

The matter will be kept under review.

Mr Bryce: Under review!

Mr CARR: That is something we have heard many times before; that is not a proper answer.

Mr Bryce: Under review! What a joke!

Mr CARR: The answer concludes—

If the Honourable Member has specific cases he feels call for study, he should advise details to the Minister for Consumer Affairs.

Sir Charles Court: I hope that gets printed in *Hansard* correctly instead of in the mumbling way you read it out to the House to try to avoid the issue.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blaikie): Order!

Mr Grayden: You realise that when we get the statistics in a couple of weeks you will be very surprised. They cut right across the argument.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Grayden: You will get those statistics soon.

Sir Charles Court: I hope the answer to question (3) gets into *Hansard*.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I would appreciate it if the honourable member was able to continue his speech without interruption.

Mr CARR: Actually, Mr Acting Speaker, I was about to conclude by saying that the Premier has not done the job. Instead he has used his old excuse of "under review". The Deputy Premier is particularly at fault here. He has not even made a representation which his own party asked him to make nine months ago. Does the Deputy Premier and Leader of the Country Party deny that?

Mr McPharlin: What particular issue are you talking about?

Mr CARR: Mr Acting Speaker, I am speechless! I leave it at that.

Mr Bryce: This is the man who emerges as the strong man in the Cabinet!

Mr McPharlin: Oh, you idiot! I have not been in the Chamber to hear the speech; I have only just entered the Chamber and cannot be expected to know what preceded my entry.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Young.

*House adjourned at 10.59 p.m.*

## Legislative Council

Thursday, the 10th April, 1975

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

### QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE POLICE

*John Martin Best: Assault Charge*

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY, to the Minister for Justice:

In view of the advice conveyed to the House when I spoke to the adjournment motion on Wednesday, the 9th April, will the Minister—

Institute proceedings to appeal against—

(a) Magistrate C. A. Fisher's decision in the case of the Police Department v John Martin Best of J. M. Best Holdings Pty. Ltd., in which he found the defendant not guilty after he had admitted the offence,

(b) the awarding of costs amounting to \$150 against the Police Department?

The PRESIDENT: I am inclined to think the question is not in order and I therefore rule it out of order.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: May I ask on what grounds you, Mr President, rule the question out of order?

The PRESIDENT: If the question asked by the honourable member refers to proceedings before a court—and let me say I am not sure whether that is so, because I was not present when the discussion took place last night—then I think the question could be *sub judice*.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: With respect, I am not asking for any opinion in respect of the proceedings before a court. I am simply asking whether the Minister would be prepared to institute an appeal on behalf of the Police Department against the decision handed down by the magistrate.

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

In reply to the question asked by Mr Cooley, and in deference to your advice, Mr President, it is my understanding the prosecution was taken by the Police Department. It is therefore up to the

department to refer the matter to the Crown Law Department for examination of the facts and a decision whether or not there are grounds for appeal. I am not prepared at this moment to indicate any personal intervention.

# QUESTIONS (5): ON NOTICE

1.

## TRAFFIC

### *Air Patrols*

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams for the Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Police:

- (1) Does the Police Department intend to continue with the use of light aircraft in the apprehension of speeding motorists?
- (2) Has this method of detection been legally challenged up to this date?
- (3) What degree of accuracy does the Department claim to achieve by this method?
- (4) At what height does the aircraft fly to carry out this work?
- (5) What are the total number of flying hours over the period from the 28th March, 1975, to the 6th April, 1975, inclusive, recorded by the aircraft engaged for this purpose, including return flights for re-fuelling, etc.?
- (6) What is the cost of the aircraft and pilot hire per hour?
- (7) How many police officers, apart from the pilot, are used at any one time in the aircraft?
- (8) What is the total value of the fines achieved by aerial surveillance over the period the 28th March, 1975, to the 6th April, 1975, inclusive?
- (9) Has turbulence encountered at low levels given cause to doubt the accuracy of this method of detection?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (for the Hon. N. E. BAXTER) replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) Accuracy of within 2 km/h has been proven by test checking of police vehicles with accurate speedometers over the measured distance.
- (4) 1 000 feet.
- (5) 42 hours and 20 minutes. No return flights for fuel were necessary.
- (6) \$19.00 per hour. Pilot is a Police Officer.
- (7) One, but when training the number varies.

(8) Action is commenced in the locality of operations and no records are maintained of the amount of fines resulting. During the period 75 infringement notices, 14 briefs, 9 cautions were issued.

(9) No.

2.

## SCHOOL BUILDING PROGRAMMES

### *Projects*

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Education:

Will the Minister supply—

- (a) a list of schools where projects have been carried out, or are planned, using general building grants from the Australian Schools Commission; and
- (b) information concerning the nature of the projects?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

(a) and (b) General Building Grants.

Projects scheduled for funding, 1974 and 1975.

### Primary Schools:

- Albany J.P.—4 classrooms.
- Allendale—3 classrooms.
- Anzac Terrace—3 classrooms, covered assembly area, office and store.
- Balcatta—Staff room extensions, office.
- Bayswater—Staff room and staff toilets.
- Beckenham—Staff toilets, office, store.
- Bentley—6 classrooms and covered assembly area.
- Bluff Point Camp School—Up-grading.
- Bluff Point—3 classrooms.
- Boddington—Staff toilets and student toilets.
- Boulder—6 classrooms.
- Brookton—Up-grading and staff toilets.
- Byford—2 classrooms, toilets and store.
- Camboon—3 classrooms and covered assembly area.
- Condungup—Up-grading and administration.
- Coolbinia—Staff toilets.
- Cowaramup—2 classrooms.
- Craigie—6 classrooms and covered assembly area.
- Cunderdin—2 classrooms, toilets and administration conversion.
- Deanmore—Staff toilets, office.
- Derby—Up-grading.
- Dumbleyung—1 classroom and showers.
- East Maddington—6 classrooms and covered assembly area.

Embleton—Toilets, staff room extensions.  
 Esperance—Office and staff room extensions.  
 Exmouth—2 classrooms.  
 Forrestfield—6 classrooms and toilets.  
 Geraldton—Staff toilets.  
 Gnowangerup—Staff toilets and student showers.  
 Guildford—Major up-grading.  
 Harvey—2 classrooms and staff toilets.  
 Hillcrest—2 classrooms.  
 Hilton—2 classrooms and resource centre.  
 Jerdacuttup—2 classrooms and staff room and office.  
 Jurien Bay—2 classrooms and staff room and office.  
 Kalamunda—Staff toilets, staff room, office.  
 Kambalda—2 classrooms.  
 Katanning—Administration extensions and staff toilets.  
 Kulin—Science room and manual arts extension.  
 Laverton—6 classrooms, H.E., M.A., Science and Library.  
 Marble Bar—1 classroom.  
 Merredin—Staff toilets.  
 Mount Pleasant—Staff toilets, store.  
 Narembeen—Administration and toilets.  
 Narrogin—3 classrooms, administration and toilets.  
 Norseman—6 classrooms.  
 Pinjarra—1 classroom, and administration alteration.  
 Scarborough—Major up-grading.  
 South Boulder—Modifications.  
 South Kalgoorlie—6 classrooms.  
 South Merredin—Staff toilets, store.  
 Swanbourne—Major up-grading and 6 classrooms.  
 Wagin—3 classrooms.  
 Walpole—Toilets and store.  
 Weld Square—6 classrooms including library.  
 West Busselton—2 classrooms.  
 West Kambalda—6 classrooms.  
 Westminster—Staff toilets.  
 West Morley—Staff toilets, office.  
 Willetton—6 classrooms and resource centre.  
 Wirrabirra—6 classrooms.  
 Wooroloo—3 classrooms and administration.  
 Yerecoin—1 classroom.

### Secondary Schools:

Applecross—Craft centre, pre-vocational centre and administration improvements.

Armadale—Pre-vocational centre.  
 Balcatta—Office conversion.  
 Balga—Medical centre.  
 Belmont—Up-grade Home Economics, staff room heating.  
 Bentley—Medical centre.  
 Bunbury—General up-grading.  
 Busselton—Pre-vocational centre.  
 Carine—Faculty Block.  
 Churchlands—Pre-vocational centre.  
 Collie—Medical centre.  
 Cyril Jackson—2 rooms, office and store.  
 Eastern Hills—2 rooms, office area, stores and minor up-grading.  
 Esperance—Additions.  
 Geraldton—Medical centre.  
 Governor Stirling—Pre-vocational centre and medical centre.  
 Hampton—Medical centre.  
 John Forrest—Commerce rooms.  
 Katanning—Pre-vocational centre.  
 Kent Street—Faculty block and pre-vocational centre.  
 Manjimup—Pre-vocational centre.  
 Margaret River—Administration additions and student change-rooms.  
 Mount Barker—Art and craft room.  
 Mount Lawley—Additions.  
 Northam—Up-grading and replacement.  
 Rossmoyne—Medical centre.  
 South Fremantle—Additions.  
 Thornlie—Science laboratories, prep. area and stores.

3.

### TEACHERS

#### *After School Care: Insurance*

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Education:

Will the Minister advise whether teachers who involve themselves in out of school care activities for children in school premises are covered by departmental insurance?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

The Education Department's public liability insurance policy covers the legal liability of the Department and its employees for bodily injury and damage to property arising from authorised activities.

## 4. SCHOOL BUS SERVICES

*Contractors: Industrial Coverage*

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Does the Education Department require those firms who contract for school bus work to pay to their employees the Transport Workers' Award wages and conditions?
- (2) If not, will the Minister undertake to ensure that such a condition is included in future school bus contracts?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) As school bus contracts are put out to public tender the matter of employees' wages and working conditions is the concern of the successful tenderer.

