

Their use in Australia is not widespread, though with a few operating in the various States it can be expected that, as our population increases and new models are produced, their numbers will increase.

Consequently the Australian Transport Advisory Committee, a joint Commonwealth-State organisation, has seen fit to examine the prospective impact which air cushion vehicles will have in Australia and what measures become desirable and necessary for their control.

Resulting from these studies the committee has drawn up and adopted a standard code of regulations. This code deals with the structural and technical specifications of air cushion vehicles and the qualifications of drivers.

Legislative authority is required in all States if this code is to be applied on an Australia-wide basis and this initial legislation will doubtless bring about consequential amendments in good time to several Acts—such as the Local Government Act and the Traffic Act, to mention but two.

The Government has also accepted a recommendation from the State officers committee which examined the question of application of the regulations in Western Australia that the third party insurance requirement should be extended to include any vessel carrying fare-paying passengers on inland waters or within any harbour, and I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. Clive Griffiths.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [5.44 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

I want to draw the attention of members to one matter. A big legislative programme will be placed before the House and I feel that members should get down to the business of making their contributions to the Address-in-Reply as soon as possible. They have had a long while to prepare their material, and if they have not had the opportunity to do so previously, they now have one to bring their contributions up to date by including matters which have occurred in recent weeks.

I see the possibility that if there is a delay in legislation which will be coming before this House we may have to sit late at night. Also, we may have to sit after tea on Thursdays and that is something which we devoutly do not want to happen. I would prefer that we finish at a reasonable time on Tuesday and Wednesday evenings and, if possible, at tea time on Thursday nights.

I want to be extremely reasonable in the matter and I ask for the co-operation of all members. If members respond we will

all be much happier. None of us wants an undesirable situation to develop. I ask for the overall co-operation of members in this House, and ask them to get down to the task and not to put their speeches off so that the debate has to be adjourned night after night.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [5.46 p.m.]: I sympathise with the Minister in his desire to complete the Address-in-Reply debate as soon as possible. However, I feel that he should repeat his message next Tuesday afternoon for reasons which are fairly obvious at the moment.

I proffer the suggestion that if the Address-in-Reply debate were to collapse at this moment, the Government would be out of business. Whilst I do not want to commit myself to openly supporting the two Bills which are on the notice paper, on brief examination they do not seem to be very contentious.

I will speak to my colleagues in this House with a view to dispensing with the Address-in-Reply in an appropriate time, bearing in mind that members are entitled to take up some time to address the House on matters of importance to themselves and their electorates.

The conduct of the session will depend very largely on the management of the legislative programme by the Government. Without being overcritical I would say that unless the situation improves on what it was last year then the difficulty which the Leader of the House has foreshadowed may arise.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.48 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 22nd March, 1973

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

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: FOURTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 21st March, on the following motion by Mr. Bateman—

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

May it please Your Excellency:
We the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of the State of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign,

and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to address to Parliament.

MR. MAY (Clontarf—Minister for Mines) (11.02 a.m.): I think this is an opportune time for me to make some comments regarding the recently established Fuel and Power Commission. Lately we have seen a great deal of publicity regarding the proposed national grid system for natural gas, and also some publicity in other areas of energy in Western Australia. In view of the fact that the commission has now been established I feel I should make a report to Parliament.

Firstly, I would like to commend the private sector. I refer to the Chamber of Mines, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Chamber of Manufactures; and I commend them for the co-operation they extended to me, the department, and the Government when we were formulating the legislation which was presented to Parliament last year. I think that was a very good exercise in liaison between Government and private industry because we got together to endeavour to compile legislation which would be acceptable to Parliament. I think members will recall that the legislation proceeded through both Houses in a most expeditious manner and with very few amendments. This is an indication that it pays dividends to get people together to discuss matters in the way we did.

I think the subject is so important that it is necessary for me to detail what has transpired since the establishment of the Fuel and Power Commission, the appointment of the new commissioner, and what we envisage will take place in the future. I would like briefly to outline some of the principal things which the Government has undertaken in the general area of fuel and energy. Members will recall that the Fuel, Energy and Power Resources Act was considered by this Chamber in August of last year and, following its passage in another place, was assented to on the 13th October, 1972. The Act was proclaimed in the *Government Gazette* on the 3rd November, 1972, and came into operation on that date.

Members will recall that the Act calls for the creation of the Fuel and Power Commission of Western Australia and the Fuel and Power Advisory Council. Applications for the position of commissioner were sought throughout Australia and the world. More than 80 applications were received from overseas and within Australia; and Mr. J. B. Kirkwood, formerly a senior officer in the Electricity Commission of New South Wales, was selected. Mr. Kirkwood has now taken up his duties and the three members of the commission have been appointed in accordance with the provisions of the Act. The officers are

the permanent heads of the Department of Development and Decentralisation and the Mines Department, and the General Manager of the State Electricity Commission.

The Leader of the Opposition has made reference to the fact that Mr. Kirkwood's experience has been in the electrical power industry. This is true, but it is not possible to appoint someone with experience in all aspects of the energy industry. Mr. Kirkwood is a man with extensive experience in the evaluation of alternative fuels and sources of energy for power generation—nuclear, hydro, and the various forms of fossil fuel. Further, he is a man who comes to us with a real awareness of the importance to the people of Western Australia of optimum development of our fuel and energy resources.

It is my view that, as a newcomer, our Commissioner for Fuel and Power might reasonably be given an opportunity to settle into his position without unwarranted harassment by the Leader of the Opposition.

Sir Charles Court: He has received no harassment at all from us.

Mr. MAY: Last evening the Leader of the Opposition commented that he was concerned about our appointing somebody with experience only in power generation. I think it is a most unsatisfactory state of affairs that when we appoint somebody whom we think has suitable qualifications, the Leader of the Opposition quickly opposes him.

Sir Charles Court: We did not oppose him at all. We were asking for information. Don't be so mean and small minded.

Mr. MAY: The Leader of the Opposition is always ready to criticise, but it is interesting to note that during the 12 years his Government was in office no effort was made to form a fuel and power commission.

Sir Charles Court: That is not true.

Mr. MAY: However, once this Government commences to do so it is criticised.

Sir Charles Court: You based your Bill on the research we did.

Mr. MAY: The records will show that the present Government was responsible for the establishment of the Fuel and Power Commission.

Sir Charles Court: Nothing of the sort. The technical work was done by the previous Government.

Mr. MAY: Mr. C. T. Pullan, representing the interests of the West Australian Chamber of Manufactures (Inc.) and Mr. I. H. Carne, representing the interests of the Chamber of Mines of Western Australia, have been appointed as permanent members of the advisory council, with

other members to be appointed when appropriate. I think that is a good idea because it gives us flexibility. We will be able to call on people in the business world with specialised knowledge as and when required. I think the flexibility of the council will be an important factor in the operations of the commission.

The nucleus of a staff has been appointed, and the Fuel and Power Commission has now established its offices at St. George's Court, 16 St. George's Terrace. The commission is already well advanced with several important and potentially far-reaching investigations and will, of course, keep me informed on a continuing basis regarding the demand for all forms of fuel and energy in Western Australia. This work has already commenced.

Early in 1971 the Government announced that a feasibility study would be undertaken of a project to pipe natural gas from Palm Valley in the Northern Territory to the eastern goldfields, and then on to Perth. However, shortly after that announcement was made, the first major north-west shelf gas strike—namely, North Rankin—was announced. In view of the evident promise of North Rankin, the Government decided temporarily to suspend further work on the Palm Valley proposal until more was known about the north-west shelf potential. The operating company, Woodside-Burmah, has announced its estimate of north-west shelf reserves and the Geological Survey of Western Australia has completed its own assessment.

Despite the extremely large gas reserves in the north, it has been decided to resume the Palm Valley studies because there are reasons for obtaining the gas from this source. It could be delivered to Perth and the eastern goldfields at a cheaper rate and possibly earlier than natural gas from the north-west shelf. This is a matter which will be examined more closely during the feasibility study, because alternative plans have been made in regard to the Commonwealth announced national grid. It was the information compiled by our Western Australian Fuel and Power Commission which was then submitted to the Commonwealth that enabled the Commonwealth Government to appreciate fully the need to establish the Palm Valley-Perth section of the national gas grid.

It is our firm contention that rather than have a pipeline from Dampier to the Palm Valley deposits, which invariably would pass through an area where the gas could not be used, we felt it would be more sensible for the pipeline to be laid from Palm Valley through the eastern goldfields and the Wingellina nickel areas and on to Perth and so make the gas available much sooner than would be possible if it were being brought from the north-west shelf. Ultimately, the pipeline which would then be between Palm Valley and Perth would

be extended northwards and when the gas is made available from the north-west shelf to Dampier the pipeline could then be extended southwards. The two pipelines would thus meet up with natural gas already in the pipeline as it is being established. This will enable a supply of gas to be provided to not only the Pilbara area but to the proposed Pilbara concept and also to the Murchison nickel areas and the eastern goldfields. It will also serve the area where Western Mining Corporation has made its uranium discoveries.

The Murchison area, which is active in terms of mining exploration, will be able to use this natural gas sooner than was originally expected and, quite obviously, this will bring those deposits into operation more quickly than was first anticipated.

In the long run it would appear that the reserves at Palm Valley would be insufficient for our needs, and in the longer term there is no doubt that we will then have to rely on the north-west shelf. By then, however, a much better resource picture of that area will be available and more will be known of the technical and cost factors involved.

We have had a good look at the situation in view of the fact that the Palm Valley deposits have not been sufficiently proven as only four or five holes have been put down in the area. The Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy has requested the companies to expedite their exploration in this area. We will thus be able to evaluate and quantify the deposits at Palm Valley as soon as possible, but in the meantime if we can get this gas to Western Australia by 1976 or 1977 it will give us an opportunity to attract industries to the State and also meet our fuel needs in this State.

Mr. Coyne: Are you going to continue the pipeline from Palm Valley to the Eastern States?

Mr. MAY: The proposal is to extend the pipeline from Palm Valley to the Eastern States in the long term. Ultimately this pipeline will meet up with the one that will come through from Palm Valley to Perth. The north-west pipeline will be connected up with the national grid system and so a supply of natural gas will be taken to the Eastern States. What is envisaged is that we will be using Eastern States and Palm Valley gas initially, and then we will be paying back this gas with that which will become available from the north-west shelf. By doing this we can get the benefit of the gas much sooner than we first anticipated.

Some of the companies have indicated that the natural gas from the Angel deposit on the north-west shelf could be available in Western Australia much sooner than was first predicted. However, we are not quite sure about this, so in view of the fact that we postponed the

feasibility examination of the Palm Valley deposits in 1971, we now feel we should wait to obtain further information from Woodside-Burmah which is a most co-operative company and which has already supplied us with details of its known reserves. These reserves were checked by the Mines Department and it was found that its figures were similar to those announced by Woodside-Burmah.

So here and now I commend Woodside-Burmah for the work it is doing. A terrific amount of risk capital is involved in exploration on the north-west shelf. The depth of water is 300 and 400 feet, and this presents many difficulties. It will involve a considerable amount of capital expenditure, and it is the intention of Woodside-Burmah to advise the public as soon as possible, in terms of capital expenditure, what the anticipated deposits will produce, and also what the cost of the natural gas will be when it is provided on-shore.

All these factors are still being discussed. We have made numerous visits to Canberra to talk with the Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy, and the representatives of Woodside-Burmah and other companies have also had talks with Mr. Connor. So at the moment we are examining the situation. The feasibility examination could commence quickly and it is interesting to note that the Commonwealth Government has agreed that our own Commissioner for Fuel and Power in Western Australia should be in charge of the joint Commonwealth and State feasibility examination.

We feel it is a step in the right direction for this State to provide the man who will be in charge of the feasibility study. Because of the information we supplied to it, the Commonwealth Government agreed there was a definite need for the pipeline between Palm Valley and Perth to pass through the eastern goldfields before reaching its destination in the metropolitan area.

In the short time the Fuel and Power Commission has been established, it is commendable that it was able to submit information to the Commonwealth Government; information which would justify that Government agreeing that it is of the utmost importance that the Palm Valley pipeline be connected to the national grid.

Members may know that every mainland State Government and elected representatives of the Northern Territory have formally laid claim to the Palm Valley reserve. In addition, overseas companies are strongly urging the Federal Government to permit exports. The situation will obviously pose a difficult resource allocation problem for the Commonwealth Government, but I believe that Western Australia

has a sound and well-documented case for an equitable share of the gas from the Palm Valley deposits.

On the 18th January I met the new Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr. Connor) in Canberra and left with him documents prepared by the Fuel and Power Commission which outlined the unsatisfactory fuel supply situation existing in Western Australia. Papers supporting this State's interest in, and the need for, Palm Valley gas were also presented. It was decided at that meeting that a joint feasibility study was needed and, since then, terms of reference have been agreed upon.

One important customer for natural gas would be the State Electricity Commission. The Leader of the Opposition has cast doubt on the wisdom of using natural gas for so-called "low quality" applications as power generation. His argument is that it is a premium fuel and it should be reserved for only the more high-grade applications. The Leader of the Opposition insists that we must keep our eyes on the world fuel scene, and indeed we must. However, we must also have regard for our urgent and pressing fuel needs here at home. His assertions concerning natural gas as a premium fuel may be relevant for the U.S.A. and the Eastern States of Australia where vast coal deposits are available.

However, in Western Australia our sole commercial source of coal is the Collie field, and the Government will ensure that full use is made of it. But in the long term it appears that the Collie reserves may not be sufficient to sustain our rapidly growing needs. In such circumstances, with no other indigenous source available, I feel we are fully justified in considering natural gas for power generation and mineral processing.

Sir Charles Court: That is a sound basis on which you have to proceed. The coal deposits will be useful in the south-west but not beyond.

Mr. MAY: We cannot delay, with the world position being as it is at present. No useful purpose would be served in leaving the large coal deposits at Collie. We have to utilise these; and I shall explain this further shortly in view of the recent drilling programme that was undertaken at Collie. Actually these coal deposits are far in excess of the quantity thought to be available, and the drilling programme undertaken by Western Collieries substantiated this fact. I agree we cannot leave the coal in the ground. The world oil scene, especially oil from the Middle East, is most unstable. We do not want to experience a power shortage in Western Australia at the present time when we are endeavouring to attract overseas and Australian industries to this State.

Even in countries where oil is readily available, it is frequently argued that natural gas should be used for power generation in preference to oil which it is felt should be reserved for use as chemical feedstock. I am told that natural gas does not make a particularly good feedstock, compared with such materials as naphtha, liquified petroleum gas, and other liquid petroleum products. Both the north-west shelf and the Palm Valley gas contains LPG and ethane which could be used as feedstock, leaving the methane for use as an iron ore reducing agent or straight fuel. Indeed, the Government's Pilbara concept proposes just such an approach to ensure that optimum use is made of the petroleum fractions which are available.

Clearly, the arguments for and against using natural gas for power generation are by no means cut and dried.

The Leader of the Opposition has said that we should backload Eastern States coal for power generation instead of using natural gas. This idea has been investigated at some depth by officers of the Fuel and Power Commission. Despite the assumption that foreign flag bulk carriers could be used, results of the study indicate that the scheme would not be competitive with alternative fuels; namely, Collie coal, imported fuel oil, and natural gas. In fact it would be essential to use Australian ships for this purpose, and this would further increase costs regardless of backloading efficiency.

However, I would like to assure members that full consideration will be given to all possible alternatives so that reliable and economical fuels are available for industry and for electricity production.

Recently discussions were held with overseas companies in regard to the export of iron ore to the Eastern States. This is one matter we are looking into very closely. My own personal view is that if we can use our own fuel and our own iron ore in the Pilbara area then all the processing should be done in that area.

A few reports have appeared in the newspapers advocating the establishment of a direct reduction plant, with an electric furnace and a small mill, in the Pilbara. I think these three projects should be located in the Pilbara area.

When I was overseas recently quite a number of companies indicated that they were prepared—either by themselves, or together with other companies operating in Western Australia—to look at the possibility of establishing the full process which involves a direct reduction plant, an electric furnace, and a small mill. This would produce semi-finished steel. Such steel can be used not only for the Pilbara concept, but also in the Near East. It would also make the economics of the proposition more viable in terms of the European and American markets in respect of sponge iron, which is iron upgraded from approx-

imately 62 per cent. plus to 95 per cent. Through a direct production process the iron ore could be upgraded.

The finished product from the direct reduction process would bring about major savings in transport costs, because only the top grade or practically pure iron would be transported away. By this method it would be possible for these companies to compete with overseas suppliers.

This is my own personal opinion. We are looking into this matter, and we are having some discussions with an overseas company next week. When discussions with all the companies have been completed we will be in a position to determine which is the most suitable company to establish the project in the Pilbara or any other area of Western Australia.

I come back to the point I made earlier; I feel the full processing of the iron ore should be undertaken in this State. Already there has been too much exporting of our natural resources. Originally this was a good method to become established. That was done to obtain iron ore markets, and we were successful. Some people have suggested the State did not get the amount of return that it should have done, but once again I go along with the theory that development had to be established first, and from that basis the State could proceed further.

Against world competition this State was able to establish markets, but not as soon as we could have done. In saying this I am not reflecting on the previous State Government. When I was overseas many companies volunteered the information that had the Commonwealth Government's embargo on the export of iron ore from Western Australia been lifted some years earlier, Western Australia would have been in world class as a producer of iron ore much sooner and we would have more of the markets than we have at present.

Different views are held in terms of markets. However, that was the information and the view volunteered to me by overseas companies. If the embargo on the export of iron ore had been lifted before 1959, Western Australia today would be in a much stronger position than it is.

Sir Charles Court: Getting back to your point about direct reduction, this is not in conflict with what I was trying to say the other night. This is only one part of a bigger dimension. Ultimately you will have to be involved with coal from the Eastern States.

Mr. MAY: In his speech the Leader of the Opposition made no mention of that. He only said there would be the export of iron ore to the Eastern States.

Sir Charles Court: And coal backloaded for use in processing here.

Mr. MAY: I realise that, but if we can use our own fuel and natural resources then obviously we should undertake processing of the iron ore in Western Australia.

Mr. O'Connor: There might be difficulties on the question of coal.

Mr. MAY: Yes, but not in terms of natural gas. That is the main factor which will get the Pilbara concept off the ground. If we are able to provide natural gas in the Pilbara region at the right price we will be able to attract industry, because every company with which we had discussions asked what it would cost in terms of fuel. If we have sufficient quantities of natural gas obviously there will be no problem.

This was one of the matters referred to the other evening by the Leader of the Opposition. I was surprised when he advocated the export of natural gas, because he did not give any qualification. I have been advocating the export of natural gas for a particular reason. In my view natural gas can be exported only after we have had the quantities evaluated. We should set aside reserves of natural gas to cover Australia's needs for a long period ahead, so that this country is not short of this commodity as the U.S.A. is. After that has been done we could look into the question of export.

I have asked the Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy what Western Australia should do. Should the State wait until the whole of the north-west shelf has been explored before it decides to export the product? His reply was "No." The north-west shelf is not like Bass Strait; it is a vast area. Ultimately I am sure there will be a sufficient quantity of natural gas available to enable the product to be exported.

I alluded to the reason for allowing the export of natural gas. The companies involved have invested a great amount of capital in getting the gas out of the north-west shelf, onto the shore at Dampier or the Port Hedland area. That is the main reason I have advocated the Commonwealth Government's approval of the export of LNG so that these companies which are engaged in exploration on the north-west shelf at present will be able to obtain a return for the large amount of capital they have invested.

That is the one reason I referred to the Leader of the Opposition. In his speech he just mentioned the fact that he considered natural gas could be exported. I agree, but there should be a qualification that Australian needs should be catered for in the long term before any natural gas is exported.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: Would the previous embargo on iron ore have been for the same reason or on the price level?

Mr. MAY: There was no doubt about the reserves of the Pilbara area, long before 1959.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: Then it must have been on price level.

Mr. MAY: I do not know why the previous Federal Government did not allow the export of iron ore.

Mr. Jamieson: Officially it was maintaining that we did not have enough for Australian needs. That is on the departmental records.

Mr. MAY: Yes, and yet we can prove from our records that there was sufficient to allow its export.

Mr. E. H. M. Lewis: Then it was the supply not the price.

Mr. MAY: The price did not come into it in those days. The concern was about the availability. A demand existed for iron ore.

Mr. Bertram: Why was the ban lifted in 1959?

Mr. MAY: I do not know, but a change of Government occurred about that time.

While on the subject of Eastern States coal, the Leader of the Opposition has also advocated on several occasions the interstate swapping of coking coal and iron ore. However, I fail to see why we should ship iron ore to the east when we appear to have a perfectly good reducing agent right here in Western Australia; namely, natural gas.

Sir Charles Court: Surely you will have some coking coal as well?

Mr. MAY: We hope so.

Sir Charles Court: That means it will have to come back here.

Mr. MAY: We feel the processing should be done in Western Australia.

Sir Charles Court: But the point I tried to make and which you are not accepting is that when you measure the B.T.U. cost of coal you must measure it against the optimum price of gas and not the giveaway price.

Mr. MAY: We have taken all that into consideration.

Projects to produce metallic iron by direct reduction are under active study right now, and I am confident of a successful outcome. With natural gas and iron ore in plentiful quantities, we have all the ingredients we need for a successful iron and steel industry.

Returning to the subject of natural gas, I would emphasise to members that Western Australia would gain one immediate benefit from the large-scale use of natural gas; namely, reduced air pollution. We must always consider the environmental consequences of our fuel choices and natural gas appears to pose a minimum of problems in this direction.

The recent visit to Canberra of Mr. Joseph Rensch, President of Pacific Lighting Corporation in California, highlights the inescapable fact that Australia is merely one factor in a global fuel supply and demand pattern. The Commonwealth will have the final say on Australia's relations with other countries, but will look to Western Australia for our opinion and advice concerning the proper allocation and use of our emerging energy resources. For this and other reasons, it is essential that we, too, remain completely up to date with the world energy scene. This is a continuing process and the Fuel and Power Commission has already established a number of important contacts throughout the world.

I would like to add that I visited quite a number of countries to arrange for them to contact the new Fuel and Power Commissioner. It is realistic to assume that eventually the commissioner will be going overseas when he is conversant with the scene in Western Australia. He will then have these contacts with whom to discuss problems.

We have all heard of the United States energy crisis which will require that country to import 50 per cent. of its oil requirements by 1980. I have no need to tell members of the enormous trade, foreign relations, and financial implications of this fact. In practice, most U.S. fuel imports will have to come from the Middle East, where much of the fuel for Europe, Japan, and Western Australia originates. I have been told that there are serious doubts that east coast United States ports have the capacity to accommodate the number of tanker ships that will be needed.

I might add that due to the rising prices of Middle East crude, and political insecurities clouding several traditional oil and natural gas supply areas, the demand for natural gas from a politically stable and reliable supplier, such as Australia, is still rising. Then, too, an acute world shortage of natural gas is developing. For instance, the Chase Manhattan Bank has estimated that in the United States alone a deficit of up to 25 per cent. of demand requirements could develop by 1985, unless the rate of discoveries leaps forward.

Very likely there will be competition—possibly intense competition—for Middle East oil. Prices will be forced upward and I am afraid that Western Australia will have little weight in this world-wide economic tug-of-war. We must keep our eyes open to these events and take steps to develop our indigenous sources here at home.

On the other side of the coin, the world's fuel-hungry nations are looking to Australia, and this State in particular, to supply them with much needed energy. While we must live in harmony with our global neighbours, we must also ensure that Western Australia's best interests are protected over the long term. The Gov-

ernment is taking action to determine our needs, measure our resources, and come up with firm policy guidelines to put to the Commonwealth Government, the petroleum industry, and the people of Western Australia.

