

## Legislative Council

Wednesday, 10 September 1980

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

### QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: TWELFTH DAY

#### *Motion*

Debate resumed from 9 September.

**THE HON. D. K. DANS** (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [5.08 p.m.]: First of all, may I thank the Hon. Norman Moore for allowing me to take up the resumption of debate? I will not be very long in speaking this evening. In making that statement I am mindful of the fact that the Hon. Mick Gayfer made the same statement last night, and I am still trying to work out when his warm-up finished and his actual speech commenced!

I congratulate the new Leader of the House (the Hon. Ian Medcalf) on his elevation to that position. I also offer my congratulations to the Hon. Gordon Masters on his being elected to the Ministry, and I offer similar congratulations to Miss Margaret McAleer on her being appointed Government Whip. I do not know that there has been another woman member of Parliament in the position of Whip, at least not in the Western Australian Parliament as far as I can recall. To the new members, both Labor and Liberal, who have taken places in this Chamber, I also offer my congratulations.

Last but not least, a few words about the previous Leader of the House (the Hon. Graham MacKinnon). Politics being what they are, the Hon. Graham MacKinnon is now sitting on the back benches. I have said previously—and indeed I said it at the send-off to the Hon. John Tonkin—it was remarkable that the Hon. John Tonkin remained in Parliament for some 43 years. Knowing the system as I do, it was even more remarkable that he survived the party system for 43 years. I do not make that statement with any rancour or malice; it is something to bear in mind.

I had a very good relationship with the Hon. Graham MacKinnon. We did disagree but that was as a result of our different political

philosophies. I would also say that not on one occasion can I recall the Hon. Graham MacKinnon, as Leader of this House, giving me an undertaking which he never carried out. As far as I am concerned that is about the highest praise I can give to him. I had his trust and I am sure he had mine. I hope I will remain at least an acquaintance, if not a friend, for some time to come.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I am sure you will.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I want to comment on the procedure of opening day when I committed that heinous offence! The members I upset, I believe, were not so upset that I was on my feet speaking, but they were upset with what I was talking about.

I would like members to bear with me because my comments are about the conduct of this House. I had two options open to me on opening day. I was able to speak on the adjournment, in accordance with Standing Orders, or when I was about to adjourn the Address-in-Reply debate I could have continued to speak until about 6 o'clock that night. I make no apology for the course that I took.

We have to come to grips with the question as to whether or not we want a ceremonial opening. If that is what we want, let us have it. I intend to have a few words to say about Standing Orders and I hope that the members of that committee will note my remarks—before I write a letter to them—and give them some consideration.

In most of the Parliaments of the Commonwealth and, indeed, in most Parliaments throughout the world, the opening is performed by the Governor. The British Parliament is opened by the Sovereign of the day, when it takes the Queen roughly five minutes to carry out that duty.

When the Federal Parliament is opened, and the New South Wales Parliament for that matter, normally the person moving the Address-in-Reply gets to his feet and seeks leave of the House to continue his remarks at a later stage. That is about it, and that is what I would call a ceremonial opening.

We now have the situation where the person moving the Address-in-Reply is afforded the opportunity to read his speech, and he also has the added assistance of being able to use a microphone. I have no quarrel with that arrangement, although I did not have those facilities available when I moved the Address-in-Reply.

If we are to be consistent, let us have proper ceremonial openings when everyone will understand what is going on. That is where the question should end.

On the same tack, I have said in this House previously that I am not a great believer in the Address-in-Reply debate. However, I am aware that private members—particularly country members—like to make a contribution. Mine is a personal view, and certainly not a party political view.

It seems to me that in this day and age, with all the problems which surround us, it could be labelled as scandalous that this Parliament assembled on 31 July last and here we are now well into September and still speaking to the Address-in-Reply. I am referring only to the upper House.

I am sure there are many other matters of importance which this Chamber could have been discussing for the benefit of the people of Western Australia, in particular. Perhaps we should look at some form of grievance debate because if a member does not speak during the Address-in-Reply debate—whether he be a Government back-bencher or an Opposition back-bencher—he could have to bottle up his thoughts—particularly as a Government back-bencher—for all the current session of Parliament and not have an opportunity to speak until the next Address-in-Reply debate.