## 5. SCHOOLS

*Sex Education Courses*

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Will the Minister table—
  - (a) the file containing the Education Department's Evaluation Committee's report on the operation of the pilot schools imparting sex education at primary school level; and
  - (b) examples of the pictorial matter and teaching aids used in the scheme?
- (2) (a) Is the scheme being continued; and  
 (b) if so, which schools are involved?
- (3) What cognizance is being taken of the need for teachers to be fully trained in teaching the subject?
- (4) Are human relationship courses still being conducted in secondary schools?
- (5) How many periods per week are devoted to that subject?
- (6) How are teachers selected to conduct the course?
- (7) What steps are being taken to integrate the subject of human relationships with other subjects?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) The Primary Education Committee is at present compiling the report.
- (2) (a) Yes, as a pilot project.  
 (b) It is desirable that the names of the schools participating in the pilot projects should remain confidential.

(3) This has been recognised by the teacher education authorities.

(4) Yes.

(5) One period per week.

(6) On the decision of the senior staff of the school.

(7) Integration is to be encouraged and several schools have, in fact, integrated the course into the English or Social Studies programmes in which cases classes are timetabled for an additional period in these subjects.

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: NINTH DAY

*Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 9th April, on the following motion by the Hon. I. G. Pratt—

That the following address be presented to His Excellency—

May it please Your Excellency:

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

**THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS** (Metropolitan) [2.39 p.m.]: Mr President, I rise to support the motion and at the same time, in common with other members in this House, express my deep regret at the Governor's enforced retirement due to ill-health. His ill-health was precipitated by many courageous actions during the war for which the Governor has been decorated. He is, really and truly, a very gallant man and it must have been difficult during his last months to have conducted the office of Governor with such dignity while suffering such pain and, from time to time, distressing conditions. One would expect such courage from the Governor who was born in Western Australia of good stock—possibly the best one could get.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: He was born at Fremantle.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: Yes, at White Gum Valley. I might add that his parents were highly respected members of the community in which they lived and, also, that they were migrants.

I have listened with interest to the tenor of the debate which has followed the move for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply. Perhaps one of the most interesting speeches was the one given to us yesterday by the Hon. D. K. Dans on the role of this House and Parliament in general. I thought Mr Dans brought some very good points to the notice of members,

not just in this House, but also in the country as a whole. At one stage I thought he was going to even suggest a coalition to get the whole of the country out of its present mess.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It may yet be necessary.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: In war-time that is so, and of course, the economic situation pervading Australia now is a grave one, although not recognisable as such by the general public.

I would prefer to contain my remarks to this House and to one other person in another place. If a back-bencher feels dissatisfied with the role he is playing in this House, it is up to that member to do something about it. It is the back-benchers who control this House, and they control it, Sir, through your office. You are our elected President. We have three Ministers to give us the voice of Government, and it is right that we should have the voice of Government in this House. It is the back-benchers who are the force in any Parliament. To sit and say nothing is a back-bencher's prerogative; to sit and to do something constructive is also a back-bencher's prerogative. No Cabinet, irrespective of its political colour, is not cognisant of the fact that the power of the Parliament rests in its members, and those members can do a great deal to change their situation if they so desire.

Let us just consider the inequitable load which the Ministers of this Government, and indeed of any Government, have to carry. I use the words "inequitable load" because I believe Ministers of the Crown, irrespective of the party to which they belong, are grossly overworked and sadly underpaid for their responsibilities. However, they do little to help themselves by trying to reorganise their offices. On the other hand, some do take it upon themselves to distribute the work load as evenly as they can.

Of the members of the present Cabinet, no three Ministers have adopted that course more than the three Ministers in this House. It is pleasing to see that they actively concern themselves with the back benches and distribute their work load as well as they are able to amongst these members—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: They never give me any.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: —within the permissible limits. It is time we looked closely at some reforms in this House and, if the other place wishes to adopt those reforms, then it should be allowed to do so. I suggest that Ministers consider closely the idea of using back-benchers, without salary, as parliamentary private secretaries. Ministers are called upon to make many interstate and overseas trips, and this leaves their portfolios wide open;

some other Minister has to deputise for them. I suggest that if a Minister were allowed to select a parliamentary private secretary, as per the Westminster system, then the work in his department could continue unabated and this Parliament would be better informed about what goes on in that particular department. That is my first suggestion in regard to ministerial duties.

On a recent visit to the Queensland Parliament, I was not surprised to find that the Premier of that State had recognised the work load of his Ministers. Indeed, the intention is to increase the number in the Queensland ministry from 14 to 16. When the original Western Australian Cabinet of 11 was suggested, and then increased to 12, ours was still a small State in population numbers. However, no matter how small the population of a State, the population still demands exactly the same attention as if we had 27 Ministers of the Crown. Therefore, as I have said, I feel particularly sorry for our Ministers. We are in an era of specialisation, and some of the ministerial portfolios carry quite inequitable work loads. Some people are said to wear two hats, but unfortunately, some of our Ministers have to wear four or five hats.

I would like to see a Government, no matter what its colour, have the courage to realise that this is an era of specialisation and to expand the ministry to make it as efficient as possible. A Minister is appointed to minister to his department, and not to administer. The very matter about which Mr Dans and Mr Clive Griffiths were complaining—that bureaucracy is lifting its head and controlling government—can be in part attributable to the fact that a Minister is not allowed to minister. He does not have the time to devote the attention he would like to give to his particular departments. I feel this question bears very serious consideration.

Our present Cabinet works as a team, and no-one on this side of the House who knows each and every Minister individually would deny that it is an extremely hard-working team and that many hours are spent by the Ministers, not just on parliamentary duties, but also on public relations duties. The situation is no different from what it was when the last Government was in office. I am appalled at the physical look of some of our Ministers from time to time, and not just the Ministers of this Government, but those of the last Government as well. At times they appear to be absolutely exhausted, and still they retain that manner which obviously made them automatic candidates for ministerial portfolios—the same politeness, the same willingness to listen to complaints from back-benchers. Now they may blush—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: There's a bit of flattery in this session!

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: I need an extra handkerchief.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: —but I think they deserve this praise. Members on the other side of the House who were involved in the previous Government will fully concur with the remarks I made in regard to the ministry. In any Government the Ministers are grossly overworked. When a man is grossly overworked he puts his health, his status, and sometimes even his life in jeopardy. I ask the Government in the future to look at an expansion of the ministry and an expansion of parliamentary assistance to the Ministers.

The other point I would like to make about the Parliament is that I am rather pleased the beautification of this actual establishment has taken place like a silent revolution. I am constantly amazed at the increase in females in this building. One walks through corridors and one is confronted by some of the most charming young ladies it has ever been one's privilege to see. Unfortunately, one cannot differentiate as to whether they are visitors, whether they belong to the WEL or perhaps to some other group, or whether they are members' secretaries.

Mr President, I appeal to you and to the Joint House Committee to examine the question of maintaining the security of this place—a very lax security—by the issue, if necessary, of a form of identification for employees who now number more than 110 in these Houses. I say that from no other point of view but from the possibility of avoiding any threat. One reads in the *Parliamentarian* accounts of people managing to get into galleries in other places with inflammable liquids, explosive devices, and what-have-you, and we say, "Tut-tut, but it will not happen here".

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: I hope you do not think that any women's group would carry that sort of material.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: I did not imply that, and I hope the honourable member does not think I implied it because it is not necessarily the case. What I am saying is that there are a number of strangers wandering the galleries of Parliament and I believe that our attendants, the police, or, indeed, officers of the House have the right to say, "I do not know you. Who are you?"

The person may reply, "I am a lost visitor" or, "I am Mr So-and-So's secretary". They could then be asked whether they had any form of identification, or told that they should not be in that particular part of the House. I believe that to be a normal domestic check; it is very difficult to keep pace with the changes in staff here at the moment.

Mr President, I hope you will not take personally my next remark, because it is not intended in any way to be personal. It alludes to your office, but not to you as

a person. I have long held the opinion—I will continue to hold that opinion until someone proves to me that I am wrong—that the presiding officers of Parliament do not have the status they deserve.

The Hon. D. K. Dans yesterday was talking about the image—although he did not use that word—of parliamentarians outside this place. In Australia it is a very lowly image and I might say that parliamentarians deserve what they broadcast, and the image they have at the moment with the Australian population.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: That is only your opinion.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: As Mr Dans said yesterday evening, when one stands in his place to make a speech, he is expressing his opinion. So, I do not dispute what Mr Cooley says; it is only my opinion. However, I have seen other Parliaments and other parliamentarians around the world at work and I have seen from my own personal observation the difference with which they are regarded in the community.

I think we could do much through our presiding officers to uplift the tone of Parliament to a stage whereby its members automatically reflect that newly acquired dignity. That is not to say that you personally have no dignity, Mr President; you have, and so does the presiding officer in another place; so had your predecessors.

However, when I look at official and unofficial rankings of presiding officers within the State and Commonwealth I find that according to the official list published by the Federal Government, Mr President in the Western Australian Legislative Council and Mr Speaker in the Assembly rank No. 13 and 14 respectively in the order of precedence. I think that is too low.

According to the unofficial list in Western Australia, Mr President and Mr Speaker rank No. 5 and 6 respectively. I cannot for the life of me understand—if one goes back into history one might then understand—in the present-day situation why the Chief Justice, as admirable and wonderful a man as he is, should be ranked above the presiding officers of Parliament. I cannot understand why Ministers of the Crown outrank the presiding officers.

The unofficial order of precedence in this State is the Governor, the Premier, the Chief Justice, the Cabinet Ministers, the President and the Speaker. It is my opinion and my opinion only—although this opinion is supported by a presiding officer in another part of the world, in Jamaica—that the presiding officers should rank immediately after the Premier, and before the Chief Justice, because they are representatives of the people, while the Chief Justice is not elected but is appointed.

Naturally, the Governor heads the table; no-one would quarrel with that. He is then followed by the Premier; but I would put the Chief Justice after Cabinet Ministers because his role is with the judiciary, and he has no real connection with the people.