The Leader of the Opposition has asked why the Commonwealth does not leave petroleum exploration and development in the hands of private enterprise. Members will know that in practice this means the hands of multinational companies with multinational shareholders. The Deputy Premier quite rightly picked up this point the other evening; namely, how do the interests of such overseas shareholders necessarily coincide with our Australian national interests? Who are the shareholders of the large oil companies? They are insurance houses, trust funds, other companies, other Governments, and a relatively few individual investors.

Private enterprise has served the oil industry well since its beginnings in the late 1800s, but people all over the world are now questioning the present and future role of companies in the vital matter of fuel supplies. Very likely we will find that an appropriate mixture of public and private enterprise is the best course.

I have mentioned the United States energy crisis and how it has focused attention on the prospect of importing liquified natural gas (or LNG) from this State. The costs involved in liquifying and shipping natural gas are so immense that there will be great incentives for the Americans to develop ways of converting their huge coal and oil-shale resources into clean fuels. For this reason the current interest in LNG could prove short-lived and this fuel may be adopted only as an interim measure. I have great respect for American inventiveness and it is prudent to assume that they will solve their energy problem successfully and in their own way.

One country—Canada—could offer particularly relevant lessons for Australia. It, too, has a large land mass, a small population, and bountiful resources. In addition it was forced to deal with the question of fuel usage and energy exports some years ago. One province within Canada—namely, Alberta—has been the major source of that country's petroleum wealth and has well developed and accepted policies concerning fuel exports and conservation. Accordingly, the Fuel and Power Commission has already established a useful dialogue with both the National Energy Board of Canada and the Energy Resources Conservation Board of Alberta.

Closer to home, the Government is maintaining very close contact with the major petroleum exploration companies, particularly Woodside-Burmah and Wapet. The Fuel and Power Commission has completed a detailed market survey for natural gas

in the eastern goldfields, Perth, and south-west areas and has co-operated with representatives of Woodside-Burmah in their market surveys. Without divulging confidential information on either side, it has been possible to determine that both market assessments are in broad agreement.

As I mentioned earlier, we were in agreement in terms of their assessment of their present deposits and the information they had to send not only to the Western Australian Mines Department, but also to the Commonwealth Government; and we were on parallel lines to the nth degree in terms of the assessment of the amount of gas which is currently available in the north-west shelf.

Fuel is a vital ingredient, possibly the most vital of all, in the Government's proposals for the Pilbara industrial complex. As the recently announced joint Commonwealth-State feasibility study of this proposal moves forward, the Fuel and Power Commission will play an important role in advising the Government in the best use of the area's fuel resources, and in providing information concerning integrated power to the study team. Since the Pilbara concept document was released there has, of course, been a significant oil discovery in the Goodwyn structure. This, and further discoveries which are anticipated, could well alter both the scope and detailed planning of the Pilbara proposal. Again, the Government has taken steps to ensure that we are fully informed and up to date on north-west shelf developments.

While I am on the subject of investigations, I am pleased to report that the Fuel and Power Commission, working in close collaboration with the State Electricity Commission and the Department of Development and Decentralisation, has commenced work on possible approaches to achieve integrated power systems in the Pilbara and eastern goldfields regions.

The **SPEAKER**: The Minister has five more minutes.

Mr. MAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To continue: The availability of power will have a major bearing on the industrial and social development of these areas and I look upon these two studies, now under way, as important items to our goal of providing the Pilbara and goldfields with plentiful electricity at the lowest possible cost.

In the long run this State's economic future—and Australia's for that matter—will depend largely on how much of our minerals we can process here. We are determined to see the optimum amount of processing take place in Western Australia. The proposed Pilbara industrial complex is one tangible example of our efforts in this direction. When one equates the amount of fuel needed to process a major share of our prodigious bauxite, iron ore, nickel, and

salt, the resulting figure staggers the imagination. Clearly we must think very carefully about how much natural gas, oil, and uranium can be prudently exported from this State. I am able to report that the Fuel and Power Commission has already provided advice on this subject of "resource matching" as it is called, and the Premier (Mr. J. T. Tonkin) has conveyed the Government's views to the previous Prime Minister.

Another fuel of importance to the State is Collie coal. It continues to provide a major share of our fuel supply for electricity generation, a role which may be capable of further expansion. In addition, Collie coal will play a key role in refining bauxite to alumina. Indeed, it could be argued that a suitable matching of our coal and south-west bauxite resources is a logical and proper way to ensure long-term stable development and employment at Collie. I had hoped that the Alwest-B.H.P. alumina project would be under way by now but unfortunately the recent United States dollar devaluation has further delayed this venture. But I feel sure it will proceed in the near future and Collie coal will have a big part to play in its success.

As Western Australia moves into the era of increased secondary and tertiary processing of its minerals it is obvious that electrical power will become an increasingly crucial factor. Mineral processing industries of world significance are emerging in the eastern goldfields and Pilbara and the provision of large-scale integrated electricity supplies will soon become urgently necessary in these two areas. As I have said, the Fuel and Power Commission has already commenced investigations into possible ways to achieve integrated power in these two regions. In the Pilbara's case, these investigations will not duplicate those associated with the Pilbara industrial complex, but will be complementary to them focusing particularly on the best ways to utilise existing and already planned electrical generating and transmission facilities.

The subject of fuel and energy is one where both the Commonwealth and State Governments have their parts to play. We have quickly established a close working relationship with the new Federal Minister for Minerals and Energy and his departmental advisers. The joint Palm Valley feasibility study is the first tangible evidence of this harmonious relationship. Officers of the Department of Minerals and Energy, and the Fuel and Power Commission will work closely together on this study and there is a firm basis for close collaboration and exchange of views on other subjects as well.

Sir Charles Court: When does the Minister expect a reply concerning the alleged farm-outs?

Mr. MAY: I have received an assurance from the Federal Minister that this will be forthcoming within the next few weeks. To continue: There will be a continuing need to keep up to date with advances in nuclear, tidal, and solar power, to name only a few. Much overseas research is under way and we must constantly be on the look-out for developments which could be applied to advantage in Western Australia. Again, through the Fuel and Power Commission, we now have the mechanism to ensure that this is done.

Mr. Speaker, I have touched on a few of the salient energy matters concerning this State and have, I believe, demonstrated the Government's firm resolve to advance Western Australia's best interests regarding fuel and energy. I believe there are exciting and challenging times ahead for all of us as our inventory of natural resources continues to grow. The Government will continue to discharge its responsibilities to the people of this State to ensure that these natural gifts are utilised and conserved in the best possible manner.

In conclusion I would like to pay tribute to the work done by Mr. Parker who has been acting as the commissioner since the legislation went through Parliament. We will retain the services of Mr. Parker in an advisory capacity until Mr. Kirkwood has settled in in Western Australia. I am sure that such an arrangement will be advantageous to Western Australia.

Sir Charles Court: Before the Minister resumes his seat, regarding the allegation by the Federal Minister that certain farm-outs were pushed through just before the last Federal elections, do I take it that they could not have been processed and documented if the State Government had not been a party?

Mr. MAY: The allegation in the Federal Parliament has been a matter of concern to me. I have written to the Federal Minister, and I am awaiting a reply.

MR. O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley) [11.47 a.m.]: I would like to join with other speakers in offering my congratulations to the member for Blackwood on his election to this House. I wish him a long and successful career in politics. I also express appreciation of the work done by the former member for Blackwood (Mr. Reid), and also for the work done by the former member for Bunbury (Mr. Williams). I wish both Mr. Reid and Mr. Williams the very best in their retirement from this House.

It is with some regret that I rise to speak during the Address-in-Reply at a time when I believe Australia is at a very bad section of the cross-roads. Apprehension and concern is widely felt, not

only within Australia but throughout the world because of certain actions taken in Australia.

The Government of Australia has had a very good record in past years. However, I feel that many people from within Australia and from outside Australia will change their minds at the next election because of the action which has been taken in Australia. The credibility and goodwill of our country has been drastically affected and I hope that something will be done to repair the damage caused.

Previous speakers have already indicated that we have sold our friends down the drain, and I support that view. Australia has linked arms with communist countries, and this has come as no surprise to some of us. When speaking last year in this House I personally indicated that action of this sort was on the way. It seemed to be quite obvious from the actions of those who are now in the Government.

At that time it was the members of the Opposition in Federal Parliament and the members of the Government in Western Australia. For many years it has been obvious that the A.L.P. has had close ties with the communists. Despite repeated warnings, many people have failed to heed them until now. However, now many are taking a great deal of notice.

Mr. Taylor: Would it be as close as the contact between the Liberals and the Ustasha?

Mr. O'CONNOR: At least some people have the decency to protect others who are being pushed into the ground. Members of the Government indicated last night they do not have that decency.

Mr. Graham: Answer the question.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Despite the fact that many people did not take notice previously, they are doing so now. It is strange to see the undue haste with which the Commonwealth Government has cast aside countries which were friends of this country; countries such as America and Taiwan. It is also strange to see how the present Government has fallen deeply in love with Red China. Some have crawled on their hands and knees to North Vietnam and Hanoi.

A short time ago the Minister for Mines said that fuel would be short in America and he predicted that America would like to obtain it from a reliable source, such as Australia. What a strange statement when Australia has just kicked America in the teeth.

Mr. Jamieson: That is a stupid statement from a stupid member.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Minister has said I am stupid. I ask him to withdraw his remark.

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr. JAMIESON: In deference to you, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the remark.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Mr. Bertram: What did the Minister say?

Mr. O'CONNOR: Had the member for Mt. Hawthorn's ears been open he would have heard. By bringing Communist China into our midst and excluding Taiwan these people have forgotten, for example, the atrocities which occurred in Hungary. To them, it is something of the past.

Mr. A. R. Tonkin: Do you know that President Nixon went to Peking?

Mr. O'CONNOR: The honourable member can have his say later. The pattern has been obvious for some time to those who have cared to watch it and observe what has been happening.

Mr. Graham: We have not sent troops there. You dumped Vietnam after murdering tens of thousands.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir Charles Court: The communist line again! The good friends of North Vietnam!

Mr. Graham: You are good friends of the Ustasha.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition will keep order and members, generally, will keep order. The member for Mt. Lawley is trying to make a speech. Others will have the opportunity to do so later.

Mr. O'CONNOR: We have seen infiltration into, and virtual takeover of, some of the unions in this State and in Australia by well-known communists. This fact has been known for a long time but not many supporters of the A.L.P. have been prepared to do anything about it.

Mr. Jamieson: You have the same with the D.L.P.

Mr. O'CONNOR: They are not communists.

Mr. Graham: Are the Ustasha?

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Deputy Premier would know about that; he is probably one of their members. Not only has there been infiltration by communists into the unions—communists who are now asserting their influence—but this also applies to the A.L.P. State Executive. This should be disturbing to the people of this country.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: That is an unwarranted reflection upon the State Executive. There is no basis for what you say.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Is the Premier denying it?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: It is an absolutely unwarranted reflection on the State Executive. You have not one scintilla of evidence to support it.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I will believe that what I have said is right until the Premier can prove I am wrong.

Mr. A. R. Tonkin: Name some!

Mr. O'CONNOR: A number of communists are members of unions.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Who?

Mr. O'CONNOR: Paddy Troy.

Mr. Graham: He is not on the State Executive.

Sir Charles Court: Does not the T.L.C. have a role to play in the A.L.P.?

Mr. O'CONNOR: This pattern is quite obvious from the actions of the State and Federal Governments.

Sir Charles Court: Members of the Government should read the speech of the Minister for Works on the Trades Hall debate. He told us where the T.L.C. stood.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Continued attempts are being made to erode State rights. Once again, a pattern is being established. If State rights are eroded what will happen? We will have a centralist Government and a dictatorship. I believe some of these people want to see a little Russia in Australia. Unless Australia wakes up and takes some action this will happen. I will fight against this as far as I can. There is enough intimidation and blackmail now and I will mention some of this in a few moments.

I hoped that some members of the Government would be interested in protecting people's rights instead of trying to push people into the ground. This is what is happening. I can understand that they want people to hold one view—their own—but we should fight for a free country.

Mr. Graham: Hear, hear!

Mr. O'CONNOR: We should fight for free expression and free action. People should not be pushed around in this way.

Mr. Graham: People should do what they want! What about the Ustashi bombs?

Sir Charles Court: Why is the Ustasha being brought in all of a sudden?

The SPEAKER: Order! Members will keep order. The member for Mt. Lawley is on his feet.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Commonwealth Ministers hold so many conflicting views, it is difficult at times to keep up with them. Everything, from the Federal sphere, indicates that the Commonwealth Government wants to go as far as it can into State fields. Discussions have been held in connection with transport. I may be wrong, but I have heard that certain people have been advised to have discussions on the railways. The discussions are to centre around the question of whether or not a Commonwealth takeover should occur. There has been intrusion into Aboriginal affairs and into education. We know this line will continue.

Sir Charles Court: Dr. Cass this morning.

Mr. O'CONNOR: That is another instance. I certainly hope the Premier and his Ministers will fight the erosion of State rights.

Mr. T. D. Evans: What erosion has there been in the field of education?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I say they are endeavouring to move into these fields.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Endeavouring to move in—be damned!

Sir Charles Court: They are moving in.

Mr. O'CONNOR: If the Minister will listen, instead of babbling on, I will endeavour to explain. If he is interested in fighting against a Commonwealth takeover he is assured of my support. I hope he is sincere when indicating he knows nothing about this and will lend his support to resisting it.

Mr. Graham: The honourable member is a fine one to talk about sincerity.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Deputy Premier would not know.

Mr. Graham: One has only to look at you.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Deputy Premier snipes in the background all the time.

Mr. Graham: You would be the greatest assassinator of character in the Parliament.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Deputy Premier is a great chatterbox but says nothing worth while.

Mr. Graham: The chatterbox is sitting beside you.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Let us look at the position with Aboriginal affairs which concerns me a little.

Mr. A. R. Tonkin: A little!

Mr. O'CONNOR: I believe that Aborigines should be brought up to a standard.

Mr. A. R. Tonkin: You had a long time to do something.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Anyone would think the member for Mirrabooka came from an Aboriginal area. I guarantee I know much more about Aborigines than he does.

Mr. A. R. Tonkin: That is a racist remark.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Certainly many Aborigines are in a bad way and live under conditions which we would regard as below normal. However, some want to live under conditions which we would not want. We also have a number of white people in extremely bad circumstances. In many ways some of them are not receiving the treatment which they should receive. The

Commonwealth Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Mr. Bryant) has made tremendously sweeping statements in recent times.

Mr. Bertram: About the knighthood of two brewers.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The honourable member may know about knighthoods; I would not know. I am speaking about Aborigines.

Mr. Bertram: So was he, the other night.

Mr. O'CONNOR: In this State at the present time Aborigines are given many considerations which are not given to white people who, I say, are in poor circumstances. For instance, when an Aboriginal hits a man with a bottle he is likely to get six or 12 days in prison, whereas a white man who does the same thing is likely to get six or 12 months.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Are you casting reflections on the judiciary now?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I am stating facts.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You are casting reflections on the judiciary.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I am stating facts.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Keep out of it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. O'CONNOR: Aborigines in this State are given free legal representation, which does not apply to the white people.

Mr. Bertram: Do you approve of it?

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Aboriginal can get away with collecting social benefits and not working in many cases but the white person finds it very hard to do that. We have been given details of a turtle farm which is exclusively for the Aborigines. In *The Sunday Times* on the 11th February there was a headline, "Homes grant a surprise to councils", and the newspaper report went on to say—

None of the councils named to receive houses for Aborigines knew of the plan, a check this week revealed.

Last weekend, the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Mr. Bryant, announced a \$3 million grant for Aboriginal advancement projects in W.A.

Gem mines and cattle stations have been bought for the Aborigines, and we even have a statement from the Government which says—

The Premier, Mr. Tonkin, said yesterday that if the decision was up to him an Aboriginal applicant for a job in the State public service would be given preference over a white person with similar qualifications.

I do not object to certain things being given to the Aborigines—I know in many cases they need help—but I am reaching the stage where I think we need equal rights for whites.

Mr. Davies: This is plagiarising.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I say, quite sincerely, that certainly the Aborigines in this country need help but we should be careful not to go overboard. We should give help to them but not overlook the white people in this country who need help just as much as do the Aborigines.

Mr. A. R. Tonkin: We can see why they did not advance under your Government.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I want to mention briefly the road toll. I will not spend much time on this matter because there is another matter with which I wish to deal to a greater extent. In the Press this year there has been a fair amount of comment about the road toll and I believe the Press has done a great deal to publicise the matter in an endeavour to reduce the toll. Seat belts were introduced last year, but there has been no obvious benefit from them. The number of road deaths has increased in both the metropolitan and the country areas at about the same percentage compared with last year.

I took the trouble to check up on other States to try to find out anything that would assist us in this field. I think just about everything that could be done has been done by the present Government and previous Governments in an endeavour to reduce the road toll. I think everyone is genuinely concerned about it. There has been talk of a police takeover of traffic control. I have not seen any statistics which indicate this would decrease the road toll. Some people say it will do so but what facts have they been able to produce to that effect?

I believe one of the factors causing the disproportionate number of deaths in the country areas is the distance involved. In Victoria there is a limited area within which people can travel and the numbers of road deaths in the country and metropolitan areas are closer together proportionately and numerically. The same applies to New South Wales. In Western Australia we have a large area of country and a smaller built-up area. I think the disproportionate number of deaths in country areas is accounted for by the fact that we have many roads and greater distances, and people are inclined to put their foot down and speed up more than they would in the metropolitan area.

In Queensland last year there were more than four deaths on country roads to every one in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Gayfer: They have police control over there.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I will come to that. When we look at a State such as Queensland, where the police control the traffic throughout the State, the proportion of road deaths in the country areas is greater than it is in Western Australia. It is therefore difficult to see that police takeover would be the complete answer here.

I believe we must do something in an effort to stabilise this unsatisfactory position. I hope the Government will give some consideration to the proposition we put forward in Parliament last year, which has been discussed again this year. A meeting of the country shire councils recently, which was attended by well over 300 people, voted almost unanimously—to within about 20—in support of the motion we put forward.

I hope that in the future the Government will make some effort to cease interfering with the law and that it will let the law take its course. I have previously spoken on this matter, and further cases have arisen, with which I will deal later on in the session. It is obvious that the Government is continuing to interfere with the normal processes of the law, and in doing so it is affecting the general operations of Government in this State.

I believe the people in Australia are living in a very critical era at the present time. In this era we are seeing Government intervention in the law; it appears the Federal Government is trying to centralise the country; we have the situation that we are being sold out to the communists; and action is being taken to undermine initiative and pressurise people into submission.

Mr. Graham: This would sound better on the Esplanade. This is Esplanade politics.

Mr. O'Neil: It is better than gutter politics.

Mr. Graham: That is true.

Mr. O'CONNOR: It is time people became aware not only of the threat on our doorstep but also of the threat in the house. The wave of protest demonstrations has temporarily been halted; we have not seen any for a while. However, the Commonwealth Government obviously has communist objectives and sympathies. I believe it is a Government in name only. It is controlled by the unions, and between them all there is obviously an intention to erode State rights and human rights.

Mr. Davies: Give us some original thoughts instead of this stuff that you have come up with. You are plagiarising.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. O'CONNOR: I am pointing out a few vital facts that are of interest to the people of this State. If action to rectify these matters is not taken in the near future, we will be wrecked.

Mr. Davies: They did not take any notice the last time you brought it up or the time before that. You have been trying to bring this to their notice for years.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I believe an erosion of State rights and human rights is taking place.

Mr. Graham: You have said it 20 times.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Government is supporting strong-arm tactics to intimidate and blackmail people into submission. The point I am making is that those who do not bow to the unions or the Government's wishes are pushed around to the extent of losing their jobs and their income. They and their families are being intimidated. This is the sort of thing we would expect in Russia but not in Australia. However, it is happening here.

Mr. Davies: Like the Croats.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Commonwealth Government is trying to force Commonwealth public servants to join a union under the threat of becoming second-rate citizens if they do not. Likewise, the State Government is trying to force people to become members of unions under the threat of becoming second-rate citizens if they do not. They will get less leave, less chance of promotion, and less pay, and this is despite the fact that some of these people may possess outstanding ability.

Mr. Davies: And they will not recognise their responsibilities.

Mr. O'Neil: You are admitting it!

Mr. O'CONNOR: People have been pushed around even in this State. Many people have been intimidated to the extent that they are not game to come forward because of the fear of reprisals. This is a shocking state—

Mr. Graham: A shocking statement!

Mr. O'CONNOR: A factual one.

Mr. O'Neil: The Minister for Health has just admitted it.

Mr. O'CONNOR: At the moment we have a person present in the House who has been intimidated.

Mr. Graham: Let him stand up and be counted.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I wish the galah would shut up.

Mr. Graham: You should withdraw that.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Deputy Premier is not prepared to protect these people. I have here a letter from the Transport Workers' Union of Australia. Any interested member would be able to obtain a copy of this letter as it was sent to all members of the oil stores industries. It reads as follows—

At a recent examination of Union cards . . .

These first few words are very interesting. It continues—

. . . installation . . .

And the letter mentions a certain place. To continue—

. . . an Organiser of this Union was threatened with violence. After a full report was made by the Organiser concerned to the Branch Committee of Management, the decision of the Branch Committee of Management was that . . .

This particular person, driving a truck with such-and-such a registered number, and the letter continues—

. . . be banned from loading, delivering or anything connected with Oil Stores operations for a period of three months commencing March, 1973.

Sir Charles Court: Real kangaroo court.

Mr. Graham: Thank God it isn't Charlie Court!

Mr. O'CONNOR: As I said earlier, a person presently in this House, as late as last week went to a fuel depot to pick up supplies. This person is prepared to verify the facts of the case if any member is interested. He went to the BP fuel depot and he was advised that the unions had informed the depot that it would be necessary for him to join the union before he could obtain supplies.

This gentleman then went to Mr. Schilling of the union, and he was advised that he would have to join the union to obtain supplies. I know that three other people are on their way from country centres and they will also state they are being blackmailed or intimidated by the union.

Mr. Graham: Always on the side of the scabs. You do not believe in unions.

Sir Charles Court: These people are employers—they are not employees.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I believe in voluntary unionism. I do not believe in compulsion of this sort. The Government members support unionism because it provides them with election funds.

Mr. Graham: Where do you get yours from? Reg Ansett and who else?

Mr. O'CONNOR: Some of the same places as the Labor Party gets its funds.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. O'CONNOR: Is this the reason behind the Labor Government's attempt to introduce the second service in this State? I was not aware of the reason.

Sir Charles Court: The men who are being intimidated at the moment, are they employers or employees?

Mr. O'CONNOR: They are employers. The members of the Government want the people to submit to the unions.

Mr. Graham: People can protect themselves by joining the unions.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir Charles Court: These people are not employees.

Mr. O'Neil: The Deputy Premier does not know what he is talking about.

The SPEAKER: Order! Members will keep order. It is no good continuing like this; we will get nowhere. If the member for Mt. Lawley will address the Chair we will make progress.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am extremely happy to address the Chair and I hope you will give me the protection I expect.

Last night in this House, the Minister for Labour was asked questions in connection with people who are being intimidated by unions. The Minister indicated that he would not protect the people. For the benefit of the House, I will read the question I asked and the reply given. The question is as follows—

If information can be provided supporting the views expressed by the member for Darling Range, will the Minister take immediate action to protect the public against blackmail or intimidation by any union?

