the amendment he moved. What

has been the result of that amendment? During the course of the debate on it this evening I read only three points outlined in the amendment. The first was that people would be better served if the Government were to concentrate on improving its administration of the affairs of the State.

No member has told us where we have fallen down on administration. Members have all had their say. This debate has reminded me of a little kiddies' concert. Most of the speakers have risen, said their piece, and then run away to play. I have never witnessed such a thin House in my existence in this Chamber. When an Opposition member has made a speech he has not remained to hear what others have said. The Opposition members have been prepared to make their speeches, but they have then run off. No valid contribution has been made.

The Hon. J. Heitman: That is only your opinion.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Could I ask you one question?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Certainly.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Have you been in your seat all night?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I have not left the Chamber.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Not all night?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I have left the Chamber for only a few minutes—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Then why say that Opposition members have run away after they have made their speeches?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: We have not seen some members since they made their speeches, and the Leader of the Opposition knows it. That is factual. Probably we will get them back in the Chamber pretty quickly now.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I suggest you start being fair now you are a Minister.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am fair.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You are not fair and you know it.

The Hon. J. Dolan: You talk about being fair!

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I have not left the Chamber. If someone suffers my speech, I will suffer his.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: When I spoke last night the mover of the motion was not in his seat for one minute of the time. I could not address one remark to him, and yet you say a thing like that!

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That might be true, but when listening to the debate on a substantive motion—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Listening to a lot of rot from you!

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: —which is supposed to reflect on the Government, members of the Opposition should at least be in their positions.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Another fact is that the Minister for Local Government was not in his place last night when I spoke. I could not address a remark to him. Don't talk about people running away!

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: He was not out of the Chamber for very long.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: He was out of the Chamber for half an hour or more.

The Hon. J. Dolan: He had a special group he was looking after.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I do not care what he was doing; he was not here! I am getting annoyed only because of the stupid accusation about members running away!

The Hon. J. Dolan: You get annoyed easily.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: Have a go at me now.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The truth might hurt.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The truth does not hurt.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If I have hurt the Leader of the Opposition, I apologise.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You are back to your old form.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The first point in the amendment concerns the administration of the State and that has never been better. Members know this or they would have raised a legitimate argument and torn the administration to pieces as we did on many occasions when the Opposition was in office. We lost the votes, of course, because we did not have the numbers.

Mr. Ferry referred to land which is to be frozen under a project plan. The same situation occurred in Kwinana in 1952. Did anyone from the Labor Party at that time accuse the McLarty-Watts Government of maladministration? Of course not. The explanation was accepted, with much debate, admittedly; but the proposal was accepted as a project plan, the same as this one should be accepted as a project plan.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Can you find the words "maladministration" in my amendment anywhere?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If the amendment does not imply that the Government is guilty of maladministration, what does it imply? It says that the Government should get on with improved administration and therefore the inference is that the present administration is not correct.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Can you find anything about maladministration in my amendment?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: As members would know, this debate would have been better served if the amendment had been moved in such a fashion that it stated that we deplore the attacks on the Legislative Council—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: We do.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: —because this is what the debate has centred around; this and nothing else. The Government has not attacked the Legislative Council.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: What about the Minister for Agriculture?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I was just coming to that matter. If the Minister for Agriculture had not made the statement to which reference has been made—and I can only go on reports—the Opposition would have had nothing about which to talk because that is the only point referred to except for something Mr. J. T. Tonkin said.

The Hon. F. R. White: You used the word “deplore”. That does not appear in the amendment.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: You did not listen properly.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: He said the Government's administration ought to be deplored.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If the mover of the amendment had the interests of the State at heart he would not have moved it. We have a large legislative programme in front of us—and it really is a large one—and members will be sorry that so much time has been spent on this amendment.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: When you were in Opposition and amendments were moved to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply did you say that then?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: No, because—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: As a Minister you are a comic strip.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: —on those occasions we had an argument and we presented it.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: And you moved amendments to the Address-in-Reply.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That is right, but we had something legitimate about which to argue. On this occasion the Leader of the Opposition raised no argument to substantiate his amendment and we have found Opposition members struggling to make some contribution. If the administration is so wrong, then those members who have not already spoken could now do so and tell me where it is wrong and how it could be improved. They could tell us what is wrong with it.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: The electors—