I do not think anyone would disagree with me when I say that the things people speak about in the Address-in-Reply debate never cause a great many waves in the bureaucracy or in their own electorates. In many cases representatives of the Press deem it their duty to report a few lines of what a member says. After all, we just heard the other day that Queen Victoria is dead, Mafeking has been relieved, and the heliograph has been invented!

The point I am making is that it is 1980. We should be looking to do things differently. I am not one who thinks that traditions should be dispensed with, but we must keep up with the times.

The Lieutenant-Governor, in opening the Parliament, spent 35 minutes on his address. He spoke slowly and deliberately, and he enunciated every word. I have stated already that Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, in opening the mother of Parliaments, normally does not spend a great deal of time on that particular duty.

We find that the speech of the Lieutenant-Governor covers 9½ pages. I suppose I could be

excused for saying that it resurrects the ghosts of Christmases past.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: Are you saying the best of times and the worst of times?

The Hon. D. K. DANC: I do not want to be controversial tonight. I can understand the dilemma of any Government in this day and age.

Towards the end of the Speech, the Lieutenant-Governor referred to 12 Bills that are to be introduced this session. Bearing in mind the times we live in and the various leaders we see in the Press from day to day, surely the speech could have contained a little more detail. I am not reflecting on the Lieutenant-Governor, nor on the people who wrote the Speech for him. However, I am suggesting that we ought to look around to see why we are here.

The speech contains a few paragraphs under the heading "The Economy". One would think from reading those paragraphs that our economy is quite in order. I do not know why we include a reference to the economy—perhaps we are still deluding ourselves that by electing this or that political party to power, somehow or other it may be able to do something about the economy.

I may have startled some people at a Cabinet luncheon the other day when I said that most of our problems are world wide. We must be looking at a global economy. What happens in other countries will certainly affect us.

Naturally the Speech contained only a small reference to State taxation. I am under no illusion: with the problems confronting all State Governments we shall be hearing a great deal more about State taxation in one way or another in the not-too-distant future.

We see that the Government is to establish a private company to promote small businesses. My advice to the Government is to hurry up with this company because of the rate at which small businesses are going bankrupt. Certainly the proprietors of small businesses have my sympathy.

The Lieutenant-Governor had this to say about transport—

The Government will continue to press the Commonwealth for important early modification of the domestic two-airline system and for a more equitable fare structure.

That sounds fine and dandy, but it does not tell us anything. It is just a bald statement, similar to the statements that people have been making for a long time. The structure of our air fares is very important to the people of our State. The last

time I flew to Melbourne at the Government's expense I just happened to look at the price on my ticket and I nearly fell out of the seat. I have been travelling on airlines for many years, but I was staggered to see that the return fare is now \$600.60.

I would like members to think about that for a few moments. Businessmen in this State—as well as families from Western Australia—who wish to move around the Commonwealth—are put at a great disadvantage. Certainly high air fares must affect tourism. I was very interested in Mr Gayfer's comment that there is a waiting list of eight months for the train to the east. I hope that is true.

A member: That was for the honeymoon suite.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The first-class train fare to Sydney is \$325—and that has nothing to do with the honeymoon suite.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: Single or return?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Single.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: It is still only the price of an air fare, and the train costs considerably more to run.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: When we consider the difference in the time taken by both vehicles, it is no wonder that people hop on the plane.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: Food is supplied for three days on the train.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: That is very true, but speed is the essence of the contract these days. Sometimes extra days are lost through washaways on the line, and then one sometimes spends a great deal more money in the bar.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: Obviously you are speaking for yourself.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I am not speaking for myself; it is a serious business.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: Has Mr McKenzie approved your speech?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I hope he has.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: We might go by ship.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I do not want to be sidetracked onto that subject. However, I can assure members that the movement of goods around the coast by what is called "sea road" is far cheaper than by any other system.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: When you don't have waterside workers to worry about; when the goods are containerised.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: It is still much cheaper from point to point using members of the WWF.

Mr Wordsworth was the Minister for Transport, and he ought to know that.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: I know it, but only if you can containerise goods.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I do not want to spend time on it now, but I would certainly like to take part in a debate on containerisation and what it has cost the Australian primary producer and Australian people generally.