Historically, this was thought to be necessary, but in this day and age I believe the requirement has disappeared. I believe Parliament should seriously consider the role and duties of the presiding officers. It is not always appreciated that they must control the entire staff of Parliament House, that they are responsible for the entire functions of Parliament House and that their greatest responsibility is for the welfare and well-being of members of Parliament.

That is a fairly onerous task on its own, but in my opinion presiding officers do not get enough exposure to the public. They are not allowed to function as are presiding officers in other parts of the world, where they have adopted the Westminster parliamentary system.

I think perhaps one of the highlights—if it could be called that—of our recent history would have been the debacle which occurred in the Federal Parliament with the removal of Speaker Cope. I do not intend to criticise anyone; I was not there; I am not a member of that Parliament and when it comes to discussing that Parliament I do so as a citizen of Australia. However, I think the action did little for Parliament.

Again I do not intend to enter into personalities when I criticise the method by which the Speaker in another place was used during the term of a previous Government.

I think it is up to us as parliamentarians, if we require a presiding officer with dignity who is willing to look after the members and their interests, to establish an entirely different system of selection for our presiding officers. This is not a new theory, and it is not the first time I have spoken on this matter.

However, like the Hon. Clive Griffiths, given the opportunity I will stand up during Address-in-Reply debates and with other members, ride my favourite hobby horse. I would like to see the right to vote taken away entirely from the presiding officers.

Obviously, one could do that only if one were assured that a conclusive vote, without a tie, could be reached on the floor of the House. I do not think it is as difficult as some people imagine. I believe that once members elected their presiding officers, the procedure would then be followed that their seats immediately would be declared vacant and that the presiding officers would become the incumbents of the seat of "Parliament Hill". They would

hold that seat at the will of the members, until such time as they either wished to retire or the members wished them to retire.

A by-election could then take place for his seat on the floor of the House. If we speak of another place, or even if we speak of this place, it would then be quite impossible—particularly in the other place—to get a tie on the floor of the House when there are 51 members.

I think, in addition to that, a residence should be provided for each presiding officer, together with a full staff, because then he, in the order of precedence would be able to entertain visitors at his own residence. I know I am trying to jump 400 years of history, but one can be entertained by the Speaker in the House of Commons in his own accommodation. Naturally the person elected to be presiding officer would be automatically expected to resign from the party to which he is affiliated. There is no difficulty about that. The Speaker of the House of Commons manages it very well and, after all, we are modelled on the Westminster system.

There would, however, be several objections. There would be the question of this one and that one, but when it really comes down to facts every back-bencher—with the possible exception of perhaps some 5 per cent—would like, in his time in Parliament, to be a Minister or a presiding officer, or he may wish just to remain a back-bencher.

The opportunity is extremely limited and arising from this extremely limited opportunity comes some of the frustrations which the Hon. D. K. Dans was talking about last evening. I do not put that forward on the presiding officer's side as kite flying. I sincerely ask that someone look at the question and look at it very carefully.

Let us get away from the fact that the ruling, or whatever, that is made from the Chair has to go against one because the person is of the opposing party. Let us get away from the dreadful situation where government is in the hands of the presiding officer. It was never intended by any Parliament in the world that the presiding officer of the Parliament should virtually be the Government and obey the dictates of the Government of the day.

It is one of the tragedies of the situation we have inherited and I think ere long we will have to look closely at that aspect if we are to inspire public confidence in Parliament and in the parliamentary system.

There are people in the world today who are actively working for the destruction of the parliamentary system. They have been working hard at it for 200 years or more.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Without much success.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: As Mr Dans has interjected they have been working at it without a great deal of success, and this is only so because of the very imperfections of our system. Because of those imperfections—and I say this advisedly—the system is bound to be a success, because we can improve.

There is no theorist I know of who could write a book and say this is the manner in which government should be conducted. As Mr Cooley has reminded me, that is my opinion and that is the conviction the peoples of the nation should have. Time bears out the fact that although the parliamentary democracies, as we understand them, have their failings there is always room for improvement.

It is high time the back-benchers in this House and those in another place got together and decided on what improvements are really necessary and, having found those improvements, I hope they will have the courage to ask the Government of the day to implement them.

Nobody likes change, but sometimes change is necessary, and the only reason that this theory can be rebutted is that people do not wish to understand it. It is comfortable to stay as we are. It may be comfortable for the incumbent of the Chair you occupy, Mr President, and it will become less uncomfortable in the future. A great number of the situations in parliamentary democracies are defused by the occupant of your Chair.

I think that you, Sir, have given a tremendous example to this House and to the public at large by your attitude and demeanor since you have occupied that Chair. You have brought to the Chair a lifetime—over a quarter of a century—of parliamentary experience, and it is that sort of experience that is needed to enhance the prestige of your office, and in enhancing the prestige of your office to enhance the prestige of Parliament and its members.

As I see it this is the only way we will get people thinking, and thinking properly that this is the place on which they can rely; that is the place where unfettered debate takes place, and where just and equitable rulings are made.

We must, of course, have party politics; that is the very base on which our system is founded. We must have an Opposition, because if there were no Opposition there would be no Parliament. Even during the darkest hours of the 1939-1945 war the Westminster system of Parliament was kept going by an Opposition—albeit a token Opposition—but they wished to enshrine the fact that under our system they had the right to criticise the Government of the day.

This is what parliamentary democracy is all about. In spite of all the kite flying that has taken place in connection with the abolition of the second Chamber one realises that the majority of the rest of the world does not agree with it. There would be three or four places throughout the world where they do not have a second Chamber.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Is there any place in the world where the second Chamber has had one party in power for 85 years?

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: I have not really researched that aspect, but if that is the basis of the Opposition's argument I suggest that the Opposition parties get out and try to change the situation.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: We would if you amended the Electoral Act accordingly.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Who is the Leader of the Opposition in Soviet Russia?

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: It is probably the fellow with the biggest gun in his pocket.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: We are not talking about a dictatorship but about a democracy.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You should not make statements like that. In the province I represent there are four or five ships waiting to be loaded and you should not talk about people with guns in their pockets if you do not want the beef market to be further depleted.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: I am quite accustomed to these dialectic interjections, but I would say that as long as we do have a Parliament with all its imperfections we can always improve.

My only point in rising is to say that I think some of these improvements should be looked at and carried out, because I feel it would be to the benefit of the members of this State—not merely to the members of this House or of those in another place; but it will be to the benefit of the members of the State and, in this fashion, the complaints we receive as members of Parliament about this department or that department can be cut severely and Parliament will be allowed to function in the way it was originally intended that it should.

**THE HON. N. McNEILL** (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [3.10 p.m.]: Apart from myself there have now been some 29 speakers including those who contributed to the debate on the proposed amendment to the Address-in-Reply moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

As members are now fully aware it is customary at the closing of the Address-in-Reply debate for the Leader of the House to endeavour to make some reply or some comment on the various matters



raised by members during the debate; and I intend to adopt that traditional practice. I make the comment that I fully accept the situation that although not all members have spoken, my rising to speak to the motion does not close the debate, but it is generally accepted that it does so.

May I join with those other members who have spoken since the occurrence in expressing great regret about the resignation, owing to ill health, of His Excellency the Governor (Sir Hughie Edwards). It is a very great personal misfortune to him and I echo the sentiments expressed by other members, and trust he will be restored to good health at the earliest possible time so that he may enjoy full satisfaction and reward for the tremendous service he has given to Western Australia and the nation as a whole.

In the nature of a reminder, I draw attention to the remarks His Excellency made concerning the prospective visit in May of Her Royal Highness, Princess Anne, and her husband, Captain Phillips. I am sure we all look forward to their visit and trust that Princess Anne and her husband will enjoy to the full the benefits of their visit to Western Australia.

I also note with great regret the passing of a former member of this House, the Hon. Ruby Hutchison, a person I almost sat alongside when I first entered the Chamber. Of course, all the more senior members of the House know perhaps better than the others the contributions she made to this House and, in fact, what a colourful figure she was in pursuing her role as a very active member of the Legislative Council.

I make particular reference to that because she, as an active member of the Labor Party, gave real meaning to the position of a Legislative Councillor in pursuing an active role as a parliamentarian representing people. Criticisms have been made of what might be regarded as an anachronistic role played by the Legislative Council. It has been said, in fact, that the Legislative Council has no role to play, but I believe Mrs Hutchison's example gave the lie to those criticisms.

I also refer to the passing of the Hon. Hugh Leslie, O.B.E. I was in the House of Representatives at the time he was a member and he had the privilege of representing the people in both the Commonwealth and State Government. He had this experience first in the State Parliament and then in the Commonwealth Parliament whereas my experience, and that of the present Minister for Labour and Industry, were the reverse.

His Excellency referred to the efforts of our community in relieving the devastation caused by the cyclone in Darwin, and members here have referred to the co-operative effort made irrespective of

political affiliations. Mr Dans last night referred to the fact that there is something absolutely basic in the thinking of Australian people which prompts them to forget all differences in an emergency and thus make great contributions towards the alleviation of the distress, personal and otherwise, in which a particular section of the community is involved.

In this respect I wish to make some reference to the activities and operations of the State Emergency Service not only in connection with the cyclone in Darwin, but also in relation to cyclones Vida and Beverley in Western Australia. During these cyclones the State Emergency Service proved that Western Australia has the expertise necessary in such circumstances. The people have learned to live and cope with such situations and they do not have the same panic and emotions undergone by others who have not had a similar experience.

I can recall the experiences at Dwellingup. I was brought up with bushfire hazards always in mind. It was noticeable that the old hands took the Dwellingup fires not exactly in their stride, because they regarded them very seriously, but they were certainly able to cope better than others who had not had experience of bushfires. Those people were not capable emotionally to deal with the situation. Western Australia in this respect has proved that it is in a unique situation particularly in connection with cyclones as is, to a certain extent I suppose, Queensland.