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Of course Mr. Ferry talked about boomerangs, although probably he would not know how to throw one. If he did hurl one it would probably come back and hit him on the head.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: They should go—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Labor Party was elected to carry out a programme, and it was elected by a large majority of voters in Western Australia. Mr. Wordsworth is laughing. I am pleased he has a sense of humour and can laugh because I will take the opportunity to wipe the laugh from his face by telling him that of the total votes cast for the Legislative Assembly in this State the A.L.P. polled 48.91 per cent., The Liberal Party polled 29.08 per cent., the Country Party polled 5.64 per cent., while the D.L.P. polled 10.71 per cent.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: By golly, with the first-past-the-post system not one of us would be here.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It is surprising that when the combined parties can poll less than 35 per cent., the Labor Party can win the Government by only one seat.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is right.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: This gives a good indication that trees-and-sheep voting definitely has a value.

In the Legislative Council for the same year the overall vote for the A.L.P. was 48.78 per cent. The Liberals even dropped down there with 27.36 per cent. The Country Party polled 5.39 per cent., while the D.L.P. polled 14.61 per cent. In all honesty, of course, we must appreciate that the D.L.P. contested every seat and as a consequence there was in the true sense of the word a false vote given to the D.L.P. on that occasion. In a general election against all candidates the D.L.P. would not poll more than 4 per cent. I am being honest because I am not trying to defeat my own argument. A possible increase would have occurred in the other seats because of those not contested by the Liberal Party, the Labor Party, or the Country Party.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Does that last explanation not indicate that percentages can be very misleading?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Of course this is true when it is possible for a party to win by only one seat despite the fact that it has won by 14 per cent. It all comes back to the fact that the sheep-and-trees voting does have an effect. I do not think that even Mr. Withers would agree that the people in his electorate should have nine times the voting power of those in my electorate. I do not think he would agree that that is democracy.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I disagree with you.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Mr. Withers believes that is democracy?

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Yes.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: He believes it is democracy when his voters have nine times the voting power of my voters?

The Hon. W. R. Withers: It depends on how big your province is.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will members please stop interjecting and allow the Minister to conclude his speech so that the House can deal with its business?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I was about to close and in so doing I would like, in lighter vein, to advise Mr. MacKinnon, who indicated that I was getting tired and old in my new job, that I will still challenge him to a 100-yard race, accompany him to the gym, or put some gloves on and tackle half a dozen rounds with him if he so desires.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That might be risky!

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—17

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. I. G. Medcalf
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. T. O. Perry
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. F. R. White
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. Clive Griffiths	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. J. Heitman
Hon. N. McNell	(Teller)

Noes—9

Hon. R. F. Claughton	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. S. J. Dellar	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. J. Dolan	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. J. L. Hunt	Hon. Lyla Elliott
Hon. R. T. Leeson	(Teller)

Amendment thus passed.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan.

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 10.02 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 21st March, 1973

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

QUESTIONS (57): ON NOTICE

1. HOUSING

Wundowie

Mr. MOILER, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How many vacant residential lots does the State Housing Commission hold at Wundowie?

- (2) Does the Commission propose to build further houses at Wundowie?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), when does it propose to commence the next group and how many houses will be constructed?
- (4) How many applicants on the waiting list for—
 - (a) rental homes;
 - (b) purchase homes,
 have indicated their preference for Wundowie?

Mr. Davies (for Mr. BICKERTON) replied:

- (1) Three lots, two of which are unsuitable for immediate use.
- (2) and (3) The commission will construct a further five houses in Wundowie on lots yet to be obtained from Lands Department. Tenders will be invited as soon as arrangements are finalised for the provision of the necessary services and land allocation is confirmed with the Lands Department. It is anticipated construction will commence early in June, next.
- (4) (a) and (b) Six applicants are listed for rental accommodation in Wundowie. One of these is also listed for purchase assistance, and another is seeking single unit pensioner accommodation.

2.

EDUCATION

Television Aids: Country Areas

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Minister for Education:

As many country school children are deprived of the benefits of participating in the very well presented A.B.C. T.V. programmes, particularly in the primary schools—

- (a) will he make representations to the Commonwealth Minister for Education requesting that facilities be provided by the Commonwealth Government for the location of T.V. repeater stations in areas which will cover the eastern and north-eastern wheatbelt of Western Australia;
- (b) will he give consideration to the provision of higher T.V. aerials for schools and teachers' houses in the more remote areas where reception is variable?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (a) The need to extend the transmission range of educational television broadcasting in each Australian State is to be included in the agenda of