

- (b) It should also be noted that a considerable number of women have been honoured by Her Majesty The Queen, both in the New Year and Queen's Birthday Honours lists—some at a very high level.

As the honourable member will know, this has resulted from recommendations of the Government.

- (c) There are many other ways in which the special significance of International Women's Year has been acknowledged by the Government, but it should be clearly understood that the important thing is to do things of a lasting and continuing nature as a matter of basic policy and progress rather than over-emphasise special occasions which might have little flow-on value.

4. INFLATION

Rate in 1974-75

The Hon. Lyla ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Justice representing the Treasurer:

Can the Minister explain why for the 12 months ended June, 1975, the inflation rate for Australia was 16.9 per cent, whereas the figure for this State was 20.1 per cent?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

The main reason for the differential movement in the consumer price index for Perth and the index for the six capitals combined between June quarter 1974 and June quarter 1975, is to be found in the behaviour of the food group of the index and more particularly in the inverse movement of meat prices.

Analysis of price movements in the meat subgroup reveals that prices for mutton and beef fell more sharply in other capital cities than in Perth. Moreover, whereas price levels for lamb were 12.5 per cent higher in Perth in June, 1975 than a year earlier, the corresponding change for the six capitals combined was a fall of 10 per cent.

It is to be noted that meat prices in general have not risen exceptionally fast in Perth; the meat subgroup of the index was only 3.2 per cent higher in June 1975 than a year earlier. However, the average experience of all capitals was a fall of 8 per cent which served partly to offset price increases of other commodities.

For the information of the honourable member I table notes and tabular material prepared by the Treasury on the movement in the consumer price index over the last financial year.

The paper was tabled (see paper No. 232).

METRIC CONVERSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 8th May.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [5.00 p.m.]: The purpose of this Bill is to metricate references currently in imperial units in nine Acts. This measure follows other Bills—we have had three previously—which have made such group amendments to other Acts by means of a schedule. I have no argument at all with the present Bill; I think this is the right way to go about the matter. When in Government we introduced two measures of a similar nature; although from memory I think section 5 of the Metric Conversion Act states this can be done by proclamation. It would appear now that in all we have altered some 75 Acts of Parliament by this method. I support the measure.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. V. J. Ferry.

House adjourned at 5.02 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 12th August, 1975

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

BILLS (37): ASSENT

Messages from the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator received and read notifying assent to the following Bills—

1. Public Trustee Act Amendment Bill.
2. Health Act Amendment Bill.
3. Agent General Act Amendment Bill.
4. Superannuation and Family Benefits Act Amendment Bill.
5. Factories and Shops Act Amendment Bill.
6. Hairdressers Registration Act Amendment Bill.
7. Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act Amendment Bill.
8. Environmental Protection Act Amendment Bill.
9. Anzac Day Act Amendment Bill.
10. Education Act Amendment Bill.

11. Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act Amendment Bill.
12. Reserve (Kwinana Freeway) Bill.
13. Registration of Identity of Persons Bill.
14. Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act Amendment Bill.
15. Constitution Acts Amendment Bill.
16. Superannuation, Sick, Death, Insurance, Guarantee and Endowment (Local Governing Bodies' Employees) Funds Act Amendment Bill.
17. Wesply (Dardanup) Agreement Authorization Bill.
18. Police Act Amendment Bill.
19. Small Claims Tribunals Act Amendment Bill.
20. Pyramid Sales Schemes Act Amendment Bill.
21. Consumer Protection Act Amendment Bill.
22. Companies Act (Interstate Corporate Affairs Commission) Amendment Bill.
23. Fruit-growing Reconstruction Scheme Act Amendment Bill.
24. Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act Amendment Bill.
25. Acts Amendment (State Energy Commission) Bill.
26. Government Employees (Promotions Appeal Board) Act Amendment Bill.
27. Salaries and Allowances Tribunal Bill.
28. Beef Industry Committee Act Amendment Bill.
29. Public Service Act Amendment Bill.
30. Fisheries Act Amendment Bill.
31. Banana Industry Compensation Trust Fund Act Amendment Bill.
32. Rural Industries Assistance Bill.
33. Education Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).
34. Pre-School Education Act Amendment Bill.
35. Phosphate Co-Operative (W.A.) Ltd. Act Amendment Bill.
36. Local Government Act Amendment Bill.
37. Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment Bill.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Appointment

THE SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson): I wish to inform the House that I have appointed the member for Moore (Mr Crane) to be Deputy Chairman of Committees in place of the member for Katanning (Mr Old) for the remainder of this session.

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES TRIBUNAL

Tabling of Report

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [4.43 p.m.]: In tabling this report I should explain that the determinations, which do not have to be tabled, are part of the document. They also appear in today's special issue of the *Government Gazette*.

The report was tabled (see paper No. 270).

QUESTIONS (61): ON NOTICE

1. KWINANA POWER STATION

Conversion to Coal Fuel

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Has any firm decision been made to convert any of the units at the Kwinana power station to coal burning units?
- (2) If not, how far has the examination extended?
- (3) Is it still intended to proceed with the installation of all the units programmed for the station or will any be installed at the Muja powerhouse, Collie?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Studies are well advanced. The new State Energy Commission is reviewing the capital and operating costs and technical factors now.
- (3) Such decisions will depend upon the outcome of the studies mentioned in (2).

2. EDUCATION

Free Milk Scheme

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

- (1) Referring to question 31 of 11th September, 1974 regarding free milk for schools, can he advise if the study mentioned has been completed, and if so, with what result?
- (2) If completed, can a copy of the report be tabled?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Yes. The study showed that there was very little difference in either the physical health or nutritional status of the 10 year old children in three "disadvantaged" schools compared with three "advantaged" schools. There was some slight difference between the most "disadvantaged" school and the other five schools but the difference was not statistically significant.

There were significant differences in the behaviour patterns of the 10 year old children in the "disadvantaged" school compared to the "advantaged". These differences are being further investigated. There was no evidence that the supply of free milk would be of any value.

(2) Yes.

The report was tabled (see paper No. 273).

3. TOWN PLANNING

Industrial Complex: Wanneroo

Mr HARTREY, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) Has the Minister's attention been directed to a news item appearing in *The West Australian* of 25th April, 1975, and headed "Wanneroo plan for big industrial development"?
- (2) Are the intentions ascribed by said news item to—
 - (a) the State Government;
 - (b) the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority;
 - (c) the Wanneroo Shire Council,
 factual?
- (3) Are the following statements, appearing in said news item, correct—
 - (a) the land involved comprises 240 hectares;
 - (b) the said land is worth \$1.3 million?
- (4) (a) Who made the said valuation;
- (b) is the said land the property of the Dillingham Corporation;
- (c) if "Yes" to (b)—
 - (i) when was it acquired by said corporation;
 - (ii) has a contract for sale of said land to Wanneroo Shire been entered into;
 - (iii) if so, for what price, and on what terms as to payment?
- (5) Has the shire council in the past two years rejected at least 150 applications (or some other, and what number of applications) from people wanting to establish businesses in Wanneroo Road?
- (6) Did such applications (if any) represent millions of dollars of investments?

- (7) Were these applications rejected to avoid restricting traffic flow and causing traffic hazards?
- (8) If so, why will not the big industrial development now planned by the shire not create the same traffic hazards or worse?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) and (b) Yes.
(c) This information is not available to me and I suggest that the Member may seek clarification from Wanneroo Shire Council.
- (3) (a) Yes.
(b) See answer to 2(c).
- (4) (a) See answer to 2(c).
(b) The land has now been purchased by the Wanneroo Shire Council from Dillingham Corporation.
(c) (i) to (iii) See answer to 2(c).
- (5) and (6) See answer to 2(c).
- (7) I understand a number of applications were rejected for traffic reasons.
- (8) No, the rejected proposals would have created ribbon development along the highway causing numerous traffic conflicts. The present proposals direct traffic to suitable entry points onto the Wanneroo Road.

4. HEALTH

Alcoholism

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

- (1) Is it a fact that the abuse of alcohol is the direct cause of—
 - (a) the occupation of one in five hospital beds;
 - (b) one in five battered children;
 - (c) one in five drownings;
 - (d) two in five divorces and judicial separations;
 - (e) almost half of the serious crimes in the whole community;
 - (f) half the deaths from road crashes?
- (2) If "Yes" to any of the above, what action has the Government taken to reduce the adverse effects of alcohol on the community and the heavy cost to the State caused thereby?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Data are available from a number of sources but it is not always possible to be certain of their reliability or relevance to Western Australia.
- (a) Probably correct.
- (b) Probably correct.
- (c) More likely one in eight.
- (d) Probably correct.
- (e) Not known. It is certainly true that a high proportion of inmates in Western Australian prisons are there for alcohol associated crimes.
- (f) Yes. This is a valid figure.

- (2) In 1974 the Western Australian Alcohol and Drug Authority was established by an Act of Parliament to provide a comprehensive service for the prevention, treatment and management of alcoholism in this State. In addition much of the Health Education Council is also directed to this end.

5. **TRONADO MACHINE**
Decision on Use: Expert Committee

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Who were the members of the expert committee of medical practitioners appointed by the Government in accordance with a decision of the Legislative Assembly on an amendment moved by the Government for the purpose of examining the desirability and practicability of making use of the Tronado cancer machine available to any patients requiring such treatment on medical advice?
- (2) In their examination of the microwave field characteristics of the Tronado S101 apparatus reported upon in pages 20 to 32 inclusive of the report of the subcommittee of the National Health and Medical Research Council, did the members of the expert committee have the assistance of an expert physicist?
- (3) If an expert physicist assisted the members of the expert committee what was his (or her) name and qualifications?
- (4) Will he table a copy of the report of the expert committee?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) The Government has no intention of departing from its decision already made public that it will not divulge the names of the

members of the expert committee and the Leader of the Opposition is well aware of this.

- (2) No. This was not a requirement of the amendment agreed to by the Legislative Assembly.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) No. The expert committee was asked to advise the Minister, not to submit a report.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: Not applicable to have a physicist!

6. **STATE FINANCE**

Loans from Private Sources

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Premier:

- (1) Has he sought permission in accordance with his election policy for the Government to borrow funds outside the Loan Council in order to enable it to provide infrastructure for the purpose of encouraging Australian participation in big development projects?
- (2) If permission has not yet been sought, is it his intention to carry out the promise?
- (3) What is the total amount of any loans for which permission to borrow outside the Loan Council may be sought?
- (4) What sources of money did he have in mind when giving the electors an undertaking that he would seek permission to borrow outside the Loan Council?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Not at this stage.
- (2) This remains the policy of the Government and the matter will be pursued at the appropriate time.
- (3) and (4) It would not be proper for details of any proposed borrowing to be revealed prior to discussion with the Loan Council.

7. **RAILWAYS**
Derailments

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) How many derailments have occurred during the past 12 months on this State Government's railway lines and what was the cause of each?
- (2) Will he specify the derailments and give the resultant costs involved in each?
- (3) At the present time on which lines are reductions in—
 - (a) loads;
 - (b) speeds operating because of requirements of safety?

- (4) Which additional lines are at present being considered for reductions in either loads or speeds because of safety requirements?
- (5) Where reductions in loads or speeds during the last 12 months have been applied, in what number of instances has action been the result of—
 - (a) union representation;
 - (b) departmental initiative?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) to (5) The information sought by the Member is not readily available and will take some little time to collate.
I will forward it to him as soon as possible.

8.

INFLATION

Government Action

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Premier:

- (1) In view of his most definite pronouncement during the last State election campaign that "Inflation can be beaten to a substantial degree State by State", will he, using precisely the same method of Treasury calculation as he did when answering questions on 18th March, 1975, explain why—
 - (a) the consumer price index figures for the June quarter for Perth showed an increase of 4.1 per cent compared with the national average of 3.5 per cent;
 - (b) the 12 month figure for Perth was 20.1 per cent compared with the national average of 16.9 per cent;
 - (c) the 12 month figure for Perth was far higher than any other capital;
 - (d) when the national average of price increases during 1974-75 fell from the 17.6 per cent, recorded in the year ended March, to 16.9 per cent the figures for Perth rose in the same period from 19.5 to 20.1 per cent?
- (2) Anticipating that the blame, for his inability to make good his word regarding the control of inflation, will be placed upon the Australian Government and seeing that the Australian Government policies would be a common denominator, why is the position in Perth the worst of all capitals?

Mr CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) Analysis of the increase in the consumer price index for the year ended June 1975 reveals that the rate of increase in the index for Perth was higher than

the average for all capitals for the last three quarters of the year. As a result, the average movement for the year was also higher.

The main reason for the differential movement between Perth and the other capitals is to be found in the behaviour of the food group of the index and more particularly in the inverse movement of meat prices.

Analysis of price movements in the meat sub-group reveals that prices for mutton and beef fell more sharply in other capital cities than in Perth. Moreover, whereas price levels for lamb were 12.5% higher in Perth in June, 1975 than a year earlier, the corresponding change for the six capitals combined was a fall of 10%.

It is to be noted that meat prices in general have not risen exceptionally fast in Perth; the meat sub-group of the index was only 3.2% higher in June 1975 than a year earlier. However, the average experience of all capitals was a fall of 8.0% which served partly to offset price increases of other commodities.

For the information of the Member I table notes and tabular material prepared by the Treasury on the movement in the consumer price index over the last financial year.

The papers were tabled (see paper No. 274).

9.

BEEF

Commonwealth Aid Scheme: Applications

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

- (1) How many applications have been received for loans under the emergency scheme for beef producers?
- (2) How many of these applicants have been granted loans?
- (3) How many applications have been declined?
- (4) What is the total amount involved in loans to successful applicants under the scheme?
- (5) What level of off-farm income is an applicant permitted while still remaining eligible under the scheme?
- (6) What return per kilo of beef or per animal is used to ascertain if the operations of an applicant are viable?

Mr OLD replied:

The Rural Reconstruction Authority has advised as follows—

- (1) 174 at 31st July, 1975.
- (2) 59.
- (3) 114. One application was withdrawn.
- (4) \$306 250 at 31st July representing an average of \$5 190 per loan.
- (5) No specific level has been set and each case is examined on its merits. Where a farmer has sought work to supplement an inadequate farm income this is accepted as such and does not count against him. However, major off-farm employment could put an applicant outside the scope of the scheme.
- (6) A general assessment of long term viability is made on the basis of size of the farm operation and type of enterprise. No budgets are prepared for this purpose and no standard beef price returns have therefore been determined.

10.

MEAT

Transport Subsidy

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

- (1) During the period which the transcontinental railway line was cut, what quantity of meat was brought into Western Australia from other States for sale?
- (2) Was this meat subject to a transport subsidy by the Western Australian Government?
- (3) If so, what was the total amount which was paid in subsidising imported meat?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Nil.
- (2) and (3) Not applicable.

11.

HOSPITALS

Development Programme Funds

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

- (1) How has the \$4.326 million made available to this State in 1974-75 under the Australian Government's five year hospital development programme been allocated?
- (2) What additional requirements for financial assistance under this programme have been put to the Australian Government?

Mr RIDGE replied:

	\$
(1) Dampier Hospital additions	208 429
Fremantle Hospital—laboratories	824
Katanning Hospital—new service block ..	1 132 000
Mt. Barker Hospital—additions	147 990
Osborne Park Hospital—additions	656 412
Perth Dental Hospital—major additions ..	632 761
Kalamunda Hospital—acquisition	343 781
Rockingham Hospital—construction	306 000
Carnarvon Hospital—major additions	565 339
Heathcote Hospital—mechanical services ..	79 716
Graylands Hospital—creative expression unit	206 728
Institute of Radio-therapy—extensions ..	46 020
	<hr/>
	\$4 326 000

- (2) A detailed five year programme has been put to the Commonwealth Government.

12.

EDUCATION

Free School Books Scheme

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

- (1) Is it a fact that school books which were issued free to students attending high schools under the Tonkin Government's free text book scheme are to be withdrawn?
- (2) If "Yes" will he give full reasons for such action?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) The free text book scheme introduced by the Tonkin Government was designed for primary schools, not high schools.

Over a period of many years the Education Department has made available supplementary materials for teaching certain subjects in high schools. These materials are still available but as schools now have the authority to plan their own courses, some are not using the supplementary materials.

It is thus not a case that free text materials are being withdrawn.

- (2) Not applicable.

13. **TRAFFIC**
Used Cars: Investigation

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) In view of the ever increasing number of complaints from people that secondhand car dealers are still selling vehicles that are not roadworthy, has a special section been set up in the newly constituted Road Traffic Authority to investigate secondhand car yards?
- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) If "Yes" how many vehicle examining officers are employed to carry out satisfactory examination of all yards?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) There are five vehicle examiners employed in checking on used car dealers and used car yards in the metropolitan area.
- (2) and (3) Answered by (1).

14. **PRE-PRIMARY CENTRES**
Canning Electorate

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

- (1) Is it his intention to open pre-primary schools in the State electorate of Canning in the 1976 school year?
- (2) If "Yes" in what areas and to which primary schools will they be attached?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) At proposed new primary schools for 1976—
 - (a) South Thornlie Primary, Ovens Road, Thornlie.
 - (b) Brookman Primary, Brookman Avenue, Langford.
 - (c) South Willetton Primary, Pinetree Gully Road, Willetton.

15. **KINLOCK SCHOOL**

Additional Accommodation

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

- (1) Is he aware of the tremendous home building rate in the Ferndale area?
- (2) If "Yes" is he also aware that more accommodation will be needed to provide for the 1976 intake of students at the Kinlock Primary School?

- (3) If answer to (1) and (2) is "Yes" will he also state what he proposes to do about it?
- (4) Will the accommodation be provided for the 1976 school year?
- (5) To assist to alleviate the overcrowding at the Kinlock Primary School, will he further advise when the Ferndale school in Wisteria Avenue, Ferndale, will be opened?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) A house count conducted on the 25th July, 1975, revealed that there were 77 houses under construction and 16 completed, but unoccupied, houses in the intake area for the Kinlock Primary School.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Demountable classrooms will be provided as required.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) It is not possible at this time to indicate definitely when the new Ferndale Primary School will be opened. The opening of the school will be dependent on the future availability of loan funds and competing needs for educational facilities in other areas of the State.

16. **KINDERGARTEN**
Bullcreek

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

- (1) Can he advise when a kindergarten will be opened or provided for the Bullcreek area?
- (2) Can he further advise the exact location in which it will be built?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) At the present time it is not possible to indicate when a second primary school, and therefore a new pre-primary centre will be established in Bullcreek. This will be dependent upon population growth in the area and on State-wide priorities for new schools.

17. **INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONVENTIONS**
Correspondence with Commonwealth

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Has the Western Australian Government previously corresponded with the Australian Government concerning ILO conventions 87 and 98?

- (2) What was the purport of such correspondence?
- (3) What was the decision of the then Western Australian Government?
- (4) Will he table the correspondence or copies thereof?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes. The Department of Labour and Industry has corresponded with the Australian Department of Labor and Immigration on many occasions during the years the Government considered the conventions.
- (2) The correspondence all centre around the problems involved in ratification of the conventions. Both conventions were ratified by Australia at Geneva in 1973.
- (3) Answered by (2).
- (4) I will make the files available in my office for the Member's perusal.

18. TOWN PLANNING

Wanneroo Road Bypass

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

Do current proposals indicate that Wanneroo road should by-pass the Wanneroo townsite to the east or to the west?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

Both the western and eastern bypass alternatives are the subject of further study with the possible effects on the environment being considered. This study is currently being undertaken by the Town Planning Department on behalf of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority.

19. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Alcoa Refinery: Mud Lake Area

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Has deposition of waste materials from the Alcoa Refinery into the "mud lake" adjacent to Rockingham Road, Naval Base, ceased?
- (2) If "Yes" what stage has been reached in consolidation of the area?
- (3) When is it anticipated that the area will be ready for re-development?
- (4) Is the land in question Crown land?

- (5) If "No" who is the owner?
- (6) What is the area involved?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Essentially yes, but some further filling of area C to fill small depressions will take place.
- (2) The area of about 120 hectares is divided into three sections: A, B and C, representing the order in which they were filled. The successive stages of reclamation which can proceed simultaneously are—

(i) Removal of caustic liquor or deliquoring.

(ii) Levelling and resoiling.

(iii) Revegetation.

Area A will be completely deliquored by mid-1977; the area has been levelled and resoiled and vegetation has been established. Area B will lag about a year behind A, and area C about two years behind A. On present indications, the whole area should be revegetated and reasonably consolidated by 1979 or 1980.

- (3) Western Australia probably leads the world in reclamation of red mud disposal areas. Consolidation depends on removal of liquor, while revegetation is also assisted by irrigation and a low water table. The time required to render the land suitable for redevelopment depends on the nature of the redevelopment contemplated.
- (4) The land is owned by the Industrial Land Development Authority, and has been made available to Alcoa pursuant to the Alumina Refinery Agreement Act, 1961-74.
- (5) Not applicable.
- (6) Areas A, B and C total 119.767 7 hectares.

20. TECHNICAL EDUCATION FACILITIES

Priorities

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

With respect to construction of new technical education facilities—

- (a) are the proposed centres of Geraldton, Kalgoorlie and Kwinana still considered to be the most urgent in terms of need;
- (b) if so, are priorities still as listed above or have they changed?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (a) The schools listed are still regarded as urgent needs.
- (b) It is not possible to indicate the extent to which priorities will remain unchanged until details are available of the finance to be provided by the State and the Commission on Technical and Further Education.

22.

SCHOOLS

Swan and Mundaring Electorates: Enrolments

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

What were the enrolment figures for all grades at the following primary schools as at 1st March, 1975, and what is their present enrolment—

Guildford,
Herne Hill,
Middle Swan,
Midland,
West Midland,
Upper Swan,
Midvale,
West Swan,
Bellevue,
Koongamia,
Greenmount,
Helena Valley,
Swan View,
Darlington,
Glen Forrest,
Parkerville,
Mundaring,
Mount Helena,
Sawyers Valley,
Chidlow, and
Wooroloo?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

21. TOWN PLANNING

Bedfordale Rural Zone

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

Will he table objections received with respect to the proposed Bedfordale special rural zone and also his replies to those objections?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

No. The objections to the Armadale-Kelmscott Council's town planning scheme amendment relating to Bedfordale are addressed to the council and I do not reply to the objections.

School	Date	Enrolment per Year										Special	Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Guildford	Mar. 1975	62	51	56	54	37	59	49	368
	Aug. 1975	63	55	56	51	42	61	53	381
Herne Hill	Mar. 1975	20	15	17	8	19	18	15	112
	Aug. 1975	17	21	19	11	20	22	17	127
Middle Swan	Mar. 1975	62	67	59	56	62	65	65	436
	Aug. 1975	63	60	61	61	57	65	68	435
Midland	Mar. 1975	34	28	34	32	48	35	40	251
	Aug. 1975	32	27	33	30	48	38	38	246
West Midland	Mar. 1975	9	11	12	32
	Aug. 1975	9	12	11	32
Upper Swan	Mar. 1975	17	11	19	16	17	15	20	115
	Aug. 1975	20	9	18	15	16	14	18	110
Midvale	Mar. 1975	44	43	37	51	37	34	46	24	316
	Aug. 1975	49	44	40	50	36	34	46	27	326
West Swan	Mar. 1975	4	9	5	5	5	6	9	43
	Aug. 1975	5	5	4	5	3	5	9	36
Bellevue	Mar. 1975	6	15	9	13	11	12	13	79
	Aug. 1975	6	15	4	11	9	14	11	70
Koongamia	Mar. 1975	55	36	39	54	33	56	39	312
	Aug. 1975	57	37	36	57	33	59	37	316

School		Date	1	Enrolment per Year					7	Special	Total	
				2	3	4	5	6				
Greenmount	Mar. 1975	26	27	31	29	33	47	37	230
			Aug. 1975	26	28	32	29	32	48	39	234
Helena Valley	Mar. 1975	10	12	14	9	17	17	12	91
			Aug. 1975	8	10	13	10	16	19	11	87
Swan View	Mar. 1975	56	65	47	45	39	49	42	343
			Aug. 1975	59	71	52	52	41	49	45	369
Darlington	Mar. 1975	45	44	63	44	61	60	60	377
			Aug. 1975	47	46	63	44	63	59	60	382
Glen Forrest	Mar. 1975	28	34	28	32	22	23	25	192
			Aug. 1975	29	31	27	31	21	23	26	188
Parkerville	Mar. 1975	8	9	7	12	9	16	10	71
			Aug. 1975	6	11	10	11	11	15	13	77
Mundaring	Mar. 1975	42	22	31	29	37	41	44	246
			Aug. 1975	40	24	27	29	37	38	37	232
Mount Helena	Mar. 1975	47	53	35	46	32	40	48	301
			Aug. 1975	47	52	38	51	31	47	54	320
Sawyers Valley	Mar. 1975	4	7	5	3	7	3	6	35
			Aug. 1975	4	6	3	3	7	2	6	31
Chidlow	Mar. 1975	13	8	13	11	10	12	8	75
			Aug. 1975	14	10	12	13	10	15	8	82
Wooroloo	Mar. 1975	16	9	9	11	9	12	15	81
			Aug. 1975	16	9	9	12	10	14	17	87

23. GOVERNOR STIRLING HIGH SCHOOL

Enrolments

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

- (1) What was the Minister's department's anticipated enrolment figure for Governor Stirling Senior High School for the year—

1972 when calculated during 1971;

1973 when calculated during 1972;

1974 when calculated during 1973;

1975 when calculated during 1974?

- (2) What were the actual enrolment figures as at the 1st March for Governor Stirling Senior High School for the years 1972-1975 inclusive?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2)—

Year prediction made	Predicted March enrolment for the following year	Actual March enrolment for the following year
1971	1 498	1 549
1972	1 523	1 585
1973	1 630	1 542
1974	1 680	1 621

24. FATAL TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS *Cost of Examination*

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Traffic:

What was the total cost incurred by the Motor Vehicles Research Branch for the examination of one aspect of the principle that vehicles driven in unfamiliar surroundings contribute to fatalities and fatal accidents, carried out by D. J. Hartley and submitted 20th March, 1975?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

The total cost of the report referred to was \$610.

25. MEDIBANK SCHEME *Counter Proposals by State*

Mr MOILER, to the Premier:

- (1) Will he table a copy of this State's counter proposals to Medibank, submitted to the Prime Minister earlier this year and which the Premier inferred he would make public after the said counter proposals had been considered by the Australian Minister for Social Security?

- (2) If not, why not?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Yes. I now table letter to the then Acting Prime Minister, Dr Cairns, of 31st December, 1974, which contains the counter proposals referred to in debate.

- (2) Answered by (1).

I should add that my colleague, the Minister for Health has asked me to ascertain whether this is actually the information sought, because he felt there might be another matter the honourable member had in mind arising from a letter he received from the Acting Premier in my absence, dealing with the subject.

The paper was tabled (see paper No. 275).

26. VERMIN AND NOXIOUS WEEDS CONTROL Employees and Costs

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

In reference to the amalgamation of the vermin and noxious weed control sections within the Agriculture Protection Board—

- (1) How many people were employed within the vermin control section as at 1st March, 1975?
- (2) How many people were employed with the noxious weeds control section as at 1st March, 1975?
- (3) What were the operating costs of both sections for the year 1974-75?
- (4) What is the estimated operating cost for 1975-76?
- (5) Would he provide a breakdown of how the costs are accredited to the farmer, local authority, State Government or department?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) 161.
(2) 89.

	Gross Expenditure.
	\$
(3) Vermin control	2 391 127
Noxious weed control	1 661 497
Skeleton weed eradication	240 371

	Gross Estimated Expenditure.
	\$
(4) Vermin control	2 675 789
Noxious weed control	1 899 151
Skeleton weed eradication	266 600

(5) 1974-75—

Vermin control:

Landholder	100 961
Local authority	283 596
Government	2 006 570

Noxious weed control:

Landholder	160 000
Local authority	60 666
Government	1 420 609

Skeleton weed eradication:

Landholder	*285 300
*Balance \$44 929 held in trust.	

1975-76 estimates:

Vermin control—

Landholder	88 350
Local authority	160 890
Government	2 426 549

Noxious weed control:

Landholder	371 760
Local authority	72 067
Government	1 455 324

Skeleton weed eradication:

Landholder	*266 820
*Estimated surplus \$220.	

Additional on-farm expenditure on vermin and noxious weed control is incurred by farmers by virtue of payment of local authority rates and through work carried out by their own labour or by contract. Some local authorities also undertake work on land for which they are responsible either by staff employed by the authorities or by contract.

27.

ROADS

Local Authorities: Expenditure

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Would he provide in some suitable form the comparative expenditures of all metropolitan local authorities on road works for the year ended 30th June, 1974, as disclosed by statements form 6F submitted to the Main Roads Department and itemising—
 - (a) expenditure from local authorities' own resources;
 - (b) Main Roads Department recoups;
 - (c) programmed roads;
 - (d) other roads?
- (2) In respect of the "local authorities' own resources" expenditure referred to in (a) would he please further analyse this to show amounts expended from—
 - (a) municipal funds;
 - (b) loan and reserve funds?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) I hereby table a statement setting out the required information.