The Governor's Speech referred to unemployment, and this was the subject of a good deal of exchange in the House, but I do not wish to take advantage of any lengthy opportunity to further debate the issue. However, during the course of their remarks, members of the Opposition stated that despite the fact that the Government had claimed it would overcome the problem of unemployment which was not necessarily all the fault of the Commonwealth Government, it had failed to do so. I think that at the time I indicated by interjection that perhaps the allegations were reversed on other occasions when a Government of a different political colour was in office.

I think it not only necessary, but desirable, to refer to the unemployment figures at the relevant time, certainly for the month prior to the opening of this Parliament. It was stated that Western Australia had the highest unemployment figure of all the States in Australia. I think we ought to keep these matters in their proper perspective and so I will quote from figures prepared by Treasury officers on the 19th March, 1975, and list the actual number of registered unemployed and unfilled vacancies. I think I should record the observations that are made.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: I think we said Western Australia was the second highest, not the highest.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I will accept Mr Cooley's observation that that is what he thinks was said. The document states—

In February the actual number of registered unemployed in Western Australia fell by 1,619 or 6.3% to 24,070. This was the largest percentage fall of all States although the level of unemployment at the end of the month was still a high 5.16% of the labour force.

For Australia as a whole the actual number of unemployed fell by 13,849 or 4.4% in February to 297,747.

So the fall for the rest of Australia was less than the fall for Western Australia. I believe seasonally adjusted figures are regarded as being more acceptable. In this connection the document states—

In seasonally adjusted terms, Western Australia was the only State to record a drop in the number of registered unemployed during February. For Western Australia there was a fall of 1.4% in the seasonally adjusted figures compared with a rise of 8.0% for Australia.

Only South Australia and Western Australia recorded an increase in the actual number of unfilled vacancies during the month. In Western Australia the increase was 754 or 26.5%. This was the highest State increase and compares with a fall of 9.6% for Australia.

The ratio of registered unemployed to unfilled vacancies in Western Australia was 6.69:1, whilst for Australia as a whole the ratio was 7.76:1.

The Hon. R. Thompson: In the latest set of figures this week the unfilled vacancies have also dropped.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: That may well be so. All I am endeavouring to do is to point out that it is a little unsound and unreliable for an Opposition to base an argument on a situation which is far from static—it moves up or down—and I think the interjection by the Leader of the Opposition indicates the unreliability of tending to base one's accusations on a particular matter at a particular time.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You do a fair bit of that in respect of the inflation rate. You are criticising the Federal Government about it all the time.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Under this Federal Government we have not seen it go down.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I was speaking about unemployment. If Mr Cooley wants to bring in the subject of inflation I will be happy to discuss it. I have not got the cutting here but I think Mr Cooley would

probably take a good deal more notice of a person who is far more eminent than I; that is, an American gentleman by the name of Professor Friedman, who is acknowledged as one of the greatest authorities and who was given considerable space in this morning's issue of *The West Australian*. He spoke about deficits in Government budgets, inflation, and the like. I will not widen my discussion—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Do you agree with Professor Friedman?

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You made a general statement that we were basing our argument on unsound ground.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I am far more prepared to accept the view of Professor Friedman than that of a number of political personalities who make observations of a pseudo-economic nature about the relationship between budget deficits and inflation.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I think his article was very good but there will be another five articles by economists who hold different views.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: But he is the best.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Not really. The Nobel Prize winner is the best.

The PRESIDENT: The Minister for Justice.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I pass from that subject to the speech on the Address-in-Reply motion which was given by the Hon. I. G. Pratt, my colleague in the Lower West Province. I would like to extend my compliments and congratulations to him for the speech he made in the House on Opening Day when moving the motion. As has been said by other speakers, it is not an experience which one greatly envies except that it carries with it a very considerable privilege, which I am sure Mr Pratt fully appreciates. He referred to inflation and unemployment, and I make no further observations about that.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I think I was the only person who spoke about unemployment.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: In view of the fact that the Government has now been in office for 12 months, and in view of a recent statement and questions asked in this House, I think I can with some justification join with Mr Pratt in expressing some confidence in the State Government and its ability to restore a steady influence on both inflation and unemployment in this State in the coming year. I say that with all hopefulness. The fact of the matter is, as members of the Opposition know, full employment is a policy common to all political parties of any repute in this country. Let us face it: no political party would contemplate even for a second adopting any other policy in relation to employment.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: And the consensus of opinion is that this is their undoing.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I think Mr Dans is theorising again in an economic area which perhaps—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I understand it very fully—much more fully than you think.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Mr Dans is anticipating me.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: All political parties in all western democracies believe in full employment.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Mr Cooley says you are a fibber. You should straighten him out.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I am sure, Mr President, you would not wish this debate to develop into a seminar on that subject.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not agree with you very often, but I agree with you on that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I think we should arrange for Mr Dans to straighten out Mr Cooley.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Mr Pratt referred to a number of matters which are of concern to him and to me—and, I am sure, to any member who may have an interest in what is and has been happening in the dairying industry. It is not my intention to analyse the observations he made because the matters to which he referred are at present under consideration; for instance, the negotiability of milk quotas which, I hope, is in the process of finally being resolved.

Mr Pratt also referred to the uncertainties in the industry and what might appear to be disunity. I regret that is in fact the situation. The dairying industry legislation which the Tonkin Government was responsible for introducing and which occupied so much of the time of the Parliament has not so far had the desired effect of bringing about the unification of the industry.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You chopped it around.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: It was not chopped around enough.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Mr McNeill spent over seven hours dealing with it.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: All I can say of Mr Claughton is that he should be presented with a small trowel—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Why a small one?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: —or a shovel—

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: It would be better in your hand so that you could cement the coalition.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: —because he spends so much time digging holes into which he himself can fall.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You would be ahead of me.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I suggest that Mr Claughton confine his observations—as I have been reminded to do on numerous occasions since I have been here—to matters of which he has a little knowledge.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are unfair; he would not be able to speak.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I find Mr Claughton has a lot of knowledge of many subjects.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I must read more of his speeches.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: If I may continue on the subject of the dairying industry, let me say that the objective has not so far been reached; we hope it will be and that unanimity of thought will be achieved. I hope that as opportunities are given to the industry—not just because of the Bill introduced by the Labor Government, but more as a consequence of the amendments made by the Parliament during the passage of that Bill—it may be able to place itself in a far more satisfactory and satisfying position than it is at the moment. I must agree with Mr Pratt that it is presently in a state of disquiet, and this is a matter of considerable concern to me, to the Government, and I am sure to all other members.

However, the Dairy Industry Authority, established as it was under legislation, has everything before it, because it has had barely 12 months' experience in operation. I am sure it realises it has the job ahead of it.

Mr Pratt also referred to the opportunity for the election of members representative of producers. My recollection of the Bill was that it made provision for representation in a manner which seemed to meet the wishes of all concerned at that time. Perhaps in the light of subsequent experience the procedure adopted was not the best one. I am aware that some moves were made—although I have really no idea of the degree of support for them—pressing for more opportunities for elective members. I do no more than record the fact that I am aware of the nature of the matter to which Mr Pratt referred.

He also made an observation on the necessity for a spirit of co-operation. I agree with him. Quite apart from the interests of the individual producers—which, of course, should be paramount—we as a Government and as a Parliament must also be conscious of the need for the maintenance of the industry and to ensure the availability of supply. It is and has been a matter of considerable sorrow to me that Western Australia has become a permanent importer of dairy produce. This circumstance first occurred a number of years ago; and you, Sir, will recall that, over a period of years in my capacity as a

private member in this place I asked successive questions directed at this very matter.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Did you say you asked an excessive number of questions?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: No. Mr Claughton's mind is running on again. I am sure he is so preoccupied with his own excesses that he is led to make incorrect interpretations.

Mr Pratt referred to the matter of environmental protection in Cockburn Sound. I think it was relevant that he should do so and that he should spell out some of the protective devices which are available, because this is a matter of importance. Mr Dans also made reference to it. I think Mr Pratt did the Parliament and the public a service by drawing attention to those bodies, groups, and institutions which are exercising a real, positive, and active interest in this question.

The matter of a jumbo steelworks has also been the subject of comment. I do not think, I need elaborate on the subject. It is well known that the report of a feasibility study on the matter will be available in the not-too-distant future. It is without question that Kwinana is one of the sites to which consideration is being given. I go no further than to say that the time for us to evaluate the situation is when the feasibility study is completed. I recognise the observations made by Mr Dans.

I do not intend to devote more than a moment to the comments of the Leader of the Opposition; because as we all know his remarks culminated in an amendment to the Address-in-Reply which was exhaustively dealt with at the time.

The Hon. R. Thompson: By the Opposition, but not by the Government.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I intend no disrespect when I say that I need make no further observations on that matter. The Leader of the Opposition knows that I made some observations on his speech on a previous occasion, and it would be pointless for me to cover that ground again.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I can agree with you. You can hardly offer criticism of my speech because I was castigating the Government, and everything I said was true.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I will agree with the Leader of the Opposition that in his speech he castigated the Government. As Mr Dellar so often reminds us, that is a right which is available to him. However, I disagree with his other proposition because his castigation and criticisms were not justified. I will not develop the subject further other than to say many references were made to that booklet which he and so many other members of the Labor Party have read so avidly.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I am reading it now.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: That is right. In view of the difficulties apparently experienced by political parties in raising funds for political purposes, it is perhaps a matter of regret that the Liberal Party did not impose a considerable charge on the sale of the booklet. It would be a best seller amongst members of the Labor Party. In terms of sales it would be the top of the pops.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I want to draw you out in respect of my castigation of the Government. Three of the things for which I castigated the Government are now being put into effect by the Government. The major one is assistance to beef farmers. At the time Mr Lewis told me I was wrong and that it couldn't be done.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Not in the way you wished to do it.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Does this mean we will pay more for beef?

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Well, labour costs and all other costs rise; why should not it be applied to the rural industries?