Containerisation was forced on people; certain cargoes were restricted to this means of transport. It is interesting that one shipping line in the world—the Chandler Line, I think—has gone back to using 15 000 tonne ships that can carry all manner of goods. This shipping line is scooping the pool. This is also the reason that the Scanaustral ships are doing so well in Australia; they are not containerised. Mr Wordsworth, who represents in part the Albany area, would know all about the great container con, as would those members who represent Geraldton and Esperance. Ships go only to the ports where containers can be handled, and Fremantle is the only such port in Western Australia. The majority of the container goods are off-loaded in Melbourne and brought back here by other means. However, we will debate that on another occasion.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: It sounds as though it would be an interesting debate.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: Would Mr Lewis be on my side?

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I do not know about that; I have supported you once this session.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: The State Housing Commission programme is described in this way—

The Commission's programme for 1980/81 will continue on a scale to enable it to hold waiting lists at the present satisfactory level.

What is a satisfactory level? I asked a question about this, and I was told that about 8 000 people are deemed to be eligible for State Housing Commission assistance. I do not think that is satisfactory.

I do not want to go on referring to all the problems that were raised and then left in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech, but I would like to refer to his comments on labour and industry. Possibly there is no one subject we hear more about in this Chamber and its effect on the economy than industrial relations. One would have thought one would hear a rather long dissertation from the Lieutenant-Governor about the Government's programme. What did we get?

Two paragraphs only were devoted to labour and industry, so one can only assume that this very delicate and important area has been left swinging. The problem is put into limbo, like a number of other things, with the high hope that it will go away.

I am trying to point out some of the matters to which we should be giving attention. I would have much preferred a Speech which said, "Look, we are pressing on as hard as we can with the North-West Shelf project with the hope that we will bring it to fruition in the very near future. We recognise that there are problems in the economy and that unemployment is the most serious challenge at the moment to Australia generally and to Western Australia in particular." The Lieutenant-Governor should then have listed the initiatives that the State Government intends to take in an endeavour to help the many young unemployed people who are genuinely looking for work, and I must point out that many older people are now looking for work also.

I do not like quoting other people's remarks, but I would like to quote part of a speech made by Sir Richard Kirby to a group of people in Brisbane. It was reported in *The Financial Australian* on Thursday, 28 August 1980.

Most people here know that Sir Richard Kirby was the President of the Commonwealth Industrial Commission for some years, and possibly regarded by many as the best president the commission has ever had. He was a man who had a very good understanding of the problems involved in industrial relations. I confess that I was not always one of his fans—it would depend on what he was saying and doing. However, I concede he was probably the best person we have had in this position. In the speech he made on that occasion he had this to say—

Full employment was more essential for industrial peace than a reduction in inflation, the former president of the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, Sir Richard Kirby, said yesterday.

He warned that the Australian workforce was sceptical about the sincerity or ability of the people at the top and said too often managements blamed strikes for production and profit declines when they should have been accepting at least part of the blame themselves.

In a wide-ranging speech to a conference in Brisbane on Queensland's next five years Sir Richard also expressed concern about the effect of the new resources boom on unemployment and inflation.

(39)

That is a point we overlook sometimes—after the boom there comes the problems. To continue—

"Existing employment and the threat of increased unemployment do not prevent or seriously reduce the worker's reliance on striking to redress his grievances," Sir Richard said.

The very threat of imminent unemployment (during times of economic depression) makes those in jobs try to get more pay to build reserves for the uncertain future.

I have mentioned this before; people work on these old-fashioned theories—and I think they were only ever theories—that somehow or other the bigger the pool of unemployed people, the less industrial unrest there is. That is quite wrong. The quote continues—

"Then most workers, or working families, have unemployed children or relatives to support."

Sir Richard said basically workers blamed the managers—the politicians, bureaucrats, employers, academics and judges—for periodic depressions they either manipulated or should have foreseen.

"The fact is we have a workforce sceptical about the sincerity or ability of us in the top echelons as entrepreneurs," he said. "Until that scepticism is removed the going will be hard."

Sir Richard gave the boom and bust of the car industry as an example of workers scepticism.

He said it reminded him of Banjo Patterson and the rabbits: "It's grand to be a rabbit; and breed till all is blue; and then to die in heaps because there's nothing left to chew."