The paper was tabled (see paper No. 276).

28. ROADS

Funds: Expenditure

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Would he advise the total amount of road funds which were at the disposal of the State in 1974-75 and what amounts were—
 - (a) spent by the Main Roads Department; and
 - (b) allocated to local authorities for expenditure by them?
- (2) Would he provide similar information as to the amounts estimated for 1975-76 indicating how much is, or has been provided by the Australian Government?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Total road funds for 1974-75—\$82 487 433.
 - (a) \$60 204 511
 - (b) \$22 282 922
- (2) Estimated total road funds for 1975-76, excluding an expected supplementary grant from the Commonwealth the amount of which is not yet known:

\$81 412 000	(Commonwealth
\$50 000 000)	
(a) \$60 994 000	(Commonwealth
\$36 977 000)	
(b) \$20 418 000	(Commonwealth
\$13 023 000)	

29. MILK

Production and Prices

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

- (1) In the year 1974-75, what was the number of dairy farmers producing—
 - (a) market milk;
 - (b) manufacturing milk?
- (2) What is the number of dairymen producing each of the two categories referred to in (1) above?
- (3) What was the total amount of market milk production in 1974-75?
- (4) What was the total amount of milk produced by non-market milk producers in 1974-75?
- (5) What was the total amount of milk produced by market milk producers in 1974-75?

- (6) What was the price of—

- (a) market milk;
- (b) manufacturing milk, in 1955, 1965, 1974, 1975?

- (7) What was the value of dairy products imported into Western Australia in 1974 from—
 - (a) Eastern States sources;
 - (b) overseas?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) and (2) In 1974-75 there were—564 dairymen licensed to produce market milk who also produced manufacturing milk; 280 dairymen licensed to produce manufacturing milk; and 165 dairymen licensed to produce manufacturing cream. Total 1 009.

- (3) Estimated at 25.5 million gallons.
- (4) Estimated at 13.9 million gallons.
- (5) Estimated at 41.0 million gallons.

- (6) Price of market milk (including allowance for market cream) at the farm, south of Pinjarra—

30th June—	
1955—In cans	31.56 c/gallon.
1965—In cans	35.31 c/gallon.
1974—In cans	50.67 c/gallon.
1975—In cans	55.28 c/gallon.

1st August—

1975—In cans 58.67 c/gallon.

Prices of manufacturing milk at farm, including bounty—

30th June—

1955—In cans 45.75 c/lb fat.
1965—In cans 45.00 c/lb fat.
1974—In cans 45.05 c/lb fat.

1st August—

1974—In cans 49.35 c/lb fat (Interim price).

30th June—

1975—In cans 55.65 c/lb fat.

1st August—

1975—In cans 47.35 c/lb fat (Interim price).

Milk from farmers' own refrigerated bulk vats receives a premium not included in the price for can milk.

- (7) Value of imports into Western Australia in 1973-74—
 - (a) from Eastern States—\$11 599 000.
 - (b) from overseas—\$427 000.

30.

MIDLAND JUNCTION ABATTOIR BOARD

Livestock Purchases

Mr GREWAR, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has the Midland Junction Abattoir Board the power to purchase sheep and cattle in other States?

- (2) Has the board at any time in the past two years purchased livestock from outside Western Australia?
- (3) If (2) is "Yes" what livestock were purchased and when?
- (4) Can he intervene in the board's decision to trade over the border?
- (5) Would he exercise this right when Western Australia had an over-supply situation?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) Yes, under the trading powers of the board.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) 410 export type cattle were purchased from South Australia in October 1973 to maintain throughput.
- (4) Yes. The board's trading powers are subject to the Minister, and the board could be specifically requested not to purchase livestock from interstate.
- (5) Yes, provided throughput at the time was not a limiting factor.

31.

PROSTITUTION

Convictions

Dr DADOUR, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) How many convictions against prostitutes have been recorded—
 - (a) during 1974;
 - (b) from 1st January to 30th June, 1975?
- (2) How many convictions for living off proceeds of prostitution have been recorded—
 - (a) during 1974;
 - (b) from 1st January to 30th June, 1975?
- (3) How many "madams" were convicted during 1974 and 1975?
- (4) What was the average amount of fines recorded against prostitutes during 1974-75?
- (5) Why are not the clientele prosecuted?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) —

	Metro. area	Kalgoorlie	Elsewhere	Total
(a)	60	43	—	103
(b)	30	29	1	59
- (2) —

(a)	10	—	—	10
(b)	1	—	—	1
- (3) 33 (involving 37 charges).
9 (involving 27 charges).
- 42 Total
- (4) \$62.

- (5) There is no provision in law for such action.

32.

ORD RIVER DISTRICT CO-OPERATIVE Government Takeover

Mr MAY, to the Premier:

- (1) Will he indicate the total financial commitment which will be the responsibility of the State Government following the takeover of the Ord River District Co-operative?
- (2) What are the terms and conditions of the announced takeover?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) The State Government has not taken over the Ord River District Co-operative. However, it has entered into an arrangement which will allow the co-operative to continue to function following the cessation of cotton processing and marketing. Under the arrangement, the Government will—
 - (a) take over and maintain the No. 2 cotton gin and certain associated assets.
 - (b) cancel the amount of \$336 920 owing to the State under the terms of the debentures on the No. 2 cotton gin.
 - (c) cancel the amount of \$310 486 owing to the State by way of deferred rental payments in respect of the No. 1 cotton gin.
 - (d) assume responsibility for payment of \$182 636 owing to farmers under the co-operative's revolving cotton toll scheme, with payment due by varying annual amounts over the four years 1977 to 1980.

The Government's commitment to meet the cotton tolls is subject to the condition that the co-operative continues to function. Should the co-operative cease to operate at any time during the remaining life of the toll scheme, then the State's obligation in respect of the tolls would also cease. In addition, the Government reserves the right to review its commitment should there be any major improvement in the cash position of the co-operative.

33.

TRAFFIC

Manning Road: Pedestrian Overway

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is he aware that students living in the Wilson area and required to attend the Bentley Senior

High School are subject to a dangerous hazard when endeavouring to cross Manning Road?

- (2) Is he further aware that an overpass is provided in Rossmoyne to facilitate students crossing Leach Highway?
- (3) Will he advise whether consideration has been given to the provision of an overpass over Manning Road and what is the decision of the department?
- (4) If not, will he institute urgent investigation with a view to providing this necessary facility?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) The provision of pedestrian facilities on roads under the control of local authorities is primarily their responsibility. No approach for financial assistance has been made by the Canning Town Council with regard to an overpass on Manning Road.
- (4) I suggest the Member should take the matter up with the local authority.

34. WYNDHAM PORT *Costs of Expansion*

Mr MAY, to the Premier:

What are the anticipated detailed costs of the proposed expansion of the port at Wyndham as announced by him in Kununurra on Saturday, 12th July, 1975?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

The preliminary estimate for the 94 metre southward extension and mooring dolphin is \$925 000. The design of the bulk loading equipment is currently being re-examined by a consulting engineer.

Indicative estimate of cost of bulk loading equipment is \$1.2 million to \$1.6 million, exclusive of any strengthening of the existing structure.

35. IRON ORE PROJECT *Marandoo: Discussions*

Mr MAY, to the Premier:

- (1) During the term of the present Government and having regard to his recent visits to Japan, has he had any specific discussions with the Japanese steel mills concerning the proposed iron ore project at Marandoo?
- (2) If so, will he indicate the Japanese companies involved?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) The State has a continuing discussion with the Japanese steel mills on those matters which affect existing and proposed iron ore projects, including Marandoo.

On the recent visit to Japan a meeting was held with representatives on executive level of all the integrated Japanese steel mills under the co-ordination and chairmanship of Nippon Steel.

These discussions were independent of comprehensive discussions with Government Ministers and the major trading houses.

36. TOWN PLANNING *Bedfordale Rural Zone*

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) On what date did he receive my letter of 16th July, 1975 concerning the Bedfordale special rural zone?
- (2) On what date did he grant final approval to amendment No. 25 to town planning scheme No. 1 of the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott?
- (3) On what date did he authorise the insertion of a notice of the above by publication in the *Government Gazette* of 25th July?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) The 22nd July, 1975.
- (2) The 9th July, 1975.
- (3) The publication of a notice in the *Government Gazette* of my final approval to a town planning scheme amendment is an administrative procedure under the town planning regulations and stems from my granting final approval.

37. PUBLIC SERVICE ARBITRATION ACT *Amendment*

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Premier:

- (1) Has his attention been drawn to the editorial in the July issue of the *Civil Service Journal* in which it is claimed that amendments to the Public Service Arbitration Act are imperative in order to provide for the settlement of disputes during the currency of an agreement?
- (2) As a case has been made out also for other amendments to make available particularly dismissal and disciplinary appeal rights to all Government officers, will he give consideration to the early

introduction of legislation for the purpose of enacting desirable amendments to the Public Service Arbitration Act?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Yes. The Government has the question of amendments to the Public Service Arbitration Act concerning the Arbitrator's power to amend agreements, under consideration following recent discussions between the Public Service Board, the Public Service Arbitrator and the Civil Service Association.
- (2) The question of legislative amendments relative to dismissal and disciplinary appeal rights to all Government officers has been raised previously on a number of occasions. Following further recent representations, these matters are again under consideration.

38. MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Metropolitan Seats: Average Cost

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Treasurer: Taking into consideration salary, electorate allowance, expenses in connection with the running of an electorate office and other incidental expenses, what is the average annual cost to the State for a metropolitan member of the Legislative Assembly and Legislative Council respectively?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

Taking into account salaries and allowances of members as laid down in the new determination of the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal and current average costs of maintaining electorate offices, the average full year costs for metropolitan members of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council are approximately \$29 000 and \$30 000, respectively.

For the purpose of this calculation, metropolitan members have been taken as those representing provinces and districts in group D in the tribunal's determination.

39. WATER SUPPLIES

Leeman and Greenhead

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) As at a land sale held at Coorow six years ago to sell blocks at Leeman and Greenhead the auctioneer promised that water would be provided to the blocks within two years, can he advise why this promise was not kept?

- (2) When will water be provided to these two seaside resorts?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Any such promise, if given, could not have been authorised by the Public Works Department, as exploratory drilling to prove a source did not commence until 1972.

- (2) The first stage of the Leeman water supply from a temporary source is to provide only a limited service to mining company houses. The date for completion is being negotiated between the company, which is making a financial contribution, and the State, but will not be later than June, 1976.

The extension of the full scheme to serve other than company houses at Leeman, together with Greenhead, will proceed as soon as finance is available to commission the permanent bore source. It is not anticipated that funds for this purpose will be available in the 1975-76 loan programme.

40. BIRD KEEPERS *Regulations*

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is he aware of the charges levied against bird keepers by the Agriculture Protection Board's new regulations published in the *Government Gazette* on 27th June, 1975?
- (2) If "Yes" what is his policy in regard to keeping birds classified as vermin provided one pays to keep them?
- (3) Is he aware these birds cannot survive in bush life?
- (4) If "Yes" then why are they classified as vermin?
- (5) As Parliament has not debated these regulations will he move to disallow them until the whole matter can be debated?
- (6) If not, why not?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) So that birds considered to be risk species will not have to be destroyed existing owners have been given the option of retaining these birds subject to appropriate safeguards being taken. The permit fees charged will assist in meeting the costs of ensuring that the provisions of the regulations are met.
- (3) No. There are at least nine species of non-indigenous birds already established around the Perth metropolitan area.

- (4) Not applicable.
- (5) No.
- (6) The regulations are based on the premise that in order to protect both the wild life and primary production of Western Australia, only those species known to be harmless should be kept or admitted into the State.

Although aviculturists have been given the opportunity to document evidence to have any species reclassified only one application has so far been received by the Agriculture Protection Board.

The principles embodied in the regulations have not only been approved by the present Cabinet but were also approved by the Cabinet of the previous Government.

41. STATE FINANCE

Interest on Investments

Mr HARMAN, to the Treasurer:

- (1) What amount of money was received by the Treasury during the financial year 1974-75 by way of interest upon investments in the money market of public moneys?
- (2) How was this amount disbursed in 1974-75?
- (3) What disbursements have been made since 1st July, 1975?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) \$9 021 295.45c.
- (2) \$2 541 537.83c, being interest earned on their balances with Treasury throughout the year, was disbursed to trust funds and authorities. The balance, amounting to \$6 479 757.62c, was held in departmental receipts in suspense at 30th June, 1975.
- (3) Nil. In line with established practice, consideration will be given to the employment of balances held in the account when the Budget is framed.

42. MENTAL HEALTH

Tresillian Hostel: Purchase Price

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

- (1) Is it a fact, as reported, the original asking price for Tresillian hostel was \$250 000 or thereabouts?
- (2) If so, what was the reason for the reduction in price to \$125 000?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) and (2) The figure of \$250 000 mentioned in early discussions with the Nedlands City Council

was an assessment of the depreciated replacement cost of alternative accommodation and bore no relationship to the valuation of the land and buildings.

Understandably, this basis of assessment was unacceptable to the council which rightly considered that a price based on current valuation of land and buildings was a more appropriate method of assessment in view of the council's intention to use the property for community purposes. Agreement was reached on a figure of \$125 000 which conformed closely to the latter approach.

43. MENTAL HEALTH

Kareeba Nursing Home: Purchase Price

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

- (1) Has the Government purchased, or does it intend to purchase the Kareeba nursing home in Belmont?
- (2) If so, when is it intended the Government will take over the home?
- (3) What was the total purchase price?
- (4) What components make up the price, i.e., building, equipment, goodwill, purchase of lease, etc.?
- (5) How was the purchase financed?
- (6) Was any assistance given by the Government in relocating those patients at present in Kareeba?
- (7) How many profoundly retarded patients will be accommodated at Kareeba?
- (8) Will structural alterations be necessary?
- (9) If so, what is the cost and nature of such alterations?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) The Government is in the process of negotiating the purchase of Kareeba nursing home. There has been an offer and an acceptance by all parties.
- (2) Vacant possession is required within three months from payment of the deposit to the present occupier.
- (3) The total purchase price is \$290 000 plus normal transfer fees.

		\$
(4) (a) Buildings	225 000
(b) Equipment	40 000
(c) Goodwill and Lease	25 000
Total	290 000

- (5) The Commonwealth Government provided 75% of the capital cost of the project.
The State Government provided 25% of the capital cost.
- (6) The question of assistance in the relocation of the patients at Kareeba has not as yet arisen.
- (7) The Physician Superintendent of the Mental Deficiency Division of Mental Health Services advises that 32 profoundly retarded persons will be accommodated in Kareeba hostel.
- (8) No structural alterations will be necessary to the present buildings. It is proposed to undertake minor modifications only.
- (9) It is estimated that \$8 000 will be required to replace two showers with two baths in the toilet areas. No other work is planned at this stage.

44. MENTAL HEALTH

Retarded Children: Accommodation

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

- (1) How many profoundly retarded children—up to and including teenagers—are currently accommodated by the State?
- (2) Where are these accommodated and what are the numbers at each place?
- (3) How many profoundly retarded children in the above category are known to be in the State?
- (4) What unsatisfied requests for accommodation for these children do Mental Health Services have?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) At the 30th June, 1975, the State provided accommodation for 66 profoundly retarded, physically handicapped persons under the age of eighteen years. In addition 16 such persons were accommodated at the State subsidised Nulsen Haven Home.
- (2) (a) The persons referred to in (1) above were accommodated as follows—
Dorset Hostel, Armadale—11;
Scarboro Hostel, Scarborough—12;
Tresillian Hostel, Nedlands—12;
Princess Margaret Hospital, Subiaco—31;
Nulsen Haven, Belmont—16.
Total—82.

- (b) The total number of profoundly retarded physically handicapped persons accommodated as at 30th June, 1975, and 31st July, 1975, is as follows—

	30th June	31st July
Dorset Hostel, Armadale	29	29
Scarboro Hostel, Scarborough	16	16
Tresillian, Nedlands	21	20
Princess Margaret Hospital, Subiaco	31	31
	97	96
Nulsen Haven, Belmont	40	40
Total :	137	136

- (3) There are 136 profoundly retarded persons under the age of eighteen years registered with the Mental Deficiency Division of Mental Health Services.
- (4) There are 15 profoundly retarded, physically handicapped persons under the age of eighteen years on the urgent waiting list at Mental Health Services. There are approximately 39 less urgent cases, or a total of approximately 54 children, for whom accommodation has still to be found.

45. ELECTORAL DISTRICTS AND PROVINCES

Enrolments and Quotas

Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) What are the latest enrolment figures for each Assembly District and each Council Province?
- (2) As the Act now stands what would be the quotas if a redistribution were ordered at the present time?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) (a) Assembly Districts:

Metropolitan Area:

Ascot	15 589
Balga	16 953
Canning	28 965
Clontarf	17 757
Cockburn	18 884
Cottesloe	16 047
East Melville	18 031
Floreat	17 451
Fremantle	17 038
Karrinyup	23 454
Maylands	16 887
Melville	16 566
Morley	20 730
Mount Hawthorn	16 350
Mount Lawley	16 748
Nedlands	15 765
Perth	14 972
Scarborough	16 962
South Perth	15 384
Subiaco	15 144
Swan	17 493
Victoria Park	16 581
Welshpool	17 481

Agricultural, Mining and 46.

Pastoral Area

Albany	8 168
Avon	7 753
Boulder-Dundas ..	8 173
Bunbury	8 578
Collie	7 963
Dale	12 807
Geraldton	8 500
Greenough	7 561
Kalamunda	11 305
Kalgoorlie	7 215
Katanning	7 807
Merredin-Yilgarn ..	7 357
Moore	7 503
Mount Marshall ..	6 938
Mundaring	9 759
Murray	9 336
Narrogin	7 894
Rockingham	10 335
Roe	8 361
Stirling	8 198
Toodyay	23 192
Vasse	8 883
Warren	7 482
Wellington	8 669

North-West-Murchison-Eyre Area:

Gascoyne	3 874
Kimberley	4 405
Murchison-Eyre ..	2 260
Pilbara	11 885
Total	647 393

(b) Council Provinces:

Metropolitan Area:

Metropolitan	79 379
North Metro-politan ..	90 467
North-East	70 699
Metropolitan	70 699
South Metro-politan	70 519
South-East	94 168
Metropolitan	94 168

Agricultural, Mining and Pastoral Area:

Central	22 585
Lower Central	23 252
Lower West	32 478
South	24 727
South-East	22 745
South-West	26 130
Upper West	23 564
West	44 256

North-West-Murchison-Eyre Area:

Lower North	6 134
North	16 290
Total	647 393

(2) (a) Metropolitan Area 17 618

(b) Agricultural, Mining and Pastoral Area .. 9 155

ORD IRRIGATION SCHEME

Costs

Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) From the inception what has been the total cost of the Ord River scheme?
- (2) What are the total costs composed of by way of detailed cost of each phase?
- (3) Has finality now been reached in the payment of the principal contractor of the main dam (Dravo's)?
- (4) What was the final cost of the dam as against the tender price?
- (5) Of all the costs involved how much was funded by the State Government and how much was funded by the Commonwealth Government?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Since construction of engineering works was initiated in 1959 the total cost of the Ord River Scheme up to 30th June, 1975, is \$40 698 000. This amount excludes townsite infrastructure costs at Kununurra.

(2) (a) Phase 1—	\$
Kununurra Diver-sion dam	8 549 000
Irrigation and drain-age works	7 871 000
Total	16 420 000

(b) Phase 2—	\$
Ord River dam ..	21 858 000
Irrigation and drain-age works	2 420 000
Total	24 278 000

- (3) No.
- (4) (a) Payments up to June 30th, 1975, to Dravo Pty. Ltd. for work carried out on construction of the Ord River dam amount to \$15 852 000.
- (b) The original tender price by Dravo Pty. Ltd. was \$12 869 000.

(5) (a) State Government	\$4 739 000.
(b) Commonwealth Government—	
Grants	\$33 539 000
Loan	\$2 420 000
Total	\$35 959 000

47. ALBANY PORT

Report by Captain Hartley

Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Works:

When is it expected that the report by Captain Hartley on the future possibilities of Albany as a regional port will be available?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

It is expected to be presented to the Government during the week commencing 25th August.

48. WATER SUPPLIES

Pilbara

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

- (1) What is the daily quantity of water supply which the PWD was charged to ascertain availability, in regard to development in the Port Hedland area, and in regard to the West Pilbara industrial complex, on a continuing basis?
- (2) In the light of current knowledge of Pilbara water resources, what average daily quantity of water could reasonably be supplied to each area in (1) above on a continuing basis?
- (3) What is the likely maximum average daily quantity of water that the proposed integrated Millstream-Gregory's Gorge Dam system could supply on a continuing basis?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) The quantity of water was related to the proposed development in each area.
 - (a) Port Hedland—up to 100 million kilolitres per year.
 - (b) West Pilbara—up to 190 million kilolitres per year.
- (2) The investigation of the surface and underground water resources of the Pilbara will continue for some years, but in the light of current knowledge a water supply strategy to meet the demands set out in (1) has been developed, though the known water resources of the area would be extended to meet the demands.
- (3) Final investigations for a dam configuration on the Fortescue River are not yet complete. It is estimated that the yield from a dam and the Millstream aquifer used in conjunction would be between 40 and 60 million kilolitres per year depending upon dam location and height and the water management technique adopted.

49. MINING

Temporary Reserve 5850

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

- (1) In regard to temporary reserve 5850, what is its area, which company has been granted occupancy rights and what are the minerals of interest?
- (2) On what dates—
 - (a) was temporary reserve 5850 established;
 - (b) were occupancy rights approved?
- (3) (a) Is the Mines Department public plan 441A/40 endorsed with the boundary of the Hardy Inlet ecological study area;
- (b) if so, does temporary reserve 5850 overlap this marked area on the plan?
- (4) (a) Pursuant to section 57 of the Environmental Protection Act was the Environmental Protection Authority advised of any details concerning temporary reserve 5850;
- (b) if so, on what date?
- (5) (a) Has the EPA requested particulars of temporary reserve 5850;
- (b) if so, on what date?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) 18.2 square kilometres; Dampier Mining Company Limited; coal.
- (2) (a) 5th September, 1973.
- (b) 6th November, 1973, to date from the 9th November, 1973.
- (3) (a) No, but there is a reference on the plan to the ecological study area without boundaries.
- (b) Temporary reserve 5850H is in the general area.
- (4) (a) Details were advised to the Department of Conservation and Environment.
- (b) 1st March, 1974.
- (5) (a) Yes.
- (b) 1st March, 1974.

50. FORTESCUE RIVER DAMS

Environmental Implications

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

Further to part (3) of question on notice 1 asked in the Legislative Council on 22nd October, 1974—

- (1) (a) Has the Ord River Ecology Committee been requested to comment on

the Public Works Department's current investigation of environmental implications of alternative dams on the Fortescue River;

(b) if not, why not?

- (2) (a) Since ecological problems have been recognised in regard to the Ord River Dam, particularly in regard to the presence of a large water mass in the tropics, and since the Millstream area of the Pilbara region is considered to be an ecological outlier having tropical characteristics, does the current environmental investigation include consideration of such problems;

(b) if not, why not?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

(1) (a) No.

(b) During the course of the environmental investigation the consultant sought advice and comments from numerous parties and made use of relevant data such as ecological studies carried out on the Ord River. Among those contacted were member organisations of the Ord River Ecology Committee.

(2) (a) Yes.

(b) Answered by (2) (a).

51.

VEGETABLES

Market Gardening Potential: Studies

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

- (1) Have agricultural studies been carried out in the Balcatta, Wanneroo, Spearwood and Karnup areas, particularly in regard to market gardening potential and urban encroachment?
- (2) What studies have been carried out in regard to the needs and economical supply of vegetables to the Perth metropolitan region?

Mr OLD replied:

(1) Yes.

The impact of urban development on market gardening areas is kept under review and is the subject of liaison on a continuing basis between the Department of Agriculture and Metropolitan Region Planning Authority.

- (2) An assessment of the vegetable requirements of the future population of the Perth metropolitan

region was made in 1974. Details were published in the proceedings of a symposium on "Water requirements for Agriculture, Industry and Urban Supply for a metropolis of two million in the South West of Western Australia."

52.

HEALTH

Lead Content of Articles

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

- (1) What avenues are open to the Government to monitor the incidence of lead in articles such as comics, newspapers and toys?
- (2) What power does the Government have to prevent the sale of such articles?
- (3) Have these powers of—
(a) monitoring;
(b) prevention of sale, been used, and if so, what are the details?
- (4) Is there evidence to show that some newspapers sold in Western Australia have an extremely high level of lead as reported in *The Australian* of 30th May, 1975?
- (5) What is the safe level for lead content in such articles?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Sampling and analytical examination.
- (2) Health Act, toxic and hazardous substances regulations, food and drugs regulations.
- (3) (a) Yes—Paints, toys, food, food-wrappings, plastics, comics, etc.
(b) Yes—As above.
- (4) No.
- (5) The safe level depends upon the type of article, method of usage and purpose.

53. PARTICLE BOARD PROJECT, DARDANUP

Environmental Protection Review

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

- (1) Is the Environmental Protection Authority satisfied with—
(a) the Wesply (Dardanup) Agreement generally;
(b) clause 16 of the agreement in particular?
- (2) Will he table the documentary evidence which authorises him to indicate that the answer given in (1) above is authorised by the EPA?

- (3) Does the EPA desire to have standard environmental protection clauses in agreements where those agreements have substantial similarities?
- (4) Has the EPA suggested modifications to the Wesply (Dardanup) Agreement at any time?
- (5) If (4) is "Yes" what suggestions were made?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) The Environmental Protection Authority has not examined the Act itself but as indicated in the answer to question 32 on 30th April, 1975, the Environmental Protection Authority reviewed a draft agreement. In view of the considerable number of questions of detail raised by the Member on this matter, I have asked the Environmental Protection Authority for a composite report on the existing Act itself.
- (2) Answered by (1) and by the above referenced answer.
- (3) Yes, where appropriate.
- (4) No. The department has done so, on behalf of the Environmental Protection Authority after discussion by the authority.
- (5) Answered by (4).

54. TOWN PLANNING

South-west Corridor: Martin Report

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

Will he table the report prepared for the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority by T. S. Martin on the strategy for future development of the south-west corridor?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

Yes, the report is tabled as requested.

The report was tabled (see paper No. 277).

55. WOOD CHIPPING INDUSTRY

Economic Study

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

Will he table the economic study of the woodchip agreement made by the Department of Industrial Development?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

No. I am not prepared to table the departmental notes called by the member "report" as it is a document prepared for the file for

internal use. It was never intended as a detailed cost benefit analysis but merely lists the possible benefits of the wood chipping operation to the State for the benefit of departmental officers and officers of other departments.

MINERAL SANDS

Maps of Claims

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

Will he table adequate maps showing the mineral claims pertaining to individual agreements for sand mining in the Eneabba area and their relationship to reserves in the area?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

Yes.

The maps were tabled (see paper No. 278).

57. HEALTH

Amaranth: Restriction on Use

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

- (1) Is there evidence to show that Amaranth (or FD and C red number 2) may cause cancer or foetal damage?
 - (2) What is being done in—
 - (a) Western Australia;
 - (b) Australia,
 to examine the possibilities of such harmful effects?
 - (3) Is it true that the substance is banned in the Soviet Union?
 - (4) What are the restrictions upon its use in West Germany?
 - (5) What are the restrictions recommended by the World Health Organisation?
 - (6) Is it a fact that the dye referred to above has no nutritional value and is used purely for cosmetic purposes?
- Mr RIDGE replied:
- (1) Yes. One report only which has not been confirmed.
 - (2) (a) Nothing.
 - (b) After further consideration following the adverse report, the National Health and Medical Research Council recommended no change in Australian food regulations.
 - (3) and (4) Not known.
 - (5) FAO/WHO has recommended a temporary allowable daily intake of 0-0.75 mgm/kg body weight.
 - (6) Yes.

58. STATE FORESTS

Clear Felling

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

- (1) How many hectares have been clear felled in forested areas under the department's control for each of the past ten years?
- (2) What is the estimate for such clear felling for each of the years 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979 and 1980?

Mr RIDGE replied:

Clear felling refers to a silvicultural system which removes the timber crop in one cut for regeneration purposes.

In Western Australia, the nearest equivalent silvicultural system currently adopted is the uniform (seed tree) method.

- (1) The following areas have been treated for regeneration under the uniform system as defined:

1965-66—25 ha
1966-67—178 ha
1967-68—62 ha
1968-69—805 ha
1969-70—965 ha
1970-71—76 ha
1971-72—118 ha
1972-73—1 464 ha
1973-74—145 ha
1974-75—297 ha

- (2) It is estimated that timber will be removed either by the uniform system or by clear felling or a combination of both from the following areas:

1975-76—4 314 ha
1976-77—3 813 ha
1977-78—1 904 ha
1978-79—2 523 ha
1979-80—2 293 ha
1980-81—Not available as beyond planning period.