The Minister would not say "Yes" to this question; he replied—

I understand the purport of the question of the member for Mt. Lawley. I would answer in this way—

I then said, "Answer 'Yes' or 'No'. Will you protect the public or not?" The Minister then replied—

If a suggestion is made in the House that something is taking place which is unlawful under the Police Act, I would say the matter should be attended to by the police and not by the Minister for Police.

That is passing the buck. He is not concerned that people are being pushed around; he could not care less. It is pretty obvious that the Government could not care less. If the Government does care, I will be anxious to see what action it takes. I will do everything I can to see that these people get the protection they deserve and to ensure they are not metaphorically pushed into the salt mines in Siberia.

Many other instances of this type have occurred. I am certain that other members on this side of the House will be able to instance similar intimidation. It will be seen that I am not the only one concerned about this.

Action of this type is despicable, and it is incredible that it is happening in a free country. In fact, I am beginning to wonder whether we are free.

Mr. Graham: Ustashi bombs!

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Deputy Premier likes the people to support him, but he will not protect those who have every right to be protected by the Government and by Parliament.

Sir Charles Court: By intimidation they are being unlawfully forced to join a union they do not need to join.

Mr. O'Neill: It is a protection racket.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir Charles Court: Protection racket.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Members will realise that I am very concerned about the situation. Something should be done about it in the interests of decency, freedom of the individual, and the development of our country.

Amendment to Motion

Accordingly I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the motion—

: but we regret to have to inform Your Excellency that we view with concern the fact that the Government is not prepared to protect employees, employers, sub contractors, and members of the public against indiscriminate action, blackmail, intimidation, or undue influence by industrial unions or other organisations.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Leader of the Opposition) [12.19 p.m.]: I formally second the motion.

MR. TAYLOR (Cockburn—Minister for Labour) [12.19 p.m.]: The topic of industrial relations has come to the fore earlier than I would have expected—this is only the fourth sitting day of the session. However, it is probably desirable that it has come forward now and in this way. Members of the House will be aware that the issues of industrial relations and communism are always thrust forward by the Opposition in a similar form. One particular matter was raised late yesterday afternoon in the House. Now, within 24 hours of the matter first being raised by way of an allegation made by a member, it has become a censure motion against the Government.

Mr. O'Neill: This has been on for months. The Government has not been aware of it; or, if it has been aware of it, it has ignored it.

Mr. TAYLOR: The matter was brought before the House only yesterday afternoon. If the problem had been evident for a long time, as members opposite suggest, then I venture to say that the Opposition has been just as remiss as the Government.

Mr. O'Neill: We have been in the House only three days.

Mr. TAYLOR: This matter was the subject of a question without notice asked yesterday. I suggest that if the Opposition has known about it for some time, it has had ample time to place a question on the notice paper.

Mr. O'Neill: Rubbish.

Mr. TAYLOR: The fact that the question was phoned to me yesterday indicates to me that the Opposition has only just become aware of the matter.

Mr. O'Neill: You knew nothing about it until yesterday.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! Members must keep order. It is no good going on like this. If we wish to make progress the member making a speech must be given a chance to do so.

Mr. TAYLOR: I will try to tone down my voice by a few decibels, Mr. Speaker. In presenting my brief comments against the amendment, I would like to relate the matter to a comment often made by the Opposition; that is, this Government does not believe in the process of the law. As I understand the amendment it criticises the Government and myself in particular for not taking action, without specifying what action we should take, to protect the rights of employers and employees. That, basically, is the tenor of the amendment: that nothing has been done to protect employees and employers from undue pressure placed upon them by unions.

When I became Minister for Labour I inherited a set of laws dealing with industrial relations. I am prepared to agree that, apart from a couple of minor amendments, nothing has been added to the Industrial Arbitration Act and other associated Statutes since we became the Government. However, I suggest that, presumably, those laws were satisfactory up till two years ago to deal with situations of intimidation, blackmail, etc. So I cannot understand why the Opposition thinks action is necessary at this time, or what has happened to change the situation in such a short period.

Mr. O'Neill: The law is there and the Minister is inactive.

Mr. TAYLOR: I cannot see what has occurred which necessitates precipitative action by the Minister or the Government to alleviate a situation which has, in one case, apparently arisen overnight.

Mr. O'Connor: I brought this up in the House last year.

Mr. TAYLOR: I am able to comment on the amendment to the motion only in respect of the information which has been put before me; and the only information I have is that which was phoned to me late yesterday afternoon. I think the member for Darling Range apologised for not getting the question to me earlier. So I have not had much time to investigate the matter.

Mr. O'Neill: It has been reported in the Press on a number of occasions. Probably the Minister was overseas at the time.

Mr. TAYLOR: Let me follow through the mechanics of the matter. We must bear in mind the amendment claims the Government should take some action in regard to the allegations. As I recall the words of the member for Mt. Lawley, he said that certain people have been refused supplies unless they join a union. That seems to be the crux of the complaint.

Mr. O'Connor: By the way, some are owner-drivers.

Mr. TAYLOR: It is still the crux of the complaint.

Mr. O'Neill: It is a protection racket.

Mr. TAYLOR: Let us get back to the process of law, which the Government is alleged not to follow. My understanding of the situation—and this follows up my reply to the member for Mt. Lawley—is that the processes of law can follow a number of courses.

Firstly, the materials which are supplied are the property of a company; they are not the property of a man or of a union. If a depot refuses to supply goods, it is futile to say in this House that the men refused to supply the goods. It would be the company that refused to supply them.

Sir Charles Court: That is not correct, because the company is being intimidated.

Mr. TAYLOR: Let me go a step further. The employer has two options available to him if his employees defy him. Firstly, he may dismiss them; that is his irrefutable right. Secondly, if the employer believes there is to be a dispute he may immediately refer the matter to the Industrial Commission.

Mr. O'Neill: So can the Minister. We asked you to do that yesterday.

Mr. TAYLOR: That is true; the Minister can also refer the dispute to the commission, and I will cover that point. However, either the company—the employer—or the employees—the union—can take the matter to arbitration. The Minister may also do that in the interests of the public. To cover the interjection made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition very quickly, I would say that as far as I can recall no Minister for Labour in the history of the Act has intervened in the interests of the public, and I refer to the present and the past Government. So to suggest that I should do so on the basis of a question without notice presented to me at a late hour yesterday afternoon is pushing the matter too far.

Mr. O'Neill: It is not a matter of intervening in the interests of the public. It is a matter of bringing it to the notice of the commission. The Minister does not know his Act.

Mr. TAYLOR: The Opposition has already suggested the matter has been before the notice of the public for a long time. The company can refer it to the Industrial Commission, and so can the union. The employer, if he so wishes, can dismiss a servant for not supplying goods; but that has not happened.

Sir Charles Court: Because the company is under intimidation.

Mr. TAYLOR: That is the argument so far as the company and its servants are concerned. I emphasise I am not suggesting that the action complained of is actually taking place because, as I implied in my answer yesterday, I have no knowledge of the matter other than what was conveyed to me by the member for Darling Range.

Mr. O'Neil: It has been on for months.

Sir Charles Court: You know about the T.W.U. sticker system.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TAYLOR: Let us look at the matter in another way—and I wish now to answer the suggestion that I should have taken precipitative action and should be censured for not doing so. If it is a matter of compelling someone to join a union, then at least some members of the Opposition should be aware that the Industrial Arbitration Act contains a provision which enables a person to be exempted from joining a union. A number of people have applied for that exemption.

Mr. O'Neil: How can an employer apply to join a union? You don't know your Act. We are talking about employers, not employees.

Mr. TAYLOR: I will repeat the point I was making, because I think it is valid. No man must become a member of a union against his wish. He can apply to the court for exemption. From memory—and I will attempt to clarify this in answer to a question on notice later—the Industrial Registrar has not declined a significant number of applications for exemption. My understanding of the situation is that the bulk of those who apply for exemption are granted it.

Mr. O'Neil: That is, if they do not pull out first. About half of the applicants withdraw their applications as a result of intimidation.

Mr. TAYLOR: Here we have a censure amendment which says that the Minister will not take action regarding the matter raised by the Opposition.

Sir Charles Court: He will not.

Mr. TAYLOR: I put it to members opposite—as I replied to the member for Mt. Lawley yesterday—that I should follow the processes of law and that if I took action now I would be interfering in a matter concerning a company and its business, workmen and their attitudes, and the general public which have dealings with them. There is a process by which the three parties may take action. The employer and employees certainly may take action in the Industrial Court; and I would think a private individual would have a civil case against the others for the non-provision of goods.

Certainly I will make this point in connection with the question placed on the notice paper by the member for Mt. Lawley when I answer it a little later. In this question the honourable member makes a suggestion of force. Our laws make provision for the protection of people against the use of force—and I use that word in its dictionary sense.

Sir Charles Court: The people concerned would be dead by the time the protection arrived.

Mr. TAYLOR: I refer now to a letter which was read out by the member for Darling Range. I do not here dispute it.

The only knowledge I have is that which I obtained from the honourable member last night and this morning. A small section of this letter reads as follows—

The organiser of this union was threatened with violence . . .

That was not questioned by members of the Opposition. To the best of my knowledge the majority of the industrial awards contain a provision giving a right to any union representative to enter industrial premises. In this case, apparently one of the organisers, whilst carrying out his lawful occupation, was threatened with violence.

Mr. O'Neil: Who was that?

Mr. TAYLOR: I do not know. I am merely quoting from this letter and those are the facts which are mentioned in it. There was a threat of violence made to a union organiser. I would like to hear from the Opposition whether it condones that and whether it would like me to take the same action to protect the organiser from any threat of violence. Obviously a breach of the law has been committed; an unlawful act has been committed. The many interjections that have been made do not cover the point. The answer to one of the interjections made by one of my own colleagues would bring about a response similar to that which I am making to this motion.

There is a process of law that must be followed. If an organiser is threatened with violence, if any representative is threatened with violence, the process of the law should be followed. If at this point in time, after the present Government has been in office two years and after many years of administration by the previous Government, we have a motion brought before the House condemning the Government and the Minister for Labour because he has not taken action in regard to a matter brought to his notice 24 hours previously, the content of the law should presumably be changed. But there has been no change in the law for the settlement of disputes between employers and employees. The existing legislation is

basically satisfactory, and certainly, before any Minister of a Government intercedes in a matter such as this, recourse should be had to the process of the law.

That is the proper course that should be followed rather than have the Minister interfere in a situation where he would not necessarily be welcome. No approach to take the matter before the law has been made by either the employers or the union, or even by any individual. Further, no approach has been made by such people to myself as Minister for Labour, to my department, or to any organisation that I know of, other than to the members of the Opposition.

Mr. O'Neil: Tell us what you think of the trial and the verdict!

Mr. Graham: This is a political stunt.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TAYLOR: I can only repeat my first remark; that those who are faced with troubles in regard to industrial relations have recourse by taking their grievances to the proper authority. I oppose the amendment.

MR. O'NEIL (East Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [12.33 p.m.]: I am completely and utterly disgusted with the attitude of the Minister for Labour, particularly in regard to the last part of his speech. In making reference to a specific instance, a specific place, and a specific person, he quoted a small portion of a letter, a copy of which has been handed to him. He said that if the organiser had been subjected to some sort of violence legal action was available to him in respect of that threat. We challenged the Minister to give his opinion as to what happened as a result of this alleged threat, but he quibbled the question and sat down as quickly as he could. I now ask him to give an answer, by way of interjection, as to what he thinks of this situation. Because a union organiser reported that a threat of violence had been made against him by some party whose name was mentioned, the union made a decision without any trial and without inquiry to the effect that the particular individual who was accused of making the threat will not be provided with any service from the depot in question for a period of three months.

In other words, the union appointed itself judge and jury and came to a verdict against which there is no appeal. What opinion does the Minister hold in regard to that type of action? That is all I want to know.

Mr. Jamieson: You are doing exactly the same thing.

Mr. O'NEIL: Let the Minister for Labour answer my question.

Mr. Taylor: The answer to that question is very simple. If no supplies are being made to that individual he can have recourse to the company concerned.

Mr. O'NEIL: The Minister is avoiding the question. He is not game to say that if the matter of the union taking direct action in a case of a threat against one of its organisers is the subject for some legal action, it must necessarily follow that he disagrees also with the action taken by the union. It is as simple as that, but he quibbled the answer. On this particular matter a number of points have been conveniently overlooked by the Minister and judging from the interjections made by some members on the front bench there are clear indications that they have little or no knowledge of the industrial arbitration law.

Mr. May: You mean the front Opposition bench.

Mr. Graham: You are in that position.

Mr. O'NEIL: By way of interjection the Deputy Premier admitted that there is a protection racket being conducted by this particular union, and his words can be checked in *Hansard*. He said, "If the man joins the union he will be protected."

Mr. Graham: That is so; that is the purpose of the union.

Mr. O'NEIL: That is a protection racket. The men to whom we refer are not employees. They are subcontractors; they are employers; they are farmers; they are service station operators who go to the depot in their own vehicles and pick up their own supplies. There is no necessity for them to become members of the union.

Mr. Graham: If anyone has been aggrieved there is provision under the law for action to be taken.

Mr. O'NEIL: The members of the Government do not care about the law; they do not understand.

Mr. Jamieson: This is not the job of Parliament.

Mr. O'NEIL: The Minister exhibited a lack of knowledge of the Industrial Arbitration Act when he spoke of intervention in the public interest.

Mr. Graham: You are interested only in the Bunbury by-election.

Mr. O'NEIL: This has nothing to do with the Bunbury by-election.

Mr. Graham: The member for Mt. Lawley has his notes written out already. You are putting on a circus; that is all you are doing.

Mr. Bertram: Hear, hear!

Mr. O'NEIL: I was referring to the situation where the Minister replied that any action taken by him as Minister for Labour would be by way of intervention in the public interest. We are not talking about that. It is perfectly true that most Governments think seriously about intervening in a dispute in the public interest

when the matter is already before the Industrial Commission. It has been done, but Governments of all colours have to be extremely careful in such situations. However, we are not talking about that.

If the Minister, or any person for that matter, is aware that there is developing a certain situation which could occasion an industrial dispute, he may refer the matter to the Industrial Commission. On many occasions when I was Minister for Labour information came to me that a problem was likely to occur in a certain industry. I would refer the matter to the commission, not for a hearing by the commission, but so that the conciliation sections of the Act could be put into operation. Frequently the confrontation between management and labour was avoided, but the commission requires to be advised of an anticipated industrial dispute before it takes any action. If the Minister knew nothing about it he is at fault. He was out of the State for some time and either he does not know what is going on or he is burying his head in the sand and does not want to know what is going on.

Mr. May: That is completely unfair! You know he has been outside the State on Government business.

Mr. O'NEIL: When we were in office massive criticism was levelled against us because of the number of overseas trips that were made by the Ministers. However, the Minister for Labour has been overseas four times since the Government took office.

Mr. Taylor: How long have you known about the matter?

Mr. O'NEIL: The matter has been aired in the Press for some considerable time. It may well be that precise evidence in the form of the letter referred to, and a document which appeared on notice boards, came into our possession within the last 24 or 48 hours, but if we had come here with some sort of airy-fairy proposition, those on the other side of the Chamber would have said, "Give us facts." We now have the facts, the Minister also has them, and he should act. It ought to be made perfectly clear that he has the power, but I do not think he is game to use it.

Sir Charles Court: He would not remain a Minister for 24 hours if he took that action.

Mr. Graham: What action should he take?

Mr. O'NEIL: There is ample opportunity to put into operation the provisions of the industrial law. I can recall a case which occurred just prior to the last change of Government when there was massive industrial unrest in the meat industry.

Mr. Bertram: Which Government was that?

Mr. O'NEIL: It was while we were in Government.

Mr. Davies: It was massive industrial unrest.

Mr. O'NEIL: In the meat industry.

Mr. Davies: You could not control it.

Mr. O'NEIL: The Minister is helping me all along the line. No doubt he would have liked us to take action.

Mr. Davies: Yes.

Mr. O'NEIL: We did, but that action was rescinded by the incoming Government. The W.A. Meat Export Works, the Midland Junction Abattoir Board, and the private abattoirs determined upon a course of action to take against the trade unions which were responsible for this industrial unrest. All this was approved, and a case was drawn up. They asked for action to be taken, and we approved of it. However, a change of Government occurred, and after the change an instruction was issued by the incoming Government that the Government abattoirs were to disengage from the action. The action was taken at the request of the Government instrumentalities and undertaken by our Government, but with a change of Government this course of action was withdrawn. The present Government boggled under and obeyed the dictates of the Trades and Labor Council.

Mr. Hartrey: What are we elected for?

Mr. Davies: Why did you not take action?

Mr. O'NEIL: The Minister has just asked me why we did not take action. I have told him the action we took. However, the incoming Government withdrew from that course of action, because it is dictated to in respect of industrial matters.

The Minister has admitted that he considers this is not a matter for the Industrial Commission or the Minister for Labour. He stated there are several courses of action open, and the police can be called in. This Government withdraws from any matters that are related to confrontation between management and labour. The Government has squibbed the issue; it has not the guts to discharge its responsibilities.

MR. THOMPSON (Darling Range) [12.43 p.m.]: I believe that the trade unions in this State and right throughout Australia have recognised a trend that has evolved over the last few years, and they do not like it. I believe they will do all in their power to create a situation where the unions become all-powerful. We have seen, both in the Federal and the State spheres which have Labor Governments, the implementation of compulsory membership of trade unions.

We saw an example of this in the Federal Parliament where legislation was recently introduced to make provision for Commonwealth public servants, who are members of unions, to be granted four weeks' annual leave, while those not members of a union are to remain on the existing three weeks. The obvious intention is to force people to join unions.

Mr. Graham: Does not the same principle apply in respect of the Liberal Party's health policy under which people are compelled to join a health benefits society, otherwise they will have to bear the full hospital costs.

Mr. THOMPSON: That is no comparison at all.

Mr. Graham: Yes, it is a comparison.

Mr. THOMPSON: We had another example in this House last year when the Education Act Amendment Bill (No. 2) was introduced and dropped. Under this legislation teachers were to be forced to join unions.

Mr. Graham: So they ought to join.

Mr. THOMPSON: This matter might come up for debate again this year. I believe in the principle of voluntary unionism.

Mr. Graham: If one wants to reap benefits one must be prepared to contribute.

Mr. THOMPSON: I believe people should join unions.

Mr. Graham: But free to scab if they want to!

Mr. THOMPSON: However, there should be no compulsion to join.

Mr. O'Connor: Pay protection money, and they will be looked after. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. THOMPSON: The Deputy Premier implied that.

Mr. Graham: So as to protect its members.

Sitting suspended from 12.45 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr. THOMPSON: Members of the Opposition feel very strongly about the matter we are discussing today, but it is clear the Government does not care very much about it because I note that we have only two Ministers in their seats at the moment.

Mr. H. D. Evans: That is enough to handle you lot.

Mr. O'Neill: You have no-one behind you.

Mr. H. D. Evans: We don't need them.

Mr. THOMPSON: The Minister for Labour is now scampering to his seat.

Mr. Taylor: He was sitting right next to you, the better to hear you.

Mr. THOMPSON: I can understand his coming to this side of the House because he feels sympathy with us. He knows

jolly well that if the present trend continues he will have to come into line with what is dictated to him from Trades Hall.

It is clear that the unions receive tremendous support in establishments such as the Midland workshops and the Midland Abattoir, and any other place where large groups of employees congregate. I believe that this is so because the radicals—the people who really want to keep the union movement together—are very active in encouraging the employees to join the union. I have had a fair amount of experience in working in similar places and I understand fully the methods employed by some people.

I said earlier that I support the principle of the trade union movement. I believe every section of the community should have some collective body to express its point of view, but I emphasise that I believe this should be on a voluntary basis. In the last few years in Western Australia particularly we have seen trade unions losing the control they once had. During the regime of the Brand Government a great amount of work was undertaken in Western Australia and tremendous pressures were applied by a number of enterprising people who took the opportunity to establish their own business ventures.

Until a few years ago builders directly employed all the necessary labour on their jobs—the bricklayers, plasterers, and so on—at the day-labour award rate, and they did everything required of them by the unions.

However, in the last few years the system has changed and, instead of the builders having the work done by the employees under their direct control, they sublet the work, in some cases to one-man businesses, and I believe the State has been well served by this system. A much smoother pattern of operation has existed in many sections of the building industry because these small businessmen have a direct interest in the success of their enterprise and have therefore undertaken their work with advantage to the builder and to themselves.

This system has spread like wildfire and the unions have suddenly realised they are losing the control they had some time ago. I submit that the principal reason the trade union movement desires to obtain control of so many sections of industry is not for the benefit of the members of the union but, indeed, for the furtherance of party-political aims.

I can recall the Deputy Premier standing on the steps of Parliament House when I had been a member for only a short time. Right next to him was a very well-known union man who I believe is a communist. This particular person was telling a gathering of people in front of

the building how much better the situation would be for the working people of this State under a Labor Government.

Mr. McIver: That has been proved.

Mr. Taylor: True.

Mr. THOMPSON: This man went on to say that if the union could not get its way it would do all in its power to achieve its objective and he even went so far as to say that it would bring this State to its knees if necessary. So far are these stirrers prepared to go that they would bring the State to its knees in order to achieve their ends. We know the experience involving the T.W.U., the very union we are discussing today. For party-political reasons that organisation took action during the visit to this State of a sporting organisation. Such action was hardly in the interests of the members of the union. It was a direct political action.

Mr. Bertram: Which sporting organisation was that?

Mr. Gayfer: Does it matter? It was hardly cricket!

Mr. THOMPSON: I think the honourable member understands quite well.

Mr. O'Neil: No; the honourable member was asleep all the time.

Mr. THOMPSON: Was he?

Mr. Lapham: What is the sporting organisation?

Mr. THOMPSON: One of the firms against whom action was taken was Bright Spot Caterers, but I am pleased to say that the proprietors of that organisation were strong enough to stand up to these people.

I believe that until such time as employers are prepared to fight this kind of union action, this State will be in for a rough time. This is not the first time that I have had occasion to speak in this House on the questionable tactics of a trade union movement. I can recall speaking in this House some time ago and mentioning a situation which developed whence there was strike action in progress at the Welsh-pool factories of two structural steel firms. I cannot recall their names but I think that one was Forwood Down. The dispute concerned a demarcation issue between two unions who represented welders, and the militant group of the union which was on strike did all in its power to ensure that the members of the other union—who were prepared to work—could not work. One of my constituents received some fairly rough treatment at the hands of the militant union people. At this time we have cases where a union is trying to force into its membership transport workers who have no cause to be a part of that union.

My attention was drawn some few weeks ago to a particular case. A small business proprietor in my electorate conducts a mixed business selling hardware, food-stuffs, oils and petrol. He is a business

proprietor and he drives his own truck. He has been in the habit of going to North Fremantle and taking delivery of produce from an oil company for distribution through his own outlet. He turned up at the Fremantle depot about three weeks ago and was met at the gate by a union picket. He was invited to join the union but he explained to the union representative in a quite friendly and amicable manner that he was a businessman in his own right, and he should not be required to join a union.

No more was said and the businessman drove his vehicle into the works expecting to be served. However, the company would not serve that particular fellow. He referred the matter to me and I got in touch with the oil company concerned. A representative of the company told me that they would dearly love to supply my constituent, and many others in this State, but they were not game to do so because the Transport Workers' Union had threatened to take industrial action against any oil company which served a person of whom the transport union did not approve.