The PRESIDENT: Order! Would the Minister for Justice please continue.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Thank you, Mr President. Again, I previously made observations on the questions of meat prices and the beef situation, and I will not use this occasion to discuss those matters.

I pass to the speech of the Hon. G. E. Masters. I think it should be appreciated by members—if it is not already fully appreciated—that he obviously studied His Excellency's Speech without the degree of bias with which certain other members studied it in their search for criticisms of the Commonwealth Government. Mr Masters spoke in particular—and I am sure with some satisfaction—of matters relating to his province. He referred to the Kalamunda Hospital. I am sure we all share with him his satisfaction at that matter being resolved.

Mr Claughton referred to education and particularly to the problem of pre-school education. Again, this matter has been handled by my colleague, the Minister for Education; and, in any case, after all the exchanges on the subject which took place in this House I think I would be uselessly wasting the time of this House if I were to canvass the ground again.

Mr Claughton also referred to the Local Government Act and, more particularly, to provision for referendums. I do not intend to discuss that matter now because I am quite sure it will be appreciated it is the subject of legislation, and the House and Mr Claughton will have the opportunity to discuss it in more detail at a later date.

No doubt the honourable member will receive answers to his questions in due course.

Mr Ferry took time out to discuss the tactics of a certain company, particularly in country towns. He made allegations, and not lightly at that, which I referred to the appropriate Minister, the Minister for Labour and Industry, and as some information comes back to me I will ensure that it is conveyed to Mr Ferry.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Before you go on, could I ask whether you were able to refer to the appropriate department, the matter relating to roads which I raised in my speech?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I am sorry I am not able to supply that information to the honourable member at the moment. I recall the matter being raised by the honourable member. It was also the subject of a question. If I remember correctly I did give some information about the use of funds on Liege Street, but I am not in a position to give any more information on that subject. Nevertheless it has been noted and I will endeavour to obtain some further information on it for Mr Claughton.

Miss Elliott, like her predecessor in this House—a lady to whom I made earlier reference—found it necessary to take to task the existence of the Legislative Council and its representation. Similar comments and observations have been made by other speakers. I thought the Labor Party may have learned something of a lesson from recent State elections, the last one in particular, and also the previous by-election on this very question, because I seem to recall that, in fact, an endeavour was made to make the subject a major issue at the time by Labor Party campaigners. If my recollection serves me correctly—and I think the facts bear this out—that campaign was not very successful.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not recall that being a part of our official campaign.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: It may not have been part of the Labor Party's official campaign but it certainly constituted an active part of the campaign.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It was Mr A. R. Tonkin's active campaign.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I could almost take some exception to the reference made by Miss Elliott in protesting about the undemocratic, unfair, and unsatisfactory parliamentary system in this State. With great respect, Mr President, to both you and Miss Elliott, I think those words must come a little close to being a reflection on this House. I do not know whether, in fact, that is what she intended.

We should bear in mind what has actually happened in the Legislative Council in recent years in relation to the votes

of the House and the passage of Bills. Certainly Mr Clive Griffiths and other members have made more than passing reference to the fact that in many instances Bills that have been sponsored by a Liberal-Country Party Government have had extremely stormy passages in this House, and on which members of both the Country Party and the Liberal Party have crossed the floor. I can say, myself, that on no less than two occasions I have been one of those members, when you were the Leader of the House, Mr President, who was very much in favour of seeing the defeat of Government legislation. I say that not with any pride or satisfaction to myself, but I do say it with pride in the operations and procedures of the Legislative Council.

*Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.04 p.m.*

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I was making some reference to the operations of the Legislative Council, and I commented on the actions of members of the Government parties during the term of office of a previous Liberal-Country Party Government. I was adverting to the remarks of Miss Elliott. Miss Elliott and other Opposition members considered that in view of the numbers in this House, the Labor Party has not had a majority, and that was mentioned by Mr Cooley today by interjection when he referred to the period of office of the Labor Government.

Those of us who have been members of this Chamber for a number of years—I myself have not been here that many years—will recall the approach of members generally, including those of the Labor Party to all matters that came before the House. In those days all members considered it to be a House of Review; and in fact that was its role.

I think there is a good deal of truth in the remarks made by Mr Clive Griffiths last evening, although they could have been made by some other member. He drew attention to the fact that it was really the attitude of members themselves which determined whether this was a House of Review, or whether this was a totally political Chamber.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Surely you do not believe that!

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Indeed I do. I go back to the period which you, Mr President, will no doubt recall. After the passage of legislation to confer adult franchise, which legislation was introduced by yourself, this House became a representative House on equal terms with members of the other House.

The members of this Chamber, perhaps informally, elected to sit in seats of their choice in order to convey the image of this being a House of Review in respect of all matters that came before it. That was

basic to their thinking. I realise that happened before Miss Elliott and certain other members were elected. It was a very commendable attitude which those members adopted.

There was great unanimity in their thinking, and it was an attitude which had to be perpetuated in the interests of the Government and the passage of legislation, particularly as it affected the Legislative Council. The fact that there are members in this Chamber today from the Government parties who sit on the opposite side of the House—which appears to be in opposition to the party in Government—indicates the attitude has continued to be adhered to.

As has so often been said, it is unnecessary to restate the extreme rarity of departures by Labor Party members in crossing the floor of the Chamber when voting on legislation in respect of which they had already made a decision at their Caucus meeting. If that is their way of operation, I am not critical of it. However, those members should also respect the fact that as Government parties we choose to operate in a somewhat different fashion.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You are only saying that.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Of course we do, and there has been evidence of that on many occasions. In saying that I am not in any way indicating, nor am I subscribing to the view, that this amounts to disloyalty to the Liberal Party, to the Labor Party, or to the Country Party. It goes far deeper than that.

Let us bear in mind that we have been elected as representatives of the people because of certain beliefs and philosophies we hold. We are here because the people have elected us on that basis. This applies to the Labor Party as it does to the Government parties.

If we depart from those principles we suffer not only criticism in this House; in fact, we face the strictures and the criticisms of those who have elected us for certain beliefs and philosophies which we hold. Once again we have an illustration of the basis on which members have been elected. I can mention the representation from the North Province at a certain period, the representation from the North Metropolitan Province, and the representation from the South-East Province. The significance of such representation is well and truly appreciated.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: How do you account for the fact that 23 Bills introduced by the Tonkin Labor Government were defeated, and 88 Bills introduced by the Liberal-Country Party Government were passed?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: In the period from 1971 to 1973 the Legislative Council passed no less than 293 Bills. I do not think that can be regarded in anyone's

language as unfair or unsatisfactory. I would remind members that Bills are destroyed by means other than defeat in the House. Some Bills lapse; some are referred to Select Committees; and others are not reported. I recall a Bill of some significance which was not reported in this House. Other Bills might be discharged from the notice paper, or left on the notice paper and subsequently lapse on the prorogation of Parliament.

To refer to Bills which were discharged in the Council, I recall that in 1971 the Bill dealing with used goods and materials was discharged from the notice paper. In 1972 the Bills dealing with local government, child welfare, and plant diseases registration fee, were also discharged.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Would you like to refer to the amendment to the Criminal Code? This measure was referred to a Select Committee by this Government against its wishes. Now the Government will not take any action on the report that has been presented. I am talking about the legislation dealing with homosexuality. It has been reported in the Press that your Government backed by the members in this House referred the Bill to a Select Committee, but now you do not have the courage to implement the recommendations.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: That was a terrible Bill; under it you were going to legalise bestiality.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The Government has the report of the Honorary Royal Commission, but it does not have the courage to implement the recommendations.

THE PRESIDENT: I would ask the Minister for Justice to continue with his remarks.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Turning to the Bills which lapsed in this House, in 1971 the Bill which sought to amend the Transport Commission Act lapsed; and in 1972 the Bills dealing with the abolition of the death penalty, with jetties, and with the Electoral Act similarly lapsed.

In 1973 the Bills dealing with the repeal of road maintenance tax, and rivers and estuaries also lapsed. The inference drawn was that all those Bills introduced by the previous Labor Government did not get through, because they were defeated. I have already pointed out there are other reasons for Bills not being passed than by being defeated.

I would like to make the observation that in respect of certain pieces of legislation the Labor Party has a vested interest in the existence of the Legislative Council, because it realises that the Council acts as some sort of protection in preventing certain undesirable legislation from going through.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That is why we are relying so heavily on the Australian Government.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: In view of certain events in the Eastern States and dealings with the Commonwealth Government, the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition have given some substance to the belief that the Labor Party thinks there is some value in the existence of the Legislative Council. On one occasion the previous Premier (Mr Tonkin) indicated that his Government need not worry about a certain piece of legislation, because the Legislative Council would not pass it.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Rubbish!

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I am basing my recollections on what was reported in the Press at the time. I have already referred to the Bill which brought about adult franchise. Much criticism has come from some sections—but not all sections—of the Labor Party about the role of this House and its representation.

I was not in this House during 1963-64 as you, Mr President, would well know, when a series of Bills were introduced in order to do certain things with regard to elections. Those Bills included the Constitution Act Amendment Bill, the Electoral Districts Act Amendment Bill, and the Electoral Act Amendment Bill. I do not have any recollection of the Labor Party opposing those propositions at the time. In fact, I think members of the Labor Party supported them.

The Hon. R. Thompson: We have had a lot of second thoughts about them.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I ask members to please correct me if I am wrong but I feel certain the Labor Party supported the propositions. The remarks of the Hon. F. J. S. Wise in relation to certain of those Bills, at the time, are on record, but I do not think I need to refer to them.

The Hon. R. Thompson: We will, later in the session.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: So, there were opportunities. The Labor Party supported the general propositions which were covered, and which introduced major and very significant changes to the electoral laws in Western Australia.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: It took the Labor Party a long time to persuade members opposite to agree to the proposals.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. McNEILL: All I can say in reply to Mr Cloughton's comment is, "Rubbish!" That is the most appropriate comment I can make. It was a Liberal Government which introduced the legislation.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Stick to the facts.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the Minister please resume his seat. When order is called for will honourable members please maintain order and not continue to interject.