59. WOODMAN POINT
EXPLOSIVES AREA*Tuart Trees and Fence*

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) On what date were the large tuart trees adjacent to the Woodman Point explosives area bulldozed?
- (2) On whose recommendation was this action committed?
- (3) From what sources were appeals against this action received?
- (4) What special features made it necessary to destroy the trees at this time when they have stood

adjacent to this area since its establishment?

- (5) Has his department any plans to screen the barbed wire and iron fence which now runs for many hundreds of metres along Cockburn Road?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Perimeter clearing within the Woodman Point explosives reserve commenced on the 9th May, 1975.
- (2) The Western Australian Fire Brigades Board and the Chief Inspector of Explosives.
- (3) The Department of Conservation and Environment and the Tree Society.
- (4) Fire control and internal security.
- (5) No.

60. RAILWAY RESERVE
Spearwood-Armadale

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Is the railway reserve associated with the now disused Spearwood-Armadale railway line still vested in the Railways Department?
- (2) If not, in what authority is the reserve vested?
- (3) If "Yes" would use of the sleeper bed as a cycleway be permitted?
- (4) Would he table a detailed plan of the railway reserve?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) and (2) Part of the Railway Reserve from Cockburn Road, Spearwood, to Hatch Place, Bibra Lake, is still in existence and under the control of the Minister for Transport.

The balance of the land comprising the former Railway Reserve from Hatch Place, Bibra Lake, to Railway Avenue, Armadale, with the exception of a strip 10 metres wide from a point 246 metres north-west of the junction of Forrest and Taylor Roads extending eastwards, excluding Forrestdale Townsite, to Friar Road, Armadale, now designated Reserve No. 31023 for the purpose of "Water Supply" and vested in the Minister for Water Supplies, is set apart as Reserve No. 27950 for the purpose of "Government Requirements" and not being vested is under the control of the Minister for Lands.

- (3) The use of this land, which at its narrowest is about 24 metres wide, is not considered economic for use as a cycleway. Nor has any such suggestion been received by the Lands Department.

Dedication for road purposes is in hand for the section between Forrest Road, Forrestdale, and Railway Avenue, Armadale. The remaining portion, contiguous with Forrest Road is held, *inter alia*, for possible future road purposes. Both actions are consistent with the policies of a Cabinet Committee appointed to consider utilisation of land from closed railways.

- (4) A plan is submitted for tabling which shows the existing Railway Reserve coloured green, Reserve 27950 (Government requirements) coloured blue and Reserve 31023 (water supply) coloured red.

The plan was tabled (see paper No. 279).

61. LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Long Service Leave

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Has he received representations from the municipal officers association with respect to portability of long service leave?
- (2) Is he in favour of such a proposal?
- (3) Does he intend introducing legislation to give effect to this proposition?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The matter is still being considered by me.
- (3) This will depend on whether a scheme can be devised which is acceptable to municipal councils and employees.

QUESTIONS (11): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. PROSTITUTION

Convictions

Mr HARTREY, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) In framing his answer to part (5) of question 31, asked by the member for Subiaco, has he considered the effect of paragraph (c) of section 7 of the Criminal Code?
- (2) Does not a prostitute's male customer—
 - (a) provide the monetary consideration which constitutes the first element of her offence; and
 - (b) furnish one-half of the meretricious sexual intercourse which constitutes the other element of her offence?

Perhaps I should read the relevant section of the Criminal Code.

The SPEAKER: I think we will have to take that as read.

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

If the honourable member will place his question on the notice paper I will answer it then.

2.

POULTRY FARMING

Hen License: Pilbara

Mr THOMPSON, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has the Minister received a recommendation from the Egg Marketing Board with respect to granting a license to put 5 500 laying birds into production in a town in the Pilbara?
- (2) In the light of existing producers being subjected to a recent cut of 12 per cent to be followed by further reductions of 1 per cent for each of three months, does he not think a proposal to further aggravate the over-supply situation is absurd?
- (3) Will he, in the interests of honouring the well understood principle in the industry that no new licenses be granted until the base license has been restored, refuse to grant the new license?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) to (3) No. Under the bases and principles approved by the Minister before the beginning of each licensing year the board is empowered to issue new licenses in that area above the 24th parallel of latitude.

I understand that the poultry farm in question has not yet been established and to this extent will not have any immediate effect on the present over-supply situation.

The bases and principles do not authorise the granting of new licenses in areas south of the 24th parallel of latitude.

The discretion granted to the board in respect of areas north of the 24th parallel of latitude is designed in order to encourage production in these areas and thus assist decentralisation.

3. GERALDTON REGIONAL HOSPITAL

Payment to Private Doctors

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

- (1) Has the Medical Department approached private doctors in Geraldton to discuss payment arrangements for treatment of

"hospital" patients, as defined by Medibank, at the Geraldton Regional Hospital?

- (2) If the answer to (1) is "Yes", will the Minister provide details of the approach and negotiations; and if the answer is "No", will he explain why not?
- (3) Is it a fact that Geraldton private doctors have refused to treat "hospital" patients at the Geraldton Regional Hospital except in cases regarded as emergencies or involving socio-economically disadvantaged persons?
- (4) Have other Government hospitals, without resident doctors, encountered the same difficulty as outlined in (3), and if so, will the Minister provide full details of each?
- (5) Is it a fact that one patient at the Geraldton Regional Hospital was in theatre for operation after having been given pre-operation medication, and was asked by the doctor whether he was a "hospital" or "private" patient, and upon declaring himself a "hospital" patient he was refused surgery and was removed from the theatre and the hospital?
- (6) If the details outlined in (5) are not correct, will the Minister please detail the correct circumstances?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) to (6) The Minister for Health has asked me to acknowledge that he did have adequate notice of the question, but unfortunately he has not been able to provide the answer in the time available. He would therefore be pleased if the honourable member would place the question on the notice paper

4. BOULDER SHIRE COUNCIL

Nonpayment of Overtime

Mr McPHARLIN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

In today's issue of *The West Australian* it was reported that the Boulder Shire Council will be prosecuted in the industrial court for breaches of industrial awards relating to nonpayment of overtime. The prosecution is being initiated by the Department of Labour. I ask—

- (1) Is this action being taken by the State Department of Labour and Industry or by the Federal department?
- (2) Is it proposed that this action will be taken against all shire

councils in Western Australia which may be in a similar position?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of the question the answer to which is as follows—

- (1) The matter has caused some confusion. However, the action has been taken by the Commonwealth Department of Labour and not by the State Department of Labour and Industry. The officers employed by the Boulder Shire come under the local government officers, Western Australia, award which is a Federal award and not a State award. Such officers come under the provisions of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act.

The prosecution action against the shire has apparently arisen as a result of inspections carried out by industrial inspectors from the Perth office of the Commonwealth Department of Labour.

Apparently over the years the Boulder Shire Council has had a gentlemen's agreement under which senior officers of the council have not been paid overtime. This is apparently the cause of the prosecution action because the procedure does not conform with the award requirement relating to payment of overtime.

- (2) I can only say at this time that I am not aware of whether other shire councils will find themselves in a similar predicament. There is the possibility, but it depends entirely on the Commonwealth.

5. MENTAL HEALTH

Tresillian Hostel: Premier's View

Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

Does he still hold the view that has been expressed to the Friends of Tresillian and the Nedlands City Council that the Tonkin Labor Government transferred profoundly mentally retarded children patients to the Tresillian Hostel in an attempt to embarrass him in his electorate of Nedlands?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

If the member for Ascot desires me to answer that question he should divulge the source of his information so that I can assess its true merit.

Mr Bryce: I did—the Friends of Tresillian and the Nedlands City Council.

Sir CHARLES COURT: If the member for Ascot will divulge accurately what I said I will answer the question.

6. MENTAL HEALTH

Tresillian Hostel: Transfer of Inmates

Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Premier:
Prior to the announcement that moves were afoot to transfer the residents of Tresillian, was any Cabinet decision taken on the matter?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I did not quite get the first part of the question. Perhaps the honourable member could repeat it by way of interjection.

Mr B. T. Burke: Prior to the announcement that plans were afoot to shift the residents, did Cabinet make any decision on the matter?

Sir CHARLES COURT: To the best of my knowledge, no; but if the honourable member wants me to pursue the matter I will gladly find out for him. Why I raised the query was that the question was put in an ambiguous way and I was not sure whether the honourable member was referring to the children being transferred to or from Tresillian. However, I gather he was referring to their transfer from Tresillian.

7. MENTAL HEALTH

Tresillian Hostel: Transfer of Inmates

Mr T. J. BURKE, to the Premier:
Has the Slow Learning Children's Group of WA (Inc.) been consulted by the Government regarding the proposal to shift profoundly mentally retarded children from Tresillian Hostel? If so, would he provide full details and, if not, why?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

In reply to the honourable member, I will consult with my colleague, the Minister for Health to ascertain whether he took that action. Essentially, this matter comes within his preserve.

8. MENTAL HEALTH

Tresillian Hostel: Consultation with Member

Mr BARNETT, to the Premier:

(1) Was the Premier consulted before the decision was taken by the previous Government to transfer profoundly mentally retarded children to Tresillian Hostel?

(2) Does he concede he should have been consulted as a matter of normal courtesy?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) and (2) I am not sure of the point raised by the member for Rockingham. I would have thought that as a matter of courtesy the Government of the day should have consulted both the local authority and myself, as well as the local residents.

When I heard what was happening I made inquiries and I was assured it was a temporary expedient to take advantage of available accommodation for a short period.

In other words, it was to be a temporary move.

On this basis, I think the local people accepted that it was temporary, and if my information is correct the local authority was very concerned that it was not consulted.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will take one more question on this subject.

9. MENTAL HEALTH

Kareeba Nursing Home: Consultation with Member

Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

In view of the Premier's reply that he accepted it was normal courtesy for the Government to have consulted him, would he indicate to the House why his Government has taken no action to consult the member for Ascot regarding the decision to purchase Kareeba Nursing Home for the purpose of transferring profoundly mentally retarded child patients to it? Particularly, in view of the fact that 40 or 50 elderly patients will be displaced, why did he not consult either the local authority or the member for Ascot in respect of that aspect of the Government's decision?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

In answer to the member for Ascot, who seems to be quite het up, may I just remind him that matters of the kind to which he refers are essentially handled by the Minister of the department involved?

Mr Bryce: But you agree he should have been consulted.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I will consult with the Minister concerned to find out what action he took.

Mr Bryce: Does the Premier believe he will have a solution?

The SPEAKER: Order! I will take two further questions not related to the series of questions just asked. That subject can be pursued at another time.

10. RAILWAYS

Bridgetown Depot: Closure

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

- (1) Has the Minister received the report of the committee of inquiry into the removal of the railway depot from Bridgetown to Manjimup?
- (2) If so, on what date does the Government propose to move the depot from Bridgetown to Manjimup?
- (3) Which of the recommendations made by the committee does the Government intend to adopt and implement, and which recommendations will be rejected?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of this question which does differ a little from the advice handed to me.

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) The honourable member did ask on what date the transfer is to take place but that request was not contained in the question handed to me a fortnight ago. The answer to the question asked is that this has not yet been decided.

11. COUNTRY PARTY POLICY

Implementation

Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

My question to the Minister for Agriculture and the Leader of the Country Party is in two parts:

- (1) Will he indicate to the House the present status of the policy speech which contained promises made by his predecessor to the people of Western Australia in 1974?
- (2) Does the Leader of the Country Party share the view of the Premier which has been outlined by the member for Stirling that the Country Party has no right to press for the implementation of its policy?

The SPEAKER: I am inclined to believe that this is not completely within the province of the Minister for Agriculture because of his ministerial position. I cannot accept the question at this juncture. Order!

If the member wishes he can submit the question to me and I will have it examined more closely to see whether it can appear on the notice paper at another time.

Dissent from Speaker's Ruling

Mr BRYCE: I have to disagree with your ruling, Mr Speaker, whereby you have disallowed my question to the Minister for Agriculture.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the member resume his seat. I just want to say that very strictly I suppose the member for Ascot could act in such a fashion. However, I warn him that if he does he is acting in a manner that traditionally in this House is considered to be not well-mannered. I have told him I think the question is out of order and if he will submit the question to me I will have a look at it and decide whether it can be asked at another time.

Mr BRYCE: You, Mr Speaker, leave me with no option but to move that your ruling be disagreed with. I move—

That your ruling whereby you disallowed my question to the member for Katanning—the Leader of the Country Party—be disagreed with on the ground that this ruling is a departure from normal practice in this House.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the member resume his seat. I tried to indicate to the member for Ascot that he was outside traditional well-mannered behaviour in this House. Indeed, he goes beyond this. The matter of questions without notice is the prerogative of the Speaker and the member for Ascot is completely out of order.

Mr BRYCE: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the member resume his seat. Questions without notice have been completed.

Withdrawal of Motion

Mr BRYCE: I am quite happy to withdraw the motion I moved.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRYCE: I withdraw the motion.

The SPEAKER: I want to indicate to the member for Ascot again that there is no real necessity for him to do that, but if he felt he should get to his feet he might have apologised at the same time. I call notices of motions.

SUPPLY BILL

Standing Orders Suspension

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [5.48 p.m.]: I gave notice of the motion standing in my name before we concluded the earlier part of the session. I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable a Supply Bill to be introduced without notice and passed through all its stages in one day.

As members know this is a motion which is moved about this time of the session so that the Government may have supply to continue the work of the Government until such time as the main Budget and the Estimates, and other papers, are presented to Parliament later in the year. On present indications, that could be during the week after the Royal Show; in other words, approximately Thursday, the 2nd October.

I do not think there is any need for me to labour the explanation in respect of the motion. If it is approved by the House it simply means I will be able to introduce the Supply Bill and it can then be debated by the House and passed through all stages at the one sitting. I commend the motion.

MR J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Leader of the Opposition) [5.49 p.m.]: The Opposition has no objection to the course which the Treasurer proposes to follow, notice of which was given some time ago.

Question put and passed.

Message: Appropriations

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

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Sir Charles Court (Treasurer), and read a first time.

Second Reading

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [5.53 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This measure seeks the grant of supply to Her Majesty of \$450 million.

The Revenue Budget and the Loan Estimates for 1975-76 are now in course of preparation and will be presented with respective Appropriation Bills later in the session. In the meantime, it is necessary, of course, to carry on the services of the State and the Bill now before the House is to authorise the provision of funds for this purpose.

An issue of \$400 million is sought from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and \$40 million from moneys to the credit of the General Loan Fund. Provision is also made in the Bill for an issue of \$10 million to enable the Treasurer to make such temporary advances as may be necessary.

The proposed issue from the Consolidated Revenue Fund is greater by \$85 million than the corresponding provision in the Supply Act of 1974. The amounts to be drawn from the General Loan Fund and the Public Account are also increased, being \$10 million and \$5 million respectively above the provisions of last year.

The increased issues from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and the General Loan Fund are required to finance the greatly expanded cost of Government services and works resulting from the current high rate of inflation.

The issue from the Public Account has remained unchanged for the past nine years and the increase now proposed is required to meet the growth in the number and amount of temporary advances that need to be made in the conduct of Government business.

The high cost of award wage increases continues to dominate the Government's finances. In 1974-75, award increases granted during the year added \$53.5 million to the cost of providing Government services in that year. However, that figure does not represent the cost in a full year of the higher wage payments granted in 1974-75, as the higher wage levels applied for varying periods throughout the year. The full year cost is in the order of \$86 million and, as a result, it will be necessary to provide in the current year for a further lift of \$32 million in the Government wage bill before allowing for award increases that will inevitably occur during the year. On present indications it appears that provision will have to be made in 1975-76 for an even greater sum for new wage increases than was the case last year.

For the purpose of estimating the Financial Assistance Grants to the States, the Commonwealth Treasury has assumed 21 per cent as the likely increase in average wages for this year. An increase of this magnitude would add \$100 million to our wages bill and the prospect of such an increase presents serious problems in shaping the 1975-76 Budget.

When providing for wage increases of the magnitude experienced in recent years, Budget planning is made extremely difficult by the uncertain course of future events. As I have remarked previously, we may hope for the best but sound financial management demands that we be prepared for the most likely outcome.

For the year ahead much will depend on the continuing course of indexation and the degree of success it will have in moderating wage demands. The Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, in accepting the principle of wage indexation, has laid down certain guidelines which it insists must be followed if indexation is to continue. At the June Premiers' Conference, State Premiers supported the guidelines and agreed to adhere to them in public sector wage

negotiations. It is vital that this be done, not just in the Government sector but also in the community at large, or inflation threatens to become completely out of control. No-one, Government or business, can plan and budget with confidence in the present inflationary economic environment.

Turning to the financial results of the year just ended, the impact of inflation is clearly evident, with revenue and expenditure both well in excess of the Estimates. However, it is gratifying to record that the actual deficit was only \$387 000 above the original Budget estimate. The final deficit for 1974-75 was \$9.133 million compared with the estimate of \$8.746 million allowed for in the Budget.

Expenditure for the year exceeded the estimate by \$17.690 million, mainly as a result of a higher increase in the wages bill than had been anticipated. Although an amount of \$42.7 million had been allowed in the 1974-75 Budget to cover expected wage increases, the actual increases exceeded this provision by almost \$11 million.

Comparison of departmental expenditures with the Estimates is made difficult by the practice of providing a block allocation in the Budget for anticipated wage increases, and subsequently charging actual expenditure on wages and salaries to the votes of departments and authorities. It is not possible at the beginning of the year to estimate with any acceptable degree of precision the likely impact of wage movements on the votes of individual departments, and control of expenditure is better served by the present practice. However, it is appreciated that comparisons between the estimate presented to Parliament and actual expenditure is not facilitated by this procedure and it is currently under review.

Another factor which tends to cloud comparison of Estimates and expenditure of departments last year was the extension during the year of Commonwealth support for a number of State programmes which resulted in departmental expenditure on those programmes exceeding the Estimates. However, in this case, the additional expenditure was offset by a corresponding increase in revenue.

If allowance is made for the distorting effect of these factors, it is apparent that in the case of most departments, expenditure in 1974-75 was close to the estimate. There were some exceptions.

An increase midway through the year in *per capita* grants to independent schools added around \$700 000 to expenditure by the Education Department. A steep rise in general running costs of schools, particularly increases in water and electricity charges, also contributed to the excess expenditure incurred by that department.

Expenditure by the Police Department also exceeded the vote by a substantial sum mainly because of increased overtime worked by the Criminal Investigation Branch and by road patrols in a concentrated accident prevention campaign.

The loss incurred on operations of the Metropolitan Transport Trust, which is recouped from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, was also considerably in excess of the Budget estimate. In addition to the effect of unexpected wage increases and changed working conditions on operating costs, the increased loss can be attributed to increased expenditure on the inner city "clipper" services and a reassessment of proportional costs associated with suburban rail transport.

Largely offsetting the over-run in expenditure, revenue collections in 1974-75 exceeded the Budget estimate by \$17 303 000.

Commonwealth payments under the Financial Assistance Grant formula were \$5.9 million higher than the Budget forecast mainly because the increase in average wages, an important factor in the formula, was higher than anticipated when the Budget was framed.

Following representations at the February Premiers' Conference, Western Australia received special additional assistance of \$7.1 million to help offset wage increases and to avoid retrenchments.

State taxation collections were \$6.9 million higher than had been expected, but this improvement was offset by a shortfall in mining royalties and revenue from public utilities.

The major shortfall was in respect of railways, where revenue fell \$3.7 million below Budget expectations. The suspension of interstate traffic resulting from flooding of the trans-Australia line earlier this year, and the disruption of grain traffic caused by the recent strike of Co-operative Bulk Handling employees, were the main reasons for this shortfall.

Prolonged industrial disputes which curtailed iron ore production were primarily responsible for mining royalties falling short of the estimate by \$2.3 million.

Having regard for the extreme inflationary pressures experienced during the year, a deterioration of only \$387 000 in the deficit originally estimated is a very gratifying result which was achieved only as a result of sound financial management. As members will recall, the Government had set aside sufficient capital funds to cover the 1974-75 deficit which has now been funded from this source.

The task we now face in framing the Budget for the current year is as difficult as ever.

As a result of the recent Premiers' Conference, additional revenue grants totalling \$32.4 million will be made available

to Western Australia in 1975-76. While this will go some way to ease the financial pressures which the State faces in the year ahead, very sound management of our affairs will be needed if we are to achieve an acceptable Budget result having regard for our need to conserve increasingly scarce capital funds.

I will comment in more detail on developments arising from decisions taken at the Premiers' Conference and on our prospects for the current financial year when the Budget is introduced later this session.

At that time I will table the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for this financial year with details of proposed outlays and the means by which those outlays are to be financed.

As members know, this is the customary information given by the Premier and Treasurer when introducing the Supply Bill. I commend the Bill to the House.

MR J. T. TONKIN (Melville—Leader of the Opposition) [6.05 p.m.]: As the Premier has outlined, he is asking for a substantially increased amount by way of supply to cover practically the whole of the financial year. In examining the reason for this substantial increase, he said that it resulted from the current high rate of inflation, for which, of course, he himself is largely responsible—this State having the highest inflation rate of any State of the Commonwealth.

During the election campaign the Premier indicated to the people that he had a special answer to this problem. He said that inflation could be controlled State by State, and all the people needed to do was to get rid of the then Government and elect his Government. He gave the impression that he could really walk on water.

Mr T. J. Burke: He still thinks he can.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: This is the main reason for the very substantial increase in the amount of money which has to be sought. You will recall, Mr Speaker, that we had not been in office very long when, because of the then rate of inflation and the unemployment position, the Premier—the then Leader of the Opposition—considered seriously denying us supply. Had he been able to prevail upon his colleagues in another place to go along with his idea, he would have forced an election. In this House he actually moved, and he was supported by the then Leader of the Country Party, that the granting of supply would be conditional upon our holding an election by a certain date. We on this side believe that when a Government is elected for a certain term—as has been set out for many years in the Statute—it is entitled to be allowed to run that term and to be given the necessary supply to do so.

There is no justification for endeavouring to force an earlier election simply because the Opposition feels that if it had the opportunity to go to the people it could change the Government.

When the opportunity arises we will be very critical of the Government in respect of a number of its deficiencies, but we do not propose to do so on the Supply Bill. We believe this Bill should be given a reasonably speedy passage, although advantage should be taken of the opportunity to discuss one or two interesting matters.

A short time ago we were treated to the pantomime of the Country Party being in the Government, out of the Government, and then back in the Government, where it is now remaining for the time being. It is interesting to recall some of the things said at the time and which I would assume must have truly represented the views and opinions of those people who gave voice to the remarks I am about to quote. You, Sir, have heard of one David Reid who was for a time a senator, and who was the President of the Country Party or the National Country Party as it is now known. He was not at all impressed by the opinion of *The West Australian*, which felt that the trouble was due to the internal troubles of the Country Party. David Reid said that the refusal to establish guidelines was one of the troubles, because the Premier would not grant even minor concessions.

He was surely in a position to know; he said the Premier would not grant even minor concessions, and he referred to it as a dictatorship. He mentioned the Premier's inflexible attitude which had even alienated Mr Bjelke-Petersen, his firm friend. According to David Reid, Country Party supporters were completely precluded from having their voices heard in the Government. What a coalition! Fancy belonging to a Government of that type and holding out to the people whom one is supposed to represent that one is in fact serving a useful purpose in the coalition when one is completely precluded from having one's voice heard.

David Reid went so far as to say that the Premier had told Country Party members of the Government that they had no right to speak on any policy matter, including the policy on agriculture. Fancy remaining in the Government under circumstances like that! No wonder two members walked out on a question of principle. One wonders how in those circumstances two other members could walk in to take their places, especially when one of them—the present Minister for Agriculture—said the Country Party would sit on the cross benches where it hoped to be able to protect its policies. But, instead, the same gentleman went back into the coalition, having been told by the president of his party of the Premier's inflexible attitude and the fact that Country Party Ministers were not even allowed to speak on policy.

More about this anon. There will be ample opportunity to probe further into this matter. However, let me say that one wonders why the Premier was disposed to say at the time that the decision to withdraw from the coalition was incredible. Mr Speaker, would you have remained in the coalition under the circumstances I have outlined? I do not think you would.

I read with considerable interest and much amusement a statement in *The West Australian* of the 25th December just prior to the Premier's trip abroad. The heading is, "Court: Trip important". Just listen to this—

The Premier, Sir Charles Court, said yesterday that hopes of a recovery for the economy would depend a great deal on his coming trip abroad.

His ability to walk on water!

Mr Davies: I'll bet he will say he was wrongly quoted.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Just imagine: hopes of a recovery for the economy depended on his trip abroad. The newspaper article went on to state—

Sir Charles said he hoped that next year would see the economy return to the condition of good health that West Australians had been accustomed to regard as normal.

He said: "All we need to cure our economic troubles is action at the State level. . .

I am still waiting for that action; it is not in the article.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [7.30 p.m.]: In taking up where my leader left off in respect of the debate on the Supply Bill, I should like to indicate that I support his point of view that we are hearing too much of the suggestion that the Premier can carry out all sorts of wonders; however, after making such statements, the Premier then lets the community down. When we were in Government I recall the Premier saying that he would solve the unemployment problem and reduce the rate of inflation within six months of gaining office—not in conjunction with the Commonwealth or anybody else, but unilaterally.

I have been criticised for saying in this place that no man can do that. The Premier certainly is no King Canute; he cannot turn back the waves. Try as we might in relation to certain financial problems, we just cannot do anything to avoid what has happened throughout the world. Some countries, because of their peculiar economic situation, are better served than others, in that they are able to hold their economies a little more steady. The Premier has said that he wants to hold our economy steady, but as a private enterprise type of person he would not

tolerate the steps which are necessary to achieve this end; namely, the complete control of the financial situation, of both wages and profits and all that goes towards forming the economy of a community. The Premier will not agree to that; rather, he is prepared to continue with his policy of boom and bust.

While I acknowledge that, in the past, the Premier has been honoured by many as being the architect of the great leap forward in the north of this State—and naturally, we are glad to see such development—I believe he also must accept the responsibility for being the principal architect of the inflationary position in the Commonwealth today, due to the vast amount of money which has been poured into these projects and the extremely high wages that were paid to unskilled workers in these areas, all of which had a very significant effect on the economy of Australia, particularly because of the tendency for itinerant workers to find employment in these places.

Even now one can see a number of these workers at Goldsworthy and in other northern areas; they flock there from all over the auction, some coming from New Zealand and others from Sydney. They are young men who work fairly long hours and take home a substantial weekly pay packet. Probably, they earn a lot more than the tribunal granted us, but that is beside the point. Of course, after receiving such high wages, these itinerant workers race south and spend their money and, having been in the habit of receiving \$200, \$300 or, in some circumstances, \$400 a week, may find it unacceptable to return to a rate of pay which would suit the type of economy the Premier would like to see. It is just impossible to offer them such wages. They say, "There is better than this about. We have had better; we know it is available." Once we have given people a taste of this sort of earning power, it is not easy to bring them back to a more sensible level. Once they have received such high wages, they do not wish to be put back with the multitude. As a consequence, of course, this is doing nothing for the economy of Australia, and, indeed is causing and will continue to cause a considerable number of problems.

Like my leader, I wish to comment briefly on the recent affairs of the coalition. I do not imagine the Government would expect us not to be prepared to comment on the debacle which occurred a short while ago when we had an "Off agin, on agin, gone agin Finnigin" type of coalition for several weeks.

Mr Laurance: What happened in Hobart over the following few days?

Mr JAMIESON: Do not tell me that the wonder from Carnarvon is still with us! They must have somebody better than him up there bending bananas.

Mr Coyne: Gascoyne.

Mr JAMIESON: Well, he lives at Carnarvon; I am localising him because I do not want to commit the fishermen at Denham to such a person.

I have in my hand a pamphlet headed, "Coalition, or Surrender to portfolios before principles. A betrayal of the interests and welfare of National Country Party supporters". It looks as though the author is one Matt Stephens, of 25 Lowood Road, Mt. Barker. It contains some very interesting material, but it is rather lengthy and I am sure you would not want me to read it, Mr Speaker; probably, you would not permit me to do so.

Mr Davies: We will work it into *Hansard* during the course of the session.

Mr JAMIESON: Perhaps we can work it in one paragraph at a time. Of course, much of what was said at the time was designed to frighten back into coalition these new members, as most of them are—except, of course, for the two new Liberal members of the Cabinet appointed by the Premier. They were told that if they continued on their course and sat on the cross-benches, the socialists would take over and run the country. This pamphlet disproves that theory. Solomon and the others who came to Western Australia to try to resolve the dispute said, "Look at those States which do not have a Country Party, such as South Australia and Tasmania. The socialists are in charge there." They are in charge in South Australia and I suppose they are still just in charge in Tasmania, where they still have a fairly big majority. The contention was that in those States which did not have a Country Party, there was liable to be a socialist Government. Of course, they forgot to mention the situation in Victoria, as the author of this pamphlet rightly points out under point 5 of his pamphlet, where he states—

In Victoria where the Country Party sits on the cross-benches State Assembly representation has been halved since 1947, but Federal representation has been doubled. In West Australia where the party has been in coalition, State Assembly representation has also been halved but we have also lost three of four Federal seats.