A very dangerous situation has evolved. The Transport Workers' Union is flexing its muscles and putting pressure on the oil companies. I suggest this pressure will spread and in time to come the union will tell the oil companies that if they supply people of whom the unions do not approve they will be put out of business.

I suggest it is time the oil companies—and anyone else who is subjected to this type of pressure—stood up and fought. If action is not taken the whole country will be in a very sorry situation indeed.

It was said earlier today by members opposite, that this fear is just a figment of our imagination. I will quote from a letter, which is headed Transport Workers' Union of Australia, Western Australian Branch. The address is Room 53, Trades Hall, Perth. The letter is addressed to the manager of a particular oil company based in Western Australia, and, in part, reads as follows—

Dear Mr. . . .

Recently during an examination of Union cards at—

The examination was at a particular depot in North Fremantle. To continue—

—Mr. Shilling, an Organiser of the Transport Workers' Union of Australia duly elected and credentialed, was threatened with violence by one known as—

I will not quote his name. To continue—
—who drives truck number . . .

The decision of the Committee of Management of the Western Australian Branch of the Transport Workers' Union on the evening of . . . was

that he be banned from being loaded at your installation for a period of three months.

Just where are we going? The union has said that a certain truck is not to be loaded. I have had discussions with the management of the particular oil company and I have been told that the company dare not supply my constituent because the union has said the company would be put out of business.

I call upon the oil companies—and on any other group of employers who find themselves in this position—to take up the matter and take on the unions. I suggest that this type of situation will deteriorate and someone will eventually have to stand up and fight. I suggest that time is now.

Mr. O'Connor: Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: The honourable member would agree there is machinery available for this sort of thing?

Mr. THOMPSON: Yes, I agree. But it is as much the responsibility of the Minister to take up this matter—particularly now that it has been raised in such clear terms in this place—the responsibility of the Minister to take as it is the responsibility of the individual operator. Indeed, I suggest it is more the responsibility of the Minister because there can be no recriminations against him from the union. I would expect that a Minister of the Crown would be immune from that sort of thing. However, we on this side of the House are realistic.

Mr. Taylor: Does the honourable member know that it is a federal union and that I have no jurisdiction?

Mr. THOMPSON: It is indeed.

Mr. Lapham: It is not within his power.

Mr. THOMPSON: The other night someone spoke about the legal position of the Government and the obligation on the Government. I believe a Government—in this case the Minister of the Government in this State—has the obligation to do something about the matter, even if he only comes out with a statement to the effect that he deplores the attitude and suggests the union should drop it.

Mr. O'Neil: We have not got a Government in this State.

Mr. THOMPSON: The Minister is not prepared to do that. It is as much his responsibility as it is the responsibility of the individual operator or oil company. Many individual operators—small businessmen—fear the impact of their own actions, so they go along, pay their subscription, and put it down to one they lost. There are some people whose principles will not allow them to do it, and I believe some of them will challenge the union. I hope they will challenge it in the courts very soon.

I think the Minister should show some initiative in this matter. He has said he was not aware of it. I suggest that if he is not aware of it he should be aware of it because there are many people in this State who have less contact than he with the industrial situation who are aware of it. If he does not know he should know.

Mr. Lapham: Did you become aware of it last night?

Mr. THOMPSON: If the Minister has known about it for some time and has not done anything, he should resign because he has not been doing his job.

Mr. Bertram: What do you suggest he should do?

Mr. THOMPSON: He should make a public statement—

Mr. Hartrey: That would make a big difference!

Mr. THOMPSON: It would make a big difference when one considers the politics with which this man sides. When the Brand Government was in power there were many occasions when the Minister for Labour came out strongly in the Press and denounced these people for what they were doing. By that very action he made a marked impact on the situation.

Mr. Hartrey: What notice do they take of a member of the Government?

Mr. O'Neil: The member for Boulder-Dundas shows little confidence in the Minister for Labour if he thinks they would take no notice of him.

Mr. THOMPSON: Precisely; and they would take more notice of a representative of a socialist party than they would of a representative from this side. I suggest they would take too much notice and for that reason the Minister for Labour is not game to do it.

It has been said that exemptions can be given to people who do not want to become members of a union. I have been associated with unionists and with people who want to opt out of a union, and it is a fact that about half of the people who make applications for exemption from a trade union withdraw their applications because of pressure applied through the Trade Union movement and they are not game to go on.

Mr. O'Neil: Intimidation.

Mr. THOMPSON: Precisely; so they go along with it.

Mr. Lapham: Would the intimidation be from a number of employers who do not want their staff to be in a union?

Mr. THOMPSON: No.

Mr. O'Neil: It is intimidation from their so-called workmates.

Mr. O'Connor: If it were, it is covered in our motion anyway.

Mr. R. L. Young: It must be a long time since the member for Karrinyup worked for a union.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. THOMPSON: When the Minister for Labour was on his feet he suggested the Opposition should consider the position of the union man who was supposed to have been subjected to a threat of violence. We did so, and I would like to quote again part of the question I asked in the House yesterday. I asked—

What is his attitude to a recent memorandum to members of the Transport Workers' Union . . .

The memorandum reads—

At a recent examination of Union cards at . . . installation . . . North Fremantle, an Organiser of this Union was threatened with violence.

That is the part to which I wish to refer. We do not question that the organiser may have been threatened with violence but we do question the right of a trade union organisation to be the judge and jury, try a man in his absence, and say, "We find this man unacceptable to us and we will put him out of business for three months".

Mr. O'Connor: Disgraceful!

Mr. THOMPSON: I ask the legal eagles on the other side of the House whether they consider that is a reasonable action to be taken by a group of people.

Mr. Lapham: Are you prejudging the union without getting the facts?

Mr. THOMPSON: I am not. I am quoting what the union said and asking whether it is considered the union has the right to take the law into its own hands. By that question I imply that the matter should have been referred to a court of law. If someone threatens me, I have access to a court of law. If a member of a union is threatened, he can take civil action against the person who levels the threat. No union at all has the right to decide whether that man is guilty of such an assault. I ask the members for Mt. Hawthorn and Boulder-Dundas to comment on that situation.

Mr. Bertram: You will not be disappointed, so just proceed.

Mr. O'Neil: No report until you get a briefing from Trades Hall?

Mr. THOMPSON: I would like to know their attitude to that situation. We on this side of the House deplore what is going on. I believe a rumour is circulating in the Transport Workers' Union to the effect that farmers who go along to the various oil company depots to pick up their own supplies will have this same sort of action taken against them.

Mr. Lapham: Complete rubbish!

Mr. THOMPSON: Is it?

Mr. Lapham: Yes. They have never yet been asked to join a union.

Mr. THOMPSON: No, nor have the self-employed people who are now being forced to join. Let us look at the pressure that has been exerted by the Transport Workers' Union in the last couple of years. It has made sure that every employee who drives a truck and takes fuel away from the depots joins the union. The union forces those people. It then turned its attention to the subcontract operators and forced them to become members of the union. There are still some of them who are not members, but the union will get them—it will work on them.

Mr. O'Neil: Are they not required to carry a sticker on the windscreen of their trucks?

Mr. THOMPSON: The union is now turning its attention to small business proprietors—people who are employers of labour—and forcing them to become members of the union. Of what advantage is it to a self-employed person who employs labour to become a member of a trade union? Farmers too, are self-employed people who also take delivery of fuel from oil company depots. The particular constituent to whom I referred earlier employs seven or eight people. Two or three people in my electorate are in the same position. The union has a very effective way of achieving this objective. It puts a sticker on the truck, and if a truck without a sticker pulls up at Fremantle it is not allowed to be loaded. That is deplorable. We will not accept that, and we expect this amendment to be carried.

MR. BLAIKIE (Vasse) [2.38 p.m.]: I support the amendment moved by the member for Mt. Lawley. I deplore the actions of the Government in this regard. I will refer to a recent incident in the Federal sphere of which members of this House will be only too well aware. I refer to the boycott on American ships by Australian seamen. The boycott was directed against the American nation in retaliation for the American policy on North Vietnam, which they said was a policy of slaughter and murder.

Mr. McIver: What has this to do with the State Government?

Mr. BLAIKIE: It has a lot to do with the State Government.

Mr. O'Connor: Of course it has. It must.

Mr. McIver: Workers in the Eastern States going on strike?

Mr. BLAIKIE: With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, the amendment states—

. . . that we view with concern the fact that the Government is not prepared to protect . . .

As far as the member for Ascot is concerned, he regards the actions of the Americans as slaughter and massacre. However, that was a policy of the American nation and I think it can best decide its own policies without suffering reprisals from Australia. Was the action of the Seamen's Union supported by the Government? No; because it was an illegal action. The union took reprisals against the American nation, which could have led to irreparable damage to the Australian agricultural industries. That is how fickle the unions have become.

The Seamen's Union does not care who else is affected. As far as it is concerned if a ship is not loaded today it will be loaded tomorrow or the next day, and the union members will receive overtime, anyway. But the fact that a beef producer cannot sell his beef because it cannot be loaded onto a ship does not worry them. It is an example of might and strength, and the union believes it is right. I am saying it is entirely wrong, and I believe the bulk of the Australian people also feel that way. Of course, the union did not realise that the American Longshoremen's Association would take retaliatory action. What a shock that proved to be.

Mr. Hartrey: That is a bosses' union.

Mr. BLAIKIE: I referred to that incident because I believe what occurred then has had a very important bearing on the situation in Western Australia today. To refer again to the action of the Seamen's Union in Australia, I would point out that the whole nation was extremely worried that our beef shipments were not getting to America. This was a matter of vital concern to the country. Of course, I realise members on the other side of the House were not very concerned because they represent the metropolitan area.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I do not.

Mr. BLAIKIE: So now the Minister for Education—

Mr. T. D. Evans: I represent the State of Western Australia, and the area of Kalgoorlie in particular.

Mr. BLAIKIE: —represents a rural area. Maybe the member for Ascot would also like to say he represents a rural area. However, if you, Mr. Speaker, were involved at the time I am sure you would have stood up and been counted in an effort to take action against the reprisals of the Seamen's Union because they were illegal and detrimental to the economy of Australia.

I make this point: where was the Prime Minister when these events took place? He was awaiting the return of the President of the A.C.T.U., who was on a cruise in the South Sea Islands. He was waiting the return of Mr. Hawke so that he could be told what to do.

Mr. Bryce: He is entitled to have holidays.

Mr. BLAIKIE: Yes, but the rest of Australia waited with bated breath to hear what the Prime Minister had to say, but he could say nothing because his boss had not returned to tell him what to say. I would like now to quote from an article which appeared in *The West Australian* on the 10th January, 1973, under the heading of "Seamen lift ban on U.S. ships". I quote as follows the remarks of Mr. Hawke—

Its president, Mr. R. J. Hawke, said yesterday that it would cover all U.S. goods and services as well as shipping.

The A.C.T.U. executive would meet on January 30 and would consider whether further action was to be taken.

Further on the article continues—

Mr. Hawke said yesterday that it would have been pointless for the Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, to comment on the ban.

I make this point: who is running the country? Is the Government of the day running the country, or is it being run by the A.C.T.U.? It is a sad state of affairs when the Government does not act as it should. I am pleased to say that the Premier said he would speak to Mr. Whitlam about the matter. However, no action was taken by the Prime Minister.

I bring my remarks closer to home now and refer to the present illegal action of the Transport Workers' Union in Bunbury.

Mr. Hartrey: I thought we were talking about North Fremantle.

Mr. BLAIKIE: I understand from other members that the union is also taking action there. This matter was drawn to my attention on Tuesday night when a person in my electorate phoned me to inquire whether or not he was obliged to join the Transport Workers' Union.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Why have you delayed so long before ventilating the matter? Today is Thursday.

Mr. O'Neil: It was ventilated in this House last year. Where there is no sense there is no feeling.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that he is not sitting in his seat.

Mr. BLAIKIE: Officials of the T.W.U. were in Bunbury on Tuesday.

Mr. O'Connor: They are trying to make the people of Bunbury submit, but they will not win there.

Mr. BLAIKIE: The purpose of their visit was to endeavour to enlist union members.

Mr. Hartrey: Very commendable.

Mr. BLAIKIE: My constituent phoned me on Tuesday night in order to ascertain whether he was legally obliged to become

a member of the T.W.U. He informed me that he went to an oil depot in Bunbury to collect fuel and was told by an official that unless he became a member of the union he would be prevented from obtaining fuel supplies. He filled out a form for membership because it is vital that he obtain supplies of fuel for his business. I might add that he filled out the form under duress.

I ascertained the legal ramifications for him. I found that, in fact, the union is operating in a completely illegal fashion. On the following morning, Wednesday, he returned to the depot to collect more fuel and was met by the union official—a Mr. Shilling—and told that he was not—

Mr. O'Connor: Not worth tuppence.

Mr. BLAIKIE: —a member of the union and that if he did not join he would be refused entry. My constituent told the official that he had no legal obligation to join the union. At that stage he was refused the supply of fuel. I notice that members of the Government are now very silent.

Mr. Bertram: They are almost asleep.

Mr. O'Connor: Yes, that happens whenever anything of interest to the people is brought up.

Mr. BLAIKIE: Of course, we realise that the present Government believes in socialisation; but the members of my party believe in the people.

Government members: What!

Mr. BLAIKIE: Members opposite may laugh about it now, but we will see who will be laughing after the 1974 polls.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Yes, we will see.

Mr. BLAIKIE: The union officials have now directed their attention to owner-drivers. They have taken reprisals against those drivers at Bunbury by refusing the supply of fuel. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that unless a driver joins the union he is denied the supply of fuel, even though he be an owner-driver. In this context it is illegal under the Act for a self-employed person to become a member of a union.

Mr. Hartrey: To which Act are you referring?

Mr. BLAIKIE: If the honourable member has done the homework that I have he would know.

Mr. Hartrey: You are the one who is speaking on this matter.

Mr. BLAIKIE: To the same extent there are other transport operators operating from the Bunbury fuel depot who are employers of labour. We have, for instance, the employer who has several trucks. Such operators are also being blackmailed into joining the union, otherwise they are threatened with a denial of supplies. In fact this has happened. Even though such

operators engage employees who are, in fact, members of the T.W.U., the union is quite implicit that the owner-operator must also be a member of the union.

In this context we find that the livelihood of some people is being jeopardised by such action. One operator who has a trucking business, and who employs five drivers besides doing some of the work himself, has no objection to his employees being members of the T.W.U. if that is their desire, but he does object to becoming a member himself if he is not required to do so. He is carrying on a business and he is faced with this threat in the middle of the superphosphate carting season.

The fuel depot is centred at Bunbury which supplies south-west centres radiating from it. I would like to know what the Minister for Agriculture, in his role as the member for Warren, would do if electors in his area were denied the right of fuel supplies from Manjimup, simply because they were not members of this union and were not legally required to be members.

It is unfortunate that the member for Collie is not in the Chamber today, because I know there are people in the Collie district who have also been required to join the union under threat of reprisals if they did not.

Mr. T. D. Evans: They can take appropriate action under the Industrial Arbitration Act.

Mr. BLAIKIE: The Minister should wait until he hears what I have to say.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Answer it. The Lord helps those who help themselves!

Mr. BLAIKIE: What is happening is that membership of the union will give these people protection against the denial of supplies. If by way of court order the T.W.U. is allowed to do these things, what other form of reprisals could also be taken? This is a threat of a very serious nature which is disturbing a great many people.

Mr. Graham: How many?

Mr. O'Neill: If there were only one the number would be too many.

Mr. Graham: The Government has to stampede just because a single individual gets excited?

Mr. BLAIKIE: Right now a large number of people are affected.

Mr. Graham: This matter is so important that the Leader of the Opposition has left Perth!

Mr. O'Connor: The Minister handling this matter is not in the Chamber either.

Mr. Graham: Your leader is 100 miles away.

Mr. O'Connor: He had to fulfil an engagement which was made many days ago. You are being unfair in what you say.

Mr. BLAICKIE: In spite of the acts of reprisals these people are making a stand against the might and strength of the T.W.U. This morning by way of interjection when the member for Mt. Lawley was speaking the Deputy Premier said, "Let them stand up and be counted." They are standing up and they are prepared to be counted. I shall back them as far as I can, and I believe the Government also has an obligation to stand by them. There is now silence on the opposite benches!

What the union is doing is illegal. I believe the Government has an obligation to protect people against this form of intimidation. The unions have gained their strength in many sectors of this community by using intimidatory tactics. They have used the threat of reprisals and the threat of black bans. I could go on and on in this way. It is sickening to see what is happening in Western Australia, and this state of affairs is being perpetuated.

The Minister for Labour said he could not do anything, because these people were operating under a Federal award. I do not deny this. However, the people concerned are citizens of Western Australia, and in view of the intimidation, the threats, and reprisals, surely the Government has an obligation to give them some sort of protection. I fully support the amendment moved by the member for Mt. Lawley.

MR. HARTREY (Boulder-Dundas) [2.56 p.m.]: The amendment, in the form of an addendum to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply, has been totally ignored by the speakers on the opposite side of the House.

Mr. O'Neil: This is not a court of law.

Mr. HARTREY: I would remind the honourable member it is. This is the high court of Parliament, and that was why the Speaker wore a wig on opening day. It was to remind us of the simple fact that this is the legislative body of the State. This is the body which makes the laws, and at times it is necessary for us to interpret the laws. However, at all times it is our responsibility to carry out our duties in this House impartially, with honesty, and with a good deal of common sense. I shall show how much common sense members opposite have displayed.

Mr. O'Neil: All that solicitors can talk about are words and technicalities, and not principles.

Mr. HARTREY: I would like members opposite to tell me how much of the amendment to the motion which is the matter before the Chair has relationship to the speeches that have been made by them.

Point of Order

Mr. O'CONNOR: On a point of order, I think the member for Boulder-Dundas is reflecting on the Chair. He indicated that none of the speeches from this side have relevance to the matter before the Chair.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

Mr. HARTREY: At all events I shall refer to the text of the amendment. It is as follows—

That we view with concern the fact that the Government is not prepared to protect employees, employers, subcontractors, and members of the public against indiscriminate action, blackmail, intimidation, or undue influence by industrial unions or other organisations.

The Government is not prepared to protect various people; this is the charge that has been laid. In view of that one might reasonably expect that some of the arguments from the opposite side of the House would have some kind of relationship to the subject matter complained of. It was said quite freely by speakers who advocated this amendment that it would be sufficient if the Premier or the Minister for Labour were to get up and say, "I deplore the action of the Transport Workers' Union." Supposing either of them did that, would that protect "the employer, the employee, the subcontractor, or the member of the public" concerned? It would do nothing but create a lot of hot air in this House, and we have had quite sufficient of that from the Opposition in the course of the debate on this matter.

There are means of protecting any citizen who considers he has been done an injustice. There is the Police Act which makes it an offence to utter threatening words. There is also the section of that Act which makes it an offence to fight or to molest people. So if the burden of the complaint of the Opposition members is that somebody's personal rights, individual liberties, or anything of that kind have been violated there are legal processes in existence to ensure that those rights will be vindicated.

It is not the business of the Government to lay a charge against an alleged offender; it is the function of the accuser. If I were assaulted the Premier would not be expected to lay a charge. I would be expected to lay the charge myself—if I were not already in hospital. The point of the whole matter is that nothing this House or this Government could possibly do would have any effect on the rights of any allegedly aggrieved person. The Opposition has treated us to a stupid political exercise.

Mr. O'Connor: The member for Boulder-Dundas admits that the action taken by the unions was illegal?

Mr. HARTREY: Yes, I think that if it happened it was a conspiracy but there are laws which enable a person to take action—if the story is true. The member for East Melville complained that the unions have been judge, jury, and executioner in this matter. However, this is precisely the role which the Opposition has adopted. No evidence of what has happened has been quoted at all, except that the member for Darling Range mentioned—after the amendment was moved—a case in connection with which he was careful not to give any names. He did not identify anybody and in a court of law not the slightest bit of notice could be taken of what he said. The Opposition claims it is not judge and jury, but that seems to be the attitude it has adopted.

Mr. O'Neil: We have an example of a Minister not knowing what is happening in the industrial world. That is incompetence.

Mr. HARTREY: The amendment refers to the Government not protecting the public against indiscriminate action. Indiscriminate action is the sort we want. We do not want discriminatory action.

Mr. O'Connor: Perhaps the honourable member should amend my amendment.

Mr. HARTREY: The member for Mt. Lawley moved the amendment and I will simply vote against it and throw it out. We want indiscriminate action but the Opposition is condemning nondiscriminatory action. The Opposition also demands that not only the unions, but other organisations, have to be condemned. I would hate to think what would happen to them if the Employers' Federation were condemned by the Opposition.

Mr. O'Connor: If that organisation were condemned it would deserve to be condemned.

Mr. HARTREY: Everybody is not as rash and silly as that.

Mr. O'Connor: If that organisation used strong-arm tactics I would get into it too.

Mr. HARTREY: Well it does. The amendment refers to "industrial unions or other organisations". The amendment is to the effect that the Governor is to be informed that this Government has refused to take action against the Employers' Federation for indiscriminate action. As a matter of fact there is not the slightest evidence that the employers have anything to do with this argument at all. The member for Mt. Lawley has said that he will have a go at the Employers' Federation. However, I think that he should think before he speaks. If he had worked out what he intended before he moved the amendment he would have done a great deal better.

Mr. Bertram: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. L. Young: If we used that technique with some of your legislation you would be most critical.

Mr. HARTREY: It is the only technique to use. We are not here to propose and enact stupid legislation. If legislation is badly worded it is the job of the Opposition to propose alterations.

Mr. R. L. Young: The member for Boulder-Dundas is saying so many words. If certain legislation stated that some particular person could not do something, and without being specific the words, "or any other person" were added, could we attack that sort of amendment on the words alone? As the member for Boulder-Dundas knows very well, one has to cast a net and so does this amendment.

Mr. HARTREY: Perhaps I know better than the member for Wembley how narrow the net may be. If a clause in a lease instrument stated that a landlord could go into a building accompanied by clerks, architects and others, that would not mean that he could take in policemen and soldiers. He could simply take in people connected with clerks and architects.

I wish also to refer to the complete lack of any sort of evidence, worth talking about, which has been put forward in support of any of the allegations contained in the amendment. There has been none whatsoever. One member said that something had happened in Bunbury. I ask: How far would one get even in a J.P.'s court if one produced an argument such as that?

Mr. W. G. Young: You are a bit hard on the J.P.'s

Mr. HARTREY: Justice Virtue made some more severe criticism of them recently, and I agree with what he said. I really believe the Opposition should study amendments carefully before putting them forward. They should be certain that the amendment makes sense. On this occasion the amendment does not make sense.

Any amendment presented to this House should be supported by evidence, but there being on this occasion nothing fit to call evidence the amendment can be treated only with the utmost contempt.

MR. MENSAROS (Floreat) [3.07 p.m.]: I promise I will keep within the amendment according to Standing Orders, unlike my friend, the member for Boulder-Dundas, who has castigated speakers from this side of the House and who did not speak to the amendment at all.

It is significant that the Government is worried about the facts and arguments which have been brought forward. In fact, the Government felt so uncomfortable that it had to employ the services of its legal advocate to put its case. However, he did nothing other than try to

criticise the wording of the amendment and he went into the legal technicalities instead of trying to defend the inaction for which the Government is responsible. The honourable member submitted that the matters that count are only those which would be acceptable as valid evidence in a court of law.

The member for Darling Range and the member for Vasse have told us about situations which have occurred. According to the member for Boulder-Dundas those instances do not count at all because no names were mentioned. There is nothing unusual about not mentioning names. We have been told about the man who was not supplied with fuel. The reason, of course, is that the union runs a protection racket. The Deputy Premier said that unions exist to protect people. However, this serious sort of situation occurred in America with the Mafia.