I do not think anyone could have put it in a better way. Unfortunately that is happening not only in the car industry, but also all around us. We are talking on Address-and-Reply debates while these things are going on and on. The newspaper report continued—

"The workers in that industry, in industry generally and indeed the whole community, need to be taken more into the confidence of entrepreneurs and the government than they are today," Sir Richard said.

Sir Richard reinforced a viewpoint I heard at the Parmelia Hotel recently at a seminar on technological change when an American manager of an Australian computer firm said that since the war, Australia had had a number of chances, and

had blown them all. We are probably facing our last chance. The extract of Sir Richard's speech continued—

Sir Richard said the 1952 wool boom and other past crises warned that great wealth flooding from outside the country into a few select and small labor force industries, carried the risk of increased inflation with very little reduction of unemployment, particularly of the young and school leavers.

Sir Richard went on to say that we should have been finding some way to use that wealth. The extract continued—

Sir Richard said he was brought up on the bench to the concept that unemployment nearing 1.8 per cent of the workforce indicated a crisis point which would throw a government out of office.

"Now we have unemployment running at near 6 per cent and the minister concerned indicated pleasure with the figures," he said.

The concluding paragraph of the extract of Sir Richard's speech stated as follows—

"This dramatic change from full employment to tragic unemployment, which has evidently come to be accepted as the norm, demonstrates the changing world in which we live and highlights need for concern."

I have tried to relate Sir Richard's remarks to some of my previous comments because I believe they are the kinds of things we should be examining. We should be getting away from the confrontation approach. I know it is difficult; one does not snap one's fingers to make something happen.

Sir Richard pointed out that, irrespective of the number of workers who are unemployed, we will still have disputes and stoppages, with people hiding away money for a rainy day. The longer that sort of thing goes on, the worse the situation will become.

I turn now to the procedures of this place. Recently, there has been a tendency to speak on the adjournment debate. I made a speech on the matter in 1977, which everyone has been urged to read. I have no great argument for the speech I made at that time. I would like the adjournment debate to be retained so that members may use it from time to time in the manner they see fit. If it is not retained, some other opportunity will need to be made available to enable members to speak on matters dear to their hearts.

I am sure members would agree it is time we changed the system of giving notice of questions.

It seems to me to be quite ludicrous that if I have 10 questions to place on notice, I must stand each time, try to catch Mr President's eye, read the question and then sit, before going through the procedure once again. Members get up and down like jack-in-the-boxes trying to get the President's call.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: It is good for the figure.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: We are talking about a procedure which takes up the time of the House when we could be debating other, more important matters. I would not be adverse to a system which permitted us to hand in our questions; they could be answered the next day in the usual manner. If that is not acceptable to members, perhaps we could adopt a system whereby a member with several questions could remain on his feet until he has asked all his questions. Even that would be a far better proposition than the system we adopt now. A considerable amount of time is wasted in this place by these procedural practices, and they all reduce the time available to members to make a more useful contribution.

I turn now to the thorny question of members reading their speeches, or looking at notes—there is a very thin line here. I know that members of the House of Representatives are allowed to read their speeches, while members of the Senate are not. I believe members of this place should be allowed to stand and refer to speech notes, just as do Ministers when introducing Bills. After all, this is 1980; we are subject to the electronic media and all the other marvels of modern communication. I do not believe the old excuse that a member could have his speech written for him holds water today. After all, Ministers from both parties have been known to come into this Chamber holding a second reading speech which has been handed to them only five seconds earlier.

We have seen during debates on particularly thorny questions the responsible Minister obtaining the services of an adviser, who has been permitted to sit alongside him. I suppose one could advance a case for the same advantage to be afforded members of the Opposition and of the Government back bench.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: It would be handy at times.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I am not suggesting we curtail the length or duration of speeches—I would have no reason to interject on Mr Pike if our Standing Orders were changed in that respect. However, if we are to maintain credibility in the eyes of the public without breaking with many of our traditions, we should examine the

possibility of overhauling and streamlining parliamentary procedures in this Chamber. It would make for a better debate.