### *Point of Order*

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: By way of explanation, I refuse to be quiet if the Minister is insulting.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order! There is no point during this debate where the Hon. Mr Cloughton can rise during the Minister's speech, or during anybody else's speech, and make a point of explanation. It can be done subsequently.

### *Debate Resumed*

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I was in the course of saying that the legislation which provided those significant changes was introduced by a Liberal Government in this State. I made no other observation or reference. The fact is we know what the situation was previously and under which there was a restricted property franchise for representation in the Legislative Council.

I think it is perhaps significant—bearing in mind that the changes were as a consequence of legislation which you, Mr President, were responsible for introducing into this House—that we find ourselves in our present position, or that the Labor Party finds itself in its present position of not having improved its numbers but, in fact, having suffered some depletion of its numbers.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Only minor.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I also remind members that the last redistribution which took place occurred during the administration of the previous Tonkin Government. I believe there was some opportunity on that occasion to at least endeavour to correct what might be claimed to be an unsatisfactory and undemocratic situation.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You cannot influence a redistribution; legislation does that.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I am perfectly aware of the observation made.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: How about getting on to the good parts of your speech.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Nothing will take me away from the point I have made, and which I have made on previous occasions. This is a problem to which all Governments have subscribed. I refer to the principle of representative government based on electoral districts, bearing in mind area, distances, vastness, and the variation of the total electorate of Western Australia. All Governments have subscribed to this principle. They have subscribed to this principle historically, and there is no question about that. The fact is that even within the present system, let me

say—and let me repeat—that in any particular electorate there is one vote-one value under which any person has equal chance of winning a seat as against any other person simply because the elections are conducted on an electorate basis.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Those are superficial arguments, and you know it.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not think we should waste time because in 10 years this place will be a museum.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Will it be taken over by Ho Chi-Minh or Mao Tse-tung?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I think he is mummified already.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: There were some other matters raised by Miss Elliott which affect other portfolios and to which I do not yet have the answers. However, those matters will be followed up.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Most of your speech has been history. I was hoping you would tell us something about what this Government would do to affect the finances of the people of Western Australia.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: The Leader of the Opposition seems to think he will draw me away from my subject with a question such as that. I will disappoint him. He knows perfectly well the role and the function of the Leader of the House in replying or making a statement in a debate of this nature. So I let his observation pass.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer referred once again to the provision of amenities in the remote and sparsely populated northern portion of the State. He was subjected to some remarks by Mr Dellar last evening. Mr Tozer commented on regional administration and his remarks have been referred to the appropriate Minister. I have been advised that his comments in relation to regional administration are in accord with the policy laid down by the Premier, and the manner in which the decentralised government is being established.

Each Government department is required to strengthen its services in the region by giving its senior officers more power and authority. The Department of Industrial Development is in the same category, and if it is found desirable to establish an officer of that department in the area then that will be done. That is not history, if that is the point which the Leader of the Opposition was raising.

The administrator, and his staff, are not overriding direction in the various departments, but are playing the role of an activator with departments, local governments, and various local committees. We can anticipate, as has already been stated, the early establishment of a regional administration centre to service the Kimberley, initially, and in due course similar establishments elsewhere as the policy develops.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis made some observations regarding changes in the structure of cereal marketing boards, and his comments have been referred to the Minister for Agriculture. I must record the fact that Mr Lewis placed the facts on the line in his defence of the confidentiality of negotiations between Governments and between the State Government in its business negotiations with companies. I think to accept criticism of confidentiality in these areas, and to discredit it as unnecessary secrecy in government, is not a valid charge.

In respect of the Government's pre-primary education policy, the Hon. Miss McAleer once again made a very useful contribution, particularly with regard to her suggestion for resolving some of the difficulties in coping with kindergarten services in the Upper West Province. I have no doubt that similar difficulties exist in many lightly-populated centres, and I believe the benefits of the system will be widely felt. The honourable member also spoke of continuing difficulties in procuring normal living amenities in country areas; some State, and some Commonwealth.

I regret I was not present in the House when the Hon. Grace Vaughan was speaking. I say, "regret" because I was called out on parliamentary business. I believe Mrs Vaughan took issue with some of the remarks made by the Hon. Gordon Masters. What is relevant in this general comment is in the reference to "bludgers" regarding some of the pension rackets. I do not know whether those claims can be substantiated. Certainly, a reference was made in *The Sunday Times* of the 30th March, 1975, under the heading, "Pensions racket revealed". I think it was described as a multi-million dollar racket in the Society Security field.

I think the remarks of Brigadier Steer, a Salvation Army officer, in relation to this matter were relevant. His remarks appeared in the *Daily News* of the 13th February, 1975, under the heading, "People who can't cope". This particular reference was to the people described as drifters, but I think it is also very relevant. I will also refer to another Press article which appeared in *The West Australian* and which refers to a nationwide survey carried out by the Australian Institute of Urban Studies. The article lists a number of problems.

The final problem mentioned in the report refers to the lack of incentive to work. I am not making my observation in any critical sense. This is the system, and if a group such as that feels the whole operation of the government system in social security in its various forms, combined with other forces no doubt, is contributing to what is described as lack of incentive to work then it does not spell out anything of great advantage to us as



a nation in the future. This is possibly one of the ongoing disadvantages of the system.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan also referred to education and community welfare which, I think, will be catered for by remarks or comments, or reports to me from my colleagues administering those particular portfolios.

The Hon. David Wordsworth spoke of trade union influences affecting the meat export market. I think his remarks are valid and they came in for some comment and criticism from the Hon. Des Dans. I have no further information by way of expansion or explanation on his comments, but they will be referred to the appropriate Minister and a reply will be conveyed to the honourable member in due course.

I think the remarks of the Hon. Tom Knight also referred to some unemployment benefit anomalies which appeared to dissuade people from seeking employment, on the one hand, and which rendered the assistance ineffective, on the other hand, when the money was spent unwisely. I do not think I need to elaborate. I think there is some relevance in the references I made a moment ago.

Mr Knight also expressed some concern about the possible discontinuance of the Perth-Albany rail service. For his benefit I have passed his remarks on to the Minister for Transport for comment, and the reply will be made available in due course. I think Mr Tom Knight's remarks on the Government's decision to carry out necessary alterations to homes of disabled people who are physically capable of living in a family environment were a real contribution.

I believe these comments will be of particular interest to the Minister, because these are very disadvantaged people. The honourable member will receive further information on this subject in due course.

You will appreciate, Mr President, that the remaining speakers spoke last evening and, in the case of Mr John Williams, just today, so I have not had much opportunity to study their comments. In fact, I believe I have already referred to some matters raised by Mr Dans during the course of my comments this afternoon. When concluding his address to the motion, Mr Dans was good enough to summarise the points about which he sought information. I have noted these matters, and although I am unable to supply the information at the moment, I believe they are relevant observations and the honourable member will be supplied with answers in due course.

Mr Dans referred to the role of the Legislative Council. I do not intend to enlarge any further on that subject. Mr Dans referred also to the lack of amenities in State Housing Commission estates, such as swimming pools. The comments made

by Mr Mick Gayfer, by way of interjection, were very relevant, and I feel due note ought to be taken of them. Earlier in my speech I referred to our great community efforts in times of national disasters, such as the Darwin cyclone. We really need a resurgence of desire on the part of the people to operate more on a self-help basis. Perhaps Mr Gayfer was referring to centres at Corrigin, Cunderdin, Narembeen, or any number of other places in his electorate. There are many such centres in country areas. No matter what amount of assistance is given, in some cases no successful result is achieved.

Last Saturday afternoon, representing my colleagues, the Minister for Recreation and the Premier, I was present at the opening of three centres in the City of Stirling. I made a point then which I believed to be completely valid. Even though such centres are provided and money is made available from State or Federal Government sources, unless there is desire on the part of the local people to make these things work, they will be unsuccessful and not fully utilised.

The building of a swimming pool, or the establishment of a community centre, will not in itself make the people live happily. We cannot throw a great many people together, subdivide the land, and hope that the area will become a living community. A swimming pool or a community centre provides something of an outlet, but it does not necessarily create what is basically so important in the operation of a community, and that is the spirit. It is this spirit that provides the drive and initiative. These comments apply just as much to the metropolitan area as they do to country areas, and even in the very remote areas. We must keep things in perspective. More and more people are expectant of Government handouts and Governments funds. Unless they get these Government handouts, they think nothing can be done. Our forebears and antecedents who built up community centres in so many areas would writhe to see this attitude so prevalent today. It has grown up simply because of the theoretical or academic approach to the provision of these real expressions of community living.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I could have been thinking of Woodanilling.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I believe that interjection is very relevant indeed, and it did not fall on deaf ears because I notice the Hon. Grace Vaughan has made a remark.

A comment has been reported to me, although I do not know whether accurately reported, but it was certainly interpreted in this way, that at a Labor Party seminar on rural affairs the Hon. Grace Vaughan advocated that small communities which

could not operate economically ought to go by the board, or be phased out. If we accept the basis of the existence of community centres on this academic approach, then we are lost. Mr Gayfer, and more particularly Mr Heltman, will know, as other members will know, that every farming enterprise in this State at certain stages could not have been regarded as economic by any stretch of the imagination. I make that historic reference, despite the earlier comments of the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: It will get that way again.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: These enterprises survived, but had they been subjected to what I now describe as tests of viability, they would never have got off the ground. If we were to operate on the basis that those who do not satisfy certain criteria are out, we would destroy all initiatives at the same time. There would be no challenge left to the people.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You do not subscribe to Sir Charles Court's statement, "Get big or get out"?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Sir Charles Court has not subscribed to that theory.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It has been reported in the Press.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: And no members of our party subscribe to that theory.