The Minister for Labour rightly told us that some people are not entitled to join unions because they are self-employed. The unions are not chasing the membership of those people, but they want money so that they can put a ticket on the vehicles owned by these people. It is a protection racket.

As was mentioned by the member for Darling Range, a union threatened to blacklist a firm which supplies oil because the people who wished to pick up the oil in their trucks did not have a union ticket. With all due respect to the member for Boulder-Dundas, what point is there in going to court when a huge oil firm can be intimidated? Individuals have had their livelihood taken away from them because of threats. People are forced to join unions; otherwise they would not be protected by a sticker on their trucks.

The Minister rose to his feet and tried to explain that he was born only this morning. I respect his intelligence but he pretended that he did not understand the situation. He talked about legalities relating to the cases, and said that, as a Minister, he was not allowed to interfere with the court. Of course, he was put right by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. It is very important for the members of this House to understand the situation which is involved in the amendment, even though the words may be criticised by the member for Boulder-Dundas. This is what we are here to discuss.

Mr. R. L. Young: What would happen if the truck driver's name were made public in this place, as has been suggested?

Mr. MENSAROS: In connection with the previous amendment I made the remark that the difference between Liberal-Country Party Governments and Labor Governments is that the former governs for all the people of Australia whereas the latter—and especially the present Federal Govern-

ment—governs for its supporters only. I should add that the latter also governs for its masters, who are undoubtedly the industrial unions.

In supporting this motion I do not want to repeat the cases which have already been cited. I want to deal with the aspect of the amendment which relates to the undue influence of other organisations. I think the member for Boulder-Dundas will admit that the Government itself is undoubtedly an organisation.

Mr. Hartrey: Not in that context.

Mr. MENSAROS: I do not think I would be in order in discussing with the honourable member an interpretation of words. In the framework of this motion, the matter about which I am complaining and which I want to highlight was briefly touched on by the member for Darling Range; that is, the reported foreshadowed action by the Minister for Works, simply to ape his Federal colleague, the Federal Minister for Works. He was not very specific about it. When he was reported in the newspaper—

Mr. Jamieson: What has this to do with the amendment?

Mr. MENSAROS: I previously explained what it has to do with the amendment. It was reported on the 28th February that the Minister for Works wanted to take similar action in order to influence unduly—those are the words of the amendment—certain people—that is, the building industry—to give preference in contracts to those who, in the Federal Minister's nebulous explanation, were good friends of the unions, or to give preferential treatment to the unions, or something like that.

I submit that if organisations such as the Public Works Department—and the State Housing Commission, if it follows suit—embark on this sort of line it would do the gravest harm not only to the industry itself but also to the economy of the State. The Minister adopts the argument that this action is necessary because the so-called workers are underpaid and their conditions should be improved. If that were so, one could agree with him, but I submit with all respect that he is quite mistaken.

Before I go into that matter, let me say the building industry and its allied trades are amongst the most important industries in the State in that they employ roughly one-third of the people employed in secondary industry. If the foreshadowed actions of the Minister take place, they will have very grave consequences.

As the member for Darling Range said, the building industry is based on comparatively small entrepreneurs—the builders—and even smaller subcontractors who are mostly self-employed and who are the backbone of the industry. Apart perhaps from the rural people who own their own land, those people form the most responsible and important part of our community,

and although they are few in number they are working for some incentive and working for themselves; they are not working for money which is given irrespective of the quantity or quality of the work they do. I submit the very existence of those people will be threatened if rules and regulations such as those indicated by the Minister are laid down.

Mr. Jamieson: That is not so, of course. You are talking a lot of rubbish again, as you usually do. You only want to attack the unions every time you get up. That is the only reason you get up.

Mr. R. L. Young: It is just constructive criticism.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Jamieson: That is the only reason you get up on your feet—to attack the unions.

Mr. MENSAROS: I am waiting for the Minister to finish his remarks.

Mr. Jamieson: They earn you plenty of money.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MENSAROS: His remarks are no different from his usual remarks.

Mr. Jamieson: Nor are yours.

Mr. MENSAROS: He is not prepared to listen to the argument. I submit that his reported reasons do not stand up at all. I give one example. There has recently been a lot of talk about the bricklaying trade. A normal bricklaying team — which on cottage work usually consists of two bricklayers and one labourer — if they are any good at all and worthy to be called bricklayers in a five-day week of 40 hours would lay about 1,500 bricks a day, which amounts to about 7,500 bricks a week. Under the present rates the team will receive \$60 for each 1,000 bricks laid, which would amount to \$450 a week, out of which the labourer will be paid \$100, which is far above the award rate. The bricklayers are left with \$350, and a generous estimate of their overheads would be \$30 a week, because nowadays bricklayers have virtually no tools to carry and such tools as they have last them for a long time. Of course, they have transport, but so does every other employee.

Mr. Taylor: They provide their own scaffolding and equipment.

Mr. MENSAROS: They do not. It is a fact that the builder almost invariably supplies the scaffolding. If a builder did not provide the scaffolding I do not think he would get a bricklaying team to work for him, or if he did he would have to pay them more. Bricklayers used to supply such things as drums and planks in the old days but they do not do so now.

In the example I have given, a sum of \$320 a week is left for two skilled men, and I submit that \$160 a week is far above the award rate — in fact, almost double the award rate.

Mr. Jamieson: You might go on to explain why so many of them leave the industry if it is so good.

Mr. MENSAROS: Unfortunately, it happens all the time in the building trade because it is one of the shakiest trades in view of the ups and downs of the economy which invariably occur in a State such as Western Australia which has a small population. When times are bad, many skilled men leave the building trade and become salesmen or go to other States, and very few if any of them come back; but this situation cannot be changed by making them employees.

However, to return to my subject: if this situation were changed and the team of two bricklayers and one labourer became employed under the present awards—suppose the bricklayers each received \$100 a week and the labourer \$80 a week, which is very much above the award—they would earn much less per week and, of course, although I cannot prove it, practical experience points to the fact that they would lay no more than about 3,000 or at the most 4,000 bricks per week. This would result because they would have no incentive; and, of course, the union supervisor, steward, or whatever he is called, would incite them not to work hard. That is the job of a union supervisor: to incite people not to work hard.

Mr. Jamieson: That is not the job of a union supervisor, and you know it. That is nonsense. What a lot of rubbish!

Mr. MENSAROS: Would the Minister say that union representatives have ever incited people, as a general rule, to work harder?

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, I would.

Mr. MENSAROS: Would the Minister give one instance of a union organiser ever inciting people to work harder and to produce more?

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, I would, and in recent times.

Mr. MENSAROS: Well, I have plenty of time at my disposal. I will pause to let the Minister tell us the instance.

Mr. Jamieson: I refer to the Kelmscott School when some men were sitting around with nothing to do and they appealed to me to obtain material for the job so that they would have something to do.

Mr. MENSAROS: I am not talking about not having work in relation to material; I am talking about working harder. I was not referring to men sitting around loafing.

If the undue influence mentioned in the amendment to the Address-in-Reply motion continues, then in the example I gave the simple result would be that the public would pay twice as much for the work, possibly the work would be of a lower standard, and of course the quantity of work would be less.

Mr. Jamieson: Does this happen in any of the metal trades?

Mr. MENSAROS: This could result in overtime being worked which, in turn, would make the job even dearer. All in all, this endeavour which purely and simply serves the interests of the unions, has no other purpose whatsoever; because I have already demolished the argument that the workers would be better paid. In fact, they would not be paid as much and this, in turn, would affect the economy.

However, if the Minister is so sure about his argument I suggest to him—as has been suggested in connection with the matter of police control of traffic—that he hold a referendum of those subcontractors who are concerned. He should go to them and ask them whether they would rather be in the position in which they are at present, where they are their own bosses, where they control their own futures, and where they have an incentive to work; or whether they would rather be employed on lower wages and loaf around. I predict that the result would be 90:10 in favour of retaining the present situation, and I do not think anyone who has any practical knowledge would contradict me.

Mr. Jamieson: I would contradict you straightaway. You go and talk to the men for a change instead of talking rubbish and nonsense.

Mr. MENSAROS: It is very hard to argue with the Minister for Works when his every second word is “nonsense” or “rubbish”.

Mr. Jamieson: When did you last talk to the tradesmen on this issue?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MENSAROS: In answer to the Minister I would say that I did just that straight after lunch.

Mr. Jamieson: They would be “yes” men. You come with me to see them and see how you get on.

Mr. MENSAROS: The people I saw are a very competent group.

Mr. Jamieson: “Yes, Mr. Mensaros; no, Mr. Mensaros!”

Mr. O’Neil: He is muttering in his beard again.

Mr. Jamieson: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is again usurping the seat of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MENSAROS: I point out that whilst I do not wish to hold up the proceedings of the House and will not use up my 45 minutes, I am quite prepared to listen to what the Minister has to say.

Another matter projects itself into the question; that is, if subcontractors were pushed out of the field it would create nothing less than that which those on the opposite side always deplore—a monopolistic situation controlled by so-called capitalists. No small builder would be

able and willing to obtain direct labour exclusively. Therefore, the only way in which Government contracts could be handled would be for the Government to align itself with huge builders who have tremendous staffs and to say to them, “If you employ subcontractors instead of direct labour then you can have the job.” One can imagine what sort of graft that would lead to.

Then, of course, the next step—and this was tried by the previous Labor Government and it failed miserably—would be an attempt to have 100 per cent. day labour. I do not think I need to mention that matter. Even those who have only a vague memory of what occurred previously will realise it was a failure.

I could go on to give many more examples, and many have already been given by other speakers during the debate. I do not wish to indulge in repetition. We have sunk so low in this State that we have arrived at a situation where we have a Mafia-like protection racket in connection with unions and the Government does not do anything about it. For that reason I think the amendment to the motion is more than justified.

MR. W. G. YOUNG (Roe) [3.26 p.m.]: I rise to support the amendment and I hope I will be able to confine my remarks to it.

Mr. Jamieson: It will be a change if you do.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: I wish to point out to the Government that the amendment refers to protecting the public against indiscriminate action, blackmail, intimidation, or undue influence by industrial unions.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Do you go along with “indiscriminate action”?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: Yes, I agree with that part of the amendment. The Government made great play this morning of the fact that the amendment was dreamed up overnight and that nobody knew anything about it prior to a telephone call coming from a country area. I would like to point out to the Government that as far back as the 13th September last year the Noise Abatement Bill was introduced into this Chamber. When it went to another place the unions threatened to ban the movement of grain and wool throughout country areas if Country Party members did not support certain clauses. To substantiate my argument I will quote from *The West Australian* of the 16th November a statement made by the President of the Pastoralists and Graziers Association as follows—

There has been an angry reaction to a union threat to put a black ban on the movement of wheat and wool in W.A. if Country Party M.P.s. vote to delete sections of the Noise Abatement Bill.

The Minister said this morning that the matter had arisen on Tuesday night. I say it started at least some five months ago.

Mr. Graham: This is the sort of thing the doctors are doing to the Federal Government.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: What the doctors are doing to the Federal Government has no relevance to the amendment we are discussing today. We are at present discussing what the unions are doing. To refer again to the Press report, my colleague, the member for Narrogin, asked the Premier in this Chamber—the Press report is dated the 16th November, so I presume it was on the 15th November—if he had seen a report of the threat and whether he intended to take any action. The Premier replied that he had not seen the report and asked for the question to be placed on the notice paper.

I have not a copy of the Premier's subsequent answer, but it is not important because it is obvious that this type of intimidation has been occurring throughout the nation for some months. That was a direct intimidatory attack on members of the Country Party in the Legislative Council, threatening that if they opposed the Bill the produce would remain on the farms.

If that is not an attack by the union in a political field I do not know what is. I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition pointed out that unions looked after their members. Most farmers are self-employed, and they are not in a position to join unions. They do not have a union to join.

Mr. T. D. Evans: What then is the Farmers' Union?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: It is not a union with compulsory membership, and I am proud of that fact. We do not force our members into compulsory unionism.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You have been trying to advocate that.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: We have not. If the Minister were to attend a meeting of the Farmers' Union he would get the shock of his life. I refer to a report which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 11th November in which the following appeared—

A meeting of railway workers at Midland yesterday asked the Amalgamated Metal Workers' Union and other unions to call a general stoppage

Through that action everybody in this State would be held to ransom unless the members of another place did what the unions wanted. If that is not intimidation of the general public by a selected band of unionists then I do not know what is. They were prepared to bring about a stoppage of all activity in the State and

to hold the people up to ransom, unless their political philosophy was agreed to by another place.

The member for Vasse has referred to a meeting calling for a stoppage of work in protest against the shipment of meat to America. That was a case in which the unions decided to show their strength. They were prepared to ban these shipments because of the political philosophy entertained by the Government at that time.

More recently they have been threatening the income of the members of the public through blackmail and intimidation. This is that section of the community which derives its income from the production of meat.

I now refer to a report in the *Daily News* of the 23rd February under the heading of "Wharfies ban export of meat" in which the following appeared—

Sydney, Today: Waterside workers today refused to load 3,000 tons of America-bound meat because of high local prices.

What do the unions know about the type of meat that was being shipped to America? I can tell them that this is the type of meat used in hamburgers and that kind of foodstuff. If that meat were offered for sale in Sydney these very people would not buy it. It was not the export of this meat that was forcing up the local price; the increase in price was brought about by a shortage of the type of meat that is consumed in Australia.

I now refer to a report which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 10th March, under the heading, "Unions may ban meat exports" which states—

Maritime unions at Fremantle warned yesterday that they might ban the export of live sheep from the port if high meat prices in W.A. continued.

The secretary of the Fremantle branch of the Waterside Workers' Federation, Mr. L. F. Quelch, said that the unions were seriously concerned at steep increases in the cost of food in the past few weeks, especially meat.

More than 488,000 live sheep, valued at about \$3,202,000, were shipped from Fremantle in the 12 months to June, 30 last year. The unions felt that unless the parties concerned made some effort to lower local meat prices they would have to consider banning shipments of sheep from Fremantle.

Do these union members know what type of sheep was being shipped?

Mr. O'Neil: They would not be prepared to eat that meat.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: That is the answer I am looking for. These are wethers which when dressed are over 65 lb., and this is not the type of meat that is sold on the local market. Despite this the unions threatened to ban the shipment of any meat out of Western Australia.

This is a direct attack on the producers who are producing this type of wether, and the unions are attacking them just because the price of lamb and baby beef is high. I ask the unions concerned, "Do their members live on mutton?" I suggest the unions do not know what they are doing. They are using strong-arm and intimidatory tactics to ensure that their image is kept before the public while the rest of the community is held to ransom.

Mr. Bertram: That is the business of the unions.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: I always understood that the duties of a union are to safeguard the wages, the conditions of work, the hours, etc. of its members.

Mr. Bertram: They have to protect wages by keeping prices down.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: If the honourable member had been listening and if he knew anything about the meat trade he would realise this had nothing to do with the local consumption of meat.

Mr. Bertram: The unions thought otherwise.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: If the honourable member and the unions had done their homework they would understand the position, and there would not then be any need for this type of threat being made. Such threats are viewed with a great deal of concern in country districts.

This is a specialised trade, and these producers are dependent on the export wether markets. If this ban is put into effect it will not affect the wages of the workers, but it will put some farmers out of business. What I am attempting to do is protect some sections of the community and the members of the public. We on this side of the House think that farmers are also members of the public although members opposite might not think so.

Mr. Bertram: The vote of farmers is equal to two votes of the general public.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: Sometimes it is.

Mr. Bertram: That is the position under the Electoral Districts Act.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: I have made my point. I support the amendment, because it is obvious the Government considers this is a matter which has blown up overnight. In fact, it was brought before the notice of the Premier through a question asked as far back as November last. I do not know what action he has taken, but whatever action has been taken has had no effect on the unions. As usual, the unions are going on their own sweet way. The only instructions the Government takes notice of are the instructions from the unions to the Government, and not the instructions from the Government to the unions.

MR. A. A. LEWIS (Blackwood) [3.37 p.m.]: I merely pick out one point from the speech made by the member for Boulder-Dundas, and that is his use of the word "responsibility". That is the only worth-while word which came out of his contribution; the rest of it comprised legal jargon and drivel.

Mr. Jamieson: That is what is coming from the opposite side now.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: Having made that interjection I hope the Minister will sit back and listen.

Mr. Jamieson: You will be given all the protection that is required.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: I am not looking for protection.

Mr. Jamieson: You were.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: The Minister is a little man who is not prepared to hear the truth.

Mr. Jamieson: You are not prepared to listen to the truth.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: The day that the Minister comes forward and stands up for people and individuals will be a red letter day.

Mr. Jamieson: There will always be that day.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: The Minister should not utter such drivel. We do not want to hear it. We want to hear facts, and we want to look after the people.

Mr. Jamieson: We look after individuals. You would not know what an individual was.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: At least there is one man on my side.

Mr. O'Connor: We do not want to have to pay protection money.

Mr. Brady: Country people get two votes as against one vote given to metropolitan people.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: The fact is that an owner-driver can be asked to join the union. This morning we heard some reference from the opposite side about scabs. What happens when these people are called out on strike? Do they scab against themselves? How ridiculous this is! Let us think about the welfare of the people.

Mr. Jamieson: It is a pity that you do not do this occasionally.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: Only one class of person has been discriminated against by the union, so let us stick up for them. The rights of these people are just as important as our rights.

Mr. Graham: Including the rights of unionists.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: I am still a member of a union, and not the Farmers' Union either. I am a member of a union of workers. My hands are still fairly horny

from the hard physical work I have done; and that is more than I can say about some members around the Chamber. They should put up their hands and have a look at them. I ask members opposite: When did they last use a pick and shovel? They do not believe in having a go. I believe in people.

Mr. O'Connor: Belt them into the ground.

Mr. Graham: Where did you get him?

Mr. Jamieson: Out of a bear pit.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: They dragged me out from the labour gang!

Mr. T. D. Evans: Were you doing hard labour? Are you on parole?

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: I feel extremely sorry for the Minister for Labour because he has a sense of responsibility and wanted to rise to his feet and tell us that he would like to protect every person in this State. However, he is not allowed to do so. He hedged around but could not say that he would like to look into this matter and protect the individuals. He did not say that, but waffled and said it was not his responsibility.

I say it is the responsibility of every member in this House to look after every individual in this State if at all possible. I remind members of the Government of this fact. The member for Boulder-Dundas did a certain amount of legal "nit-picking" but I remind members opposite that the responsibility is theirs.

Mr. Hartrey: Quite right.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: The member for Boulder-Dundas sometimes reminds me of an old woman. He should not always get up and give us the legal angle, but give us some common sense. We do not want to get down to the standard of the Government.

Mr. Jamieson: Big, brave man.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: Do I hear the little fellow again with his intimidation?

Mr. Jamieson: Go back to your bear pit.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: I am a bit too big to be intimidated. The Minister can interject and scream as much as he likes but any time he wants to intimidate me let him come and stand beside me.

Mr. Jamieson: He is not afraid of you, either.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. R. L. Young: The Minister would simply tell the honourable member to shut up.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: It might not be a bad idea for him to shut up because he has not yet grasped the point that he has a responsibility to the Government of this State.

Mr. Jamieson: He knows his responsibilities.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: Has the Minister, or his Government, a responsibility to the citizens of this State?

Mr. Jamieson: Of course I have, in the same way as everybody in this House.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: Well, recognise it.

Mr. Jamieson: I do.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: Get up and say so.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Jamieson: I will still be here when you are sitting down.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: Do not try to shout me down; I have been in the bush for a long time. No man, woman, or child in this State should be intimidated. Members of the front bench on the Government side should stand up and say that they believe in the right of every individual to live in this State without recrimination of any kind against him. It is all very well for the Minister to sit back and interject, but every member in this House should support the amendment.

The member for Boulder-Dundas does not understand the situation. I deplore people who sit and snipe, and who are not prepared to stand up for the individuals of this State.

Mr. Jamieson: They should put a ticket on you.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: The Minister has said that he believes in the rights of the individual, but it took him 10 minutes to admit it.

Mr. R. L. Young: He has not admitted it previously in a period of 22 years.

Mr. A. A. LEWIS: It seems that at least I have done something in this House! Members in this Chamber have talked about responsibility. They should come forward, reveal their true colours, and show that they have a responsibility. *Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.05 pm.*

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—19

Mr. Blaikie	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Coyne	Mr. O'Connor
Dr. Dadour	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Ridge
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Thompson
Mr. A. A. Lewis	Mr. R. L. Young
Mr. E. H. M. Lewis	Mr. W. G. Young
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. J. W. Manning
Mr. Mensaros	

(Teller)

Noes—19

Mr. Bertram	Mr. Hartrey
Mr. Brady	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Bryce	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Burke	Mr. McIver
Mr. Cook	Mr. Moller
Mr. Davies	Mr. Sewell
Mr. H. D. Evans	Mr. Taylor
Mr. T. D. Evans	Mr. J. T. Tonkin
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Harman
Mr. Graham	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Sir David Brand	Mr. Bickerton
Sir Charles Court	Mr. Jones
Mr. Ruatton	Mr. A. R. Tonkin
Mr. McPharlin	Mr. May

The SPEAKER: The voting being equal, 2.
I give my casting vote with the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate adjourned until a later stage of the sitting, on motion by Mr. Harman.

(Continued on page 248)

QUESTIONS (42): ON NOTICE

1. PRICES CONTROL

Goods at Supermarkets

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

In view of the fact that at a public meeting recently held in Bunbury the Premier referred to excessive price rises on items sold by supermarkets, will he indicate specifically the items his Government would consider controlling under any price control legislation?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

The question should, more appropriately, have been addressed to me and I propose to answer it.

The statement referred to was a quotation from a report which appeared in *The West Australian* of 5th February, 1971 and which read as follows:—

"Rising prices in the past few months are worrying some Perth grocers and supermarket managers. Some of them say that prices are now rising so fast that they can only just keep up with the labelling problem. An article in the Associated Grocers Limited monthly journal said that there had been more price adjustments in the past few months than at any previous time . . . The manager of a suburban supermarket said he was receiving notifications of price increases from firms at the rate of 10-15 a day."

As the situation has worsened considerably since 1971, surely it is obvious that control, to be effective, should not be limited to a few specific items, and it is necessary to have the power to cause manufacturers and retailers to justify prices being charged.

I would like to add that it has been brought to my notice that the Leader of the Opposition, in Bunbury, has been endeavouring to infer from my statement, which was a quotation only, that I referred to the traders in Bunbury. I say, without the slightest hesitation, this is a despicable action on his part.

Mr. Graham: Typical!

TRAFFIC CONTROL

Report of Superintendent Monck

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

- (1) Will he table the recommendation by Superintendent Monck to the Government resulting from the superintendent's overseas traffic inquiry?
- (2) Which of the recommendations has the Government—
 - (a) approved;
 - (b) under consideration?
- (3) Will he present equated statistics of traffic fatalities and accidents between Western Australia, Australia, New Zealand and Sweden for as many of the last four years for which these figures are held?
- (4) Does he know if the police forces of New Zealand and Sweden are responsible for traffic control?
- (5) Has his department copies of Swedish and New Zealand traffic control legislation and regulations, and, if so, will he table them?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) Superintendent Monck's general and principal recommendations are too bulky and do not lend themselves to reproduction for tabling in the normal way. However, they will be made available to individual Members as desired.
 - (2) (a) The general recommendations consisting of matters of interest were approved by Cabinet for distribution to the departments and bodies concerned.
 - (b) The principal recommendations relating to vehicle inspection stations and allied matters were referred, by Cabinet, to the Minister for Traffic Safety, who has set up a special committee to deal with the matter.
- The special committee has recommended that these principal recommendations be investigated in more detail by the proposed Department of Motor Vehicles.
- (3) This information is not readily available but will be supplied to the Member when to hand.
 - (4) It is understood that traffic on main roads in New Zealand is controlled by officers of the Transport Board, a Government body. Traffic in cities and towns is under the control of the city or shire councils. All serious injury or fatal traffic accidents are attended by the police.