This indicates that perhaps the visit of "the wise men from the East"—the Nixons and the Solomons—was not all it was supposed to be and that some members of the Country Party in this State were not hoodwinked.

He points out a few matters and I do not want to weary the House by quoting too many of them. However, point 7 is interesting. It reads—

7. David Reid and Peter Jones continually exhorted Matt Stephens to see that McPharlin stood firm on the quota issue as success on this issue was vital to Party prestige. Yet when

pressure was applied to re-enter coalition all three except Matt Stephens deserted McPharlin.

It is nice stuff, Mr Speaker, and I think you will like it.

Point 8 is one point I would like to make. It is as follows—

8. Matt Stephens refused to enter leadership ballot for two reasons:

(a) Would not desert McPharlin in his decision to stand firm in accordance with National Country Party wishes and also consistent with the Platform.

(b) He was not prepared to re-enter coalition unless the Premier made some concessions.

With all these things going on, who needs members on this side of the House? We can leave the members on the other side to argue among themselves. Probably the Premier had to change the light on the political issue by some other means and he may have done that by his recent announcement on future distributions. However, that is a matter for the future.

Let me return to a few other financial aspects. The Premier is always complaining he does not have enough money for this or that, but he is prepared to squander money at the rate of hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in a manner that no other State does, with the exception, perhaps, of Queensland. I am not sure of the position in that State now but in every State with the exception of Queensland and Western Australia the Commonwealth and the States have joint electoral rolls. The keeping of these electoral rolls and the maintaining of electoral departments of the size necessary in this State run into considerable expense each year.

Back in antiquity the Parliament of this State, when amending the Electoral Act, realised this and granted power to the Governor of this State to negotiate with the Governor-General for the purpose of having prepared a common roll for use in electoral matters. However, for a number of years there were differences, such as the eligibility time for enrolment; then, in regard to one shifting into a new home there was a difference between the Commonwealth and the State and, of course, while the Legislative Council franchise was different there was a requirement for the Government to maintain a special kind of roll for the Legislative Council and to make a special enrolment. However, after that was avoided by an amending Act of Parliament, one would have thought the next step would be to economise wherever one could by having the rolls for both the State and the Commonwealth brought under one jurisdiction.

Irrespective of which way one looks at the matter I do not know whether the great socialist hordes could have had any

advantage from a move such as the one I suggest. The only way I view it is that it would effect some form of financial saving in having almost to eliminate the department on which the State is forced to spend money. Naturally we do not want to sack people—I am saying that before the Minister for Transport gets ready to say that I will be putting people out of employment or something like that—

Mr O'Connor: I never said anything.

Mr JAMIESON: The Minister was getting ready to say that. I always like to provoke the Minister into saying something and I know that somewhere along the line he will co-operate. However, I do not envisage any officers being sacked, because each year there is a natural increase in Civil Service personnel and the people at present employed in the Electoral Department could be placed in other departments.

Mr O'Connor: I thought you were trying to be constructive.

Mr JAMIESON: I am still being constructive, despite what the Minister says. The outcome of all this, despite the fact that I raised the question a number of times, was that Cabinet made the decision that it would not go ahead with the suggestion. I do not know why, because previously I have never received a letter such as the one I have before me now. This is probably one of the exceptions that proves the rule that if a member of Parliament says something in the Budget debate sometimes someone will look at it and send the member a letter about it. The Minister for Justice has sent me such a letter. So that members may be clear on it, the Minister indicated that he selected the items mentioned in the letter from my speech on the Appropriation Bill (Consolidated Revenue Fund), and in the letter he said—

I confirm your statement that an Arrangement was entered into between this State and the Commonwealth during the term of your Government, on the understanding that planning for the introduction of the scheme would be instituted at the level of the Australian Electoral Officer and the Chief Electoral Officer in Western Australia.

The Arrangement was also to come into force on a date to be fixed by the respective Governments. The Western Australian Government gave consideration to the matter, and decided that no further action be taken. No further consideration has been initiated by either Government in respect of financial or other arrangements. In any case, the present view of the Government is that the State Electoral Office retains its existing functions and responsibilities.

That is a duplication that does not need to exist under any set of circumstances. There is no necessity to retain that department and if it were disbanded it would save some money for those people who have had an increase in rates and other charges. Some cuts must be made in these unnecessary departments which the Government still insists on carrying on despite the fact that they represent duplications of a situation that exists in the Commonwealth sphere, especially in regard to enrolments. In speaking of the duplication of electoral matters there is, of course, extra printing and other expenses incurred in maintaining the two electoral departments. Also a great deal of time is spent by the Commonwealth when enrolments are being made in the Commonwealth Electoral Office to ensure that the State enrolments are completed for the convenience of the public. These then have to be forwarded to the State Electoral Department and vice versa.

All this duplication costs time and money and is quite unnecessary. Obviously it should be avoided at the earliest opportunity. However, for some reason or other if any person suggests that these two departments should be combined he is accused of centralising in some way. In introducing the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal Act a while ago, I think the Premier said that this was the same arrangement that the Commonwealth had in order to avoid having an excessive number of tribunals. So apparently the principle I am putting forward seems to work in one way but does not work in another—in the opinion of the present Government. Bodies such as a salaries tribunal and a few others would cost only a fraction of what it costs to maintain and administer the Electoral Department each year.

Looking at another financial aspect I received some information today from the Minister for Works in respect of the cost structures in the Kununurra area, relating to the Ord Dam, etc. It would appear that the taxpayers of Australia—basically, I say "Australia" because of the principle involved—are financing an investment of something like \$40 million-odd in this area, to say nothing of the infrastructure costs and other costs for the development of the town of Kununurra and other features to meet the requirements of the proposed development in and around the Ord River scheme.

Also this would include other ancillary costs which no doubt would amount to many millions of dollars. My point in bringing this matter up is to show once again where there has been expenditure of great sums of money without the resultant ready income. Much finance has been poured into the State for that project, and business houses and others

up there have profited from it. However, after the project was completed we found there was nothing which could be grown viably. Efforts are still being made to find a viable crop. One week the growing of kenaf grass is advocated, and the next week the growing of lemon grass is suggested. I suppose people who advocate growing lemon grass are influenced by what they see in the television soap advertisements, and they think it is a good idea.

People may advocate the growing of lemon grass, kenaf grass, sugar cane, and a multitude of other crops; but there is no firm opinion as to the direction the settlers up there should take. I suggest no concerted opinion will be arrived at in my time. As far as an exercise in finance is concerned, the project has turned out to be a disaster.

Members should not gain the impression that I am against some form of development in the north of the State. As a matter of fact, at one time I was in the forefront of those who readily advocated the damming of all rivers in Australia, but as time passed I became a little more conscious of our environmental responsibilities. Today I see that difficulties could be encountered in the damming of all our rivers. In the main, Australia is a fairly dry continent, and if we are to develop the fertile plains we have to establish projects like the Ord River dam. However, there is no concerted idea as to the best means of achieving this; there is nothing coming forward in that respect, and there is not likely to be for some time.

Bearing all this in mind I suggest that until we are able to arrive at a concerted idea, we should develop this type of project in the north principally as a tourist attraction. In the last few years that part of the north has derived more money from this source, than from any other.

When we were in Government and after I had returned from a visit to the north I indicated that I had committed the Government to further expenditure in the area. My colleague, the then Minister for Agriculture, nearly had a heart attack when he heard me say this. He told me what he thought of me at a hectic Cabinet meeting. At the time I wanted to give a little impetus to the project, while it was being further looked into; but the further it was looked at the worse the project appeared. The circumstances being what they are, we cannot resolve the present impasse.

Some time in the future I see that part of the north as being a very important region for producing foodstuffs, probably not for the people of Australia, but for the other countries of the world and particularly the Asian countries. We would have to arrive at an international pact to achieve that objective and to use the area effectively. I am sure that one day it will be used effectively.

However, it is my opinion that for the present we should put the project into wraps. The asset will not deteriorate. There is a minimum amount of maintenance required on the main dam, although there is a little more maintenance required on the diversion dam. As a capital investment I daresay its value would increase as time passes. For the equivalent of the work done on the Ord River project we would have to look at something like \$100 million on present costs. That is the feature which is in favour of the project.

The Ord River project is akin to a huge office block built in London. Though that block may not have had a tenant, the investors are quite happy with the position because the capital value is appreciating at a faster rate than if the premises were let. I do not understand this kind of finance, but if it works in respect of that huge office block in London I suggest it will also work in regard to the Ord River project, especially as it will be used to good purpose; that is, as a tourist attraction. We do not look like breaking through the barrier of difficulties inside 20 years; and it would be up to us in that time to find some way to overcome the problems that beset the project.

I do not wish to deal at length with the various items I have in mind. It was not my intention to speak, but as circumstances compelled the Leader of the Opposition to attend a function I felt I should fill in on two or three items he contemplated raising. The last item I want to deal with concerns the determination of the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal which I have examined briefly. One wonders how the members of that tribunal carry out their duties. I have not been one who has advocated any specific amount to the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal, because I do not know what can be used fairly as a yardstick to determine the appropriate salary payable to members of Parliament. I have been diffident in making any recommendation on a basic salary payable either to myself or any other member of Parliament. I have found this to be difficult to assess.

On the other hand I have also found it very difficult to understand the determination of this tribunal. I say this with all due regard for the repercussions which will arise; my impression is that the members of that tribunal must have stones in their heads, in arriving at a determination of \$16 170 per annum as the base salary for a member of the Western Australian Parliament.

We should compare this with the salaries that are payable in the other Parliaments in Australia. In South Australia we find the base salary for a member is \$16 500, and in Tasmania the figure is \$16 582. Nobody can convince me that a member of Parliament in Tasmania,

mighty as that little island might be, has the same responsibilities and faces the same problems as do members of Parliament in Western Australia. Even the inmates of the Premier's Tresillian Hostel would know that. However, for some reason or other the three members of the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal do not seem to understand the basic concept. I suggest that in arriving at their determination they will run into a great deal of trouble. Taking into account the salary determination for magistrates, the Premier will be confronted with a furore which he never expected would arise.

I realise it is not easy to establish tribunals and expect them to make fair determinations; but on the other hand it is not easy for members of Parliament to be convinced that an equitable decision is made when those members have information relating to the base salaries that are paid in the other Parliaments of Australia.

The base salary of a member of Parliament in New South Wales is \$17 280; the figure for Victoria is \$19 500; and the figure for South Australia is \$16 500. Might I point out to members that the base salary of \$16 500 payable in South Australia is not the only remuneration to members of Parliament in that State. Most members of the South Australian Legislative Assembly are in receipt of additional payments, because they serve on a number of statutory committees. Generally the chairman of such a committee is paid at a higher rate than the other members. When the appointments to such committees are shared between the 47 members of the South Australian Legislative Assembly we find not too many of them miss out on additional payments. For that reason I say the base salary payable in South Australia does not reflect the total payment.

In the case of members of Parliament in Western Australia, we find some members serve on committees such as the Joint House Committee and the Public Accounts Committee, and such service is regarded as part of their normal duties the payment for which is included in their base salaries.

The Tasmanian figure is \$16 582 and is an average of all the other States. I think that State does it the easy way. The method was probably forced upon the State because it did not want to be above the average of the other States.

We all know that Queensland is the mighty State of the Petersen people who can afford all things big. The parliamentarians there have a base salary of \$20 840, while the base salary of the Federal parliamentarians is \$20 000. Queensland and Tasmanian members had their salaries adjusted on the 1st July and now ours has been adjusted. When that adjustment is taken into consideration by Tasmania its average will again be increased and its figure will be \$2 000 ahead of the salary of Western Australian members.

I can see no justice in the situation. I understand that the tribunal commented that comparisons of salaries could not be made. Maybe this is so, but it is strange that all delegates at a CPA conference are on a parity with each other. As a matter of fact I think maybe the time has been reached when, no matter in what State they live, all members of Parliament should receive the same base salary. The work of a fitter, for instance, is no different, whether he resides in Perth, Brisbane, or Sydney. Various district and other allowances would apply, as well as over-award payments, but this system is also applied to members of Parliament with their district and electorate allowances. Basically the time is certainly approaching when we should classify the occupation as that of a parliamentarian whose base salary is a certain amount, no matter what his location, and then other adjustments could be made to suit that location.

The situation has become laughable when we consider the state of affairs in Tasmania. The Legislative Assembly members represent an area of a Federal Electorate. But the seven who represent each area would choose a certain section on which to concentrate, so they would not each be committed to the whole of the area. The Legislative Councillors represent 17 more or less evenly divided provinces right throughout the State. Nevertheless all those members are on this rate of pay.

There is very little justification for the tribunal's determination. I am not advocating a particular salary, but I cannot reconcile the decision with the facts, and if a decision cannot be reconciled with the facts, it is a bad decision. Of all the decisions made on salaries since I have been a member of Parliament—and there have been some very controversial ones, whether made by the Chief Justice as a commissioner or by special commissions—this is the one I have found most hard to reconcile with the facts as they apply to this State and to the other States.

I do not know whether the personnel were appropriate. One of the personnel was recently connected with the Treasury and therefore should know the Treasury situation backwards. Perhaps he was still more interested in the Treasury, and if the joint electoral roll situation had been finalised he might have been able to see his way clear to advocate a wider margin from the amount saved.

When introducing the legislation the Premier indicated that he wanted this tribunal in order to obviate any big adjustments in the future. I am afraid that by next year if we are to anywhere near catch up, the adjustments will certainly be huge and there will be a furore from the public.

Perhaps the public are justified. A fitter applies for a small increase and gets a

few dollars a week, but members of Parliament obtain an increase only every now and then. In Queensland the salary went up by something like \$6 000—which was well in advance of ours prior to that—to \$20 800. If such increases are to be made every year instead of once every three years, the public will certainly take notice. So to that extent we could be worse off.

Mr Speaker, you and I have been here a long time. We both know that the public does not agree with salary increases whether they are recommended by a tribunal or, as is still the case in some Parliaments, they are made by the parliamentarians themselves. That is not very desirable. However, when people are charged with the responsibility of recommending a salary, they must be able to justify the decisions they make. On the surface at this stage the decision which has been made in our case cannot be justified. I suggest that the members of the tribunal should have gone into the situation more thoroughly. Maybe they could be excused on one ground, and one ground alone. Their decision was made too hastily. They had to make a quick decision and therefore did not have enough time to do the job as thoroughly as they should have done it. They were committed to submit a report by the end of this month. Actually it was submitted a lot earlier than that. If they had taken a little more time and gone into all aspects of the matter and been prepared to call more evidence—perhaps even from the public—they may have reached a different conclusion. The public participates in connection with other salaries.

Everyone knows what is going on in the court before a determination is made. Everyone who is interested can hear the arguments, and I think the public are entitled to hear the arguments, because so often they do not. Consequently when a decision is made they are very annoyed and they are probably entitled to be annoyed.

When on this side of the House, the Premier was hostile about what he called the secretiveness of the then Government. He said he hated things being hushed up.

Before I conclude I would like to mention another matter which concerns me; that is, the crime rate in the State at the present time. I am not referring to the petty crimes such as drunkenness which are committed all the time. I am not even referring to those who drink and drive. While we do not condone their behaviour and we realise they deserve what they get in the way of punishment, my main concern is about major crimes which are not being solved.

The Police Force has to be shaken up. We have never before had such a spate of crimes including bank holdups and garage

holdups. Even the Taxation Department was held up. The situation is getting dangerous. That department might not have enough money with which to make all the necessary refunds if the present situation continues. It is rather important that the police do not lie down on the job.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has another five minutes.

Mr JAMIESON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It will be quite sufficient. I have spoken for twice as long as I should have.

Mr O'Connor: Can you constructively say what we can do in this regard?

Mr JAMIESON: I am not a policeman. The interjector is the Minister for Police and I am saying that the force must put a spurt on in this regard.

While I say I do not condone drunken drivers, and people who commit that sort of offence, I certainly do not condone the holdups and robberies involving large sums of money which are occurring. I sometimes wonder whether too many policemen have transferred to the Traffic Patrol, and not enough new policemen have been taken on to fill the positions vacated. The Police Force does not seem to be getting anywhere.

A few years ago a murder similar to that of Mrs Finn would have been sorted out, in some way, within a few days. That is what the people in this State were used to; murder cases being solved within a short time. However, in recent times a number of murders and robberies have occurred and the trend seems to be unending. We have to put a stop to that trend, otherwise the public will lose faith in the Police Force. The strength of a country rests with the Police Force—the peace-keeping officers. If we cannot do more than has been done recently there will be a revulsion on the part of the public. I suggest more policemen should be appointed if that is to be the solution. If necessary, we will have to bring in outsiders to advise us on the reason for the increase in the crime rate and to help us solve the major crimes.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [8.12 p.m.]: Both speakers from this side of the House have referred to the debacle of the coalition during the past few months. I will content myself with one brief reference to the situation because of its relevance to my remarks. Recently an article appeared in *The Albany Advertiser* in which the Premier was accused of desiring the Country Party back in the coalition to wreck the credibility of the party. I do not think there is any need to worry about that; it had already been wrecked at that stage. The party certainly has many fences to mend. There will need to be a great

improvement in its performance before it can claim to represent those whom it purports to represent.

The people with whom I am most concerned at this stage are those who are probably in greatest need. I refer to the beef producers. Reports which have appeared in the Press have mentioned that in the order of 300 producers are in immediate danger of going out of the industry. However, that figure of 300 does not include those who are associated, in varying degrees, with beef production for their general income. The involvement does vary but perhaps we can examine that aspect in some depth a little later.

I feel it is necessary to appreciate the position of these people, and then weigh that position against what has been done by the present Government, and what will be done through the measure now before the House. We must also weigh up what needs to be done. The disparity is rather alarming.

I will refer to a series of figures which were taken out by an accountant. The figures concern his clients, who are not named but simply numbered. The returns of those clients for the 1971-72, 1972-73, 1973-74, and 1974-75 seasons are set out in terms of value and total sales of all cattle—baby beef, culls, cows, and bulls. The aggregate return for 11 producers during 1973-74 was \$140 649. That represents an average return of \$122 per head. For the year just ended, 1974-75, the total number of sales from all sources returned \$67 131 or, strangely enough, \$66 per head. That is precisely half the amount paid during the previous year, and roughly it is the general situation throughout the industry.

The beef industry, in itself, is bad enough but when the producer is also connected with the dairying industry his predicament is even worse. When he is also associated with the fruit industry his position is absolutely crucial. I would like to cite the case of an apple grower and if he is not in need of assistance I do not know who is. He sent four consignments of fruit to a Perth agent. The four consignment of delicious, Jonathons, Yates, and Cleo apples totalled 354, 302, 349, and 215 bushels. The average return for the four consignments was \$2.50, \$2.45, \$1.30, and \$1.71. That gave him an average return of under \$2 per bushel. However, the producer actually had to pay out in cash transport freight to Perth, 42.5c, packing, 65c, strawboard, 11c, labels, 1c, poly-liners, 10c, box hire, 15c, transport from packing house to market, 10c, cool storage, 10c, and insurance, 2c, making a total of \$1.72 per bushel. In addition, picking costs amounted to 40c. His outlay in hard cash was \$2.12 and his return from the four consignments to Perth was less than \$2 per bushel. So, he has to pay for every bushel of apples he sends to market, without taking into account the cost of

growing the fruit and all orchard expenses, and the man about whom I am speaking is no mean farmer. He has a beef stud and he has an orchard, but that is his situation. His orchard-growing activities, coupled with his beef industry occupation, place him in a very serious plight.

I will not make any reflection on the marketing situation which is, in part, responsible for the present situation. I will leave that for another time in another situation. I am dealing with the final position which the producers will face unless some meaningful form of assistance is made available to them.

The reply I received to a question I asked today indicated the extent to which aid has been granted to the present time under the scheme drawn up by the present Government. I asked how many applications had been received for loans under the emergency beef scheme and I was told that the total was 174 at the 31st July, 1975. Of that number, 59 had been granted assistance, which is something in the order of one-third of the total number of applicants. The average amount, stated at \$5 190, was also provided in the reply to my question.

I would like to refer to a letter I received from my colleague, the member for Collie. He expressed concern because of the attitude conveyed to him by a bank manager in his own area.

I do not propose to read the entire letter. The substance of it is that the bank manager reported he had helped seven applicants in their efforts to obtain assistance but they were refused assistance because they were not viable. The bank manager was unable to reconcile this situation with the situation which obtained in the area to which he had previously been posted, which was further north in the grain-growing country. He could not understand the manner in which the scheme was being applied in his new south-west location.

This, of course, gives rise to the question of eligibility and what is involved and required at least to resolve in the short term the problem with which these people are faced. It is said 300 beef producers are on the way out, but there are many more who are just on the verge. A number of possible applicants have said to me, "It is no good applying for a beef loan. You do not get it. Nobody is eligible until he has reached the bottom of the barrel, where assistance is of no use to him anyway." This attitude has been expressed by a number of farmers, particularly in the Walpole and Northcliffe areas, who are possibly as hard hit as any farmers in the lower south-west. I am sorry the member for Vasse is not present. I have had a visit from several of his constituents who indicated the situation in that area is not greatly different from that in my own region.

The **SPEAKER**: Would the honourable member resume his seat. I take the opportunity to remind the member for Warren that he has on the notice paper a motion for the appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate all aspects of the meat industry. I do not rule that he cannot speak at all but I ask him to be careful not to impinge upon matters which he used in dealing with that motion and with which this House has already dealt and will be dealing again. Will he ensure he does not offend against Standing Orders.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Your well-known tolerance is appreciated, Mr Speaker. I am relating this point to the need for aid to a particular section in the south-west—in particular the small farmer in the region extending along the south coast.

I turn now to the measures which need to be applied if any meaningful assistance is to be granted in the present circumstance through the proposed Budget of the Government of this State. The aid given up to the present time has been by way of loans, and I have pointed out their shortcomings in terms of eligibility. It was announced that a concession had been made to beef producers to allow them to lease while they took another job—a magnificent gesture compared with that of the Tonkin Government, whereby development obligations were waived for a considerable period and fees were waived for some years. The gesture of the present Government measures up very poorly in that light.

The voluntary beef scheme—the Government's attempt at market reform—is a shambles at the moment, and the total industry will be a shambles before Christmas. There is no other way to describe it. It cannot improve. Those concessions are hopelessly inadequate. Something vastly different is needed if help is to be given to the class of farmer who has the capacity to survive financially and the necessary personal equation and component of character.

I would like to suggest a subsidy on interest rates is probably the best form of assistance which could be granted. Interest rates at the present time are crippling. They are running at something like 14 per cent, and even if a farmer has access to finance from a bank or a stock firm he just cannot service it with the present prices of cattle. He cannot hold the cattle over for any period of time because he is steadily going back. If the interest rates could be subsidised, there is a chance that the individual who is hard pressed at the moment will be able to service a debt at 5 per cent or 7 per cent interest. A subsidy of, say, 7 per cent would mean a total debt servicing of \$14 million.

Mr Laurance: We used to have those sorts of interest rates once.

Mr H. D. EVANS: That is so. Let us have them again. It is not impossible and it is the kind of assistance which is required. Instead of wringing their hands, as members of this Government are prone to do, and pointing to the east saying, "It is they who are responsible, not us", they should get down to doing something meaningful. This is about the only measure which will help many of the farmers to remain where they are. The present schemes have the inherent disability that the people who receive assistance cannot do much with it. I take the opportunity to suggest that provision be made for subsidising interest rates in the 1975-76 Budget.

I also point out that the limited assistance which has been given has already been used up by the increased charges which have affected country producers, especially those relating to licenses for road vehicles of all kinds. The imposts by the State Energy Commission cannot be related to the inflation index; they greatly exceed it. The Tonkin Government increased electricity charges very reluctantly on one occasion only, in contrast to the record of the present Government. Water charges have also hit all country producers; and charges in the irrigation areas, which will be discussed at a future time, have had a direct effect. Any assistance forthcoming to farmers in the south-west has been more than offset by the charges imposed by this Government.

If further assistance is not granted to these farmers, their outlook will be very grim indeed. The only way to assist them is by a reduced or subsidised interest rate. There is no other way in which the farmers, who can make a contribution in the long term, can be saved.

MR HARMAN (Maylands) [8.29 p.m.]: The Supply Bill provides the opportunity for Parliament to assess the performance of the Premier and Treasurer, because he is asking Parliament to appropriate certain funds to the Government until the legislation dealing with the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure has been approved. On that basis, the Opposition has the opportunity to assess the performance of the Premier and Treasurer, and in order to do so we must examine what he says and then examine what he does.

Mr O'Connor: Do you assess the Prime Minister as well?

MR HARMAN: If we examined the performance of the six Premiers of Western Australia since the last World War, we would find the present Premier has said the most and achieved the least.

Of all the six Premiers, Sir, he has been the one from whom we have had a whole series of promises and platitudes—called the sayings of Premier Court. The people of Western Australia had their hopes and expectations built up solely so that the Premier could gain political power. As we

know now, Sir, the people of Western Australia have had their hopes and expectations dashed. In fact, the words of the Premier were endless, but it is regrettably true that they were also empty. I am not stating something here which cannot be proved. Even in the last two years we have heard literally countless accusations and statements from the Premier and these indicate that my remarks are quite true.

Some 18 months ago our imaginations were stirred by the famous saying of the Premier that he would put things right. Later on he made these statements—

We need a Government that stands up to Canberra;

We need a Government that puts Western Australia first and fights to put things right;

We have a strong programme of well-planned economic growth; and

We are concentrating on better ideas, better plans, better management, better results.

What are the facts? What is the reality of the situation in Western Australia? The Premier said he would put things right and he would stop inflation. The increase in the cost of living in Perth was the highest of any capital city in Australia. Our unemployment figures rose from below 2 per cent when the Tonkin Government was in office to a maximum of something like 5.2 per cent of the population, during the term of the present Government. Even now the unemployment rate is much higher than it was when the Tonkin Government went out of office.

Mr O'Neil: It is lower than the national average.

Mr HARMAN: That is the reality of the situation. The people of Western Australia could not be blamed; our dazzling Premier said that he would defeat the problem of inflation. He said that inflation came about because there were too many strikes. He said that the simple answer to inflation was to beat the shortages that were driving up prices.

Previously our Premier assured the people of Western Australia that he would clean up the unemployment problem in six months. He has had 16 months and the rate of unemployment rose from below 2 per cent to a maximum of 5 per cent before it slipped back to a figure of nearly 4 per cent.

Mr O'Connor: What was the date on which he said that?

Mr HARMAN: It was in August, 1972.

Sir Charles Court: I am glad you said that—

Mr HARMAN: He wanted the opportunity to improve unemployment figures.

Sir Charles Court: —because then we had a Government in Canberra that would let us.

Mr HARMAN: Oh no, the Premier did not make any qualifications such as that.

Sir Charles Court: It happens to be true.

Mr HARMAN: The Premier knew that the only opportunity he would have to solve the unemployment problem—

Sir Charles Court: August 1972, that is the crucial thing!

Mr HARMAN: —would be when his party became the Government.

Sir Charles Court: That is right.

Mr HARMAN: And the only opportunity he had was when the State election came around in 1974.

Mr Barnett: He said he would clean up inflation State by State.

Mr HARMAN: The Premier did not qualify his statement with any "ifs" or "buts". He said that if elected to Government he would solve the unemployment problem.

Mr O'Connor: We did not have the same Government in Canberra.

Sir Charles Court: In August, 1972, we were quite happy to take it on.

Several members interjected.

SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HARMAN: In the Liberal Party policy speech, delivered on the 14th March, 1974, our present Premier said that his party was concerned about the upward trend of rates, taxes, and Government charges. He was concerned all right, and since his party became the Government, he has done something about putting them up.

Mr Jamieson: We will have something to say about that tomorrow.

Mr HARMAN: I cannot think of one Government charge which has not been increased in the 16 months of the Court Government. I do not think the Government could name one Government charge that has not been scrutinised and in some way increased. As I have said, the Premier assured the public of Western Australia that he would defeat inflation. Previously he undertook to solve unemployment. We still have these two problems in Western Australia, and it is obvious the Premier has failed on both counts.

My next point is in regard to the sorry position Western Australia would be in if it were not for the massive infusion of Australian Government money in the last 16 months.

Sir Charles Court: Don't give us that!

Mr HARMAN: That is the reality of the situation.

Sir Charles Court: It ill-becomes you.

Mr Watt: That is just giving people their jobs back.