During the Address-in-Reply debate, the only Minister who contributes is the Leader of the House, and then only in reply; his two ministerial colleagues do not speak. In fact, I had not intended to enter the debate; however, I thought I should stand and make a few points. The Address-in-Reply debate is virtually the only opportunity available to members to discuss matters important to them. I believe the adjournment debate should be allowed to continue, even though it seems to stir up members, and the speaker on his feet does not seem to get much of a go.

Another matter I wish to raise falls within the province of the Library Committee. I believe this is the only Parliament in the Commonwealth of Australia which does not have a tape recording system to back up its *Hansard* staff, and such a facility is long overdue. The procedures of the Industrial Commission and of most local councils are tape recorded; certainly, all speeches at meetings of the Cockburn Town Council are recorded. It would be an excellent back-up system for our *Hansard* reporters, and a facility could be available in the library for the use of members correcting their speeches, or for those members who wished to hear the debates of Parliament without actually being in the Chamber.

I do not know why Western Australia, which is supposed to be the State of excitement, and the State on the move, tends to drag the chain in regard to ordinary innovations which have been in operation in other States for a long time.

Mr President, I regret interjecting last night while you were on your feet. I regret having lost my cool when Mr Bob Pike was trying to make a statement and I very much regret I hurled a couple of unparliamentary phrases across the Chamber. I do not like doing those things; in fact, I believe it hurt me more than anyone else. However, these things are said in the heat of the moment.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We should have had tape recorders last night.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: If we did have them, perhaps some of us would not be so eager to draw our guns and fire. At the moment, of course, we do get the opportunity to correct the *Hansard* reports. In fact, I recall being saved from a fate worse than death when Mr Tozer asked me whether I had said a certain thing. I did not need to fib because *Hansard* had not reported it, so I remained mute.

I am not so naive as to think the Standing Orders Committee will be so emboldened as to recommend in one fell swoop all the changes I have suggested. However, I am convinced that in the fullness of time, these changes will come about, particularly with regard to placing questions on notice, and members using notes to assist in making their speeches. I concede it would be a very dreary speech indeed if a member simply stood and read from notes. However, it would not hurt to have speech notes as a memory aid. After all, we constantly see national and State leaders referring to speech notes on television and in other places, and I believe the same advantage should be made available to members in this Chamber.

Finally, I was very interested in Mick Gayfer's statement about the rural sector. In my few years in Parliament, I have not learnt a great deal, but I have gained a deep respect for the primary producers of this country. At one time, I used to engage in all the old jokes about our farming community. I believe what Mick Gayfer said. I firmly believe we owe a great debt of gratitude to our primary producers; this is especially so when one compares the price of our foodstuffs with that applying in other parts of the world. I am fast coming to the consideration that we do not do enough for them.

With those remarks, I support the Address-in-Reply motion.

**THE HON. N. F. MOORE** (Lower North) [5.41 p.m.]: I was very interested in Mr Dans' remarks about possible changes to the procedures and format of this House. I certainly agree some areas need consideration, perhaps for the benefit of the House as a whole.

I would like to stick with one tradition tonight, and that is to congratulate certain members. Firstly, I congratulate the Hon. Ian Medcalf on his election to the position of Leader of the House, and the Hon. David Wordsworth on retaining his position in the Ministry. My particular congratulations go to the Hon. Gordon Masters on his being elevated to the Ministry. I also pay tribute to the Hon. Margaret MacAleer on her being elected Government Whip.

I also congratulate those new members who were elected to the House, and those who were re-elected at the last election. From the speeches we have heard so far in this debate, we know we have a fine bunch of new members. I was particularly impressed with the contribution to the Noonkanbah debate made by the Hon. Phillip Pendar. I thought he handled it extremely well.

When the House adjourned at the end of last session I did not have the opportunity to say a few words about Mr George Berry, who was my colleague in Lower North Province. George represented Lower North Province for some 12 years, and now is taking advantage of his well-earned retirement in Carnarvon. He has not had much time to go fishing and do all the things he hoped to do. However, he is looking extremely healthy. I believe it is appropriate that I say a few words about him on this occasion.

George Berry was the sort of fellow who represented his electorate with a great deal of dedication. He had a very down-to-earth approach to the problems of his constituents. He did not spend a lot of time writing letters or making long speeches; he simply got down to the issues at hand and assisted the people in his electorate to get their problems solved.