In Sweden, the highway police control all autobahns (main highways) and the Kanton, or shire police, control the towns' minor road systems.

(5) No.

3. TRAFFIC

Fatal Accidents: Factors Involved

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

How many of this year's fatal accidents have involved—

- (a) single vehicles;
- (b) motor cycles;
- (c) alcohol;
- (d) country domiciled drivers in—
 - (i) country accidents;
 - (ii) metropolitan accidents?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (a) 55,
- (b) 7,
- (c) 44,
- (d) (i) 54,
- (ii) 3.

4. TOWN PLANNING

Land Exchange: Armadale and Kelmscott

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) Has the M.R.P.A. agreed to exchange reserve land at Armadale for reserve land in Connell Avenue, Kelmscott?
- (2) Is the authority aware the shire wishes to make the Armadale land available to the Armadale-Kelmscott Historical Society to establish a historical museum for the shire?
- (3) When is the title for the Armadale land expected to be made available to the shire?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The authority understands that part of the land may be used by the Historical Society.
- (3) As soon as transfers in relation to the widening of Albany Highway have been completed. These are currently being prepared by the Crown Law Department following the completion of survey work.

5. KELMSCOTT SCHOOL

Improvements

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) As it is very necessary to have the resurfacing complete before winter of the assembly and play

area at Kelmscott primary school, when is this work expected to be commenced and finished?

- (2) When will the new entry and access road and scheduled fencing for the school be installed?
- (3) Is the demolished fence between the church and cemetery and the school to be replaced at the same time as works listed in (2)?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) The Public Works Department is further examining the bitumen area with a view to bringing it to an acceptable standard before winter.
- (2) This work is listed for 1973-74.
- (3) No, the fence will be replaced within the next six weeks.

6. SCHOOLS

Commencing Time after 9.00 a.m.

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What schools in the metropolitan area commence the school day after 9.00 a.m. and when do these schools start?
- (2) Is this later starting time due to availability of public transport?
- (3) Are initiatives being taken with the transport services towards eliminating late starts?
- (4) What is the departmental attitude and policy on the starting time of schools?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Generally, pupils at primary schools are within walking distance and thus not affected by public transport.

In secondary schools transport is involved and starting times are often later than 9 a.m. The following are examples—

Balcatta	9.10 a.m.
Bentley	9.15 a.m.
Cannington	9.05 a.m.
Carine	9.20 a.m.
Churchlands	9.20 a.m.
City Beach	9.10 a.m.
Cyril Jackson	9.10 a.m.
Hampton	9.10 a.m.
Hollywood	9.15 a.m.
John Forrest	9.10 a.m.
Kalamunda	9.05 a.m.
Kelmscott	9.20 a.m.
Morley	9.05 a.m.
Rockingham	9.10 a.m.
Rossmoyn	9.05 a.m.
Swanbourne	9.10 a.m.
Thornlie	9.20 a.m.

(2) Yes.

- (3) The starting times are determined after consultation with the M.T.T. so that schools and the trust can work to mutual advantage.

- (4) The Education Department's attitude and policy with respect to the starting times of schools is one of co-operation with the M.T.T. provided that the efficiency of the schools is not impaired. There is no evidence that a later start is detrimental.

7. MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Invitations to Public Functions

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is it still the policy of his department to invite Members of Parliament representing the area to public functions such as openings or nurses graduation?
- (2) If it is, why is it not practised in the Floreat electorate?
- (3) If the policy has changed, can he give reasons for this?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) to (3) There has been no change of policy, as far as I am concerned, from that applied by the previous Government. If the Member has any specific complaint and will say so, it will be looked into.

8. WESTERN AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Student Protests: Use of Violence

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has he read the article entitled "Student Protest: The Success of Violence" in the W.A.I.T. December, 1972 Gazette?
- (2) If so, does he agree with the expressed and implied invitation to the use of violence in a democratic society as a means to achieve an end?
- (3) If he does not agree, will he take any steps—notwithstanding that the W.A.I.T. is an autonomous body—by way of his influence to prevent such articles being printed in the future which affect youth in an undesirable way?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) to (3) The article referred to is a reported one on views expressed by the President of the Australian Union of Students in his speech at the final lecture of the W.A.I.T. community lecture series.

It is not the role of a democratic government to restrict the publication of such items whether they conflict with another person's views or not. The W.A.I.T. is an autonomous body and no doubt well qualified and capable of

deciding upon the content of their publication without political influence.

All printed material is of course subject to existing laws relating to defamation, violence, disorderly conduct, and indecent publication.

9.

LAW REFORM COMMISSION ACT

Proclamation

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Attorney-General:

- (1) Has the Law Reform Commission Act been proclaimed?
- (2) If so, when?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) 19th January, 1973.
- (3) Not applicable.

10. ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX

Effect of Abolition

Mr. W. A. MANNING, to the Premier:

Is it a fact that if road maintenance tax is abolished the Government proposes to restrict the use of trucks on the roads and raise rail freights in order to raise a similar amount of revenue?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

No. This guess is wide of the mark.

11.

LIQUOR ACT

Charges

Mr. W. A. MANNING, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

How many charges have been laid under section 126 (1) (d) of the Liquor Act in the years 1969 to 1972 and in the months since June, 1972?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

The Liquor Act came into force on 1st July, 1970. Control was previously vested in the Licensing Act 1911-1967 under section 141. Three charges were laid under this section between 1st July, 1969 and 30th June, 1970 and three convictions were obtained.

One charge has been laid under section 126 (1) (d) of the Liquor Act 1970-1972 from 1st July, 1970 to date and this was dismissed.

12.

JURY SERVICE

Refusal by Females

Mr. BATEMAN, to the Attorney-General:

- (1) Is it a fact that when females are called upon for jury service they may if they so desire refuse this duty?

- (2) If (1) is "Yes", does the same apply to males?
 (3) If not, can he give reasons?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Section 5 (2) of the Juries Act, 1957-1961 provides that a woman may cancel her liability to serve as a juror.

Exempted persons, both male and female, qualified under section 6 (1) are described in the second schedule.

In accordance with sections 27 and 32, males may be excused from jury service.

- (2) and (3) Answered above.

13. WATER SUPPLIES

Broome

Mr. RIDGE, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What was the cause of the water supply failure in Broome which resulted in the closure of the Christian Brothers College on 3rd March?
 (2) How many bores supply the town's water requirements?
 (3) Are all of the bores in operating condition?
 (4) Is it likely that the commencement of the cattle killing season and the subsequent heavy draw on the town water supply by the meatworks will have an adverse effect on the supply to any areas in Broome?
 (5) What plans does his department have for the provision of additional bores and improved pumping or reticulation facilities so as to ensure there is not a repetition of the recent situation?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) A pump failure damaged a bore.
 (2) Five.
 (3) No.
 (4) Arrangements have been made with a drilling contractor in the area to drill a new bore before the start of the cattle killing season at the meatworks.
 (5) It is proposed to drill and equip additional bores this financial year.

14. POLICE

Halls Creek: Accommodation

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

- (1) What number of police charges were heard at Halls Creek during the 12 months ended—
 (a) 31st December, 1970;
 (b) 31st December, 1971;
 (c) 31st December, 1972?

- (2) Is it a fact that the charges have been heard in the police station office which accommodates two officers and measures approximately 12 feet by 14 feet, including the space which is set aside for the public?

- (3) On what date will the Halls Creek police assume traffic control and vehicle licensing responsibilities?
 (4) What extra staff will be provided?
 (5) When is it intended to extend the office accommodation at the Halls Creek police station?
 (6) What is the nature of the proposed extensions and will air-conditioning be incorporated?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) The number of charges are not readily available but will be supplied to the Member when to hand. However, for the years ended 31st December, the following arrests were made:

1970	168
1971	320
1972	519.

- (2) Yes. When necessary shire offices are used.
 (3) Traffic control was taken over on 1st January, 1973. Vehicle licensing to be taken over on 1st April, 1973.
 (4) One female clerk.
 (5) Very soon. A tender has been accepted.
 (6) Extra office and store room space, female toilet facilities, and vehicle examination facilities. No air-conditioning to be incorporated. Halls Creek Police Station is in the zone for air-conditioning and this is expected to be provided in the near future.

15.

COURTHOUSE

Halls Creek

Mr. RIDGE, to the Attorney-General:

In consideration of the high number of court cases which are heard at Halls Creek in a totally inadequate building, will he advise when it is intended to build a courthouse in the town?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

Plans have been approved for the construction of a court on the site of the Halls Creek Police Station. The Public Works Department has been requested to put the work in hand as soon as possible.

16. *This question was postponed.*

17. WATER SUPPLIES

Wickepin-Merredin Pipeline

Mr. GAYFER, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Has a survey been made by the Public Works Department for a pipeline to connect Wickepin and Merredin?
- (2) What diameter pipe is proposed?
- (3) What is the total length of connection envisaged to be?
- (4) How much is the proposal envisaged to cost?
- (5) Will he table a plan of the proposed route?
- (6) Has the plan been approved?
- (7) If so, when will construction commence?
- (8) If the plan has not been approved, why not?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) Preliminary surveys are in course for a pipeline route between Wickepin and Merredin.
- (2) The proposal to construct a pipeline from Wickepin to Merredin has only reached the early planning stage and no pipeline size has been determined.
- (3) The length of the pipeline route being investigated between Wickepin and Merredin is approximately 110 miles.
- (4) to (8) Answered by (2).

18. EDUCATION

Boarding-away-from-home Allowance: Means Test

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

- (1) With respect to the Prime Minister's statement (*The West Australian* 17th January, 1973) that children who do not have daily access to a suitable Government school would be given \$350 free of means test towards boarding away costs, will this be in addition to the boarding allowance paid by this State to similar children irrespective of whether attending Government or non-Government school?
- (2) With respect to the same Press statement will the additional \$350 per year, subject to a means test and the further sum of \$304 for clothing, books and general needs in cases of particular hardship be in addition to assistance provided by the State?
- (3) What means test as in (2) will be applied?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) The Commonwealth allowances will replace those previously provided by the State Government.
- (3) The means test will be operated by the Commonwealth Department of Education and provides that the maximum additional allowance of \$350 will be paid where the adjusted family income does not exceed \$4,200 and will be reduced thereafter at the rate of \$1 for every \$5 by which the adjusted family income exceeds \$4,200. The adjusted family income is calculated by deducting \$450 for each dependent child other than the scholar from the parents' gross income.

19. PRESCHOOL EDUCATION

Scholarships for Trainee Teachers

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

With respect to the Prime Minister's statement (*The West Australian* 17th January) that special scholarships would be available this year for students to train as pre-school teachers and including an allowance of \$800 for students living at home and \$1,300 for those living away from home, how do these allowances compare with student teachers' allowances in our teachers colleges?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

Teachers' college allowances

	Under 21 years	21 years
	\$	\$
1st and 2nd year	963	1242
3rd year	1140	1242
4th year	1285	1285
Living away from home allowance	—\$320 in addition to above.	

20. ABORIGINES

Warburton and Jigalong: Economic Independence

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

What plans are there to "help the Aborigines at Warburton and Jigalong to become economically independent" as envisaged by the Commonwealth Minister for Aboriginal Affairs in *The West Australian* of 5th February, 1973?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

The Commonwealth Government has made available \$305,194 for Warburton Ranges and \$155,000 for Jigalong.

Action has been instituted to incorporate the Aboriginal communities at each centre as part of

overall community development programmes and to provide them with expert advice and support.

It is envisaged that the communities will conduct the local stores and other service activities. In addition, plans are being formulated for the development of a tourist industry based on the Warburton Ranges and for further development of the existing cattle project at Jigalong.

Other economic possibilities are being investigated and will be developed if and when their feasibility is established.

21. COMPREHENSIVE WATER SUPPLY SCHEME

Boundaries and Areas Served

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Will he make available a map showing—
 - (a) the boundaries of the original comprehensive water scheme;
 - (b) the boundaries of the modified scheme;
 - (c) the areas of (a) and (b) already or in the course of being reticulated;
 - (d) the areas of (a) or (b) which are the subject of the next phase of development within the scheme?
- (2) Outside of "local schemes" have any areas outside of (1) (a) and (b) been reticulated; if so, which are those areas?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) (a) to (c) Yes, plan herewith tabled.
 - (d) Not yet known. The 1968 proposals, shown on the tabled plan in yellow, have been refused by the Commonwealth Government.
 - (2) Yes. Kalannie district, North Koorda, North Bencubbin and Wilgoyno area.
- The tabled plan illustrates the position.

The plan was tabled (see paper No. 66).

22. UNEMPLOYMENT

Grants to Local Authorities

Mr. MOILER, to the Premier:

Since the inception of the State Government's \$1 million scheme to grant financial aid to metropolitan local authorities for the relief of unemployment—

- (a) how much has been allocated to the Shires of Swan, Mundaring and Kalamunda;

- (b) for what works were the allocations made;
- (c) how much was allocated to the three shires under a similar scheme for the non-metropolitan area with finance provided by the Commonwealth;
- (d) for what works were the allocations referred to in (c) made in the respective shires?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

	\$
(a) Shire of Swan	44,000
Shire of Mundaring	19,000
Shire of Kalamunda	40,000

- (b) Shire of Swan — Construction of concrete slab footpaths; stone pitching Lille Hill Park; employment of attendant for landfill refuse disposal area; maintenance of roads, reserves and installations; repair and paint bridge rails and posts, guide and sign posts.

Shire of Mundaring — Improvements to drainage schemes Swan View, Darling-ton and Greenmount areas.

Shire of Kalamunda — Construction of concrete slab footpaths; stormwater drainage; maintenance, alterations and extensions to public buildings.

	\$
(c) Shire of Swan	20,700
Shire of Mundaring	17,000
Shire of Kalamunda	Nil

- (d) Shire of Swan — Removal of dead timber and re-growth from drains and road verges; construction of concrete slab footpaths; erection of fences and clearing existing fence lines; clean up in district generally. Shire of Mundaring— Construction of timber jetty and stone quay, de-snagging, pruning and general maintenance at Lake Leschenaultia; construction of fencing, seating, barbecue and planting trees and lawns at various parks and reserves; top-dressing of reserves, clean up roadside verges, provision of bins and construction of kerbing.

23.

MIDLAND JUNCTION ABATTOIR BOARD

Members

Mr. MOILER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Who are the present members of the Midland Junction Abattoir Board?

- (2) Whom do they represent?
- (3) When do their terms expire?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Mr. E. H. Wheatley,
Mr. W. Pope,
Mr. R. C. T. Davies.
- (2) Mr. Wheatley represents the interests of consumers of meat; Mr. Pope the interests of butchers; and Mr. Davies the interests of producers of meat.
- (3) 9th April, 1973.

24. WATER SUPPLIES

Hills Area: Expenditure on Upgrading

Mr. MOILER, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What was the total expenditure by the Metropolitan Water Board for the upgrading and extension of water supply to the hills area incorporating Mundaring and Kalamunda, during the fiscal year 1971-72?
- (2) What will be the total expenditure in the same area for the fiscal year 1972-73?
- (3) Would he itemise the works on which the expenditure has been made?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

- (1) \$682,170.
- (2) \$700,000.
- (3) Replacement of tube mains.
Gooseberry Hill tank.
Kalamunda—extension and replacement of 10 in. main.
Kalamunda—replacement of tank roof.
Lesmurdie—summit tank.
Darlington tank.
Darlington high level 12 in. outlet.
Lesmurdie 21 in. outlet main.
Gooseberry Hill 8 in. Noel road main.
Bickley and Victoria reservoirs—supplementary pumping.
Bickley pumping station.

25. COMMONWEALTH GRANTS

1962 to 1973

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Treasurer:

Will he tabulate the dates and amounts of general revenue and loan grants (i.e., other than those for specific purposes based on section 96 of the Constitution) which were received by the State from the Commonwealth during each financial year from 1962-63 to and including 1972-73 up to now—in addition to the yearly general grants?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

Full details of Commonwealth grants and loans to Western Australia are set out in the publication "Commonwealth Payments to or for the States" copies of which may be obtained from the Parliamentary Library. In addition to a tabulation of grants and loans payable each year, the publication also provides information on the purpose of the grants and any conditions that may apply.

26. TRAFFIC HAZARDS

Eric Street, Cottesloe

Mr. HUTCHINSON, to the Minister for Works:

As the traffic arrangements on and about the Eric Street bridge Cottesloe are still not satisfactory and still present a number of hazards, will he advise what measures are planned to overcome these hazards in the future?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

Consideration will be given to programming traffic control signals at the Curtin Avenue-Eric Street intersection next financial year.

27. WOOL SAMPLES

Presence of Noogoorah Burr

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has he received any advice that wool samples brought to Western Australia by a private wool broking organisation contained Noogoorah Burr?
- (2) If this advice was given and is correct, what action was taken by his department?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The broker has been directed to export the samples from the State.

28. WORKERS' COMPENSATION

Pneumoconiosis and Silicosis

Mr. HARTREY, to the Minister for Mines:

From what percentage of pneumoconiosis must a disabled mine worker suffer for the mines medical officer to classify him as suffering from advanced silicosis?

Mr. Graham (for Mr. MAY) replied: Percentages are not used in the diagnosis of advanced silicosis. A worker is deemed to be suffering

from advanced silicosis when his capacity for work is or has been seriously or permanently impaired by the disease.

However, if the Member is referring to the degree of incapacity assessed by the Workers' Compensation Board when arriving at payment of assessed disability, this matter would have to be referred to the Workers' Compensation Board.

29.

COAL*Reserves at Collie*

Mr. JONES, to the Minister for Mines:

(1) In view of the fact that additional economic coal reserves have been proved at Collie following an extensive drilling programme carried out by Western Collieries Ltd. and Peabody Coal of America—

(a) has he been supplied with a copy of the boring report;

(b) if so, will he advise of the volume of additional coal deposits proved at Collie;

(c) if "No" to (a), is he aware of the additional tonnages of coal involved as a result of the boring programme?

(2) Has a decision been made to extend the Muja power station?

(3) If not, when is it anticipated that a firm decision will be made regarding future power extensions?

Mr. Graham (for Mr. MAY) replied:

(1) (a) A complete report on the drilling programme at the Western No. 5 area has been supplied.

Only interim reports on Western No. 1, Muja and Collie Burn areas have been supplied to date. The department is waiting on completion of the drilling and the final reports for assessment.

(b) and (c) The quantity of coal proven to date by the company is confidential and cannot be disclosed at present.

(2) No.

(3) The S.E.C. has indicated to the Government the need to order more generating plant. The Government is currently evaluating the possible further development at the Muja power house and an early decision is anticipated.

30.

WATER SUPPLIES*Roe Electorate*

Mr. W. G. YOUNG, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) What is the current position regarding the supply of piped water to the town of Kukerin?

(2) When will a connection from the existing water main to the east of Dumbleyung be extended to the township of Moulyinning?

(3) When is it anticipated the extension of the water main from Kulin to Lake Grace will be completed?

(4) Is there any plan to improve the water supply at Hopetoun?

(5) If (4) is "Yes" when will the town of Hopetoun be reticulated?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

(1) This is not currently proposed due to unattractive economics.

(2) This work is listed for consideration in 1973-74 works programme.

(3) This work is listed for future consideration but is not regarded to have a high priority.

(4) Extensive investigations have failed to reveal an economic proposal for a water supply for Hopetoun.

(5) Answered by (4).

31.

WATER SUPPLIES*Ongerup and Jerramungup*

Mr. W. G. YOUNG, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) Has any decision been made regarding the upgrading of water supplies to the towns of Ongerup and Jerramungup in regard to the proposal to pipe water from Mills Lake to these centres?

(2) Has any decision been made regarding the use of large quantities of potable water in the Hunter River area?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

(1) No. However, indications are that Mills Lake could not be recommended as a source for Jerramungup. Investigations into its possible use for Ongerup are proceeding.

(2) No present use is planned of the Hunter River source, as the immediate needs of Bremer Bay can best be met from local underground sources.

32.

KATANNING HOSPITAL*Extensions*

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Health:

(1) Have the plans for the extensions to the Katanning hospital been completed?

(2) Is it expected that the hospital will be built in stages, and, if so, how many?

(3) When is it expected that tenders will be called?

- (4) If the answer to (2) is "Yes" when is it expected that the first stage will be completed?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) Yes, contract documents are now being prepared.
- (2) Yes. Three.
- (3) Early next financial year provided that funds are available.
- (4) Approximately 12 months after the contract is let.

33. ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX

Payments Outstanding

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

How much road maintenance tax and permit fee money remained unpaid at 1st January, 1973?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

This information is not available. A check of the records of each individual operator would be necessary to extract the information sought.

34. ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX

Nonpayment: Detention

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police:

Of the seven persons arrested for non-payment of road maintenance tax—

- (a) how many are being currently detained;
- (b) on what date was each person—
 - (i) arrested;
 - (ii) released?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

(a) Nil.

- (b) (i) arrested
- 29/10/72
 - 6/3/73
 - 10/10/72
 - 3/8/72
 - 6/3/73
 - 27/9/72

- (ii) released
- 29/10/72
 - 6/3/73
 - 10/10/72
 - 14/8/72
 - 10/3/73

Not known. Information to be obtained from the Carnarvon police station and will be supplied to the Member when available.

Of the seven persons originally supplied, one was arrested on 2/9/1970 and was not applicable to the question.

35. CHANNEL 7 STADIUM

Location

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

Is the proposed Channel Seven stadium to be built on land referred to in the first schedule of the Perth Regional Railway Act, 1972?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:
No.

36. CHANNEL 7 STADIUM

Construction on Railway Land

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the Government entered into a firm commitment with Channel Seven regarding the erection of a stadium on railway land in the centre of Perth?

- (2) If not, what is the current position?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) There has been agreement on the general principles of the proposal.
- (2) Final details for inclusion in the agreement are still being examined.

37. FLUORIDATION OF WATER SUPPLIES

Discontinuation

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

- (1) What quantity of fluoride is being used in metropolitan water supplies?
- (2) In view of his comments to this House will a Bill be brought forward by the Government this year to eliminate fluoride from our metropolitan water supplies?

Mr. J. T. TONKIN replied:

- (1) 150 tons per year.
- (2) This will depend upon the amount of support which the members of the Member's party in the Legislative Council are prepared to give to such a measure. Early indication of this would be appreciated.

38. ABORIGINES

Housing in Country Areas

Mr. STEPHENS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) Is it the intention of the Community Welfare Department to house Aboriginal people, now living in sub-standard accommodation in the metropolitan area, in vacant State Housing Commission houses situated throughout the country?

- (2) If "Yes" what method or methods will be used to induce these people to leave the metropolitan area, and what employment will be offered to those who agree to move?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) The Community Welfare Department has no jurisdiction over the housing of Aboriginal or any other families. This is the responsibility of the State Housing Commission.

However, the Minister for Community Welfare did state that if Aboriginal families desired to move from the metropolitan area to country areas where a State Housing Commission home and suitable employment were available, his Department would assist as required.