The Hon. J. Heltman: If you want to know who said it, it was Doug Shepherd.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: And also Doug Anthony.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Whoever said it was wrong.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: It is quite irrelevant anyway.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It was never refuted in the Press.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: What is important is the reported statement of Mrs. Vaughan.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Thank you.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Mrs Vaughan said there is no place for small communities such as Woodanilling. I am one of those people who has had some knowledge of the community of Woodanilling over a long period. People in rural areas, in a community sense as well as in an economic sense, have made a tremendous contribution to this State. Without them we are left with the metropolitan area, and not a very economic metropolitan area at that. The truth of this statement became very apparent during the period of the rural depression when the decline in rural industry was not offset or compensated for by manufacturing or secondary industries. The people in the metropolitan area suffered considerably as a consequence. So if these statements made by Mrs

Vaughan are in any way correct, and if they illustrate the thinking of the Labor Party, it is a rather tragic thing.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: It would have shown wisdom if you had checked on the statements before dwelling at length on them.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: They have not been refuted.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: If this is the thinking of the Labor Party, it substantiates the criticism of so many opponents of the Whitlam Government, and not necessarily political opponents, but opponents of its policies concerning rural industries. I believe it puts things into perspective.

In his comments about the Legislative Council as a House of Review, Mr Dans said that it is established under our Constitution, and that is the law, the absolutely basic and fundamental law of this State. As I said earlier, it behoves all of us as members to do our best to make it operate in the way I believe Mr Dans suggested. I feel the purpose of the remarks of the honourable member was to suggest some improvements in the system. He made the observation that this is a party House, and one of its downfalls—my word, not his—was the presence in this Chamber of Ministers of the Government. I took out some details, and I found out that in the Forrest Ministry, 1890-91, Sir George Shenton and Stephen Parker were Colonial Secretaries, Edward H. Wittenoom was the Minister for Mines and Education, and George Randall was Colonial Secretary and Minister for Education, representing the Government in the Legislative Council.

During 1930 to 1933, the Hon. Charles F. Baxter was the only Minister in this House. From the Throssell Ministry in 1901 to the Brand Ministry, there were generally two Ministers in the Council, and on the 17th August, 1965, during the Brand Ministry, my colleague, the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon, was appointed to the Ministry and became the third Minister in this House. So virtually throughout its history there have been Ministers in this House, and for some good, sound, valid reasons.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I was not challenging that.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: It is laid down in the Constitution that there have to be Ministers in this House.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: That is exactly what I said.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I am fully aware of that; I gave an opinion.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I am sorry, Mr. Dans, I was answering Mr Cloughton.

I was merely putting this on the record. We have seen some improvements, as I instanced earlier, such as adult franchise.

Of course, consequential improvements arose from those very significant pieces of legislation of the 1963-64 period.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths spoke about the State Housing Commission administration, the Commonwealth and local government funds scheme, and more particularly, an item about which he went on at some length, the MRPA decision about a tavern site. These matters will be the subject of some further investigation and the result will be conveyed to the honourable member in due course.

I think Mr Dellar's remarks were to a very large extent directed towards the comments of Mr Tozer, and I feel there is little I can say about them.

Finally, on a closing note I wish to refer to the remarks of Mr John Williams today. He put the debate back into perspective when he commented that this House is deserving of a certain status, and he reminded members of this. I am sure that due note was made of his remarks, and I am aware, of course, that certain of those remarks had some bearing on your high office of President of this Legislative Council, Sir.

To those members who have made observations or who have raised questions to which I have made no reference I give the undertaking that I will have the issues they have raised conveyed to the relevant Ministers and departments and will supply the appropriate information direct to the members concerned.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Does that include my question?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Yes. I am grateful to members for their contributions to the Address-in-Reply debate and I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Question put and passed; the Address-in-Reply thus adopted.

#### *Presentation to Lieutenant-Governor*

**THE HON. N. McNEILL** (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [4.46 p.m.]: I move—

That the Address-in-Reply be presented to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator by the President and such members as may desire to accompany him.

Question put and passed.

#### **ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE**

**THE HON. N. McNEILL** (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [4.47 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

#### *Administrator of the North-West: Functions*

**THE HON. J. C. TOZER** (North) [4.47 p.m.]: I believe the House should defer its adjournment for a short time to clear up a question which arose during the

debate yesterday, when Mr Dellar referred to me personally. From information which I will provide to the House, it will be seen that Mr Dellar reflected upon the truthfulness of some of the comments I made during the Address-in-Reply debate.

I suggest that before we adjourn there is a need to clarify this matter once and for all. During the Address-in-Reply debate I outlined the history of the administrative set-up which existed in the north-west to cope with the rather special circumstances existing there.

#### *Point of Order*

**The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON**: Mr President, I believe this is a matter that should be cleared up by way of personal explanation, as provided for in the Standing Orders.

**The PRESIDENT**: I do not think there is any substance to the point of order. The honourable member is speaking to the motion that the House do now adjourn.

#### *Debate Resumed*

**The Hon. J. C. TOZER**: During the time I was speaking about this special administrative set-up I carefully avoided using the names Harry McGuigan and John Tozer. By interjection, Mr Dellar challenged the truthfulness of one particular assertion and as you know, Mr President, I tried not to be diverted by these unseemly interjections.

That would have finished the question, but unfortunately Mr Dellar would not leave well alone and last night persisted with this business that when the administrator terminated his employment in the north-west in fact he was not out of work. In fact, the administrator was dismissed from his post and was out of work, and I have brought along evidence to prove that this was the case.

Although I did not mention my name during the Address-in-Reply debate, it was quite clear that I was the person to whom Mr Dellar referred; there is a fair chance that I would know more about this situation than would most other people.

**The Hon. S. J. Dellar**: I would hope so.

**The Hon. J. C. TOZER**: I do not like airing my personal affairs in public, but it has become necessary because this matter has been bandied around the Parliament of Western Australia at odd times during the last three years, and I feel the matter should be clarified. Having presented my proof, I hope that Mr Dellar will buy me a glass of beer by way of apology after the House adjourns.

I should like to commence by reading extracts from three letters in my possession. The first is dated the 18th October,

1971, the full text of which reads as follows—

Dear Mr Tozer,

As you are aware, there have been progressive changes in the circumstances surrounding the development of the North of Western Australia.

In the early 1960's, activities were against a background of very small and isolated communities, poor communications, and financially and technically weak local authorities. At that stage there was considered to be a need for the local authorities to have on-the-spot guidance, advice and aid by a representative of the State Government.

It was for this purpose that the office of the Administrator for the North West was created and it has performed a valuable service.

As the circumstances underlying the original concept have markedly changed, it is considered that the time is now opportune to bring about a reorganisation in the administration in the North.

A decision has been taken to modify the existing administration in the North and the Acting Co-ordinator of Development and Acting Chairman of the North West Planning and Co-ordinating Authority, Mr D. C. Munro, has been requested to discuss this matter with you.

I will await the advice of the Acting Co-ordinator in respect to the above but I would like to take this opportunity of thanking you for your efforts and what you have done while you have been resident in the North, particularly during the period of the current Government.

Yours sincerely,

H. E. GRAHAM, M.L.A.  
Minister for the North West.

That was the first indication I, as the holder of this post of administrator, had that the Government contemplated, in any way or form, to change the situation.

The next letter is a brief one from the Acting Co-ordinator of Development and Chairman of the North West Planning and Co-ordinating Authority. It reads as follows—

Dear Sir

I wish to confirm the telephone advice of the Secretary of the Authority that the Hon. Minister for the North West, Mr. H. E. Graham, wishes me to discuss with you at the earliest the proposed modification of the existing administration in the North. I am advised that you have received separate written advice from your Minister.

For this purpose I anticipate seeing you at 9.30 a.m. on Thursday, October 21 in my office in this building.

That letter was also dated the 18th October, 1971. The third letter is dated the 26th October and is from Mr H. E. Graham, then Minister for the North-West and in part states—

I wish to confirm discussions which you had on October 21st with Mr D. C. Munro, Acting Co-ordinator of Development and Acting Chairman, North West Planning and Co-ordinating Authority.

You are now advised that a decision has been taken to abolish the position of Administrator—North West and formal notice is given of the cancellation of your Indenture to take place three calendar months from the date of this letter, as provided for in Clause 2 of the Indenture.

The next item to which I wish to refer is a letter to the Under-Treasurer signed by the deputy co-ordinator, Mr T. J. Lewis. Its heading is, "J. C. Tozer—Termination of Contract" and, in part, reads as follows—

The Administrator for the North West Mr. J. C. Tozer's contract was terminated on the 26th January, 1972.

Under its terms the agreement provided for payment of Recreational and Long Service Leave on a pro rata basis.

Hereunder, for your consideration, are details of payments due.

I do not want to state the actual amounts; however, I will read the headings, which are as follows—

Accrued Long Service Leave  
Pro Rata Long Service Leave  
Accrued Annual Leave  
Pro Rata Annual Leave

Under the heading, "Taxation", 5 per cent of the lump sum due to me was calculated. It is well known that 5 per cent of a retiring allowance is the amount that is actually taxed. In other words, the total salary is not taxed; only 5 per cent of a retiring lump sum is taxed. Mr Lewis continued—

If you concur I will submit the payment for approval by the Minister for Development and Decentralisation on his return to Perth.

A senior Treasury officer noted in writing on the bottom of this letter as follows—

Deputy Co-ordinator

The above calculations of the retiring allowances due to J. C. Tozer have been checked and found correct.

The emphasis that I make is the matter under discussion was "a retiring allowance".

The next item to which I wish to refer is a taxation return. It is my personal copy and therefore cannot be regarded as valid documentary evidence of the return which was delivered to the Taxation Department for the year ended the 30th June, 1972.

However, I should like to refer to the triplicates of the group certificates. Certificate 1126373 notes the employee's address as the Department of the North West and sets out the instalments deducted. The period of employment was shown as being from the 1st July, 1971, to the 2nd December, 1971.