Mr HARMAN: This massive amount of money has been spent in various areas, some of it in unison with State Government spending and some of it to provide

new and excellent facilities both for the young and the old. The State Government would never have had the opportunity or the finance for many of these projects. This money has provided employment and the means for many factories in Western Australia to produce certain products so that these facilities could be provided.

The education system in Western Australia has been revolutionised since 1972. The Australian Labor Government has been able to provide millions of dollars through the RED Scheme which has meant employment for thousands of men and women. A great number of community projects have been completed or are in the process of construction. As a State we ought to acknowledge assistance of this type provided to us by the Australian Government.

Mr Shalders: With whose money—our money!

Mr HARMAN: Of course it is our money, and there is nothing wrong with that. We never had that sort of money prior to 1972. As long as this State Government is in office, it will never acknowledge that we have had an infusion of Australian Government money since the Labor Party took office in Canberra. The State Government refuses to acknowledge it. I can recall last year that I had to ask the Minister for Local Government to raise his voice when I forced him to tell the House the amount of Australian Government assistance which had been made available directly to local authorities in the State of Western Australia. It is the first time money of this sort has been made available direct to local authorities.

Mr Rushton: That is a lot of rubbish.

Mr HARMAN: The Minister must acknowledge that sort of assistance. In the City of Stirling it meant \$500 000 last year and another \$500 000 this year. Now it must be acknowledged by this Parliament that the assistance is coming to Western Australia from the Federal Government.

Mr Rushton: It is still not as much as the States are giving to local government.

Mr HARMAN: Here we have the situation that the Premier has made all these statements and promises but he has been unable to fulfil them. If we analyse the performance of the Premier in these terms, the only conclusion we can come to is that the people of Western Australia have been subjected to one of the greatest confidence tricks ever perpetrated. They have been conned by our Premier into believing that all sorts of things would happen and they have not happened. The Premier said a few more things.

I invite members to examine the following interesting statement made by the Premier during a television broadcast in March, 1974—

We see Government as a service and not as a dictatorship.

That is a very interesting statement, and I am sure the members of the Country Party, along with many other people in Western Australia, are interested in that quote.

I have not yet had an opportunity to determine whether the Premier today tabled the report of the Royal Commission which inquired into the franchise of the SGIO.

Mr Davies: He didn't.

Mr HARMAN: I honestly cannot see any reason at all for the Premier not to table that report. If it is so that various Government departments are analysing the report and preparing submissions upon it, they could still make their analyses and prepare submissions if the report were tabled in this House. Just because the Royal Commissioner brought down a report does not mean that the law must be changed immediately. Bearing in mind the report was requested by the previous Government, I do not think the present Government has any right to withhold it from the public. The Premier informed me that the report was available to the Cabinet in May, 1974. It is now August, 1975, and we still have not seen it, so it has been withheld for over 12 months. I have asked the Premier on half a dozen occasions if he would be kind enough to make the report available, and each time he has said that he will, but something must happen here or there first.

The whole philosophy of the Premier is that it is all right to make statements to excite the people, but they must not be told anything, nor should they be allowed to participate in government. "Keep them at arm's length; don't involve them"; that is the philosophy of the Premier, and I have seen it time and time again in this place when we have asked for Select Committees or Royal Commissions. On every occasion that we have asked for some sort of inquiry into a particular problem—one in which we wished the public to participate—our Premier has said, "No, we don't want the public of Western Australia to be involved. We know what is right. We have a divine right to rule, and we will rule without consulting the public and do what we want to do."

So it is all very well for the Premier to say, "We see Government as a service and not as a dictatorship", because he is there to con the people.

Then later on in the same television broadcast he said—

A properly staffed enquiry office will be established in the centre of the city where city people can ask about anything concerning Government departments and get some positive guidance.

Mr Davies: Except the SGIO.

Mr HARMAN: During the same broadcast our Premier also said—

I spoke earlier of the housing shortage. I speak now of the housing land shortage which is forcing prices up. Land cannot be sold for homes until it gets essential services. The Liberal answer is an imaginative—

A very emotive word. He continued—

—new scheme to arrange finance for the missing services to end the land shortage, to create competition and to hold prices down.

Here is the crux of his statement, which I claim is a deliberate con of the people of Western Australia—

For low income earners we've got a practical plan to help them get both home and land.

Sir Charles Court: My word, we have.

Mr HARMAN: Note the words, "we've got". Last session in this House the Premier admitted that he did not have a plan, but that one had been requested from the housing study group. He admitted that so far no plan had been formed. Yet, in March, 1974, he told the people of Western Australia that he had a plan. What has happened to that plan? Where is it? The plan is similar to the Pilbara plan we used to hear about; it was never in the files of the department, but in the Premier's head. However the Premier's statement offered some hope to the people of Western Australia, and particularly to low income earners. They thought, "Oh, Sir Charles Court has a plan!"

Mr Davies: They call him Charlie.

Mr HARMAN: This is a deliberate confidence trick. I go on to make another quote from the same television broadcast—

We will set up an independent body to be a watch dog for the public to see that the laws and the regulations do not trespass unduly on personal rights and liberties, and this body will see that the public is better informed on by-laws, regulations, documents, reports that are tabled in Parliament.

That is very emotive stuff designed particularly to attract people to say, "Well, we will be able to participate; this is the style of government that we like." But, of course, no such body has emerged.

I could go on because the list I have is endless. However, unfortunately for the people of Western Australia these are empty statements.

I am reminded again of an English Prime Minister (Mr MacMillan) who once said that a politician in particular is unable to disguise himself for long, and the mask he wears will be taken away. In other words, the public soon realises what sort of a man a politician is by the number of statements he makes and the veracity of those statements when they are assessed

—not immediately, but later. I am sorry to say that the Premier is facing that situation at the moment.

I believe the people of this State now realise they have been conned. They realise the Premier has not been able to do many of the things he said he would do, and that he has already been forced to back-track on quite a few of his statements which were designed solely to influence the people and with no intention of carrying them out. I feel sure the Premier is well aware of the attitude of the public towards him and his Government. Of course, being ever resourceful, the next thing we hear from him is that electoral boundaries will be changed. We will have something to say about that later on.

It is now 90 days since the Premier's leadership came under question when the member for Mt. Marshall—then the Deputy Premier—and the member for Stirling—then the Chief Secretary—walked out of the coalition. At the time the President of the Country Party said the reason for this action was the one-man-band style of government by the Premier. Even the member for Mt. Marshall—who I think showed admirable courage to walk out of the coalition with his two other Ministers—said, "We have the guts to stand up for what we believe in." I think that was a big thing for a Deputy Premier in a coalition Government to do. He had had enough and so had the Country Party, and that is the reason he walked out.

Those members wanted to stand on their principles, and that is what they did. But along came the member for Katanning. When I came into the House last year and first saw the member for Katanning sitting on the other side I said to one of my colleagues, "I thought the member for Katanning was a member of the Country Party." My colleague replied, "Yes, he is" and I said, "But he is sitting between two Liberals over there." I notice that the member for Mt. Marshall also is sitting between two Liberals.

Mr Jamieson: He had no other seat to go to.

Mr HARMAN: I found this strange, but did not think any more about it. Later, the member for Katanning had some words to say about our Premier. He said that he was inflexible and unbending. I think it was only a day or so before he walked back into coalition that he said the views of the two parties were irreconcilable.

When I heard that comment, I thought of the member for Collie, because over the years that member has taken a great interest in the affairs of the Country Party. He missed out on an invitation to the wedding of the Country Party and the National Alliance because of some malfunction or another; nor did he receive an invitation to the divorce of the Country Party from the National Alliance.

Mr B. T. Burke: And now it is a *de facto* relationship.

Mr HARMAN: He did not receive an invitation to the wedding of the Country Party and the Liberal Party, and I felt sure that with all the gyrations which were going on, with the Country Party walking out of coalition and then perhaps going back and perhaps not going back, the member for Collie would have been well and truly giddy. I am only sorry he is not here tonight to take part in this debate, when we are discussing the affairs of the coalition and the leadership of the Premier.

As I said, along came the member for Katanning and led the party back into coalition in a way which I suggest was akin to that famous Norwegian politician Vidkun Quisling, who got up to all sorts of tricks and has quite a history. I then discovered that the now Leader of the Country Party was a former member of the Liberal Party.

Mr Jamieson: What makes you think he has ever given them away?

Mr Bryce: You could not be elected member for Katanning if you were a member of the Liberal Party.

Mr HARMAN: So, everything started to fit into place, and we had the member for Katanning, an ex-Liberal, as a Minister of the Government and the former Leader of the Country Party and Deputy Premier sitting on the back benches because of his principles.

Mr Barnett: I wonder how the member for Mt. Marshall feels about that.

Mr HARMAN: I suggest he feels quite proud of himself. While discussing the member for Katanning, the now Minister for Agriculture, I should like to say that when I write letters to Ministers I believe it is only courteous that I receive an answer direct to me, rather than see the answer printed in a Press release.

I wrote to the Minister and asked him whether he would make available to the Opposition committees relating to consumer affairs and agriculture an officer of his department with experience in matters relating to the milk industry. Although I have not received an answer, Press comment last week indicated that the Minister had agreed to supply the committees with such an officer. I do not think that is the best way to start off in the Ministry; I think common courtesy calls for a letter to be supplied to the member making the request. However, the Minister is new to the game; perhaps if we bring these matters to his attention now, they will not occur again in the future.

Mr Nanovich: You are not upsetting him at all, you know.

Mr HARMAN: I do not know the member for Katanning, so I would not know. We then had a situation which arose a few weeks ago from an action taken by

the Industrial Commission under the powers conferred upon it by section 132 of the Industrial Arbitration Act. Prior to taking this action, the Industrial Commission wrote to the unions registered under the commission and advised them that it was considering the possibility of taking action under section 132, a section of the Act dealing with strikes and lock-outs.

There is nothing wrong with such a proposal because the necessary power is contained in an Act of Parliament, and the commission's job is to ensure that, as far as the administration of the commission is concerned, Acts of Parliament are upheld. When I first heard about this matter, I immediately asked the Premier to intervene. I did so for two very good reasons, although there were many other reasons. Firstly, a previous Government of Western Australia—not the Tonkin Government, but the Brand-Nalder Government—had written to the Australian Government informing it that Western Australia accepted the particular ILO conventions which recognised the right to strike. The Government has not denied entering into such a contract with the Australian Government, and I cannot for the life of me understand why the Minister for Labour and Industry refuses to table the relevant correspondence.

Mr Grayden: I have said that you can come to my office and look at the file at any time. What is the difference between that and tabling the letters?

Mr HARMAN: If I go down to the Minister's office and have a look at the file I am bound by some rule that I must keep the information confidential.

Mr Grayden: You can see precisely what is on the file and express your thoughts on the matter. You know what the situation is.

Mr HARMAN: If the Minister is prepared to assure me that I can examine the file in his office and then return to the House and quote from that correspondence, I would be happy to view the file; however, the Minister is not prepared to give me that assurance.

What the Minister wants me to do is to go to his office, look through the correspondence and see the letter written by, I think, the now Deputy Premier informing the Australian Government that the Government of Western Australia supported the particular ILO conventions to which I have referred, but not quote directly from that correspondence. Why cannot that letter be tabled? What is the secret? What is all the hassle about? If the letter is there in black and white—I am fairly sure it is; do not forget that we had three years in government, too—what is wrong with tabling the letter? Does it not merely confirm that the Government accepted these ILO conventions?

Mr Grayden: It was the non-Labor Governments which agreed.

Mr HARMAN: That is what I am trying to prove.

Mr Grayden: You are trying to prove nothing of the sort.

Mr HARMAN: I am trying to establish that a Government of which the Premier and Deputy Premier were Ministers agreed to the ILO conventions which recognised the right to strike.

Mr O'Neill: You said, "the right to strike". I wish you would read the conventions.

Mr Grayden: Read the conventions!

Mr HARMAN: I have read the conventions.

Mr O'Neill: Read them out to the House.

Mr HARMAN: I do not have to do that.

Mr O'Neill: What about the freedom of the right to associate?

Mr HARMAN: I know what the Deputy Premier is getting at. However, the conventions do not say anything which does not support the right to strike.

Mr O'Neill: Nor does it prohibit freedom to associate, which is contrary to your union principles.

Mr HARMAN: But what was said by the fact-finding commission which investigated hundreds of cases? It said that inherent in these ILO conventions was the concept of the right to strike; members opposite do not deny that.

Sir Charles Court: Compulsory unionism is contrary to ILO principles.

Mr HARMAN: When the commission took action under an Act of Parliament, I asked the Premier to intervene because a previous Liberal Government had agreed to these conventions. The Premier said, "No, I will not intervene."

Sir Charles Court: Tell me where we contravened the ILO convention, because a union does not have to come under the Industrial Arbitration Act?

Mr HARMAN: Here we go again.

Sir Charles Court: It does not.

Mr HARMAN: But is it not better if it does?

Sir Charles Court: It has freedom of choice.

Mr HARMAN: Would the Premier prefer to see the unions come under the Act or not?

Sir Charles Court: They do it by choice.

Mr HARMAN: The Premier would leave it to them?

Sir Charles Court: Yes, they do so from choice.

Mr HARMAN: That was the first reason I asked the Premier to intervene. The second reason was that since the Industrial Commission had taken no sort of

action it seemed to me that if we have a law it cannot be applied indiscriminately every now and again, because if that were done it would be a bad law. The third reason I asked the Premier to intervene was that I could see that, ultimately, there would be a general strike in Western Australia.

Mr O'Neill: Did you check to see whether the Premier had a right to intervene?

Mr HARMAN: I listened to some of the Deputy Premier's wafflings during the 1973 debate. As Deputy Leader of the then Opposition he had some words to say about intervening at that time. The following is quite interesting because it is what the present Deputy Premier had to say then—

Even when management and labour consent to an industrial award there must surely be occasions when the Attorney-General who, I think, is the Minister for the purposes of this Act, should have the right to intervene in the interests of the State and in the public interest.

Mr O'Neill: And it is still in the Act, and you are trying to take it out. I am talking about intervening when the Minister takes action. There is not any dispute. You ought to know because you were a Minister for Labour.

Mr HARMAN: The Minister did not take action. The unions were told only that it was being considered. Fortunately for Western Australia along comes our present Minister for Labour and Industry back from Geneva. He had been there listening to the ILO convention being debated, and no doubt listening to some advice from Bob Hawke and others attending that convention and therefore he would be well aware of the industrial scene. Back comes the Minister to this State with the knowledge that Australia has ratified the ILO convention. He knows full well that when unions talk about the right to strike this is inherent in ILO conventions and, to his credit, he immediately got down to taws and some real talking with the trade union movement.

Now there are moves afoot which should have been taken before. We tried to take them but they were rejected. Moves are now afoot, I understand, to redraft section 132 of the Industrial Arbitration Act.

The SPEAKER: The member has eight or nine minutes.

Mr HARMAN: As I see it, one of the problems in Western Australia at the moment is that among some investors there is an investment strike. There are some notable cases where firms in Western Australia are investing money. The other day I was fortunate to attend a dinner with the general manager in Australia of G. J. Coles & Co. Ltd. and from

him I learnt that that company is investing a large amount of money in Western Australia in the erection of new shopping centres and other similar facilities.

Mr Clarko: At the same rate as it was previously?

Mr HARMAN: I think it is even greater. The company proposes to erect five or six large supermarkets. That is the sort of investment we welcome in this State. There are others also, of course, that are investing money in Western Australia for some reason or other, but there are quite a number who are on an investment strike. All that is needed here is a word from the Premier indicating some enthusiasm for Western Australia. Instead of knocking the system as he is now, he should endeavour to encourage more people to invest in Western Australia.

The other day I noticed a Press report in which he seemed to take Lang Hancock to task because that gentleman had announced the proposed development of the Marandoo iron ore deposits. I can only assume that he must have made the announcement ahead of the Premier, because no doubt the Premier would want to announce it first.

Sir Charles Court: I did not take him to task.

Mr HARMAN: The Premier, I understand, was not too happy about Mr Hancock's announcement. Apparently he has some sort of argument with him as to whether or not Mr Hancock had received a letter of intent.

Sir Charles Court: There is no argument.

Mr HARMAN: Well, the Premier says there is no argument. With the sort of situation we have in Western Australia at the moment all that is needed is for the Premier to forget all about the "economic disasters" that are emerging from Canberra. People want to invest in Western Australia; people are investing in Western Australia and with a little more encouragement from the Premier many more people would invest in this State. If the \$6 000 million project at Marandoo gets off the ground many more people will be investing in Western Australia by tendering for the various contracts that will be let for the proposed development in that area.

Mr Mensáros: What! For \$6 000 million?

Mr HARMAN: Probably more. I have tried to say in the House that the people of Western Australia have been subjected to a big confidence trick by our Premier. They have now, of course, come to realise the handicap under which they are labouring. I only regret that the performance of the Government, as bad as it has been, can only produce a blank in one's mind

when one asks oneself what this Government has done in the last 16 months, because it is so difficult to think of anything the Government has done.

The SPEAKER: The member has five more minutes.

Mr HARMAN: In conclusion all I want to say is that in the Premier's policy speech in 1974 he said, "There has to be a better way." I do not believe the Liberal way is the better way. From 1971 to 1974 I think we showed that in this State the Labor way is the better way and the sooner we return to that sort of Government the better off the people of Western Australia will be.

MR HARTREY (Boulder-Dundas) [9.08 p.m.]: As I understand it, we are debating a Bill which may be cited as the Supply Act, 1975, the context of which is, in itself, illuminating. So far in the debate it has not received very much comment, but that is, of course, because it is one of those debates that allows more latitude than do others, and most of us who are not financial geniuses, and some of us who are not financial at all, get more fun out of debating other matters than in arguing about figures such as those set out in clause 2 of this Bill.

I have been pleased to note that the debate has ranged from China to Peru for quite a long time and I think I will be able to range even a little further than that before my contribution to the debate terminates.

To begin with I must congratulate the member for Maylands on his very apposite quotation from the propaganda speeches of the Premier. It is a fine and exalting principle to declare that "we see government as a service and not as a dictatorship." I wonder why it was the Government finally saw the Premier not as a service but as a dictator, so that some of his Government colleagues departed from him, shook his "dust"—I mean the bovine type—from their shoes metaphorically speaking and shifted to the back bench.

In the past the Premier has achieved a certain amount of quite honourably-acquired fame for his great steps forward. Unfortunately since he has become Premier he has become noted for his great steps sideways, and he has taken evasive action whenever the occasion has arisen. I do not want to gloat over the position which has developed between the Liberal element and the Country Party element of the Government. In the spirit of charity and brotherhood between all men I congratulate the new Ministers on their elevation to the Ministry, but I would be less than just and by no means generous if I did not also congratulate the honourable member for Mt. Marshall—I use the word "honourable" very sincerely—and the honourable member for Stirling for having forsaken the dictatorship Government, and

for showing the courage of their convictions by retiring with honour to a less exalted but perhaps much more dignified situation.

When all is said and done, if the Country Party has any role at all, it is as the champion of a fairly downtrodden element in our community—the element which has a great champion in this House, who is among the ranks on this side. I refer to the member for Warren. No-one can say there is any member in this House who is better qualified to put forward the interests of the primary producing element of Western Australia, than he is.

No member in this House knows more about or cares as much for the problems of the primary producing section of the community, and certainly the member for Warren has spoken very eloquently, very trenchantly and more to the point about that element. The Country Party has for many years past endeavoured to do it as well as the member for Warren has been gifted to do. For that I give him great credit.

It has been well said that when the going gets tough the tough get going. It is up to the Country Party which has the interests of the rural element at heart to get going even if it means abandoning the Liberal Party altogether. Can any member tell me what the Liberal Party has done for the downtrodden elements of the rural population of Western Australia since its election to office?

I am not being unfair and I am not indulging in cheap invective when I invite members of the Liberal Party to join in this debate and tell us what they are trying to do to alleviate the burdens that have been placed on the rural community—the people who are going broke as the member for Warren reminded us a while ago such as the apple and pear growers and the people who are experiencing a mighty hard struggle in making ends meet in milk production. In other words they are the pawns in the game of politics so far as the St. George's Terrace farmers are concerned. I refer to the stock and station agents the mortgagees, the banks and the big and exalted financial organisations which bludge on the rural industries and depress the members who produce the goods that constitute the products of the rural industries.

Let us be charitable and pass over that very ugly aspect of the performance of the present Government since March, 1974. To come to some matters in which I am quite interested personally, I note that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition mentioned the subject of the police. I have often said, and I say it again: the police form a most valuable adjunct to society. In fact, without an efficient Police Force society can hardly be safeguarded; but an efficient Police Force does not mean a tyrannical one. An efficient Police Force means a just, temperate, and honest force.

I think that for the most part we have an efficient Police Force, and we have a just and reasonable type of force. That is the rule, but there are exceptions to every rule. I am happy enough to pay a tribute to our Police Force, and we certainly have a courageous force. So, I quite freely and honestly pay a tribute to the Police Force for its efficiency, courage, and integrity. However, there are some "buts".

I was not at all happy to read in yesterday's newspaper that the police had "nabbed 1 800 drivers" of motor vehicles, by hanging around outside hotels waiting to apprehend the patrons as they stepped into their cars. I would have thought that prevention of crime was one of the first avenues to which the police officers would be instructed to devote their attention. It appears that the instructions from those higher up in the force were not to prevent the commission of offences, but to nab the drivers of cars in the act of committing offences.

Mr Watt: It was not quite that.

Mr HARTREY: I do not know whether the honourable member was among those who were picked up by the police. If he has been picked up he would know what I am talking about.

Mr Watt: I suggest you talk to the Minister.

Mr HARTREY: I suggest the honourable member talk to the Minister, and allow me to address the House.

Mr Watt: You should get your facts right.

Mr HARTREY: I have got my facts right. The honourable member would know nothing about the matter with which I am dealing. I know more about the Police Force of this State than he has ever learnt in his lifetime.

Mr Watt: I am not talking about the police but about the number of drivers.

Mr HARTREY: I know what the honourable member is talking about, but for the time being I do not want to have a conversation with him. It would be a privilege to talk to him about this in the bar but not in the Chamber.

What the members of the Police Force have been instructed to do should be stopped at once. If it is not stopped I will want to know the reason. The police ought not to be put in the situation of an agent provocateur. Police officers should not be instructed to wait and pounce on drivers. It should be their duty to approach a driver who is not fit to drive a car and say, "You are not fit to get into your car and drive." If after warning the driver gets into the car, then the police should nab him. If a driver does not have enough brains to do what he has been advised by the police then it serves him right if he is taken to the lockup and later on fined.

The drivers should be given the opportunity to avoid arrest by being warned to go on their way, to engage a taxi to drive home, or even to sleep it off before attempting to drive. What the police officers have been instructed to do is wrong and is to be deplored.

Under Standing Orders I do not think I am permitted to make any further reference to the atrocious traffic Bill we passed here at the end of last year. However, I shall not forget the occasion and I shall not forget the sorry sight of Opposition members outvoted all the way by people who, in their hearts, knew very well that the law was being made far too stringent and unfair. Some comparatively mild forms of careless driving could now result in the equivalent of a manslaughter charge.

A further subject that has been raised by the member for Maylands has interested me considerably. I intended to raise it myself, but I thank him for having done it so very well. I am referring to insurance. I appeared before the Royal Commission investigating the State Government Insurance Office, and I gave evidence on behalf of the Labor Party.

I sat and listened to other evidence for a couple of days and I was much impressed by some of it. I was looking forward to the mature judgment of the eminent judge who was appointed as Royal Commissioner. However, I am afraid that despite all the good intentions of the people who appointed the Royal Commission, and despite all the expenditure of public money on the production of the report, we are to get nothing at all. The report is to be kept secret. Here of course is a brilliant example of where service to the community takes second place to dictatorship.

Mr Grayden: It will not be secret for long.

Mr HARTREY: Thank goodness for that. I am most encouraged. I am glad indeed to know it will be made public and therefore I will be happy to drop the subject. However, I do want to say a few words about insurance.

We cannot open a newspaper today without seeing full-page advertisements beseeching the people to think of their rights, of private enterprise, and of personal freedom, by voting for the tariff insurance companies; those great benefactors of the community. This just boils me.

Mr Davies: They have the biggest buildings.

Mr Shalders: What about the full-page advertisements on Medibank? Did they make you boil?

Mr HARTREY: I did not read half of them. The first address I had the honour to make in this House contained the following passage—

If a bookmaker loses a bet he must pay. If he welves he is out. He

may not pay that one bet, but then he will never get another one. He cannot even appear at a racecourse, whether he is licensed by law, as here, or whether he is not, as is the case in many other places. However, he will not practise if he welves on a bet.

This does not apply to the insurance companies. The insurance company which did not welve on a bet would be a freak. I have had so many examples of this that it makes my heart bleed to think of them.

Then I quoted a few. I can quote another tonight and I will do so presently.

It has become a habit with the Liberal Party element in this House, when stuck up a pole, to attack the Federal Government, or as it is fondly referred to by some, the Australian Government. Members opposite attack the Federal Government as a matter of course; although when the Liberal Government was in power in Federal circles it had the same attitude towards centralism. One thing that members of the Liberal Party are upset about is the terrible thought that there might be an Australian insurance corporation. As members know, I am not a great advocate of any kind of Federal activities intruding upon State activities, and I do not apologise for saying that again as I have said it before. I would prefer to see the State authorities operating solely in the insurance field, and a Federal authority in its own sphere; but I would far sooner see either than have us go on the way we are at present—being exploited by the tariff companies.

An example of this came to my knowledge yesterday out of the blue. The person involved is not a constituent of mine, nor is he an acquaintance or anyone who has had anything whatever to do with me. I was recommended to him by someone I do not know because a question of insurance law was at issue.

The facts of his case can be briefly stated. I am not actuated by any vindictiveness towards any company. I will not even mention its name. I told him straightout that unless we could get some sort of justice I would give the insurer an advertisement tonight which would do more harm than all the pages of advertisements in the paper. I do it freely and gladly, without mentioning names. As members know we are all well and truly above the law of libel in this House. However, I will not mention the company. I will merely state the facts and members will judge for themselves.

The man is a foreigner. He can speak English, but he brought someone with him in case there was a certain point he could not make me understand. However, I did not need the interpreter. For years and years on the goldfields I have dealt with

people who do not speak much English, but they have been able to make themselves reasonably understood.

Here was the problem. This young fellow, between the age of 21 and 25—that is immaterial—was driving a seven-year-old Monaro which was insured for \$1600, because that is what he owed on the list price.

Mr Watt: Not with a tariff company?

Mr HARTREY: It was insured with a tariff company all right. If the honourable member does not believe me he can come and look at the papers afterwards.

Mr Watt: I will.

Mr HARTREY: I wish the honourable member would not interrupt me. I am not interested in his remarks and I doubt if anyone else is.

The vehicle was insured for \$1600 at a premium of \$106. It was involved in an accident in March. The driver pulled up at an intersection, which he was bound to do to give way to traffic on his right, and a car behind crashed into the back of his vehicle. The damage was not heavy because the total cost of repairs for the body work was, on the cheapest quote, \$489. Obviously the damage was not serious because as members know there is not a car around today which can take much belting and be repaired for that amount.

However, damage was also done to the gearbox and the cost of repairing that was \$270. The insurance company said it would not pay the \$270. It was an old car—seven years old—and consequently the gearbox would not be much good according to the company. It therefore undertook to pay half the amount. That sounded fair enough to me. I rang up the person who was supposed to repair the gearbox and asked if the amount for the repairs was \$270 and I was told that it was, but that the insurance company would pay half. I was told that therefore my client would have to pay only \$135.

I did not think that was unfair, so I told my client. He thereupon told me that he had to pay \$270. I told him he did not have to pay that amount, but only \$135 which is exactly half. I told him I would ring the insurance company to check. I did this, and was told by the company that my client had to pay the \$270. I asked the company why, because it had said it would pay half the cost. I was thereupon told that this was so, but that my client had to pay a franchise of \$135. When I asked why, the representative of the company asked me had I read the policy. I told him I had and that the franchise was \$85, and not \$135. I was told to have a look at the policy again.

I am used to reading insurance policies, but I missed this item, I admit. Therefore, what a foreigner would make of it,

when he could not read or write English properly, I cannot imagine. But the information was there in paragraphs (a), (b), and (c). Paragraph (a) stated that any person who was insured would pay the first \$50, no matter who he was.

Any person between the age of 21 and 25 years will pay another \$85 on top of the \$50. Then, any person who has had a previous accident or who is a probationary driver of any age will pay another \$50 on top of that. The result was that my man paid a premium of \$106, then an additional \$270 to have his car repaired out of a total cost of \$760. The insurance company got out of it for 50 per cent of the total cost. Exactly half of the total is paid in the form of \$270 for repairs to the gear box, and \$106 for the premium. What sort of a game is that? Would anyone be expected to call that justice? One insures against total risk. Of course, if the car is a write off the owner would be lucky to get \$700 for it even though it is insured for \$1600 because the insurance companies never pay the full amount for which the vehicle is insured. They usually pay according to the market value in the little red book or the little yellow book—whichever one they choose. That is the price which a dealer would have paid for the car.