39. HARVEY SCHOOL

Resource Centre

Mr. I. W. MANNING, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What work and alterations are planned for the establishment of a resource centre at the Harvey primary school?
- (2) When is it anticipated that work on the construction of the planned resource centre will be undertaken?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) The establishment of a resource centre at Harvey is not included in the current programme.
- (2) The need for a resource centre will be considered in a subsequent programme.

40. TRADE UNIONS

Compulsory Membership

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

- (1) Does he know pressures are being used to force people to join union organisations in Western Australia?
- (2) Does he believe intimidation tactics should be used to force people to join organisations against their wishes?
- (3) Will he act to see that pressures are not used on members of the public to join organisations against their wishes?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) I am aware that there have always been attempts to persuade and to dissuade individuals from joining all forms of organisations. However I am not aware of the use of "force" in the context of the question.

- (2) and (3) I believe that people should join organisations established to advance their well being. I do not believe in the use of "force" to require persons to so do.

I feel that section 61B of the Industrial Arbitration Act which allows for those conscientiously objecting against joining a union to obtain an exemption is, under the present Act, sufficient safeguard against persuasion and I also believe criminal and civil laws are sufficient to protect the individual against "force".

41. MAIN ROADS DEPARTMENT

Receipts and Expenditure 1969 to 1972

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) What was the total sum of money made available to the Main Roads Department in Western Australia from all sources for the years 1969-70, 1970-71 and 1971-72?
- (2) What was the total sum spent by the Main Roads Department on projects and responsibilities in the north-west above the 26th parallel?
- (3) What was the total sum spent in the South West Land Division on all projects?
- (4) What was the total sum spent in the metropolitan area on all projects?
- (5) What was the total sum spent in any other area of the State not included in the above questions?
- (6) What was the total sum made available to local authorities in the north-west, the South West Land Division, the metropolitan area and elsewhere?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

			\$
(1)	1969-70	51,797,067
	1970-71	57,417,316
	1971-72	61,679,704
			<hr/> *170,894,087

*Includes statutory grants to local authorities.

			\$
(2)	1969-70	10,924,140
	1970-71	13,252,450
	1971-72	17,247,140
			<hr/> *41,423,730

*Includes the expenditure within the Shire of Shark Bay.

		\$
(3) 1969-70	18,180,020
1970-71	19,598,920
1971-72	20,545,740
		<u>*58,324,680</u>

*Excludes expenditure within the Perth statistical division.

		\$
(4) 1969-70	15,615,810
1970-71	19,362,650
1971-72	23,095,560
		<u>*58,074,020</u>

*Expenditure within the Perth statistical division.

		\$
(5) 1969-70	5,044,010
1970-71	4,402,450
1971-72	5,804,190
		<u>15,250,650</u>

(6) (a) North West

		\$
1969-70	1,027,105
1970-71	1,123,744
1971-72	1,250,712
		<u>3,401,561</u>

(b) South West Land Division

		\$
1969-70	7,848,899
1970-71	8,438,682
1971-72	9,101,699
		<u>*25,389,280</u>

*Excludes expenditure within Perth statistical division.

(c) Perth Statistical Division

		\$
1969-70	5,498,313
1970-71	5,841,302
1971-72	6,141,327
		<u>17,480,942</u>

(d) Other Areas

		\$
1969-70	1,328,989
1970-71	1,439,613
1971-72	1,615,367
		<u>4,383,969</u>

These sums include statutory grants and recoups made to local authorities.

42. COMPREHENSIVE WATER SUPPLY SCHEME

Area Served, Expenditure, and Dams

Mr. GAYFER, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) How many acres of land are yet to be served by the comprehensive water scheme within the boundaries of the original scheme?
 - (2) What amount has actually been spent on the comprehensive water scheme—
 - (a) to service towns;
 - (b) to provide farm reticulation—
 - (i) within the original boundaries of the comprehensive water scheme;
 - (ii) outside the original boundaries of the comprehensive water scheme but within phase 2 of the modified comprehensive water scheme?
 - (3) How many years has this taken and what area, in acres, has been reticulated?
 - (4) What has been the yearly contribution by—
 - (a) State;
 - (b) Commonwealth,
 towards reticulation of the comprehensive water scheme?
 - (5) What are the terms and conditions of repayment of the Commonwealth money?
 - (6) What was the original water storage envisaged would have to be built to service the completed comprehensive water scheme?
 - (7) On what was the answer to (6) based?
 - (8) Where were the storages to be built, and what were the capacities?
 - (9) What was the construction programming for (8)?
 - (10) What dams are currently in use to service the comprehensive water scheme and what are their storage capacities?
 - (11) What other sites (dam or underground) can supply water to the comprehensive water scheme?
 - (12) What is the envisaged capacity needed to ultimately service the whole of the completed comprehensive water scheme?
 - (13) On what are the answers to (12) based?
- Mr. JAMIESON replied:
- (1) 4.207 million acres.

- (2) (a) It is not possible to segregate towns from farm reticulation as many mains are common to both.
- (b) (i) \$45,906,500
(ii) \$1,944,000
- (3) 24 years and 7.8 million acres.
- (4) (a) and (b) The yearly contributions are:—

	State	Commonwealth
	\$	\$
1949/50	8,144	74,734
1950/51	701,808	437,079
1951/52	417,482	577,217
1952/53	671,736	444,839
1953/54	482,870	732,446
1954/55	935,120	668,092
1955/56	1,140,000	1,303,590
1956/57	1,259,748	925,001
1957/58	961,682	1,353,533
1958/59	1,048,896	1,048,755
1959/60	1,217,082	1,217,082
1960/61	1,033,036	1,033,036
1961/62	662,596	122,596
1962/63	713,000	—
1963/64	703,150	—
1964/65	1,063,604	—
1965/66	1,250,000	1,250,000
1966/67	1,250,176	1,250,000
1967/68	1,500,000	1,500,000
1968/69	2,050,000	2,050,000
1969/70	2,000,000	2,000,000
1970/71	1,792,000	1,792,000
1971/72	2,000,002	2,000,000
1972/73 (to 28/2/73)	988,474	158,000
	25,850,500	22,000,000

- (5) The terms and conditions applying to repayment of the Commonwealth moneys are:—

- (i) The loans are repayable from a source other than consolidated revenue fund;
- (ii) Repayments are by thirty equal consecutive half-yearly instalments, commencing ten years after the date of payment by the Commonwealth;
- (iii) Interest rate shall be the rate of yield to maturity of the long term loan last raised by the Commonwealth in Australia for public subscription, prior to the date upon which the amount was paid or advanced;
- (iv) Interest is payable from Consolidated Revenue Fund.

The contributions received prior to the year 1965-66 were by way of a Commonwealth grant, and are not repayable by the State.

- (6) Raising of Mundaring and Wellington Dams.
- (7) The original scheme of 11,607,000 acres.
- (8) Mundaring Weir was to be increased from 4,600 million gallons to 15,000 million gallons and Wellington Dam from 7,500 million gallons to 38,000 million gallons.

- (9) Completion in the early stage of the scheme. Raising of Mundaring was completed in 1951, Wellington in 1960.

- (10) Answered by (8).

- (11) At the present time no other sources are connected.

As demands from the comprehensive scheme, and from other users drawing water from the same dams, increase in the future it may be necessary to augment supplies by drawing water from elsewhere. The water could be taken from surface or underground sources from many alternative locations in the South West of the State. The choice of any source of water to augment the supplies will depend upon the circumstances existing when augmentation becomes necessary.

- (12) No definite answer is possible as it is expected that demands will continue to increase progressively.

- (13) Answered by (12).

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION

Council Personnel

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

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

As to Consideration

The SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

Mr. O'Connor: What about questions without notice?

The SPEAKER: I waited to hear if there were any questions without notice.

Mr. O'Neill: I have two here, but I did not think you waited, Sir.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: FOURTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from an earlier stage of the sitting, on the following motion by Mr. Bateman—

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

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

DR. DADOUR (Subiaco) [4.41 p.m.]: I do not think the Premier will be pleased when he hears what I have to say.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition can ask his questions without notice next week.

Dr. DADOUR: I am sure the Premier will not be happy after he hears what I have to say.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: I am not thin-skinned, so you can say what you like.

Dr. DADOUR: I will give it to the Premier where he needs it. I intend to confine my remarks to local government. It is at this level in this State where the Labor Party has fallen down. I feel so ashamed when I look at the report which I have before me and then look across the Chamber to see all those members who are supposed to represent the people. But they do not represent the people; they represent only groups of people. It is we, on this side of the House, who represent the people.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: Particularly vested interests.

Dr. DADOUR: I will get to the Premier shortly! I have a letter here which I intend to read because I have caught him now. This will be the third time I have read this letter in the House, but on previous occasions the Premier has not been present.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: You represent, particularly, vested interests.

Dr. DADOUR: I represent my electorate just as all the other members on this side of the House represent theirs.

Mr. Graham: That goes for us on this side, too.

Dr. DADOUR: By appointing the Boundaries Commission the Government has put fear and trepidation into the minds of the people. The report that has been issued by this commission leaves so much to be desired.

Mr. Graham: It has been made as a result of your legislation.

Mr. Nalder: What a pitiable excuse.

Mr. Graham: Yes, it was introduced by your Government.

Dr. DADOUR: The members on the other side of the House are using the report in a way that was never intended. They are putting fear and trepidation into the minds of the people. Last year a report appeared in the Press that there was corruption on the part of certain members of a local authority. The local authority was not named and as a result practically every local authority in Western Australia was under a cloud and in fear of being accused of corruption. I made it known to the House and to the people of Western Australia that the local authorities should be relieved of this fear by being told what was going on. I made it known that the Subiaco City Council was the local authority concerned. That was one way by which fear and trepidation was built up in the minds of those in local government.

Then the Boundaries Commission was appointed and produced this report which I have in front of me and in which I find so much wanting. For example, the Boundaries Commission was given not one term of reference. Surely, when a Minister appoints a commission to investigate certain matters it is his duty to give that commission certain terms of reference. If I am wrong and he did lay down certain terms of reference for the guidance of the commission, no mention is made of them here. This is another example of the intimidating methods that are being used. I believe that the Minister said to the members of this commission, "The green light is on! Get out and cut up the local authorities!"

When I read this report I was more convinced that this was the attitude adopted right from the beginning. The members of the commission were acting under orders to chop up the local authorities without any thought being given to the people.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: If you believe that, you will believe anything.

Dr. DADOUR: In this report to mention is made of the people. It is the most shocking report I have ever seen. All that is contained in the report is a small summary concerning what the local authority considers should be the area within its boundaries; and whether it wishes to remain the same size or to become larger.

This is how shocking it is when we have a Government which is supposed to be catering for the little people. However, what is it doing? It is slowly choking them and I hope it succeeds in doing so because then no-one will ever have faith in this Government again. I have lost faith in it. I look at members opposite and say, "My goodness."

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: How can you lose what you have never had?

Dr. DADOUR: I came here with a completely wide open mind.

Mr. Brady: As a Liberal or an Independent?

Dr. DADOUR: There would probably not have been anyone less political than myself in this House.

Mr. Brady: Why did you not stand then as an Independent instead of a Liberal?

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: We have had no evidence of that.

Dr. DADOUR: I would have had fewer political ideas than anyone else. I believed that we could work together to clear things up, but I found out I had to get down to the same dirty level as everyone else here.

Mr. Graham: You paragon of virtue!

Dr. DADOUR: I am very adept at it now and could give a few lessons to the Minister for Sewerage.

The first report of the Boundaries Commission consisted of a map only and then later we received a written report. After having read it I am more convinced than ever that never at any time had the commission thought of the people. It had blithely divided all the area into units containing 40,000 inhabitants, and we will see why in a moment.

No thought has been given to cultural differences or anything else despite the fact that a great number of differences occur in the various suburbs. We know the experience of the past with football clubs. The West Perth Football Club plays on the Leederville Oval owned by the Perth City Council. The Subiaco club plays on the Subiaco Oval run by the Subiaco Council. The East Fremantle Club plays at East Fremantle; and so we have these identities. Yet this Government is hell bent on destroying them. I have analysed the matter and I know. It is purely political. I do not know why the Government should be so hell bent in this direction because it amounts to political suicide. This was proved in East Fremantle and Subiaco where the people demonstrated viciously to indicate that they will not tolerate this treatment. The result was that the Premier has, I presume, told his Minister that a Royal Commission will be held to hear objections rather than have Caesar judge Caesar; that is, rather than have the Boundaries Commission hear the objections.

A loss of the personal representation will result. Each councillor will represent a greater number of ratepayers, and will not be able to do so in an honorary capacity because he will not have the time. In this way party politics will creep in and local government could become a training ground for State Parliament. Who knows?

Another political aspect will be that no longer will the ordinary working man be in a position to afford to stand for election.

Because of the greater number of people for whom the councillors must cater, the ratepayers will not be able to contact their councillors so readily and have their little problems solved. Local government is back-yard government. It is for the people and is at their level. It is true that local government is called upon to do many things.

According to the report local authorities will be called upon to undertake far more work than they have done in the past. They will have their own bitumen works and cement works. They will have to obtain machinery of all descriptions which means that they will become semi-governmental works and very little work will be offered to private enterprise. At the moment private enterprise undertakes this work and completes it quickly and cheaply. It has been proved time and time again that when

a Government department becomes large the inefficiency increases and this is not as it should be.

Under the new system we will have many paid public and semi-public servants. The little man will no longer be able to stand for election because he will be unable to afford to do so whereas today he must find only \$100 or \$200 for this purpose.

Once the local authorities are increased in size the age-old problem of party politics will creep in.

I would like to refer to the report of the Boundaries Commission which interviewed all the metropolitan councils, cities, towns, and shires, and received submissions from them. All the submissions are summarised at the back of the report. I have here the complete submissions from the Nedlands and Subiaco Councils but these submissions have been considerably condensed in the report. In fact the summary consists of about two or three lines and much relevant data has been omitted. On the other hand all the relevant data submitted by the Town Planning Department, the Main Roads Department, the Secretary for Local Government, the Commissioner of Public Health, the Government Statistician and, goodness knows why, the State Librarian has also been included.

The request of the Town Planning Department is included—almost a full page—and portion of it reads—

We concluded that town planning interests would be best served by fewer, more financial municipal districts.

The Main Roads Department deals with the matter under several headings including "Existing Local Authority Boundaries", "Urban Arterial and Sub-arterial Roads", "Statutory Road Grants", "Area and Population", "Shape and Location", etc. The last few lines of the summary read—

The Boundaries Commission gave careful consideration to the views of the Main Roads Department, and whilst agreeing with the majority of the criteria suggested, considered that the proposals were too far reaching at this stage of development in the metropolitan region.

Only 11 local authorities were requested. The report stated that the proposals were too far-reaching at this stage of development which means that the Boundaries Commission is looking even further ahead and will again reduce the number of local authorities.

The Commissioner of Public Health stated that the essential need for public health administration is that a district be economically viable. This is the only time in the whole report that the word "viable" is used, so obviously it is not thought that viability means a thing. Why does the Commissioner of Public Health say this?

I will tell members. It is because not so very long ago he moved to Peppermint Grove and he is enjoying the nice surroundings and low rates there. He does not want to be moved and so he does not commit himself.

The report of the State Library Board is of no significance. The only point raised is that another library will be required in Claremont.

Then we come to the Local Government Department and here we have the real evil—of all Government departments. It is just unable to cope. The Local Government Department discussed the matter under the headings of "Minimum Effective Revenue", "Adequate Representation", "Optimum Physical Size of a District", "Borrowing Powers", and "Public Relations". This is the greatest joke of all times—public relations. I have never in my life been so ill when reading anything as I was when I read that. Let us deal with these items, the first one being "Minimum Effective Revenue". Each council or unit will require qualified personnel such as engineers, town planners, etc. When we consider these officers at local government level we realise we are getting near the bottom of the barrel.

I say this because anyone who may be good is employed in private enterprise. So many times local authorities end up with those from the bottom of the barrel but they are asked to employ them. Who pays for them? The ratepayers. However, that is of no significance as I will demonstrate shortly. With regard to the size of districts the idea is that as little time as possible should be spent in travelling, but that is about all that says. With regard to adequate representation, the idea is that we must not lose the personal touch because it is important. When a unit consists of 40,000 people the personal touch is lost almost completely.

The next item is "Borrowing Powers" and this is the real crux of the matter. The normal borrowing power of a council is \$400,000. If two local authorities amalgamate the borrowing power will still be only \$400,000 and this is why some of the proposed amalgamations have not been carried out; that is, the fear concerning borrowing powers. This leads me to pose the question: How much does it cost the State Government for the administration of local authorities? The answer is that it does not cost the Government a bean because the local authorities pay all expenses from the rates they levy and from Commonwealth Government grants. Consequently I do not know why the Government is griping itself, thus putting itself in so badly with the ordinary people.

Now we come to the crux of the matter—public relations. What do we mean by public relations? I know what I mean, but

I do not think those on the Boundaries Commission do. About four or five weeks ago I was knocking on doors in a certain street in West Leederville. I notice that the Premier is leaving the Chamber. I hope he will come back because I have a letter to read to him.

Mr. J. T. Tonkin: I will look after myself. You look after yourself.

Dr. DADOUR: I have a letter to read to the Premier.

When I was engaged in the doorknocking in West Leederville I realised that some people were living in fear because they did not know what would eventuate. They knew they would have to vacate their homes within a certain time but they did not know how long it would be. The Perth City Council has put the fear of the Lord into them because it has indicated that it wants their property to make way for a freeway. The council commenced to buy up the houses and made a real shambles of the situation. It bought houses and then found that it had to let them. From what I could find out, it seems that the Perth City Council bought the wrong house on one occasion and had to resell it. It was the wrong site.

Before all this happened, a notice appeared in the *Government Gazette* in June, 1971, stating that the freeway would take a certain route. The only people who knew about that were the ones who actually read the *Government Gazette*. One gentleman whom I know found that it would go over the top of his house and he was not at all pleased. In September of the same year the route had been altered.

I told the people in West Leederville I would try to find out for them what was happening. Inquiries of the Perth City Council proved fruitless. I then ascertained that the Town Planning Department could perhaps be of assistance. I contacted the department and an officer arranged for a gentleman from the Main Roads Department to be present at the time of the interview. After two minutes I realised that the man from the Main Roads Department had all the data I needed. He was an extremely good officer and gave me everything I needed openly and quickly. I told the people concerned what was going to happen and they were extremely pleased to know this. Even though they had to vacate their homes they were pleased to know the approximate dates. I had to act as public relations officer for the Perth City Council, the Town Planning Department, and the Main Roads Department. Surely these organisations have their own public relations officers, but apparently they are not doing any work. All members at some time have found in their electorates that they must go out themselves and ascertain what is going on.

This happens because Ministers are rubber stamps. They do not have their fingers on the pulse of their portfolios. Through not knowing the details themselves, the Ministers are rubber stamps to commissioners or departmental heads. Even when a Minister acts as a rubber stamp he should, at least, be a buffer between the bureaucrats and the little people. In my opinion some Ministers have a great deal of soul searching to do.

We cannot expect people to be pushed around any longer. These people have been pushed and pushed. Some have lived in their homes for up to 50 years but are now being forced to vacate them. Some have already vacated them. All must leave to enable certain stages of the freeway to be proceeded with. Some will leave in February next, some in June, and the balance in 1975.

The problem of public relations in local government could be overcome through communication between the council and the ratepayers. It is believed by the Department of Local Government that this can be achieved best in a municipality with sufficient financial resources by employing a public relations officer or by keeping people informed through a publication issued by the council and directed to electors.

I act as my own public relations officer. I do all my own work. I act as my own social worker in my capacity as a general practitioner; if I did not, I would not be a complete general practitioner. I must keep my finger on the pulse of everything to be able to give adequate care and attention.

The Government Statistician's report is, in my opinion, no argument at all. He is merely saying, "If the boundaries are altered, alter them to fit in with our machinery."

I now move on to the deliberations of the Local Government Boundaries Commission. The commission talks about size, approach, and whether the word "local" should or should not be retained; the commission believes it should be retained. It talks of ratable size and says it should be sufficient to allow for all the amenities to be supplied.

On the question of rates, I make the point that if the City of Subiaco were to charge the rates which the Perth City Council charges, to justify those rates it would have to build a concert hall bigger and better than the one recently built in Perth and another Beatty Park pool. In fact, this would happen every five or six years because of the amount of money that would be received in rates.

The report states that Subiaco should be swallowed by the Perth City Council. I am using Subiaco as my reference because I know the applicable figures. The Premier himself would know the position in East

Fremantle and Fremantle. The Boundaries Commission talks of a community of interest and it is interesting to read the following—

We find it extremely difficult to define "community of interest" and indeed this has been so in other cases which have been referred to us.

In other words, the Boundaries Commission cannot define it. Initially, the commission thought "community of interest" means that an individual eats, sleeps, lives, shops, and enjoys his recreation in the one area. It would be rather stupid for me to attempt to surf in the City of Subiaco area. Obviously the commission has no idea of the meaning of the term. To me "community of interest" means the number of social clubs and service organisations in an area; it means the people are proud to live there, and to see new buildings erected and improvements to the parks and lakes etc.

The Minister for Water Supplies would know that most of the water levels in the metropolitan area are falling greatly. Shenton Park Lake is fairly low and, because of this, we have built a retaining wall, about two feet high, to stop the banks subsiding and undermining the trees surrounding the lake. There were many protests from people because they felt that the long-necked tortoise would not be able to leave the lake, take the customary trek across the road, and lay eggs in the gardens of the neighbouring houses. Consequently we put in ramps so that the tortoises could leave the lake. This action did not make some people completely happy, but they are happy enough. This is only one point of community interest which I have mentioned.

Details are given in the report as to how much it costs to administer councils of different sizes in the metropolitan area. Administration costs per ratepayer are higher in smaller councils than in larger ones. It then talks of *per capita* population and rate revenue per taxpayer. It also mentions the number of square miles each council in each area represents in addition to the number of people each councillor represents. Nowhere in the report is specific reference made to the rates charged in the various areas. Apparently, this is of no significance. It does not seem to matter if the municipality is such that its rates are low; that people receive efficient, fast service; and that amenities are supplied in that area.

The significant factor, according to the report, is that municipalities must be of a certain size to allow for qualified people to administer them. The commission obviously did not give thought to the smaller authorities which make use of private enterprise. Many make use of a consultant architect or town planner. Of course, it is much cheaper for larger authorities to employ such people on a full-time basis.

Often it happens that those who work in this way at local government level are at the bottom of the barrel; if they were any good they would be in private enterprise.

Let us use the best available for the cheapest cost. We use private contractors for our roads and it is far cheaper than the cost to other authorities which employ their own people to do the work, including the bituminising. It is far cheaper to construct kerbing by using private enterprise.

Not one word is said about interviewing councillors to ascertain their views. We do not know whether respective councils consider themselves to be viable. There is nothing about what a municipality means to the people concerned. It is not simply the fact that rates may rise. Authorities will lose their identity if they are taken over. This has happened in the past.

West Leederville is like a scrap heap. If the arterial roads were routed through the area of Subiaco, the council would do everything in its power to let the people know whose properties would be resumed. It would act in every way to try to please the people. The Perth City Council left the people in West Leederville for dead. The matter was handled by the Town Planning Department and the Main Roads Department and the people did not know where they were. West Leederville is the forgotten part of the Perth City Council.

Let us look at Victoria Park. There has been no end to the complaints from residents in Victoria Park because they feel they have not been given a fair deal by the Perth City Council. This kind of thing has been allowed to go on.

The law at the moment virtually states that the Minister for Local Government may join two or more municipalities or may annex one part from another, and he may do this with nothing more than the approval of Cabinet and the granting of permission by the Governor.