At this time, the switch was made and the administration was transferred to the authority of the Department of Development and Decentralisation. The second group certificate, No. 662193 shows the employer's name as the Department of Development and Decentralisation, sets out instalments deducted, and gives the date of employment as being from the 6th December, 1971, to the 26th January, 1972.

The third group certificate is numbered 662213 and shows the period of employment as being from the 13th March, 1972, to the 30th June, 1972. In other words, the three certificates reveal that this particular person was unemployed for the period the 26th January, 1972, to the 13th March, 1972. If anybody wishes to pursue the matter, the file number with the Taxation Department is 167788.

The letter to the Under-Treasurer refers to the termination of my contract; I think it should be clearly understood that this was a five-year contract, and that only two years had been served.

The Hon. R. Thompson: What are you trying to prove?

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: It was the third contract I had entered into with the State, the first two having been served out to completion.

I think I have shown that the previous administrator was unemployed, and so I will welcome the glass of beer that Mr Dellar is going to buy for me.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I wouldn't buy you a glass of water.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: I only wish I could extract a similar type of apology from Mr Graham, Mr Bickerton, Mr Evans, and others who have made the same silly comment in this Parliament.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: How do you know they have made it?

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: The reference is quite clear, and if any honourable member wishes to refer to the *Hansard* record over the last three years, I will provide him with the references. Mr Bickerton and Mr Evans voiced their opinions loud and clear, when the explanation was made

very well by Mr Alan Ridge, member for Kimberley. I refer members to *Hansard* No. 3 of 1973, pages 2486 to 2489. I do not intend to read the extracts now, but it is there if anyone wishes to read what these people said. They made the same untrue comment that Mr Dellar made; namely, that the administrator was not sacked.

Just in case there is any misunderstanding on this question of the transfer in my employment, I came down from Port Hedland looking for a job. The last thing I wanted to take on was a job with the Government of that day. I did not think very highly of that Government.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I wonder why?

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: That is a fair question.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I wonder why they transferred you.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: I did not think very highly of that Government after the way it had treated me. However, beggars cannot be choosers so I took the opportunity that was presented to me and accepted a position with the Department of Development and Decentralisation. I have in my possession a copy of the Executive Council's order. It was departmental No. PSB 324/71, where a person called John Carmichael Tozer was appointed Administrative Officer, Townsites, with the Department of Development and Decentralisation at a salary of \$11 500.

It is worth mentioning that the salary this man enjoyed when he held the job of administrator was \$16 784. I also comment that even as Administrative Officer, Townsites, I enjoyed a higher salary than I would have enjoyed as a member of Parliament at that time; this still would be the case. Despite my reticence about again joining the service of the Government, I enjoyed my job. It made full use of my long experience in local government and in fact enabled me to keep close contact with the urban development in the Pilbara.

As a last word may I refer to what the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council had to say on page 410 of *Hansard* dated the 26th March. He said—

Before you go any further, we were most disappointed with your activities and the way you worked.

That comment was made by way of interjection, and I do not know on what basis Mr Thompson made the comment.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You were blowing your bags out and saying what a good bloke you were and what a wonderful job you had done and I pointed out that we were all disappointed with you as was the previous Government.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: Mr Thompson was not a Minister at that time so I cannot see what grounds he had for making such a remark. However, I am not very

concerned with Mr Thompson's interjections; as members know I do not usually concern myself with interjections.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You must do—you quoted one.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: Then, last night, Mr Dellar also rambled on on the same subject.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I did not ramble on. I took far less time than you did.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: I would now like to refer back to the letter I received from Mr Graham dated the 26th October, 1971, in which he said—

You have been associated with the North West Department, previously as Assistant Administrator and latterly as Administrator—North West and you have seen remarkable progress in the North West during your term of office.

I can assure you that your efforts and those of your predecessor contributed in no small way to overcoming many of the difficulties that must inevitably arise with such rapid expansion.

On behalf of the Government, I would like to place on record its appreciation of the work that you have done.

That letter was written by a senior Minister on behalf of the Labor Government.

The Hon. R. Thompson: We would have given you an illuminated address to get rid of you.

The Hon. J. Heitman: That would be better than being downgraded by you.

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: I have a folder here in which probably there are about 500 cuttings, letters to the editor, remarks by shire councils, the Chamber of Commerce and other organisations concerned with the north of Western Australia. This spate of newspaper publicity went on so long that it eventually proved an embarrassment to me and to others who were involved.

Flicking through these papers I found one discordant note which I feel it would be of some interest to read. It appeared in the social notes of the *Hedland Times* dated the 11th November, 1971—

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Under the heading of "Tea Party".

The Hon. J. C. TOZER: No, it was under the heading of "Barbecue" and it reads as follows—

#### BARBECUE

Mr. Jack Hunt, MLC for North Province, and Miss Lyla Elliott, MLC for North-East Metropolitan, were guests of Port Hedland branch of the Australian Labor Party last Friday night at a barbecue at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Gil Barr.

Although the Pilbara is not her electorate, Miss Elliott was interested in hearing about the problems of people living in the area.

Several members expressed their agreement with the Government's decision to abolish the posts of administrator and assistant-administrator of the North-West.

I do not blame Miss Elliott at all for that comment; but to the best of my knowledge that is the only comment that came out of the north which, in fact, seemed to have agreed with what the Government was doing at the time.

I feel sure that many people here will not consider the comments made by Mr Thompson and Mr Dellar as being authoritative. I certainly do not. The 500 newspaper clippings, etc., came from people in the north and from all sources.

I would now like to read a leading article that appeared in *The West Australian* of Saturday, the 6th September, 1971. I will read only two short passages as follows—

It is strange that the State Government should deny itself the services of a man in the field able to take a broad, detached view of northern needs and to provide a liaison between northern people and the apparatus of government.

This is a decision that affects the wants and hopes of people who are making a tremendous material contribution to Western Australia. The Government has financial difficulties but it should have second thoughts about withdrawing the personal touch from its conduct of northern affairs.

I do not know whether it is generally thought by members here that there is any substance in the comments made by Mr Thompson and the ramblings of Mr Dellar, but I place the matter before the House so that members can make their own judgments.

#### *Labor Party Seminar: Misreporting of Reference to Woodanilling*

**THE HON. GRACE VAUGHAN** (South-East Metropolitan) (5.05 p.m.): I hope the House will not adjourn until it has heard what I have to say in connection with the remarks made by the Minister concerning what was reportedly said by me about Woodanilling.

I was not born yesterday; I have fairly broad shoulders and am also fairly thick skinned, and therefore I do not usually respond in an impulsive way when I have been misquoted. I would not have risen and delayed the House further had not the Minister said what he did. I do give him credit for having said that it was a reported statement I had made, though he did enlarge on it in such a manner that

perhaps further damage may be done to the sensibilities of the people of Woodanilling and also to my own reputation.

I would be the last person to advocate the demise of a town such as Woodanilling. I know the town well; I have stayed with people in the district and I have found it to be a beautiful district. The town is quaint and the people enjoy life in that town; indeed I went in to bat seriously and stuck my neck out concerning amenities and facilities for Woodanilling, because I share Mr Gayfer's views that from an economic point of view there is a difference in the usage of facilities that are provided in the city from those which are provided in a town where there is perhaps isolation and a small population that is shrinking.

I was, however, quoted out of context, and I may add that I was not aware that a member of the ABC was present at the time. Had I known this I would not have dreamt of mentioning Woodanilling—I would have referred to Woop Woop or some other place—when I was talking about the question of isolation and the problems I saw as a sociologist. I was suggesting what could be done in connection with the social contacts and the lack of interaction which the farmers thought were affecting their children as a result of the people they met and the experiences they had.

This was a serious discussion. It was one in which we considered ways and means of overcoming the problem. In fact one of the farmers went as far as to suggest that in order that his wife and children may enjoy greater advantages and social contacts that he should not be so selfish as to continue working and living where he was but that he should live the life of a suburban commuter who leaves his home in the morning and returns in the evening. He felt that his wife would thus enjoy more social contact. It was suggested that some scheme could be tried out, though not necessarily accepted, in which towns could be set up in the middle of farming districts and people could live in the town and the father would do the commuting without the wife having to go to the town or nearby city. It was only an idea.

I am old enough to know that one does not use specific names if these are likely to be reported in the newspaper. I said, for instance, that Woodanilling is so close to Wagin that perhaps one could experiment, and I immediately received a response from farmers who were present who said, "Hey watch what you say! We are from Woodanilling." There was a fair bit of leg-pulling going on.

As I have said I had no idea an ABC reporter was present and when he spoke to me later he did not touch on this subject but referred to other matters. I know

people who live in Woodanilling would realise that this is the last thing I would say. I would certainly not suggest the disappearance of Woodanilling.

Some farmer did mention that perhaps these very small towns will eventually in the future fade away because people will not patronise the stores; that they would perhaps go to the towns where they would get a better service.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: If the town is as quaint as you say it is surely there would be something that would keep it alive.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I hope that Woodanilling will blossom. The word "quaint" probably has a different connotation for me than it has for others. For example I think Mr Gayfer is quaint!

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: But loveable.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Yes, very loveable.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the honourable member please address the Chair.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: That seems to call for an immediate remark from me but as it might be considered to be disrespectful I will not say it. When something is said out of context it can be taken too far, and I think the Minister said rather unfairly that what I had said reflected the policy of the Labor Party.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Were there many at the seminar?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: There were not many.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Is it true there were only five?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: It is obvious that someone wants to give me star billing the moment I talk about Woodanilling. If any of this is reported I hope the people of Woodanilling and the Rural Labor Association whose conference I was addressing will realise that I have been quoted out of context. The secretary of the conference is going to send a letter to the secretary of the shire conveying our apologies for the misreporting, and saying we hope to see Woodanilling continue for a long time and that I am most grateful for the hospitality I received from the people of that town.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 5.13 p.m.*