That is the sort of justice which people are receiving from these companies—private enterprise insurance companies. Very enterprising, believe you me, Sir, and extremely private! Every insurance policy contains an arbitration clause. Fortunately, it does not apply to hire-purchase transactions, because we as a Parliament, refused to allow it to operate in that context. It has been wiped out as far as hire-purchase transactions are concerned. However, where a transaction does not include a hire-purchase agreement—and some do not—the policy has an arbitration clause under which a person cannot get any satisfaction. He cannot sue the company, or go to a court of law as is the right of every citizen. The clause sets out that one has to go to a private individual, usually a barrister in private practice who demands a large fee—one does not have to pay a magistrate, who is paid by the State—and even though the insurance company might be involved in a swindle there is a lot of hush hush and no-one knows about it. I hope the day will presently come when arbitration is cut right out of all contracts. As an experienced practitioner in law I can assure members that arbitration is much more expensive than any litigation in any proper law court, whether it is the Local Court or the High Court.

There is not any one court as unsatisfactory and expensive, and unskilled and hopeless as arbitration. So I sincerely hope it will be abolished altogether. So much for that.

Another subject to which I would like to devote some of my attention is the right to strike. This is really something! Here is a member saying that a worker has the right to strike. That is a shocking thing to say! However, I say that a worker has a right to strike.

It will be said that the person who has a right to strike will ruin the community. The community will be conspired against by workers trying to get something more than they are entitled to. People will suffer because of the loss of electric power and the disruption of railway transport and air transport. It is claimed that tremendous inconvenience will be caused to the community, and here is a man who has the cheek to get up in Parliament and say that the workers have a right to strike!

Let us look at the claim that a working man has not the right to strike. What way has a man who is a labourer, or who is a tradesman skilled in only one particular branch of industry, of earning his living except by his wages? If he has not the right to say he refuses to give his services for the wages which are offered to him, and that he wants a certain wage and will not work for less, why should he not have the right to strike? He did not have the right to refuse to work in early feudal times, and he did not have the right in the days of William the Conqueror. He did not have the right until the black death, but after that he did have the right for a while because so many people were wiped out during that plague that his labour was at a premium.

However, Parliament then passed a law, the contravention of which was punishable by flogging or death, to say that a worker had to work for the wages paid prior to the black death. The workers were serfs; they were slaves—though not chattel slaves as they were in America more than 130 years ago. However, they were bound to the soil and were not allowed to go from village to village without the permission of their masters. If a worker did flee to another town and was dragged back before a year expired he was flogged or put to death. It was nothing for a serf to be hanged. That was a fine time during which to live!

If a person says he will not work tomorrow because he is not getting enough for his labour, or he is not getting what he used to get in proportion to other people of a similar status, he is breaking the law. He will not be hanged or flogged because such stupid laws cannot be enforced today, and there is no reason why they should. If there were a power in this State to effectively drive a working man into the position where he had to accept work or starve, what sort of a country would we have? I certainly would not want to be a citizen of such country; much as I love Western Australia. I would emigrate.

Why is there not a right to strike? It is a fundamental right of a human being. A man who has not the right to refuse his labour is a slave. So do not come to me whining that the worker does not have the right, or should not have the right, to strike. What rubbish! It simply nauseates me. I believe the well-intentioned people who take the entirely opposite view do not have the human sympathy to realise what it means.

Another part of the policy of the Liberal Party since March of last year, to which I will devote some attention, is the famous subject of education. I am very much inclined to be impatient with people who keep on talking about education. I made some similar remarks about a year ago to the effect that man thinks he has control over words, but words sometimes revolt and have control over men. The word "education" is quite often one of these revolting expressions. It is sometimes used but not necessarily in relation to the education of students. What does our glorious Liberal Party propose we should have for an education policy? It proposes pre-school education; pretending to teach tiny children while their mothers play bridge? Giving the children something to do; spending public money on "teaching dear little children to play".

A cat knows intuitively how to teach its kittens. It is instinctive to animals of the human race, as well as to the quadrupeds and our feathered friends, to amuse themselves and make social contacts at the age of two or three. It is interesting to see how a couple of children who do not know each other become pally. We do not need pre-school education to teach children that kind of thing; but that is what we are getting, and we are spending Government money on it. It is a lot of boloney.

We also presuppose we can change the level of adolescent life by a whole 12 months simply by passing an Act of Parliament. It has been the custom for a long time now to have youths and girls of 12 years of age going into the first year of high school. We will institute a reform and make them fit for high school at 11 by Act of Parliament, which is as silly as to pass an Act of Parliament requiring it to rain every second washing day through the winter season.

That is the education policy of the Liberal Party. Of course, it cannot implement the policy because it does not have the money to do so. I certainly do not rejoice over the situation of our State Government being short of money except on this solitary occasion. Under the existing constitutional arrangements with the Federal Government, the State Governments are kept short of money, which annoys me very much; but when I find the State Government cannot find enough money to indulge in this piffing nonsense I rejoice, because it is a lot of boloney.

Mr Sibson: Obviously you have no children young enough to go to pre-school.

Mr HARTREY: At my age! I am 74½. There are other aspects of our civilisation to which I could possibly devote some time but perhaps I should leave things as they are at present. I have the greatest faith in my fellow man. I have the kindest feelings towards my fellow men—those on this side of the House, anyway—and I do not think it would be fair to devote my speech entirely to invective or denunciation, even of my political opponents. They have their merits and their faults, as we have ours. We are inclined to rejoice over their internecine disputes, and they have plenty of opportunity to rejoice over ours if it comes to that. In the spirit of friendliness I will conclude by saying that with all their faults I love them still.

MR DAVIES (Victoria Park) [9.44 p.m.]: No doubt the member for Boulder-Dundas is one of the most benevolent members on our side, and I will see whether I can do something to let the House know that we, as an Opposition, are not quite so happy with the Government's performance as he might lead one to believe.

The Supply Bill requires Parliament to make money available to the Government so that it can continue to run the State until such time as the Budget is brought down and dealt with. As the Leader of the Opposition said earlier this evening, although we should probably say we deny supply, we are not of that mind because we believe the Government should run its full term of three years unless it does something fairly drastic. I have not quite made up my mind what would be drastic enough to ask the Government to resign. Perhaps on another occasion later this week we will be able to do that; but I join with the Leader of the Opposition in supporting the Bill for the continuation of the Public Service although I must express concern about the fact that we are not getting value for the money we are spending, in my opinion.

I believe the Public Service is grinding to a halt for two reasons. One is the fear on the part of the different branches and some Ministers in taking what they consider to be the necessary and appropriate action to run their departments; the other in the lack of staff to run the departments. I believe these matters can be driven straight home to the Treasurer. Very creditably—and here again is an item which curries favour with the electorate—he said he would limit the growth in the Public Service during the year which has just ended to 2 per cent. He thought that was reasonable. Indeed, we have seen the Federal leader try to go one better.

I do not want to discuss Federal politics and draw red herrings across the trail, but last year there were perhaps greater increases in the Federal Public Service than

there would normally have been and it is time to call a halt. The Treasurer of this State seemed to think 2 per cent was an arbitrary figure, and he would not go beyond it. Trouble has been experienced in interpreting what the 2 per cent means. Despite what has been said in this House, I believe even if public servants are appointed whose salaries are paid by the Australian Government, they are counted as part of the 2 per cent. That was denied by the Treasurer earlier this year.

However, following a direction which came from the Public Service Board in about February last—I think it was probably directive number 11—the heads of branches were left in some confusion as to how they should apply the growth rates for their departments within the arbitrary figure of 2 per cent which had been set down by the Treasurer. Indeed, the Public Service Board was reluctant or unable to give a decision on some recommendations for appointment, many of which had been outstanding for a long time—once again because of lack of understanding of the Treasurer's direction.

Towards the end of the first part of this session I asked a question regarding the appointment of a pre-school health screening team which was to be set up and paid for by the Federal Government through the Australian Children's Commission. The team was to comprise a medical officer for child health, a social worker, a speech therapist, three trained nurses, and a typist. The proposal was put up some considerable time before I asked on the 1st May whether the team had been appointed.

The Minister led me to believe that a team had been appointed and that the matter was going ahead satisfactorily. The reply was as follows—

The pre-school team is in the process of formation and action is being taken to create the necessary positions under the Public Service Act.

At the time I asked that question I believe no decision had been taken. The matter was still with the Public Service Board and some confusion existed as to who would make the recommendation and whether or not the board was allowed to make the appointments even though the salaries for the positions were to be paid for by the Australian Government. The board still did not know whether these appointments were to be part of the 2 per cent overall increase in the staff of the Public Health and Medical Departments or whether they were to stand alone. I do not think that question has been resolved properly as yet.

When I asked that question the decision had not been made, but between the time of asking the question and the time it was answered the approval was given by the Public Service Board. I believe that at

that stage no-one wanted to say approval had not been given.

A few days later I asked whether these appointments would be affected by the Premier's direction regarding the growth of the Public Service and the answer to that was "No". At a later stage I may ask for the board's direction to be tabled.

Indeed, the Public Service Board does not know what it is doing in regard to the appointment of staff because it cannot interpret properly the directions given by the Premier. Without proper regard for the functioning of one department against another, the Premier has set an arbitrary growth figure of 2 per cent. It may be that this will have adverse effects on some departments, be acceptable to others, and some may be able to get by. However, the fact remains that the Premier has set this limit of 2 per cent, and that illustrates his attitude towards the growth of a service responsible for running this State.

Some appointments are necessary and although they have been agreed to by everyone who is reasonable and responsible within the Public Service, they are not being made because of the Premier's direction. As a result, work is either falling behind or an extra work load is being placed on some people who cannot cope reasonably with it. It is for this reason I believe it is taking much longer to obtain information and replies to queries from Government departments. Indeed, the Premier's Department is probably one of the worst in this regard. Back in October I wrote to the Premier seeking further information about a question. I let the matter go for several months and I then wrote again. Someone from the department telephoned me to say that my original letter could not be found. I let the department have a copy of my letter, but I still have not had a reply. I believe also this is not an isolated instance and other members of Parliament—at least on this side of the House—have found they have had to wait a very long time to receive a reply from the Premier's Department or from other branches. I see the Deputy Premier is becoming a little irritated so I must say that I will excuse the Public Works Department. I must be fair and say that his department always replies reasonably promptly to my queries.

Mr O'Neil: The member for Kalamunda would not agree with you. He has a question on the notice paper about a delayed letter.

Mr DAVIES: I was just intending to add that I do not always receive prompt service in maintaining my office. No-one is perfect all the time.

Although we are making money available to the Government to run the State, we do not like the way it is being run. We believe the Civil Service is very unhappy about the treatment it receives from

the Government, and the responsibility for this can be shot home directly to the Premier because of his lack of direction and his arbitrary limit of the growth rate of the Civil Service to 2 per cent.

The Opposition is unhappy about many other actions taken by this Government, and many times we have raised our eyebrows about things it has done. At this stage I do not believe I shall go into the dealings of the urban land commission—if that is its correct title—except to say that some very harsh things were said about a proposal made by the Tonkin Government for such a body. We were told that probably this was the worst type of Government control which could be instituted, and a matter of this type should be left entirely to private enterprise; it was not one for the Government at all. We now find that this body has been working without the backing of legislation, and no doubt it has great difficulty in working effectively. This is a double turnaround on the part of the Government. A body proposed by us is said to be absolutely unacceptable to the public and harmful to the State at large, and yet here is this Government setting up exactly what we proposed to set up.

I was very surprised also to find out that the Government is sponsoring a study of the necessity for a port in the region of the mouth of the Moore River. This is the area we proposed to call—

Mr O'Neil: Salvado.

Mr DAVIES: —Salvado. I thank the Minister. It was intended to name the port Eglinton, after the Eglinton Rocks. At that time the Premier said, "Surely to goodness you do not intend to forget Bunbury. The whole future of the State revolves around Bunbury. That will be the area for development."

Sir Charles Court: It has been done.

Mr DAVIES: The Premier also said, "You cannot spend any of our money and use our resources in another area. Bunbury is the place we love and Bunbury is the place to develop." Now together with the Australian Government, I understand—and I hope its money is not tainted—the State Government is sponsoring a feasibility study of the area in and around Moore River. Had the Tonkin Government been returned to office, such a study would have been completed by now. We knew the necessary terms of reference and we knew how the study was to be set up. The project would have been proceeded with straightaway. We are now 18 months behind what would have been the position had we remained in office.

This is another example of an about-face on the part of the Government. Such a study was not wanted when the Government was in Opposition, but now it is the Government it is highly desirable. It is matters such as this that make people

very suspicious about this Government. I could deal with many other similar projects but I do not think I will do that now because we are dealing mainly with money.

The next matter I wish to raise, although I will not dwell on it, is in relation to the developments—and I use that term loosely—since the House last met; that is, the falling out of the friends of the coalition between the Liberal Party and the Country Party, or the National Alliance, the National Country Party, the National Democratic Party, or whatever it is currently called.

I noted that the trouble seems to boil over whenever the Premier is away. On the first occasion there was an argument about the Lamb Marketing Board when the Premier was absent. I think on the recent occasion he was in America solving the inflation problems not only of Western Australia and Australia, but of the whole world; and again there was a blow-up of feelings in the Cabinet.

Only three people really deserve congratulations out of all this. I feel we must congratulate the two ex-Ministers who now sit on the back bench for the firm stand they took. Perhaps they surprised us all, because the action they took is not an action that one takes lightly. One does not lightly give up a position in the Ministry; it is something which is highly prized and although it means a great deal of work—as anyone who has been a Minister will know—it is a position in which one takes a great deal of pride and in which one does not mind working hard. So to make a sacrifice like that, irrespective of whether a member wishes to continue farming or to continue in private enterprise, and to give away the pride that goes with being a Minister is a very hard thing to do.

When the announcement was first made the feeling was that it was London to a brick on that the whole matter would blow over in two or three days and that the persons who resigned would be back in the Government. However, the member for Mt. Marshall and the member for Stirling are to be applauded for the stand they took. I only hope the electorate at large will recognise this at the next election; and I hope those members will be able to further the interests of their party from the positions they now occupy, perhaps in a more forceful manner than they might have been able to do in the Cabinet.

The third person I would like to congratulate is the Premier, because there is no doubt he emerged not as the king, but as more of a dictator. I think that is the better title for him. Despite all the harsh things said about him by his friends from Queensland and other areas, despite all the things people within this State—and some from within his own party—said about him privately, and despite all the

things members of the Country Party or National Alliance, or whatever it is currently called said about him, he was the one who emerged in the winning position. There is no doubt now that he holds the whip hand, and he will have his way for as long as the people of Western Australia are content to leave him there—and, more importantly, for as long as his own members are prepared to have him as their leader. Therefore I think he deserves our congratulations for emerging in the manner in which he did.

I intended to express some concern in respect of the decision regarding pre-school education centres, but some of the concern I feel in regard to the money which is being spent has already been expressed by the member for Boulder-Dundas. Perhaps I would not have expressed all the sentiments he expressed, but I would like to mention my concern at the lack of cohesion amongst the bodies which have a real interest in and, I hope, some real control over, pre-school centres in Western Australia. Another matter for concern is the way in which funds are being allocated. For instance, in the Bentley area there are already two kindergartens, and in addition a pre-school class has been established in one of the local schools. It seems that this area is being flooded with pre-school education opportunities which might be better provided in some other areas. I am not aware that any policy has been announced in respect of this matter, but perhaps the Government will have an opportunity to let us know its thinking on it. A great deal of money has been spent in this area of late, most of it provided by the Australian Government.

Mr Laurance: And they are determining the areas in which the centres are situated.

Mr DAVIES: I did not think the Australian Government would be allowed to do that, but it is good to know it is possible. I think the person who pays the piper is entitled to call the tune some of the time. I know in the past there have been areas of wanton waste of public money, and if money can be properly spent on agreed plans by liaison between the Australian and State Governments then I think we will receive better value for the money we spend.

I was pleased to see that the Government dropped its intention to send children to high school in their twelfth year because this policy was the cause of great concern amongst headmasters and staff of high schools, let alone the headmasters and staff of primary schools. They were concerned at the fact that there was no rhyme or reason behind the proposal of the Government. The Government had advanced no reason for its proposal, and those people felt they would not obtain the best use of their resources if the present system was disturbed. Like the rest

of us, they are glad the Government no longer proposes to implement the policy.

It was disappointing, of course, to hear the Deputy Premier, in the absence of the Premier, say the policy had to be withdrawn because the Australian Government would not provide the funds for it. I think that was the general tenor of his remarks. He said it was the fault of the Australian Government.

Mr O'Neill: I don't think I made a statement on the issue.

Mr DAVIES: I believe at the time the Premier was away, and I recall thinking that the Deputy Premier had learnt his lesson very well. I was sure his leader would be proud of him when he issued the statement, because it parroted the statements the Premier makes when anything goes wrong; that is, "It is all the fault of the terrible Australian Government."

I do not suppose one can really blame the Australian Government for everything, although the Premier tries very hard to do so. I seem to recall that after the last Premier's Conference he said, either as he stepped off the plane here or by phone ahead of his arrival here, that water rates and electricity charges would have to be increased because the Australian Government would not provide all the funds the State Government required. In Western Australian newspapers three weeks prior to that it was announced that electricity charges would be increased from the 1st July, and the Government issued no denial. Yet the Premier returned from the conference and said these charges would have to be increased because the Australian Government would not give the State Government sufficient funds.

It is interesting to consider the amount of money which has been supplied to Western Australia by the Australian Government. The amount of financial assistance has been very generous. As the Premier said tonight, we are in a difficult position because we cannot get enough money and, as much as he hates to increase taxes and charges once again, this must be done because he has to find money to run the State and the Australian Government will not give him sufficient assistance.

In the last financial year the Australian Government increased capital grants to this State by 24.7 per cent over the previous year. I am sure the cost of living did not increase by 24.7 per cent in 12 months. General revenue grants were increased by 25.8 per cent, and loan funds by 24.7 per cent. That is an average increase in those three important fields of something like 25 per cent over the previous financial year. Does the Premier call that ungenerous? Of course, these figures do not include all the extra funds allocated separately to the State by the Australian Government through the Schools Commission, the Children's Commission,

the Hospitals and Health Commission, recreation grants, Aboriginal affairs grants, the Australian Assistance Plan, land grants, the Regional Employment Development Scheme, and so on. In all those areas extra money has been provided to the State. We must bear in mind that since the present Australian Government took office the amount of money allocated for State schools has been 13 times greater than the amount allocated in the previous two years by the previous Liberal Government.

An increase of 1 300 per cent certainly is not to be sneered at. Increases occurred not only in these fields but also in other areas to which I have referred; namely, from the Children's Commission, the Hospitals and Health Commission, and the like. I draw attention to the fact that in 1974-75 under the Australian Government's five-year hospital development programme, \$4.326 million was allocated to Western Australia. From this money there were able to be additions to the Dampier Hospital, construction of laboratories at Fremantle Hospital, a new service block at Katanning Hospital, additions to the Mt. Barker hospital and the Osborne Park Hospital, major additions to the Perth Dental Hospital, purchase of the Kalamunda Hospital, construction of the Rockingham Hospital, major additions to the Carnarvon Hospital, the provision of mechanical services to the Heathcote Hospital, a creative expression unit at the Graylands Hospital and extensions to the Institute of Radiotherapy. All this was provided from the \$4.326 million grant from the Commonwealth.

I believe none of that work would have been done, or other work would have seriously suffered, had not the Australian Government been so generous, and that was only in the first year of the plan. It has now called for a further five-year programme, and the State Government again is on the bandwagon trying to get as much as it can for hospitals in this State. I do not blame it; if I were in the same position, I would get every penny I could from the Australian Government, provided the money went to areas of most need, and provided it was not used to build a hospital or put some medical services where it was politically expedient to do so, but where all the authorities said such a thing was not necessary.

All too often this Government—and, no doubt, Governments of my political colour as well—has spent money because it is politically expedient to do so. I believe there are areas now which are being investigated for political expediency but which all the reports which have been brought down—and there are two very good reports kicking around at the moment—deny are necessary.

Yet in the face of these reports the Government proposes to go ahead with the projects, probably because of political

expediency. I would suggest that it is no good having a committee developing and writing a report and then doing nothing about it. Professor Lennon, the former Dean of Medicine at the University of Western Australia, wrote a very good report on the medical needs of this State, but I do not believe it has been seriously studied. A committee established by the Australian Health Council—goodness knows, that body has not been too active over recent years—wrote a very comprehensive report on the future hospital needs in Western Australia but, again, I doubt whether this report has even been looked at. Probably, it has been put in a corner somewhere and forgotten.

Because the Government feels pressure in a certain area, that is where the money goes. We just cannot run our hospital system like this, and I am pleased to see that the Australian Government is working on a five-year plan so that it can plan ahead and see that the most urgent needs are properly met with the money that is available.

To return to the point I was making earlier; in the last three years there has been a general increase in revenue from the Australian Government to this State of 25 per cent, in addition to amounts of money like the \$4.3 million provided by the Health Commission for the hospitals of this State, and money which has been provided through other committees and commissions. Despite all this assistance, the State Liberal-Country Party Government has imposed severe increases in taxes and charges, and I should like to refer to a few such increases.

Since the 1st July, 1974, there have been increases in electricity charges of 18 per cent and 25 per cent; sewerage and water rates have increased by 37 per cent; hospital fees have been increased by 50 per cent—until the advent of Medibank, of course—vehicle registration has gone up by 65 per cent; shipping freights by 30 per cent; and metropolitan train and bus fares by 27 per cent. I think for the purpose of writing these increases into *Hansard*, it might be worth mentioning a few others.

The Premier has the gall to say he can get somewhere near his Budget figure only by careful management. He would be miles behind it, if it were not for the generosity of the Australian Government. If he cannot put a proper case, he has only himself to blame. Some of the other charges which have been increased since the 1st July, 1974, are as follows: Abattoir slaughtering fees have incurred increases ranging from 15 per cent to 30 per cent, effective from July, 1974; sewerage and water rates have increased by an average total of 37 per cent; shipping freights affecting the State Shipping Service have increased by 30 per cent; rail freights,

country train and railway bus fares have increased by 17 per cent, although the Tonkin Government tried desperately—and indeed succeeded—to keep down fares for country people; and, the State Government Insurance Office has had a 25 per cent premium increase for motor vehicle insurance since the 1st August, 1974, and another increase was announced recently.

I have already mentioned that electricity charges have increased by an average of 18 per cent; the cost of natural and manufactured gas also increased by 17 per cent in that period; metropolitan train and bus fares increased by 27 per cent; Government hospital charges increased by 50 per cent; State Housing Commission rents increased from \$1 to \$3.45 a week in September, 1974, and the interest rate on future SHC purchase homes increased from 5.375 per cent to 5.75 per cent.

Pay-roll tax increased by .5 per cent; as I mentioned, vehicle registration fees increased by an average of 65 per cent from the 1st October, 1974; stamp duty on cheques went from 6c to 8c, an increase of 33½ per cent, in a Budget announcement last year; liquor licenses for hotels and licensed clubs rose by 27.3 per cent from 5½ per cent to 7 per cent and for taverns and licensed stores by 10.3 per cent, from 7½ per cent to 8 per cent, also in a Budget announcement; and, as I mentioned, country water rates and country water bills rose in a Budget announcement. Although some selective reductions in this area were made; members will recall that they were not as generous to the people using water in the country as the Tonkin Government had been.

Mr T. D. Evans: They applied beyond the 26th parallel, too, which was very selective.

Mr DAVIES: That is true; they were very selective. Meat inspection fee increases ranged from 137.5 per cent to 525 per cent—a fairly staggering increase—to apply before Christmas, 1974. Unfortunately, I was not able to ascertain the exact date the increases came into effect. Road permit charges increased by 20 per cent in the week commencing the 6th January this year. On the 13th January, 1975, electricity and natural gas charges were increased by 25 per cent and 20 per cent respectively and a further increase in electricity charges of 12.5 per cent was announced on the 1st July, 1975. Excess water charges rose by approximately 50 per cent, while water rates rose by about 30 per cent on the 1st July, 1975. We then had a further increase in SGIO car insurance premiums of 20 per cent as at the 1st August, 1975; in addition, no claim bonus concessions were dropped.

That is not all, by any means. Recently, when handling an estate I was staggered to find that Karakatta Cemetery charges

had suffered severe increases; probably, these increases went unnoticed because the service is something that most people do not have a great need for. Most people would not know when they received an undertaker's account whether or not fees had increased. I noticed that some of the fees were particularly steep, but there had been no public outcry about the increases.

I have written to the State Energy Commission about its method of charging for electricity and, in particular, about one aspect in regard to which the Minister may be able to give me some explanation. When increases in charges take place from a certain date, depending on when the meter is read, I understand that there is a *pro rata* payment at the new rate and the remainder of the account is assessed on the old rate. I am not certain how this is arrived at. I do not know whether the method of assessment has ever been announced. However I have written to the State Energy Commission asking what the true position is. Perhaps the Minister can explain how a consumer, who has his meter read on the 1st July, 1975—the date when the latest increases take place—has a proportion of the electricity he has consumed charged at the new rate.

At the very latest, I suppose, a meter reader would work until 5.00 p.m. on the 1st July. In the case I have just cited to the House, if this were the last meter he read on that day the very longest the consumer could have been using the electricity at the new rate would have been something like 17 hours; that is, from midnight until 5.00 p.m. on the 1st July, and therefore the amount of electricity used at the new rate over the 90-day period would have been practically negligible. Although the table for the rate that applied from the 13th January, 1975, was issued by the State Electricity Commission; although we have the new rate as published in *The West Australian* on the 24th June, 1975, and we have that information at our fingertips, we are unable to work out how the 530 units of electricity consumed by this householder came to a sum of \$20.22. I understand that when he went into the office of the State Energy Commission—and many people were complaining about this—he was told that it had directions in this regard but it was not quite certain how the directions were applied. However, apparently, if a consumer's meter was read from the 1st July up to the 7th July that consumer was charged on a *pro rata* basis of one-thirteenth of the quantity of electricity consumed at the new rate. However, even working on this basis we cannot obtain the rate charged on the account.

I maintain that any increase in this electricity account is unjust, because it was read on the 1st July, and on that date it could have been read at 9.00 a.m. and before one unit or even one part of a unit of electricity had been consumed. If this amount has been charged on a

pro rata basis over a period of one week at the higher rate for the amount of electricity consumed I believe the matter should be reviewed by the State Energy Commission and this consumer should be granted a refund regardless of whether it is only 30c or 40c. I believe this method of assessing the charges is completely unjust and at least some more equitable arrangement should have been worked out in assessing the electricity accounts.

I do not know whether or not the Minister has any information as to how electricity accounts are assessed, but if he does have that information I should be pleased to hear it from him. As I have said, I have written to the State Energy Commission and no doubt it will advise me in due course as to the true position.

These are not the only circumstances or instances that concern me when such steep increases are made over a period of less than 12 months for services such as electricity. For example, many voluntary organisations are affected. For senior citizens in my electorate something like 30 000 meals a year are provided. Therefore the increase in the cost of electricity that is used to provide those meals will be substantial. That is only one minor matter. I am sure the cost of these meals to pensioners will have to be increased to cover the increased electricity charges, because at the moment a meal is being provided at a cost of 45c, and even though the Australian Government pays a subsidy of 30c it is rather difficult to provide a three-course meal at that price these days. When such a voluntary organisation faces increases in electricity, rates, and other charges, it is almost impossible for it to carry on and people are inclined to say to themselves, "We should give up, because why should we work our guts out for this organisation when we have to go back constantly to ask for more money from these aged people to meet the cost of the meal, and when the Government will not make any concessions in these charges?"

The Government has been particularly slow in making an announcement on the report of the committee of inquiry that was established to inquire into concessions for pensioners which could be reasonably applied. Surely if the Government has had the report since last May it is not unreasonable to expect that by now it could have had some decision announced. Is this another example of how the Civil Service cannot get down to examine the position because it does not have the staff? This brings me back to the point on which I opened my speech; namely, that the Civil Service is grinding to a halt because of lack of direction and lack of staff.

THE SPEAKER: The member has four minutes.

Mr DAVIES: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Perhaps this is a suitable place for me to stop because this is the point on which I commenced my speech; that is, there is a need to have a serious look at what is happening in the Civil Service. I know that it costs a great deal of money to keep the Civil Service operating, but when nothing is happening; when replies cannot be obtained to correspondence after several months have passed; when reports have been produced without any action being taken, and when other things that should have happened have not happened, it is time to see whether we are obtaining value for the money we are asked to appropriate tonight.