Mr. Moiler: The Minister does not do this without consultation.

Dr. DADOUR: The Minister may consult with the Boundaries Commission but there is nothing to say he must do this; the Minister can take action independently of the Boundaries Commission.

It has been suggested that a referendum should be held when it is proposed that local authorities be annexed. To hold a referendum and to decide, by a majority of the voting, to unite would surely be a much better way to handle the situation. This would do away with standing over various local authorities in a willy-nilly way. At the moment it is proposed that some be taken over completely and there would be no chance of any redress. The authorities concerned will never forget what is happening. The holding of a

referendum would remove the dark cloud which hangs continually over the heads of local authorities.

I have here a letter, dated the 24th January, 1969, addressed to the Town Clerk of the Subiaco City Council. It reads—

In accordance with the request of those present at the recent meeting between the various local authorities effected by alterations of boundaries in the Local Government Assessment Committee's report, I arranged an appointment with the Hon. J. T. Tonkin, Leader of the Opposition and report as follows—

I informed Mr. Tonkin of the meeting that had been held and who participated and outlined details of the proposed action to be taken by the authorities with regard to having a Deputation to the Minister. I then asked if it would be possible for either himself or another member to introduce a Private Member's Bill making it compulsory for a referendum to be conducted of those effected before any amalgamations take place.

Mr. Thompson: Who said that?

Dr. DADOUR: The letter is from the Town Clerk of the Town of East Fremantle to the Town Clerk of the Subiaco City Council.

Mr. Thompson: To whom did it refer?

Dr. DADOUR: Mr. J. T. Tonkin, who was then the Leader of the Opposition—a position we hope he will hold again next year. The letter continues—

Mr. Tonkin asked me to pass on to the representatives that he was prepared to arrange for a Bill to be introduced if the authorities so desired, but whether he introduced the Bill or another member, would be decided at a later date when it could be assessed what would be the best interest of the Bill.

Mr. Tonkin also stated that as the Party favours reference of matters such as this to the people concerned for decision, they would have no hesitation in supporting a proposal that before amalgamation takes place, the matter should be referred to the people concerned by way of referendum.

We will see how the Premier reacts next week.

Mr. O'Neil: That is astounding. Keep the letter.

Dr. DADOUR: I would like to know how he will get out of that one.

Mr. Thompson: He did not hear you.

Dr. DADOUR: He was listening to me with one ear. Many of the existing municipalities, although not large in size, are viable in the sense that they are providing a good service and the rates are

reasonable. It is my belief that our only way to remove this dark cloud from over their heads is to conduct a referendum amongst the people concerned as to whether or not certain councils should be amalgamated. This would be the democratic way and the only way to do it. I am sure that the Liberal Party would have changed the legislation years ago had it realised that something of this nature could occur.

I do not believe a Royal Commission to examine the report of the Boundaries Commission will help very much. The Boundaries Commission has made a report, and it is very difficult to undo the effects of a report especially when members concerned have already been swamped with many opinions.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

Dr. DADOUR: In my opinion a decision to amalgamate should only be made as the result of a referendum—and then a high percentage vote in favour of the proposal should be required to make it valid.

Mr. Graham: Would you agree that all people in a municipal district should have the vote? Or perhaps you are thinking of a referendum on a restricted franchise basis.

Dr. DADOUR: A referendum of all the people. It is my belief that people paying rent are in the same position as ratepayers.

Mr. Graham: Such people are entitled to be enrolled now, but I was thinking of adult children living with parents.

Dr. DADOUR: Yes, all residents of 18 years or older.

Mr. Graham: In other words, people on the Legislative Assembly roll.

Dr. DADOUR: Yes, that would be fair enough, but I believe amalgamation should take place only after a high percentage poll. I feel we would need a 40 per cent. poll before it could be recognised as an authentic poll.

Mr. Graham: Would you favour optional or compulsory voting?

Dr. DADOUR: I do not care personally but local government elections are optional at the moment and I believe a referendum such as this should follow local government policy.

Mr. Moiler: Do you also support adult franchise for council elections?

Dr. DADOUR: I would not object to that.

Mr. Graham: Such a system operates nearly everywhere in the world except in Western Australia.

Dr. DADOUR: In other words, local government elections could be based on State and Federal rolls.

Mr. Graham: There are too many Tory Governments in Western Australia—for instance, the Legislative Council.

Dr. DADOUR: In fairness to people in the areas which will be affected by any amalgamation, I feel we should conduct a referendum. The people may then make their own choice. Each local municipality has its own community interests and the people residing in the area are proud of this fact. Representation on the council is such that the residents have easy access to their councillors.

The residents in the affected areas have made such strong representations about the proposed amalgamation, I feel we should come to their assistance. People who support different political parties have expressed the same view. I believe that many people who have always been Labor Party supporters will now change their vote, and it takes a lot to change a man's loyalty from one party to the other. In my opinion the Government will be in trouble if it does not closely examine this question.

MR. E. H. M. LEWIS (Moore) [5.23 p.m.]: May I commence my brief contribution to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply by congratulating the member for Blackwood, not only on his election and his maiden speech, but also on his more recent contribution to the debate. I have read that "the word Lewis denotes strength", and—

Mr. Davies: Wait a minute—I hope there is no nepotism there?

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS:—I hope that the strength of his argument will match the strength of his voice to enable him always to stand up for the people he represents.

Mr. H. D. Evans: Is he related?

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: He played the ball sedately back along the pitch in his maiden speech, but in his second contribution to the debate, he slogged the Government all over the paddock.

I would like to make the comment that I hope in future questions and copies of *Hansard*, the member for Blackwood and I will be distinguished by initials, as is the case with the member for Narrogin and the member for Wellington. No matter how delighted I may be to accept the speeches of the member for Blackwood, I would not like to inflict upon him the anguish of accepting mine.

On Tuesday the Premier replied at length to a question asked by the member for Dale about the publication *At the Half Way Mark*. This publication has been referred to frequently, and we were told that it cost approximately \$607. I believe we must accept that Governments are entitled to issue statements which could be taken as political propaganda from the Premier's

Office. However, I take exception to such propaganda when it spills over into departmental publications.

Mr. H. D. Evans: It is good stuff, though.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: I have here the latest issue of the newsletter issued by the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority. The newsletter is printed by the Government Printer and is dated March, 1973. The editor is Mr. T. Long, who is a community liaison officer, and the publications officer is Mr. G. Lorkin. I do not know the latter gentleman, but I have considerable respect for Mr. Long who was an officer of the former Native Welfare Department. I believe he did an extremely good job in that department.

During my term as a member of this House, I have come into contact with many public servants but I have never been concerned about the political philosophy they follow personally; my only concern has been that they perform their work in a satisfactory way. I repeat, I have always found that Mr. Long performed his duties satisfactorily.

In the early part of this publication is an article headed, "Comment". It is not signed at all, so I assume the author is either the editor or the publications officer. However, it may be someone else.

The important point is that I do not believe comments of this type should appear in departmental newsletters. I realise that departmental officers now have the right to criticise Governments if they so desire. Members will remember I did make the point that during the term of the previous Government, we gave earnest consideration to ways and means to liberalise the principles in relation to permitting public servants the right to criticise, if they so wished. I do know that consultations took place, at the behest of the Government, between the then Director-General of Education and the then Public Service Commissioner. We now know that public servants and teachers are free to criticise. However, I do not think the political views of public servants should intrude into departmental publications. I will quote from the article—

Once again, dramatic and significant changes have taken place in the conduct of Aboriginal Affairs. The Labor Party's election victory has heralded yet another approach to the generally unco-ordinated and piecemeal history of the relationship between the Aboriginal people and a long succession of State and Federal Governments.

For the first time, the election platform of the new Government featured the plight of the Aborigines within the Commonwealth as a major political issue. The performance of Mr. Whitlam's Government, to date, has borne

out these election promises and the new Minister for Aboriginal Affairs Mr. G. M. Bryant, has shown not only a deep empathy for the people in his charge but a commendable impatience to get on with the job. Events are really moving and large and realistic infusions of money for housing, health and employment are being administered.

Then it goes on to quote what the *New York Times* had to say about this. Among the statements published by the *New York Times* appears the following—

"Australia's real test, as far as the rest of the world and particularly our region is concerned, is the role we create for our own Aborigines," Mr Whitlam told the voters. More than anything else, this would be the thing on which Australia would be judged "not just now, but in the greater perspective of history." He promised that a Labor Government would abolish discriminatory laws and give the Aborigines ownership of their traditional lands.

Then it concludes—

Mr. Whitlam's efforts to bring justice to a long-oppressed minority in Australia should command the attention of governments in other countries which are confronted with comparable problems.

That is the end of the quotation from the *New York Times*. That was, of course, before Wounded Knee. When I was Minister in charge of Aboriginal affairs I made a sincere endeavour to do this, and I can say the same of one of my predecessors, the present member for Swan. We always tried to treat the Aboriginal problem on a non-party basis. We never tried to make political capital out of it. I think every Government in turn, and each Minister saddled with the responsibility—I will not use the word "control" because I do not think anyone controlled the problem—has, I believe, done his best to make progress in what is a difficult and long-term job.

I wish the present Minister the same success in his endeavours. I repeat that Ministers in the past have never tried to make political capital out of Aboriginal welfare and I hope others never do. Therefore I deplore all the more the attempt to read into this some party political propaganda.

It is true that the Commonwealth Government has made available a great deal more money towards implementing the policy of the ultimate assimilation of Aborigines, but in my view—and I believe the member for Swan will agree with me on this—it is not just a question of money. Money helps, but we must get a response from these people and we will not get a

response from them in the way we desire—that is towards eventual assimilation—unless we pay much greater attention to instilling in them a sense of responsibility. Whilst there are some Father Christmases going around giving them handouts and buying them stations, this in itself will get them nowhere.

Mr. Bryant, the Commonwealth Minister, has stated that he will spend \$5,000,000 a year on buying sheep stations for Aborigines. The buying of sheep stations in itself, and the appointing of overseers and other men to manage the sheep stations does not mean that the Aborigines will engender sufficient interest in them to make them economic propositions for themselves. Today, in answer to a question, we heard that \$305,194 is to be spent on the Warburton Ranges. I was particularly interested in this. A survey was made of the economic possibilities of the Warburton Ranges, but in view of the fact that the annual rainfall at the Warburton Ranges is only three inches a year—although in some years it has been known to be 10 inches—it was considered that it was neither a cattle nor a sheep proposition and those conducting the survey suggested that the only avenue available there for Aborigines was for them to be employed as tourist guides.

However, tourism depended on the up-grading of the road from Laverton to Giles. It is a distance of 365 miles from Laverton to the Warburton Ranges, and Giles is much further on than that. If the Commonwealth Government intends to spend money to upgrade that road with a view to encouraging tourists to visit the area, there may be some logic in the argument that the expenditure of such money would provide some tourist development in the Warburton Ranges. Nevertheless, I am afraid, like earlier ventures that have been started in that area in an endeavour to get the Aborigines interested in mining ventures, this one will prove to be a failure. I do not want to say that the expenditure of such money is being wasted, but to a great extent consideration is not being given to what the Aborigines themselves really want. In fact their only desire is to enjoy life and this is not unnatural. All people want to enjoy life, but most of us have learned that what we eventually enjoy we must first pay for.

In this House we had a statement of policy tabled by the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare. This was read on Tuesday last. The statement is headed, "Australian Aborigines. A Statement of Policy, Western Australia." The statement is undated and unsigned. The name of the author does not appear on it. We do not know whether the author is the Minister for Community Welfare or not. The only indication we have of when the report was issued is the Legislative Assembly stamp that has been placed on it

showing the date it was received in this House. That is the only date that appears on it.

This is a statement of policy. We cannot quibble at that, because it is consistent with the statements of policy we have followed for many years. The wording is different, but, in substance, it is just the same as statements that have been made in the past. The Minister for Community Welfare went on to say that this statement has been issued with the full approval of the Aboriginal Advisory Council. The Aboriginal Advisory Council was set up, and the chairman is Mr. Davis. I am not criticising Mr. Davis, but I do know that Aborigines less than 100 miles from Perth will not recognise Mr. Davis as their leader. They dissociate themselves from many of his statements.

I am now speaking of some of the more responsible Aborigines, but I would point out that even the more responsible of them progress so far and then, unfortunately, revert to their natural way of life. I know one man who is much better than the average. He has what I call a degree of principle. When he gets into trouble and is locked up, his response to the suggestion that his wife and family should take advantage of the social service benefits available to them is: "I do not want any Government to look after my wife and family; I am able to look after them myself." He has always refused to accept any charity in the way of social service benefits. I have told the Chamber this to indicate the manner of man he is. His income would average over \$100 a week throughout the year. Even he has been known to leave his job on a farm without any notice being given to his employer. During harvesting time when all the operations have to be co-ordinated in the morning, on many occasions this man has not turned up and it has been found that he has gone into smoke. When he returns and the employer has something to say to him, he expresses his apologies and says he appreciates the difficult position in which he has placed his employer. He settles down for another fortnight or three weeks and then disappears again.

I have been trying to get a house for him at Milng, because he has expressed a desire to obtain a house in which to live at that centre. I have been unable to contact this man at the present time. His mother lives at Moora and she has told me that she does not know where he is. This is the degree of irresponsibility to which these people revert. I suppose that at some time in the future they will overcome this tendency, but let no Minister, including Mr. Bryant, think he will solve this problem in the life of one Parliament or one Government, because it is a long-term job.

I have every sympathy for any Minister who is saddled with this responsibility. I do not go along with all the handouts that

are being made to Aborigines because this will only encourage the Aborigines or anyone else into thinking, "Now that Father Christmas has come around everything in the garden will be lovely." The implementation of such a policy will, in many instances, kill them with kindness.

I will now deal with one of the two matters that might be considered to be parochial, and yet may have application over a wide area of the State. I again make a plea to the Minister for Education to give some further consideration to reducing the payments made by parents under the subsidised school bus service.

Last year I sought the permission of the Minister to peruse the file on school bus services and he was good enough to make the file available to me at the Education Department. I subsequently wrote to him and quoted the file number so that he could easily refer to the page on the file, and I mentioned that at the time there were 34 instances where parents, who have to contribute to a subsidised school bus service, were paying up to \$1 a day per family. This was at Marvel Loch. Other parents, at Halls Creek, were paying \$5 a day to transport children from a station to a school three times a week. There are also other parents at Dandaragan in the same position. These contributions aggregate \$63 a week, or \$2,500 a school year. I suggest that steps be taken to relieve these parents of the burden of having to make such contributions. A contribution has to be made by those who participate in the subsidised school bus service. I appreciate that there are many parents in the metropolitan area who are obliged to transport their children some miles, perhaps to a school bus or some other form of transport. I make the suggestion to the Minister that even if he cannot see his way clear to reduce the total contribution paid by the parents he should at least reduce it to a maximum of 50c a week, which is the contribution made by parents whose children travel on M.T.T. buses.

The Minister was good enough to reply to my letter and I am not going to be harsh on the Minister by criticising his reply, but nevertheless I would like him to have another look at this matter. I do not agree with the reasons he gave me for rejecting this request, because I do not think they will hold up. In his letter the Minister said—

Apparently contributions by individual parents are made only where a profit motive exists or where some parent requires a closer service than that officially approved by the Education Department.

I do not think there are many parents who would use the subsidised school bus service unless the qualifying distance was met. In many cases these people enjoy a

contract service, but the numbers have dropped, and I pay a tribute to the Minister who, instead of insisting that the number should remain at 12 where the number of school children falls to, say, 11, allowed the contract system to continue. I commend the Minister for that action.

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

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: He said that this would continue until at least the end of the year when a review would be made. He said—

I am also advised that, if the parental contribution is waived or limited to a set figure, the way would be opened for subsidised bus operators to demand higher rates of payment since they would be aware that any increases would be a charge upon Government funds and not borne by individual parents.

I am sure a way could be found to counter that one. I can appreciate the difficulty. When we raised the subsidy from 10c per loaded mile to 12c I met with the same objections from the department, but I countered them by saying that we would raise it to 12c and if a higher rate were desired the operators would have to justify it. I believe that we can overcome this point if we make up our minds to do so.

In answer to a question by the member for Mt. Marshall the department said that it was not aware of the maximum amount being paid by parents as this was private information. However, I am sure the department could obtain the information if it so desired. It reminds me of an experience in my younger days when I was out with a girl. I told her that where there is a will, there is a way, but her reply was that where there is no will there is no way. This can be said of the department. If it desired to obtain the information it would find ways and means to do so.

I hope the Minister will give further consideration to this matter because it involves a burden on a comparatively few parents who are singled out by virtue of their unfortunate circumstances to make a contribution which is far and above that made by parents in other parts of the State. Therefore I hope the Minister will give further consideration to this problem.

I wish now to briefly touch on three reports although not necessarily in the order in which they were presented. The first is the Stern report on agricultural education which has been before the Minister for a considerable time. Last year when I asked whether the Minister would implement any of the recommendations in that report his answer was that it had been referred to an officer of the Education Department for advice on the priority in

which the recommendations should be implemented—or words to that effect. I realise that some of the recommendations represent long-range planning, but we have not heard any more about the report, and I would be interested to know at some time whether the Minister has given further consideration to it. Members of our party particularly are interested in those recommendations.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Would you outline to me how far your party would like to have them implemented?

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: My party has already made its recommendations on the implementation of the report and I am sure that these will be readily available to the Minister without the necessity for me to go into them now.

The second report with which I wish to deal is the Knox report on pre-school education. I appreciate that the Minister has been subjected to some criticism for not having made up his mind on this matter.

Mr. T. D. Evans: He has made up his mind all right.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: He has not made his thoughts known to the House.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Not yet.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: Some people have said to me, "What is the use of the Government appointing someone to make a report if it is not going to act on it?" I replied that it is easy to have something investigated, but when the recommendations entail the expenditure of a considerable sum of money a Government has the right to indicate that, for very obvious reasons, it cannot implement them.

As an ex-Minister I know the difficulties which would be involved in implementing the Knox report, but it will be interesting indeed to hear the Minister's comments on what part if any he proposes to implement in due course.

The last report with which I will deal—and this is the final matter on which I will touch—is the report by Mr. Dettman on discipline in secondary schools.

In my understanding, the inquiry was not made at the instance of the Minister. In the preface to the report Mr. Dettman said—

In December, 1971, in response to concern expressed by the Executive of the State School Teachers' Union of Western Australia over what they viewed to be a deterioration of standards of discipline in secondary schools in this State, I set up a committee—

Mr. T. D. Evans: That is right. This was done at the instigation of Mr. Dettman himself.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: The report of the inquiry is a big one and it makes fairly heavy reading. The inquiry was conducted in some depth.

Mr. Nalder: Have you read it?

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: I have read the report but I have not read all the appendices.

The appendices give some idea of the questionnaires that were sent out not only to what are termed "administrative officers" and senior officers of schools but also to school teachers, students, and parents.

There is one revealing fact in the report. It was always my belief—apparently quite an erroneous one—that indiscipline in schools stemmed from a minority of university students. I had the idea that their bad example was spilling over to secondary students. However, the report reveals quite the contrary. It reveals that indiscipline in schools is greatest in the second year and then tails off to practically nil in the fifth year.

Mr. W. G. Young: They have to get down to work then.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: At that stage the youngsters are older and more serious-minded. Perhaps they are going on to a professional life and they are more responsible. They apparently give up this silly nonsense. The teachers designated the incidence of indiscipline as follows—

				%
First year	6
Second year	57
Third year	32
Fourth year	2
Fifth year	1

The number of school teachers contacted was 2,062, which shows the depth at which the inquiry was conducted.

The 54 school administrators who were contacted designated the incidence of indiscipline as follows—

			Boys %	Girls %
First year	4	Nil
Second year	41	67
Third year	5	3
Fourth year	3	Nil
Fifth year	Nil	Nil
Upper school	1	Nil
Lower school	32	24

The upper school comprises the fourth and fifth years, and the lower school comprises the first, second, and third years.

Mr. Nalder: Is there any reference to children leaving school during that period?

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: Yes. A wealth of information is given in the report—the types of discipline, and so on. Questionnaires were conducted among the students.

The number of first-year students contacted was 1,407; second-year, 1,392; third-year, 1,295; fourth-year, 393; and fifth-year, 373.

Mr. Nalder: Is this the dropout rate?

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: No. Those are the numbers of students contacted about their views on indiscipline, whether it had interfered with their studies, and so on. It would be worth while for members to read the report. It is readily available and there is a wealth of detail at the back of it.

A number of recommendations were made, the main one, in my view, being that there should be greater communication between the school, the students, and the parents. Altogether, I think it is a very satisfactory report.

I noticed in the paper this morning or last night a statement that not many people had commented on the report. I thought I would make a comment. I do not know whether I have added anything that people did not already know, except perhaps that apparently indiscipline does not stem from university students. University students may be glad to know about that.

I should speak about water supplies because I asked a question on this matter today. While I commend the member for Avon in pushing the claims of his area—and I say “hear, hear” to that—I hope anyone who is in a dry area will be relieved of the water problem as quickly as possible. I will lend my support wherever it may be required.

I point out that when the boundaries of the comprehensive scheme were originally drawn, at least in the electorate of Moore the shire boundaries were followed. As everyone knows, shire boundaries zigzag around in an arbitrary fashion, so that a property which is completely dry could be just over the fence from a shire included in the scheme. That property would not be considered because it is outside the scheme, while some properties inside the boundaries which are well supplied with water could receive more water because they are within the boundaries of the scheme.

In any future consideration of the extension of water schemes, I hope the Minister and his department will give prior consideration to the places where water is needed, irrespective of whether or not they are within the original boundaries. The original boundaries have been departed from in what is known as the “modified” scheme. Certain parts of the Mt. Marshall area have now been supplied, whereas formerly they had no chance because they were outside the boundaries.

There is an area east of Pithara and Dalwallinu, and west of Ballidu, which is very dry and it is impossible to find water there in dams or bores. The farmers at Bindi Bindi have been forced to cart water

for a long time. Although the advisory committee has made loans available to them, dam sites cannot be found. Some dams have been put down, but it takes more than putting down a dam to obtain a water supply if the dam cannot be filled. There has not been sufficient rain to fill the dams for years, and the only thing that can be done is to hook that area up to the comprehensive water scheme. I suppose some of these dry areas will have to wait in the queue until the member for Avon is satisfied; but no button off his shirt—good luck to him! I will not be the one to say his area should stand aside. Let all dry areas, wherever they are, be supplied as soon as possible, but let us not confine our attention to the boundaries of the comprehensive water supply scheme.

Mr. Hutchinson: The pity is that part three of the comprehensive scheme will not start.

Mr. E. H. M. LEWIS: This is so, and it is no new experience. The Commonwealth Government can spend \$5,000,000 a year to buy sheep stations which are doubtful propositions for the benefit of Aborigines but when it comes to making loans on reasonable terms to the States for the reticulation of water the Commonwealth will not agree. When we were in Government the Commonwealth made us a loan but the terms were most severe. Had we not wanted the water so much we would have told the Commonwealth to keep its loan. In any event, we did receive a loan.

We now want more money from the Commonwealth. The Government should make another approach, particularly as the Commonwealth Government is in a generous, Father Christmas mood. I have an idea the Government could be successful in such an approach, particularly towards the end of the present calendar year. I wish the Minister luck in that one.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Hartrey.

House adjourned at 6.01 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 27th March, 1973

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

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES

Report of Commission

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) On what date did the Local Government Boundaries Commission make its report to the Minister on metropolitan municipal boundaries, 1972?