MR BRYCE (Ascot) [10.27 p.m.]: My colleagues on this side of the House have indicated that this type of Bill is designed precisely for Parliament to approve an allocation of money to enable the Government to meet its commitments. One of the commitments the Government will have to face in the ensuing months is the purchase of Kareeba Nursing Home in my electorate for \$290 000. That figure was confirmed by the Minister representing the Minister for Health in the House this afternoon.

I feel confident I express the disquiet of the people I represent when I say that the way in which this Government has handled the sale of Tresillian Hostel, and the Government's proposals to purchase Kareeba Nursing Home as a replacement constitute an abuse of power. It has been described as a shoddy and shabby affair by the members of the Belmont Shire for very good reason and I, as the local Legislative Assembly member, whole-heartedly agree with their viewpoint.

This afternoon the Premier indicated to the House quite adequately that he has been totally inconsistent in his view of the standards he expected of the previous Labor Government when it decided to transfer profoundly mentally retarded patients to a hospital in his electorate compared with the sort of treatment his Government is prepared to mete out to myself and the local governing authority the boundaries of which are roughly contiguous with those of my electorate. The local governing authority to which I am referring is the Belmont Shire.

I think it is fair to say that the way in which the Government has handled this matter—and I believe we can place the bulk of the blame at the feet of the Premier, because Tresillian Hostel is in his electorate and he has handled the issue in public terms—has demonstrated an incredible lack of understanding of people's feelings. That is in respect of the old people so far as the Kareeba Nursing Home is concerned, and the profoundly mentally retarded children so far as Tresillian Hostel is concerned.

The aspect of supply that should concern Parliament is that of the announcement that Tresillian Hostel would be sold because certain people in Nedlands were outraged at the suggestion that profoundly mentally retarded patients would be moved into their neighbourhood; a further suggestion put forward was that the local authority concerned should buy the hospital from the State Government.

The figure that was suggested by the Minister for Health as being the value of Tresillian Hostel was \$250 000. Of course the local authority concerned, the Nedlands City Council, would not agree to purchase the hostel for that sum, and it seemed that overnight the sale price of the hostel to the local authority was reduced to \$125 000. We might well ask whether this reduction in price had anything to do with the fact that the institution is in the Premier's electorate, and that the Premier has a viewpoint on this question which is totally divorced from any compassion for the sensitivity of the people concerned.

Sir Charles Court: That is not correct. There are more institutions in my electorate than in any other electorate.

Mr BRYCE: During the course of my remarks on this question; I have accused the Premier of being bloody-minded and obstinate. I regret I was not responsible for coining that phrase, as it was coined by the President of the Country Party during the kerfuffle between the coalition parties in Government. Nevertheless it was a very apt phrase to use in this situation. I used that phrase to describe his actions, because he was hell-bent on preventing the profoundly mentally retarded patients from remaining in his electorate—

Sir Charles Court: We are trying to find an answer to the whole lot, and not an answer to just a few.

Mr BRYCE: The Premier is hell-bent on doing that.

Sir Charles Court: You will have to take the blame for slowing down the finding of a remedy.

Mr BRYCE: The Premier has accused me of introducing party politics. I propose to demonstrate to the House that he has a purely party political motive in moving these people out of his electorate. When the decision was made by the previous Government to introduce these profoundly mentally retarded young patients into his electorate there was a small circle of people who reacted rather viciously. I am pleased to say that the people of Nedlands in general certainly have not endorsed the views of this very vocal and vicious minority. I understand that the minority is such that it comprises fewer people than the number of patients at Tresillian Hostel. So, it was the reaction of the local people that brought this about, and this group comprised a very small number of people.

The Premier's personal view, which I asked him to confirm by way of questions this afternoon, is based on two particular arguments he has used in his electorate. He has used them both to the Nedlands City Council and the group of people known as the Friends of Tresillian. Basically those two arguments amount to this: Firstly, the Premier objects very much to the fact that when the Tonkin Labor Government was in office and the decision was made to place those young patients in the institution in his electorate, he as the local member was not consulted. He finds that particularly galling.

The second argument that has been used by the Premier—and this I find totally distasteful—is that this decision was made by the previous Government deliberately to embarrass him. I think we ought to examine the motives of anybody who alleges that a Government would actually take action to place mentally retarded patients in his electorate in order to embarrass him. What sort of person would interpret a Government's action to be a deliberate act of embarrassment to the local member of Parliament? Perhaps it would be to somebody who was so completely concerned with the preservation of the tone of the town that he saw the introduction of this group of mentally retarded patients as having some effect on the tone of the City of Nedlands.

I live approximately 200 yards from Nulsen Haven at Redcliffe. I can assure the Premier that the people who live in the immediate vicinity of that institution, which caters for a similar type of patient as does Tresillian Hostel, derive a great deal of satisfaction in being able to assist that institution wherever and whenever possible.

That is why I, on a personal basis alone, find it most distasteful that the Premier of the State should take a stand on the basis that he was determined to remove the young mentally retarded patients because they had been put there to embarrass him, and because he had not been consulted.

This afternoon I asked a number of questions relating to this matter, as did a number of my colleagues. I believe the House should clearly acknowledge what has been revealed in the answers to those questions. My question without notice to the Premier was—

Does he still hold the view that has been expressed to the Friends of Tresillian and the Nedlands City Council that the Tonkin Labor Government transferred profoundly mentally retarded children patients to the Tresillian Hostel in an attempt to embarrass him in his electorate of Nedlands?

The Premier's answer is worthy of note. He said in effect—I have not the exact words of his reply—that he refused to answer

my question until I had provided him with the details of the source of my information used as the basis for asking the question.

Sir Charles Court: And the accurate words.

Mr BRYCE: The Premier asked me for the source of my information.

Sir Charles Court: The source as well as the accurate words.

Mr BRYCE: I invite the Premier to deny now that he has ever stated in his electorate that it was his opinion the Tonkin Labor Government placed these young patients in his electorate to embarrass him, and that he has not expressed his personal disenchantment because not only was he not consulted, but also the Nedlands City Council was not consulted. So, a further question was asked of the Premier by the member for Rockingham.

Mr O'Connor: Organised by you during the huddle in the corner.

Mr BRYCE: Surely we should be allowed to use the facilities at our disposal to ask questions in order to elicit information from the Government. The member for Rockingham asked the Premier whether he felt slighted by the fact that he was not consulted when the previous Government placed the young patients in the institution in his electorate, and whether he believed that out of a sense of courtesy he should have been consulted.

Once again the Premier's answer was most revealing. In short the Premier said in reply that he was dissatisfied that he had not been consulted, and furthermore he indicated that he was expressing the dissatisfaction of the Nedlands City Council as it had not been consulted either.

Sir Charles Court: The council will speak for itself.

Mr BRYCE: The Premier spoke for the council this afternoon.

Sir Charles Court: You should quote the actual words that were used by me. I agree I was very annoyed at the time because I had not been consulted, for the reason that I had done a lot to help the institutions in my electorate. Similarly you should be consulted in respect of your electorate.

Mr BRYCE: The local authority in my electorate was very annoyed that it had not been consulted. The very point I have been making is that if it was good enough for the Premier to expect to be consulted, he being the local member when the Tonkin Labor Government decided to place these patients in the institution in his electorate, and if it was good enough for the local authority in his electorate to expect to be consulted, then when the present Government decided to purchase Kareeba Nursing Home in my electorate the Premier should have consulted the local members of Parliament. However, it

was not in the Premier's mind that the local members—in either the Upper House or the Lower House—should be consulted.

There was no action on the part of his Government to consult any of the local representatives and, more particularly, the response to inquiries from the local governing body in my electorate—which shares my concern for the welfare of the people in the district's only "C"-class hospital—to the Public Health Department was poor. Those making the inquiries were fobbed off and insulted. We could not even obtain confirmation, let alone any form of consultation beforehand.

In my view this action well and truly justified the questioning we indulged in this afternoon in order to illustrate to the House the double standards the Premier is perfectly capable of adopting. The main concern in my electorate is that unlike the Premier's electorate and others in his part of the State, the district of Belmont, comprising 36 000 people, contains only one "C"-class hospital. Many other suburbs are very adequately catered for in terms of facilities for the needs of elderly people. I repeat that in a community of 36 000 people there is only one "C"-class hospital.

If the Government had consulted with the local governing body in Belmont or with any of the local members, it would have come to appreciate the very significant dislocation that would result to the old people who are in that nursing home and to others in the district who are on the waiting list.

Another point the Premier would never appreciate because of his different electorate is that a very high proportion of the people in the Kareeba Nursing Home comes from the immediate vicinity of the home. In other words, many of the patients are local people and therefore their families live in the immediate vicinity. These families are rather keen to maintain close contact with the patients.

More significant still is the fact—and again this will not be appreciated by the Premier because of the different electorate he represents—that because of the soaring charges made of necessity by the nursing home, a number of people actually work in the home for the sole purpose of earning money to offset the cost of maintaining their relatives in the home.

When I first contacted the Minister for Health and asked about the arrangements the Government was prepared to make and the guarantees and undertakings it would give to look after the interests of the people in the Kareeba Nursing Home I was completely ignored. When I sent an urgent telegram asking that the question be looked at I was then told the question had not arisen yet.

Let me assure the Premier that the question certainly has arisen. Today in

this very Chamber the Government confirmed that it is to purchase the Kareeba Nursing Home for a sum of \$290 000. This means that somewhere between 40 and 50 elderly people will be moved out of a "C"-class hospital in order that the Premier's obstinacy might be catered for. The mentally retarded people will be shifted from Tresillian to Kareeba. What amounts to a "Catch 22" situation results. Thereafter the Nedlands City Council which is purchasing the Tresillian Hostel will make it available for old people. Consequently, what is the reason for the game of draughts? It is nothing more than an abuse of power to accommodate the viewpoint of the Premier, because he was put off by the actions of the previous Government which placed these young people in his electorate, according to him to embarrass him, and without consulting him.

It is important that we place on record the type of answer we are inclined to receive from Government Ministers these days on questions as important as this one. Because of the anxiety being expressed by the patients of the Kareeba Nursing Home, and their relatives, on the 1st July I wrote to the Minister for Health under the heading, "Government's decision to dispose of Tresillian Hospital". I regret we do not have a Standing Order to allow me to seek to have this letter incorporated in *Hansard*. I will make it as brief as I can. The letter reads—

As a result of publicity which is being given to the Government's alleged decision to sell Tresillian Hospital and resettle the patients elsewhere, I have been requested by constituents to seek confirmation of the suggestion that the State Government has negotiated, or is negotiating, for the purchase of Kareeba Hospital in Belmont as an alternative to Tresillian Hospital.

Associated queries which I would appreciate replies to on an urgent basis include:—

1. What arrangements will be made, or undertakings given, by the State Government to assist the elderly patients of Kareeba Hospital in respect of their need for alternative accommodation.
2. Has the Government, in fact, made a decision to remove the children from Tresillian? If so, for what reasons are the children being shifted.
3. In the event of the Government shifting the patients from Tresillian, will the Minister confirm that the estimated cost will be in the vicinity of \$250 000, or otherwise indicate the estimated cost.
4. How does the Government justify the expenditure of a substantial sum of money to shift the children...

The Minister's reply was, to say the least, nonsensical gobbledy-gook. Not one question was answered directly or in a meaningful way. The Minister's reply, dated the 11th July, under the heading, "re: Tresillian", reads—

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 1st Inst. and in response to your queries advise:—

The State Government is negotiating for the purchase of two sets of premises because of my concern and that of Mental Health Services at the shortage of accommodation for profoundly mentally retarded children and persons.

The situation is that there are on the average approximately 18 patients accommodated at Tresillian, and at present I understand 19, there are 30 at Princess Margaret Hospital for children for whom it is essential re-location take place and there are some 37 cases in Private Homes who should be accommodated so that they can receive necessary treatment in addition to relieving the burden on their families.

The planning of these moves has been carefully considered to cater for as many of these patients as possible and the retention of Tresillian is not feasible within the plans.

What a gobbledy-gook expression that is! To continue—

With regard to the premises we are negotiating to purchase the situation regarding any patients in those premises has been fully considered and alternative accommodation can be arranged.

The cost of the acquisition of the premises under negotiation has not been finalised so that I cannot advise what the cost will be . . .

You will understand, Mr Speaker, that when a member of Parliament contacts a Minister on a question of immediate concern to 40 or 50 elderly citizens in his electorate he expects to receive a more definite answer than the one I have quoted. In fact, I asked what arrangements the Government was making and what guarantees it would give. The question was ignored.

Subsequently, of course, further publicity was given to the Government's decision to purchase Kareeba Nursing Home. So, whilst I was waiting to raise the question in this House by way of question and, if necessary, by way of contribution to debate, I found it necessary to contact the Minister urgently. On the 8th August I sent him a telegram. That was the day on which this matter received further publicity in the newspapers. My telegram was as follows—

Reference my letter of July 1st and your reply of July 11th re Kareeba Hospital guarantee required urgently

that State Government will assist patients of Kareeba Hospital in respect of alternative accommodation if Government purchases Kareeba Hospital.

I received the reply about four days later. The reply from the Minister for Health was simply—

The question of existence—

I think that word should have been assistance. To continue—

—to patients seeking alternative accommodation to Kareeba has not arisen at present.

I would like the Premier to take the message back to the Minister for Health that the question certainly has arisen as far as those people in Kareeba Nursing Home are concerned, and as far as their relatives living in the immediate vicinity of the hospital are concerned. The question has become a very real one.

Because of the Premier's desire to shift a handful of young people we find that between 40 and 50 elderly people will have their lives thoroughly disrupted. They are suffering a great deal of anxiety and yet the Minister for Health, through the Minister representing him in this Chamber, answered a question I asked by saying that the Government is definitely going to buy Kareeba Nursing Home, and pay a price of \$290 000. Yet, the Minister told me only 24 hours ago that the question had not yet arisen regarding the need for the people concerned to seek alternative accommodation.

The question is very real to the people concerned and I conclude by saying that the letters which have been sent from my office to the Minister for Health, the statements which have been made, and the answers to the questions which have been asked in this House indicate that the Government has shown an abominable lack of consideration for the people concerned.

If the Government is prepared to be judged by the measure of its compassion towards the young patients in Tresillian Hostel who are being booted out of the Premier's electorate without regard for their feelings, and its lack of regard for the feelings of people involved at the other end of the deal who are being booted out of Kareeba Nursing Home, it is a very sad day for the State of Western Australia.

MR T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [10.54 p.m.]: I hope that if the Minister for Mines is in the building someone will draw his attention to the fact that I intend to exercise my time speaking to his portfolio.

Sir Charles Court: He is here.

Mr T. D. EVANS: I am aware he was present earlier this evening.

Sir Charles Court: He is in the Chamber.

Mr T. D. EVANS: In the absence of the Minister for Mines previously—I believe he was overseas at the time—I was not able to pick and choose the time I could speak on this subject so I contented myself with speaking rather briefly on that occasion. At least, I served notice on the Minister that at the first opportunity available for me to speak on this particular subject I would do so.

I refer to the question of the Paterson Range gold find. This subject has been ventilated spasmodically, but rather dramatically, in certain news media, and persons who had to rely solely upon the disclosures and the conjecture associated with those disclosures might well be excused—they might well be applauded—for coming to the conclusion that here under the nose of the present Minister for Mines a gigantic fraud is being perpetrated against an individual person who believes, and who has used every means at his disposal to proclaim, that he was the finder of the mineralisation in the area concerned. He believes that it was through his efforts and his disclosures to the company concerned that the company in what he believes to be a breach of trust towards him has pegged this large area. This multi-national company has pegged the area concerned and has treated him rather shabbily.

I refer to Jean-Paul Turcaud. He is a young Frenchman who was born on the 5th April, 1940, and whose educational standard on leaving school in France was approximately that of the Australian leaving standard. He served a short time in the French Army by way of conscription, and during a period of 2½ years rose to the rank of second lieutenant.

This young man, since coming to Australia, has equipped himself with a commercial pilot's license and is also in the process of furthering his education. I do not wish to spend a great deal of time on any personal detail. I make the point that when I spoke on this subject during the Budget debate last year it was not the first time the subject had been raised in this Chamber.

I can recall that during the Budget debate of 1973, when I was sitting on the other side of the House and the present Minister for Mines was sitting on this side, the then member for South Perth—now the Minister for Labour and Industry—raised the subject and he claimed then that the Newmont mining company was sitting on a real bonanza, and that the then Minister for Mines had wronged in granting to the company certain reserves to complement the large number of mineral claims that it had pegged—or the mining tenements it had; I will not say they were all mineral claims because I think there was a mixture of mineral claims and gold-mining leases involved.

The member for South Perth castigated the then Minister for Mines for granting to the company the additional temporary reserves to complement the other mining tenements it had pegged.

The member for South Perth then claimed this would be an El Dorado, that it was wrong that this multi-national company should be given such preference over Australian explorers, and that there was no scope for Australian explorers to enter this large area. I am giving the history of this matter and trying to be fair and objective. It is not the first time the matter has been raised in this Chamber, and I am not motivated by politics in raising it, either, because this saga commenced in 1970 and has spread through the terms of three Governments.

In the session which lies ahead of us a large part of our time will be concerned with debating and putting the sign of approval on a new Mining Bill. Some people claim there is no need for a new Mining Bill and that the old one has stood the test of time. Others believe a new Mining Bill is appropriate in order to simplify the large number of tenements which exist under the current legislation and to limit the number of tenements to provide greater security to the holders of tenements, which view I endorse. I believe any piece of legislation dealing with the natural resources of our great State should also concern itself with ensuring that when those resources are alienated from the Crown those who are the recipients of them acquire them not only according to the letter of the law but also according to the spirit of natural justice. I believe that is incumbent upon the present Government, because it is only now the full story can be told.

I think it is fair to say that at the time the member for South Perth raised this issue in 1973, the aggrieved prospector Turcaud would not have been able to put before the then Minister for Mines a story as convincing as the one I hope time will permit me to put tonight before this Chamber, and particularly the Minister for Mines. By way of questions I have asked the Minister for Mines to consider seriously instituting an inquiry into the manner in which the Newmont company acquired the mining tenements in the Paterson Range.

About three weeks ago we read that the gigantic BHP company had decided to enter into an agreement with Newmont for the exploitation of the Paterson Range gold find, and from all accounts the forecast made in 1973 by the member for South Perth, who is the present Minister for Labour and Industry, has in fact come true. I think it would be fair to say that when the member for South Perth made that forecast the then Minister for Mines was inclined to discount it because at that stage gold deposits, if they were known to exist, were believed to be only marginal. It appears

the member for South Perth was gifted; he made a forecast and his forecast seems to have come home with full honours.

In the light of that, I believe in the interests of natural justice the Government is duty bound to consider seriously calling upon all those who are willing and competent to give evidence in this case with a view to determining whether the Newmont company did in fact acquire these mining tenements in a manner befitting a company which was acting with fairness and honesty.

By way of further background and to demonstrate the complicity of various people, I remind the Chamber of questions I asked last year. First of all, I asked the Minister for Lands why certain names which Turcaud claims he put forward to the nomenclature committee for consideration had been rejected and why others had been accepted. It seems passing strange that those which were accepted by the committee were kilometres away from the interesting mineralisation area, while those which were rejected were right in the area. Turcaud was asked to justify the names he suggested and give his reasons. I have read his reasons, and I think those which justify the names in the area of mineralisation are more convincing than those given for some of the names which were accepted.

I then asked questions of the Minister for Mines in relation to the 1973 annual report of the Mines Department. Some departments are notorious for submitting late reports, and the 1973 report is the latest report of the Mines Department. On page 113 of that report, under a heading "Note on the Paterson Range Gold Prospects", appears the figure 45, and reference is made to the Parallel Range, which is one of the names Turcaud submitted to the committee under the jurisdiction of the Minister for Lands.

I asked the Minister for Lands how the committee came by this name. He indicated to me that it was put forward by a person—I do not wish to mention his name because he is an employee of the Government although his name was used in answer to the question—on behalf of Mr Turcaud because he was a friend of his. He indicated in the letter he submitted on behalf of Turcaud that the Minister for Lands gave him the information. I asked the Minister for Mines where he had got hold of the name. The Minister for Mines replied that he obtained the name from Newmont Pty. Ltd. I told him then and I tell him now that Newmont Pty. Ltd. got the name from Turcaud.

Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Crane), with your indulgence, I would like to refer to a document I have been supplied with by Turcaud, setting out in detail the time, events, and sequence leading up to this

matter. I suggest that members look at this document. If anyone comes to the conclusion that what Turcaud says is all fiction, perhaps there is someone around today who, in many years' time, may be regarded as the Shakespeare of 1975. This is more than fiction.

I believe it is important to refer to the early part of this narrative in some detail. I will start from October, 1970, when Mr Turcaud was prospecting, roughly in the Paterson Range area. He says—

From the 6th. prospected towards the Broadhurst Range where I found interesting small Gossans in the Eastern side . . . Moved then to the Throssed Range but spent only two days and did not find anything of interest. Came back East to the Paterson Range and prospected North up to Christmas Pool . . . 15th Found Parallel Range Gossans and Copper.

I referred to Parallel Range just a few moments ago to show the conflict between the answers given by the Minister for Lands and the Minister for Mines. The answer given by the Minister for Lands is correct, and the answer given by the Minister for Mines does not accord with the facts. Perhaps it is not quite fair to say that, but his answer was a long way from the truth. The name emanated from the company, and the company acquired it from the notes given to it by Turcaud.

Turcaud refers to prospecting in the Paterson Range, and this matter is important because it has been argued that if he found it why did he not peg it? The company pegged it—the company was the first in time, and it was bad luck Charlie for Turcaud. That appears to be the view of the company. These were the words written by Turcaud at the time—October, 1970—

Concerning the prospection in the Paterson Range, the comment could be that the progression was slow, but it must be understood that all the prospecting was done on foot, and the car was used only as a mobile base (to save petrol and avoid damage) . . . The progression was in criss-cross pattern. When I got out of the Paterson Range, I thought that I had found a very large Copper Deposit . . .

He thought he had found another Mt. Isa. To continue—

The area which I considered of interest and prospected as best as I could was about 20 by 40 miles.

This next part is most interesting as I believe it sets the pattern for what is to follow. His report goes on—

When I reached Marble Bar, I dispatched my samples (approx. 200 lbs) by carrier to Dr E. Schiller and R. Berven and Associates of Sth Perth, after a phone call to them and their

assurance that they would certainly be glad to have a look at what I had found and that my samples would be duly appraised. At a previous meeting in Perth, they had said to me that it was better for me to deal with a company through a consultant; as my interests would be better represented because a full appraisal would have been made on my samples.

Turcaud was then in Marble Bar, and he had sent his samples off to consulting geologists in Perth. To continue—

In the afternoon I met there by chance in front of the store Mr W. Brook Senior geologist and Representative of Newmont in Marble Bar . . . I said that it was a pity that I had not met him sooner, because I had found something really good and he could have been interested to look at it; but I added that I was now committed to a firm of geological consultants of Perth Dr Schiller and R. Berven and Assoc. Then I added, in the event of these people not being able to handle this prospect, would his company be interested in it. He answered by the affirmative and in trust I discussed the find with him. However Mr Brook told me that his firm would not be interested in going to the Paterson Range immediately because:

1—They were on a very promising Zinc prospect in the Marble Bar Area and were very busy working on it.

2—The time was not right to go to the Paterson Range—

Remember that at the time Turcaud was in Marble Bar. He goes on—

—and they would have to wait until the weather cooled down.

Mr W. Brook said to me "Please contact us—".

Notice he says "us" and not "me". He goes on—

"—again in Perth after the summer". Turcaud says he did this. He then says that he went further prospecting and continues—

At the end of November, when I reached Perth, I called at the office of Dr E. Schiller and R. Berven and Associates, Labouchere Road, South Perth. They were very interested in the prospect, the gossans were beautiful and there was up to 1.9% Cu in them. Dr Schiller asked me to report the position of the samples on the map of the Paterson Range, which I did. But he said that they were too busy now—

I do not know who he means by "they". It may be that the consultants were also peggers or purely consultants. Perhaps I had a few shares in their companies at that time, but I do not know. The report continues—

—pegging claims around Laverton for Nickel and they could not possibly save the time to go all the way to the Paterson Range.

He said he knew of two companies which may be interested.

I will not continue at this point because I do not think he did any good with the two companies concerned. One was Day Dawn Minerals and the other was Academus Minerals. Day Dawn Minerals figures in the story later, but Academus Minerals seems to drop out of it. This next part of his report is important, and I feel I will now have to mention the person's name which I balked at mentioning before. The report continues—

At about this time I gave to Mr P. Bridge, Conservator of the Government Chemical Laboratories, some little samples of the Main Gossans of the Paterson Range.

Also some samples from the Lake Waukahichar where subsequently some very rare mineral was found.

The file indicates that the Government Chemical Laboratories issued a receipt for these specimens. Reference also appears in the *Government Gazette* that the specimens were donated by Turcaud, through the conservator, to the Government Chemical Laboratories; yet some people say he has never been to the Paterson Range. He then went on to say that in December he approached a company by the name of Hawkstone Minerals, and later he was introduced to another company, Anglo-American. The latter company is important because it did in fact go to the Paterson Range and look at the prospect.

I come now to February, 1971. Mr Turcaud states—

In this month, sometime after I had returned from the Paterson Range with Anglo-American and the weather having cooled down, I contacted Newmont as I had been invited by Mr W. Brook. Calling by phone their office, I was advised that Mr Brook was in Perth but not in at the moment. Upon being asked if it was an urgent matter, to which I answered by the affirmative, I was given Mr Brook's private number. I called Mr W. Brook and he invited me to bring all my samples, documents and maps to his house. Therefore I loaded into the car the representative samples of the Paterson Range Gossans, the documents from Dr E. Schiller and R. Berven and Associates, also the documents from the Anglo-American trip and my map of the Paterson Range showing the location of the main Gossans in the Paterson Range (Parallel Range, Mt. Crofton, Pascale Hills, Mt. Balthazar).

Those are all names he submitted to the Minister's committee, some of which were accepted and some of which were rejected.

Again, without drawing any conclusion, it is interesting to note that the names which were accepted were miles away from the gold prospect, and all those which were rejected are in and around the area of interest. He goes on to say—

We discussed the prospect for some time also the fact that Anglo had turned it down (which was not helping) finally Mr W. Brook said to leave everything with him. Less than a week later I called Newmont again by phone and asked for Mr Brook, he was not in again; I then phoned his home and being in, he invited me to come to see him. I came immediately and upon arrival Mr Brook said to me "I am sorry, Newmont is not interested in your Paterson Range prospect!" Well! again I collected my samples, documents and map and went away.

After that a further visit was made to the Paterson Range area by Turcaud with representatives of Western Mining Corporation. I will not go into a great deal of detail here; I will merely establish the fact that Turcaud was able to introduce two large companies on site in the Paterson Range, namely Anglo-American and Western Mining Corporation, as well as inform Mr Brook, the senior geologist for Newmont, and leave in his possession the samples, maps, and the geochemical appraisal made by the firm of consultants. Those things were in Newmont's possession for a week before Turcaud was advised that Newmont was not interested in his prospect.

Turcaud makes the point here—it is perhaps interesting in the light of later events—that following the return of Western Mining Corporation—which was looking for base metals in those days, but it has now turned its eyes back to gold—he was advised in April, 1975, that some of the samples collected by Western Mining Corporation were re-assayed for gold in 1972 upon the announcement of Newmont's gold find. Some samples from Pascale Hills showed up to three ounces of gold to the ton.

No wonder the member for South Perth—as he was then—was able to proclaim with such confidence in September, 1973, that here was the richest gold find subsequent to the Golden Mile which has made Kalgoorlie and Western Australia so famous.

I turn quickly now to August, 1972. Turcaud states—

It was during this time, that being at Wittenoom a week-end; I learned there from Mr Dick Zeelanberg of Western Mining Co, who I had visited, that Newmont Mining was pegging the land I had previously proposed.

Having studied his samples, maps, and other information in February, 1971, and having rejected his proposal at that time,

he then learnt in August, 1972, that Newmont was pegging the area that he had introduced to that company. So he came back to Perth, and he was fairly furious. He states that he called at Newmont's office at 190 Hay Street, East Perth, on the 29th September, 1972. He goes on to state—

The Manager of Newmont, Western Australia, Mr David Stuart Tyrwhitt was expecting me and we walked into the conference room; followed by three people: Mr Hunt, Newmont Administrator, Mr Adamson senior geologist and another tall person whose name I have forgotten but who was, I believe, in charge of their drilling program.

We sat, I was slightly taken aback as I did not expect to be facing 4 people.

I said something to the effect that I was not happy with what was going on. Dr Tyrwhitt told me that he had only a vague recollection of the details concerning the Paterson Range, reported to him by his senior geologist Mr W. Brook and that Newmont had got there completely independently of me.

Mr Turcaud continued—

"If you got there completely independently of me", I said, "can you please tell me how you were introduced again to this area."

"By two Kalgoorlie prospectors" was the answer "They went to the Paterson Range and discovered the show".

I make the point that nowhere else in this large documentation, either on the part of Turcaud or on the part of reported statements by Newmont personnel, or by way of letters written by Turcaud and copies of letters purported to be written by the company, is there any other reference to two Kalgoorlie prospectors, because another story unfolds from there.

The information leading to the Paterson Range find was purchased by Newmont from the Day Dawn company which as I have mentioned was one of those companies with which Berven and the other geologist, Dr Schiller, were associated in their profession. The claim by the State general manager of the company that two Kalgoorlie prospectors had been responsible for the Paterson Range find seemed to have been quickly forgotten and dropped, because it does not seem to have been raised again by the company.

I will leave people to judge for themselves, but the first answer given by the State manager of Newmont was that two Kalgoorlie prospectors found the deposit and the company came by the Paterson Range find quite independently of Turcaud. Nevertheless, he "vaguely" remembered Brook drawing his attention to Turcaud's interest in the Paterson Range area.

Mr Turcaud continued—

Mr. Adamson was suspicious and was not convinced that I had ever been to the Paterson Range. After the meeting, I took him to the Government Chemical Laboratories Mineral Collection and he saw the samples from Pascale Hills, Mt. Balthazar and Parallel Range.

The Parallel Range is the range referred to in block 45 of this report. He continued—

... upon being given permission by the Conservator took a sample of Copper Gossan from the Parallel Range. He asked me to describe Pascale Hills and point out the location where the Gossan was the richest. I did so convincingly.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes remaining.

Mr T. D. EVANS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The net result of this was that the company asked Turcaud to sign an agreement; if he signed, and something big developed—as the member for South Perth forecast—he would be paid \$60 000. But do members know what he was asked to sign? He was asked to sign a statement which declared that he had nothing to do with the Paterson Range area the company had pegged. They claimed they had obtained the information from Day Dawn, but were going to pay Turcaud \$60 000 to tell a lie. Yet it has been claimed that Turcaud had not been to the Paterson Range area.

Turcaud would not sign that agreement because he wanted the credit for being the first to introduce the company to the area, and the company was not prepared to set out the facts truly in an agreement. He would not sign the agreement because it did not give a truthful account of what happened, and he was not being given proper credit for what he had found. He had already given the company substantial information, and he was to be paid \$60 000 if the company found something else. It had already picked the eyes out of the area, but if something good came from something else Turcaud had found, the company would pay him \$60 000.

I believe all is not well in the State of Denmark. I have a lot more evidence to support this case, but time is not available for me to present it more fully. I have had to be economic in my choice of matter, but I hope I have been sufficiently selective to indicate that all is not well and that at least there are sufficient grounds to convince the Government that it should give serious consideration to instituting an inquiry into whether these very rich mineral areas in the Paterson Range now to be developed by Newmont, in association with the great Australian company, BHP, were not fairly acquired by Newmont.

I make the point that without exception, up to the time of the discovery of nickel at Kambalda, leading back to the great gold discoveries, all such discoveries were made by the prospector who, because he did not have access to the large moneys available to these multi-national corporations, could not develop an area on his own initiative.

If he pegged an area at all, he had to peg it in its entirety to protect his interest, because once he applied for one area and advertised it in accordance with the law, he would draw attention to the fact that he was working in the area. This applies to any prospector. Turcaud was such a prospector; he relied on the trust and goodwill of a company such as Newmont. He did not enter into an agreement with Western Mining Corporation or the Anglo-American company; he went to Newmont.

At the time, they were looking for other base minerals; they were not looking for gold in 1971. In fact, very few other companies were looking for gold in those times, as I well know. But Turcaud entered into a gentlemen's agreement with those two companies, as any prospector would do with any great company.

Mr Mensaros: But as a former Attorney-General you will know this has nothing to do with the Government.

Mr T. D. EVANS: This man claims the companies have not done the right thing by him. I make the point that any great body politic such as the State of Western Australia should be concerned; when its natural resources are alienated from the Crown, it is incumbent upon the Crown and the people to take action.

Mr Mensaros: Why did you not institute an inquiry when you were Attorney-General? This has nothing to do with the Government.

Mr T. D. EVANS: I have already answered that question.

Mr Mensaros: This is a private matter between the people concerned.

Mr T. D. EVANS: Mr Speaker, my time is limited.

Mr Mensaros: I have not interjected upon you up to this point.

Mr T. D. EVANS: When we were in Government the full story had not developed, as it has now. It is incumbent upon the Government to hold an inquiry, otherwise it will continue to be the case that all is not well in the State of Denmark.

MR SKIDMORE (Swan) [11.38 p.m.]: The Supply Bill now before the House is to provide the Government with the necessary funding so that it may carry out its programme in the forthcoming months. I should like to feel that the Government will give consideration to some of the issues I have raised previously

in the House and that some of this funding will be made available for those projects.

However, before proceeding to those matters, there are one or two small issues which I should like to bring to the attention of Ministers. I refer firstly to a report submitted on the 13th June, 1974, to the then State Electricity Commission by a Mr R. G. O'Rourke, secretary of the board covering the cinematographic operators. The report mentions that the industry is fairly static, but that the number of new applications seeking the right to operate under the workers' regulations covering these workers was not great.

One would have thought the board would be concerned at such a remark and would have made some effort to ensure that young people were encouraged to join the industry as trainee operators.

The report goes on further to say—

The majority of applicants for licence are young persons who for various reasons do not follow their applications to conclusion, finding employment outside the industry where, to them, prospects may be brighter.

I challenge that statement made by the secretary of the board although no doubt it was made in good faith. It has been brought to my notice, by a person who is known to me and who is a senior operator in a theatre group, the difficulties faced by young people who desire to seek employment in the theatre industry. A young person entering the industry as what one might term an apprentice to serve a two-year period of training appears to be faced with some difficulty because of the grading system introduced in relation to films which is upheld under another Act passed by this Parliament. Under this grading system any young person under the age of 18, including cinematograph operators, is unable to view certain films that are graded under the "R" classification, although the relevance of that classification is not germane to my argument.

In this instance, an operator's son, who is 16½ years of age, started as a trainee in the industry to serve his two-year period, but was then advised by the management of the theatre that he would be unable to continue with his training because he was not able to operate a film projector that projected an "R" film, as he was under 18 years of age.

The Government should subject this legislation to a close review to ensure that youths who wish to enter the industry are given an opportunity to conclude their term of training without being forced out of it due to the fact that they are too young to view an "R" classification film. This seems to be a very illogical way to try to encourage operators to qualify for

the license that is issued by the cinematograph operators' board. Therefore I hope the Minister will take note of the position and review it to ascertain whether it is possible to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion which will allow these young people to enter the industry at school leaving age and not 18 years of age, because it is not until they reach that age that they are eligible to train as film operators. This is an imposition on youths who desire to enter the industry. It greatly concerns me and is a matter that should be looked at by the Government.

I now wish to refer to the financing of one of those issues which is very dear to my heart because it involves workers who are injured during the course of their employment. I was hoping that more money would be made available to promote industrial safety than has been evident during the life of this Government, because the funding of safety courses and activities is, to say the least, deplorable. The Government has made no effort whatsoever to consider the interests of workers in so far as industrial safety is concerned.

I have addressed this House on numerous occasions in dealing with this subject and I do not intend to traverse tonight the ground that I covered previously. Nevertheless I would like to comment that this evening mention has been made that strikes represent an extremely significant factor in the number of man hours lost to industry. Unfortunately because of the omission not only of this Government but also of Governments in the past statistics available to us are not completely up to date. This Government and others in the past have failed to recognise the necessity to keep such statistics up to date. As a result I can quote figures for 1972 only.

In 1972, 756 man hours were lost due to industrial dispute, including strikes. In the same year, 40 456 days were lost as a result of injuries to workers in industry. On previous occasions I have challenged the Minister for Labour and Industry to give some consideration to funding a worth-while and proper scheme for educating workers on safety principles. On each occasion I have been advised that it would be the intention of the Minister to get on with the job and I would not be surprised that at a later date, with the use of similar terms, I will be advised that this matter is still receiving the attention of the Minister. I am still waiting, and I believe I will be waiting for a long time yet unless my appeal tonight will have some effect on the Minister somehow so that he will give consideration to some funding in the future to take care of industrial safety.

In my possession I have at the moment a letter that was forwarded by the Minister for Labour and Industry, who is also the member for South Perth, to Mr

Clohesy, the Secretary of the Building Workers Industrial Union, on the 27th April, 1974. I will not quote the letter, but in it the Minister said he had observed the information passed to him by the building industry union concerning the type of safety training which is available to people in New South Wales. He went on to say that he regretted his department did not have the necessary staff or organisational structure to permit similar comprehensive courses to be conducted in Western Australia. Of course, that, in itself, would require funds and I would suggest it does not necessarily mean that because the department does not have the staff or organisational structure that we have to leave the position at that. We should be a little more constructive and find some means to finance safety training courses in this State.

Mr Grayden: All sorts of safety courses are being undertaken.

Mr SKIDMORE: I agree that in this letter the Minister said the Industrial Foundation for Accident Prevention, which is affiliated with the National Safety Council in this State, does have the necessary facilities and trained staff and that that organisation would be prepared to investigate the possibility of conducting safety courses if there were a demand and a response from the industry. I do not quarrel with that and I accept in good faith what the Minister has said. However, I wonder whether the Minister has been misled by the activities of the Industrial Foundation for Accident Prevention, especially when we look at a document which has been issued by the Industrial Foundation for Accident Prevention which is headed—

Construction Safety and Compensation A Seminar for the Building Industry

In this document it is stated that the date of the seminar will be Wednesday, the 26th June, 1974, and, Mr Speaker, do you know for whom the seminar was being held? The Minister promised that workers would be trained in industrial safety. He said that courses in industrial safety would be available. However, the seminar to be conducted by the Industrial Foundation for Accident Prevention was for builders and construction managers. The whole purport of the course was to inculcate a consciousness of safety, but as the course was at a high level for builders and construction managers it would be of no advantage to workers themselves.

Mr Grayden: That is only one of many.

Mr SKIDMORE: I can mention many others. The only course that is being run by the Industrial Foundation for Accident Prevention which involves the workers is that concerned with the training of fork lift drivers. The Minister does not seem to substantiate his statements in any way.

I am not unmindful of the affairs of the Industrial Foundation for Accident Prevention, and I have accepted the invitation to address the safety course to be undertaken by industrial people on the 25th of this month relating to the role which the trade unions can play in promoting industrial safety. However, I will find it rather difficult to be serious and sincere in my approach to that subject when I look at the way the trade unions are treated by the Government in respect of industrial safety. In that regard one would be a little sceptical as to when one will see some action by the Government, as promised by the Minister on many occasions.

Mr Grayden: There has been a great deal of action taken on this particular subject, but obviously you are not aware of it.

Mr SKIDMORE: The Minister says a great deal has been done on this subject. I hope when I ask questions, as he suggested I should—and these I will place on the notice paper as quickly as possible—in order to get some answers, he will be able to show me what action the Government is undertaking.

Mr Grayden: You will be surprised.

Mr SKIDMORE: I have been getting the same sort of statement from the Minister for the last two years or thereabouts.

I would now like to refer to a report which I understand has been sent to the State Energy Commission by various inspectors. I have before me quite a voluminous report covering many aspects. However, I shall deal with the mines electrical inspectors at the Kalgoorlie office who presented an annual report covering the activities of the Kalgoorlie office for the year 1973-74. The inspections and investigations dealt with caravans, nickel, salt and gypsum, gold, iron, tin, mineral sands, bauxite, lead, talc, uranium, quarries, accidents involving electrical tradesmen, etc. I would like to refer to an electrical fatality involving J. Devany, who was 42 years of age.

A simple analysis of the report reveals that this accident happened because a person who had not been trained in industrial safety carried out an alteration to an extension cord. Originally the extension cord was wired by a certified and experienced person, but it was wired incorrectly. The fact was that an incorrect connection was made at both ends of the cord, and so it operated satisfactorily except that the colour code was not correct.

An uninformed person, in a sincere effort to correct what he thought was an obvious mistake, reversed the connection at one end of the cord and thus created a dangerous situation as a result of which someone was electrocuted.

Had the workers been able to undertake a course of information—not necessarily for the purpose of carrying out electrical work which is the legal right of the electrical tradesmen who are properly trained—they would have recognised readily the mistake that was made. In this particular case the person concerned reversed the connection at one end of the cord in good faith.

This is one example, but there are 10 to 12 others I could quote where accidents occurred under similar circumstances when uninformed workers carried out work in the electrical field. The danger is ever present, although in the case of electricity one cannot see it. The Minister should look into that aspect to ensure that all the agreeably surprising utterances he makes will become realities in the very near future.

I refer to a further letter that was sent to the Trades and Labor Council regarding the activities of the Industrial Foundation for Accident Prevention, dated the 8th July, 1974. This is from the Industrial Foundation for Accident Prevention. One paragraph reads as follows—

Also, as no doubt you appreciate, we are registered as a non-profitmaking organisation, and consequently our charges for providing such safety training are based on covering the expenses involved only. Also, we are non-political and have a Charter from the State Government to promote industrial safety within W.A. by education processes.

If that is a charter then I believe it is time the Government asserted its authority and gave another charter to ensure that people concerned with accident prevention undertake courses in industrial safety that instruct not only supervisors, managers and owners, but also the workers.

Another avenue is available to the Government, and this is written into an Act of Parliament. This gives an opportunity to an existing board to promote training and instruction on the matters I have just raised. However, it seems that no Government has made the effort to ensure that the board carried out these functions, for which power already exists.

I refer to the Workers' Compensation Act, section 25 (14) (a) of which states—

The Board may engage in and carry on the education and instruction in accident prevention and first aid work of workers and others and may impart such education and instruction by demonstration, exhibits, lectures, classes or otherwise and may hold examinations and issue certificates to persons whom it may deem sufficiently skilled in such matters as to warrant the issue to them of such certificates.

This takes me to the question of fumigation of many of the factories which undertake the processes of providing food to the people. The industry with which I am most familiar is the flour milling industry in which fumigants, insecticides, pesticides of all types, and sprays are used for the control of weevil in flour, as well as many other beetles and infestations that occur in wheat. Some of these would be known to the farming community and to Country Party members.

Such sprays have been of great concern to the workers, and for a very good reason. Some contain 20 per cent carbon tetrachloride, and this is a well known killer of people.

To quote an instance where a person was killed by such chemicals; the person concerned sat in an armchair for two or three hours looking at television after the armchair had been cleaned with carbon tetrachloride six hours previously. He sustained a fatal collapse. This is a dangerous substance, as has been proven in many cases.

It seems that nowhere is the Government concerned with the education of the worker. It may be true to say that industry itself should undertake the provision of worker education. The union concerned has undertaken that responsibility, despite very limited resources and a small membership of some 285 persons. This union has very limited funds at its disposal. Along with the mill owners the union has initiated worker education which is an object lesson to others.

I wish to make a comparison. The Public Health Department requires people who use the types of spray to which I have referred for the control of termites in homes to have a license in order that they might be strictly controlled and be made aware of their responsibility and the need for care. However, the worker who uses the same insecticide in a flour mill is given no such training or protection by any Act. The workers in the industry are instructed to do the spraying. We have been able to resolve the problem only by refusing our workers the right to undertake the spraying; but that is not the answer to the problem. The answer is the provision of a school to provide for the education not only of mill workers, but also workers in food factories who use the same sprays for the control of infestation by insects which are deleterious to the items that are produced. No effort in this regard has been made by the Government. I hope that in the near future someone somewhere will provide some funds in order to carry out the objectives I have mentioned.

I have one small issue I would like to raise with the Minister for Housing. I have raised this issue on many occasions with previous Ministers for Housing and also with the Acting General Manager of

the SHC. I am very concerned that after the third winter no effort has been made to alleviate the position of the old-age pensioners who live in flats in West Road, Bassendean. During the last three winters these people have had the whole of their backyards covered by an average depth of water of three to six inches. I have requested repeatedly—in fact, I have even abused the Acting General Manager—that something be done, but the situation is still the same this winter as it was three winters ago.

I know that certain difficulties are involved with the particular site, but I suggested an easy solution to the Acting General Manager. I asked him to give me the right to engage a truck for the day so that I could have sand carted and thus solve the problem in a day by sand filling.

The pensioners have dug a trench in their backyards from the back steps to the end of their blocks. It is some 15 to 18 inches deep and they took this action in an endeavour to drain the blocks. However, they have merely created a worse situation because whereas they previously walked in five inches of water they now have to hurdle a drain 15 to 18 inches deep. Their efforts were a failure.

I again raise the matter and trust that by next winter some efforts will have been made in this regard and I will not have to again raise the matter with the Minister.

Having got that complaint off my plate I would like to refer to some other problems which have been disturbing me in relation to the passing of the Supply Bill. One would expect that the people's money would be spent in a realistic way to ensure that those appointed to the Industrial Commission would have a sense of fair play. Money has been spent on the provision of an Industrial Commission, but I believe it is inevitable that there will be a clash between the trade union movement and that commission if the latter continues to adopt the attitude it recently adopted in regard to the workers' right to strike.

It is about time that Governments which are opposed to this supposed right that workers have to strike realise that the worker will not give up that right. We can impose whatever punishment we like on the worker. We can talk to him, fine him, and put him in gaol, but he will come out time and time again and indicate that he will strike.

I abhor the expenditure of money on a commission which has no sense of responsibility in considering the question the Act itself asks it to consider. The Act which governs the commission involves conciliation, mediation, and arbitration. Mediation and conciliation are expected to be adopted before arbitration. However, the present commission threw all those principles out of the door and, very simply,

resorted to arbitrary jurisdiction. The Federal commission agreed to a 3.6 per cent wage increase and to wage indexation. The Premier mentioned this matter. I also note that our illustrious salaries tribunal but-toned on to the Federal Government's decision in the parliamentarians' case. I am very intrigued at the thought that on some future occasion I may have to appear before that tribunal to remind it of some of the mistakes in its decision; but I will leave that matter to another day.

I merely say that in considering our own Industrial Commission, one would be amazed at the waste of money in keeping the commissioners in office when they are not solving, in a conciliatory way, the problem of industrial unrest.

The commission had before it many State applications for amendments of awards following the Federal decision of a 3.6 per cent wage increase. In its wisdom, and rightly so, it determined it should not act until it had an opportunity to study the guidelines the Federal commission sought to have inserted in relation to wage indexation. It subsequently brought down a decision that wage indexation would be adopted along the lines laid down by the Federal commission.

After the decision had been handed down 19 unions fronted up to get their 3.6 per cent increase and wage indexation if they so desired; but they were told by the Commission in Court Session that it had adjourned the applications *sine die*. When questioned as to the reasons they could not go on with the applications, the unions were advised by the commission that workers had been on strike and that as a result the 19 unions would not get their increase.

The commission had had before it many knowledgeable employer, Government, and trade union representatives who, in good conscience, had set forth their case to the commission. The commission had brought down a decision which was fair and just to all; that there should be a 3.6 per cent wage increase and wage indexation. Having done that it then commenced an exercise in industrial blackmail of which it is always accusing the unions when they go on strike. However, the commission is not above saying to the workers, "You are entitled to receive a 3.6 per cent wage increase, but you will not get it because I understand you could be going on strike."

Some of the 19 unions and others which will have applications before the commission have not been in a dispute for 45 years. Some have never been on strike, but they were subjected to the same ultimatum as the other unions. They were judged guilty without any effort being made to ascertain whether or not their workers would go on strike. So much for conciliation and an endeavour to ensure that some justice be given.

If the findings of the commission cannot be in line with equity and good conscience, then the Minister should be looking at the internal workings of the commission to ensure they follow the normal tenets of decency.

I might say that this dispute was precipitated by some workers from Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. who had a disputation involving award conditions. They had actually returned to work before the commission provocatively determined that the registrar should take action and fine the workers concerned. The employees had met the employers and resolved the disputation. The employees were happy and the employers were happy, and the commission then took the employees to task and fined them.

Approaches are made to the commission on the basis that the workers will receive some relief from the commission. I have a right to be upset because I was one of those applicants who had to stand before the commission and be lectured like a little boy with regard to what we ought to do. I took strong exception on behalf of the union I represented. We were included with a group of other unions and told that because we were going to do certain things we would not receive our 3.6 per cent increase, or wage indexation.

History will reveal that this is only one aspect of the activities of the commission which concern me. I am most concerned that efforts will be made—no doubt by those forced into the position—to endeavour to have the Act amended to overcome the problem area which has arisen because of the commission's activities.

The commission clearly indicated that under the provisions of the Act, agreements cannot be touched by the commission with the type of order which the commission can place on an award. In other words, the criteria for an agreement are distinct from those for an award. An award has to be applied for wage indexation under the criteria laid down, Federal and State. An agreement can be registered with the commission to give it some supposed legality.

The Premier has already said that unions do not have to apply to the Industrial Commission. I agree, but we do not have to take agreements to be registered if we do not want to. However, we do so because we believe in conciliation and arbitration. One becomes hesitant to do that when the unions have to approach the very same commission which is to undertake at least some arbitration and conciliation.

So the right of a worker to strike revolves around the question of supply and demand. This is something with which I am concerned. There has to be more rationality. Surely it is not necessary for the employers or the employees to go hell-bent on a course of destruction. The regulation recently brought down creates

a tremendous vacuum in the activities of the unions. The unions will be bound down by regulation which cannot work. If common sense prevails the unions and the employers, and the Industrial Commission, can undertake an exercise in rationality and overcome the problem.

I believe the problems of strike action likewise can be overcome in a sane and sensible manner, because, whether or not we like it, the workers will never give away their right to strike. No matter what we decide in this place the workers will exercise that right, come hell or high water, and no-one can change that attitude.

It might be a reckless assertion by a member of this House but the realities of life indicate to me that these unjust laws will be fought most in a way in which the employers will not accept.

I conclude by saying there are a number of questions I would like to take up but I will leave them to other debates on future occasions. I hope the issue I have raised regarding the cinematograph operators board will receive some consideration; that the Minister for Housing will look at the problem confronting the pensioners in West Road, Bassendean; and that the Minister for Labour and Industry will use his ability and persuasive powers to influence his Government to provide greater funding in the area of industrial safety. I suggest the Minister does not believe everything told to him regarding industrial safety. I believe he has been misled by some people and he should have a close look at the position.

My understanding is that lack of industrial safety is the greatest robber of man hours in this State. A total of 40 000 man days lost is not a good record. I hope funds will be made available to undertake further action, and that the compensation board will receive some funds so that it may carry out those functions it is already empowered to do under the Act.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [12.17 a.m.] I realise the Supply Bill is a measure on which members can roam from one end of the globe to the other, and they usually do. I would be quite unnatural if I did not expect the Opposition to react as it has done. Members opposite will be relieved to know that I do not intend to deal with every point raised tonight because, quite frankly, although many points were raised very few call for any special comment.

I can understand the Opposition being a little reluctant to fully extend itself during a debate such as this, because members opposite represent a party which is in disarray throughout Australia. They represent a party which has presided over the greatest inflation and the greatest unemployment we have had.

Mr Bertram: You were going to fix that.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Of course, members opposite are also the State representatives of a party which has a record of increased charges which makes the State Government look as though it is dealing only with petty cash.

Mr Davies: Impossible!

Sir CHARLES COURT: I gather from the notices which appear on the notice paper we will have ample opportunity to remind members opposite of some of those facts. I want to remind them that in respect of the problems confronting Australia—and they are very real—Western Australia has managed to bring itself to a situation where we have, at the moment, the least unemployment in the whole of Australia, and during the last five consecutive months lower than the national average. This is so in spite of the frustration experienced in trying to get a development programme moving. I leave that thought with members opposite because if they want to attack us on so-called lack of performance they want to remember that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones. When members opposite start to criticise they should look at their own performances because they cannot divorce themselves from their counterparts in Canberra.

Mr Jamieson: And we won't divorce our performance from the 3 000 workers employed under the RED Scheme.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I would remind members of the Opposition that the Commonwealth Government is now in the process of cooling off the RED Scheme. The Commonwealth Government has also given notice to the Premiers that it wants to get out of the other unemployment assistance scheme. If it had not been for the entreaties of the Premiers—Liberal, Labor, and Country Party—at the Premiers' Conference, the assistance we have been receiving, and which goes back to the time of the Tonkin Government, for the State unemployment relief scheme—which is much more effective than the Commonwealth scheme—would have been discontinued.

Mr Bryce: On what basis do you say that?

Sir CHARLES COURT: It is much more effective because it involves much less administrative cost—virtually none. It is effective the minute money is made available.

Mr Bryce: There is no evidence of that where I come from.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I remind members opposite that the Prime Minister had served notice on the Premiers that the Commonwealth-State unemployment assistance scheme was to cut out at

midnight on the 30th June, 1975; and it was only because of the entreaties of the Premiers that he agreed to phase it out, giving a lesser amount per month, until it disappeared completely by the 30th November. At the moment all the Premiers are joining together to ask the Prime Minister to take at least a more realistic approach to this matter and realise that if he cuts out that scheme as well as phasing out the RED Scheme it will not be a very happy Christmas for many people in Australia. I am happy to say that on present indications the people in Western Australia will be better off than those in any other State.

We see members opposite with disappointment all over their faces. They were hoping we would come into this part of the session without a coalition, but we have a coalition.

Mr Jamieson: There is no coalition.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We have a coalition in the Government, and members opposite come into the House for this part of the session at a time when their own party has never been so unhappy with itself as it is at the present time.

Mr Bryce: We would bolt in in an election at this time. That is why you are going to fiddle with the boundaries, to try to save yourself.

Mr O'Connor: You would be talking out of your hair if you had any.

Mr Bryce: A really brilliant comment from the Minister for Police.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer.

Sir CHARLES COURT: There is disappointment all over the faces of members opposite. They were hoping to come into this part of the session with no coalition in the Government. They now find themselves not only with a strong coalition in Government but also with their own party in disarray. And what a debacle it is! The Harradine affair is one of the least of their problems when we think of what has happened—poor old Barnard, Crean, Cairns, Cameron, the Northern Territory election, the ACT election, the Queensland election, the Bass election, and the South Australian election. What a record!

Mr Davies: Tell us about the South Australian election.

Mr B. T. Burke: What about poor old Dick?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I congratulate members of the Opposition for their loyalty. I admire loyalty. It is hard to be loyal sometimes, when a party is as far down as theirs is. I must say that, from their leader down, the worse things are in the party the louder the noise they make. But on this occasion tonight there has been no great spirit in the debate which came from the other side, so there

is very little to be answered. However, I want to thank members for supporting the Bill, even though they did so grudgingly.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Sir Charles Court (Treasurer), and transmitted to the Council.

*House adjourned at 12.27 a.m.
(Wednesday).*

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 13th August, 1975

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE HOSPITALS

Private Consulting Facilities

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER, to the Minister for Health:

Has the Government made it possible for doctors to have the use of private consulting facilities at public hospitals under the Hospital Agreement between the Commonwealth and State?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

I thank the Hon. H. W. Gayfer for giving me prior notice of this question, the reply to which is as follows—

Under the terms of the Hospital Agreement between the Commonwealth and State all out-patient attendances at a recognised hospital must be free of charge to the patient. A private medical practitioner is entitled to charge for a consultation carried out in his private consulting rooms.

If a medical practitioner intends to charge for a patient consultation, it is essential that the place of the consultation is recognised as a private consulting area.

Where it has been found necessary for a doctor to visit a hospital in a private consulting capacity on a casual basis, a charge of \$10 per day for the use of a consulting room applies. Where arrangements are

made for a medical practitioner to have the use of private consulting rooms within a hospital on a continuing basis, the charge is \$25 per day.

QUESTIONS (15): ON NOTICE

1. ROAD TRAFFIC AUTHORITY

Personnel and Cost

The Hon. R. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) What is the current force of the Road Traffic Patrol?
- (2) How many of these men have been inducted from—
 - (a) the Police Force by voluntary transfer; and
 - (b) Country Shires' Traffic Control?
- (3) What is the ultimate strength of the Road Traffic Patrol?
- (4) What has been the cost to date?
- (5) What is the anticipated total cost to bring the Road Traffic Patrol to full strength?
- (6) Is the current policy of spot breathalyser checks in line with the Minister's second reading speech in introducing the Road Traffic Bill?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) 423.
- (2) (a) 399.
(b) 24.
- (3) Anticipated 510.
- (4) Salaries 1st June, 1975 to 31st July, 1975—\$650 593.
- (5) At full strength an additional monthly amount of \$47 850 (salaries) would be required.
- (6) The current campaign against drinking drivers cannot be described as spot or random checks. It is based on observing driver behaviour in the vicinity of places where liquor is dispensed and drivers can reasonably be expected to have consumed liquor.

2.

ABORIGINES

Hostel: Swan District

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

Further to the reply to my question of the 19th March, 1975, concerning the urgent need for hostel accommodation for homeless Aboriginal people in the Swan District—

- (a) Has any action yet been taken to establish such a hostel;