When one of his constituents had a problem he would ring George and tell him about it. George would get on the telephone and call the person involved. He would discuss the matter and obtain the answer and then call back his constituent with the problem solved. He had no need for an elaborate filing system, because generally he solved his constituents' problems on the spot.

Mr Gayfer said the House will miss George Berry in many ways because he was the sort of fellow who would examine in great detail Bills coming before this place. Very often, he was able to point out to the relevant Minister an area of doubt in a piece of legislation. He was never backward in coming forward and giving Ministers advice. In that respect we will miss George's often cryptic remarks.

I am sure Mr Dans will not forget George Berry, because from time to time we see a little pack of grapefruit arriving from Carnarvon for Mr Dans, who is a great supporter of the Carnarvon grapefruit industry.

I wish to take this opportunity during the Address-in-Reply debate to talk about the Legislative Council, because this topic has been discussed by some members at certain times during this session. I wish to refer members to this week's version of the Labor Party's platform as it relates to what it sees as the role of the Legislative Council. I say "this week's version" because it does change from time to time. I understand the Labor Party now does not want to abolish the Legislative Council; it merely wants to change the voting system. I find it very hard to accept that policy will remain as Labor Party platform forever and a day; although perhaps members opposite may argue with me on that

score. We see from this week's version of Labor Party policy that it wants to introduce a system of proportional representation.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Why don't you say, "this year's version" or "the version adopted by the Labor Party Conference"? We meet to consider our platform only every two years.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: In looking at this year's version of the ALP's platform for what it calls "Reform of the Legislative Council", I will indicate the premises for what I consider should be the role of a member of Parliament. Firstly, members of Parliament should be accountable to an electorate. Secondly, members are elected to represent constituents. So the two premises are that members must be accountable to an electorate and they must be elected to represent an electorate.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: The ALP system of proportional representation suggests each party should put forward a list of candidates to represent the whole of the State. Who will determine these lists of candidates? It is quite obvious it would be determined by the party machines.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Who selects the Liberal Senate ticket?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: The Liberal Party.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Who pre-selects candidates?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: People in the electorate select candidates to represent their electorate.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: It is still the party system.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am not denying that; the party machine will determine the candidates.

It is logical to assume that the first 14 or so from each of the major parties would be elected automatically. It stands to reason that would be the case.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: It would be only 16 each time.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: It would be logical to assume that the Labor Party machine would select the first 14 Labor members for the Legislative Council. This means those members would have a job for life. There would be a job for life for those who remained faithful and toed the party line. I am talking about members on this side too.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Are you worried about something?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I will get to that later.

This means that members who are elected under this system would not be accountable to the electorate but to a party, because the party would determine whether they would be elected. Because they were not accountable they would not be representing anyone. These members would supposedly represent the whole State, but would represent no-one. They would not be accountable to the electorate. They would be accountable only to the party. The Senate members are accountable to the State which elects them to Canberra, so they represent an electorate.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: So would representatives of this place.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Let us look at what the Labor Party suggests in terms of proportional representation. Let us consider some of the disadvantages of such a scheme. Earlier, Mr Dowding asked whether I was frightened. If I was in the first 14 I could sit down and basically do nothing and still have a job for life. From that point of view, the ALP's proposition might be supported by many members of Parliament. But the people who would be disadvantaged would be those in the remote and country areas of the State—the people I represent.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Not at all.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: The list of candidates would be determined by the party machines, and who runs the party machines? Ours is run from the metropolitan area, and I assume it is the same with the Opposition. Most of the voting power would be with the city.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Our party is sympathetic to remote areas.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: That is shown by your results in remote areas! City interests would largely determine who was named on the tickets. Once members were named, because they would not be accountable to an electorate, they would have little reason to have anything to do with remote areas. They would not be accountable and so they would not have to do anything to be re-elected. They would not bother about getting out from the comfortable city and visiting remote areas.

Some members might suggest that that would be fair and reasonable and that they would like to get out and about to see where the wealth of the economy is produced. But there would be no need for them to visit those areas, because they would

not represent anyone and, therefore, they would not be accountable to anyone for their re-election. So the people who would be disadvantaged by this Labor system would be the people in the remote and country areas.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: That is purely the argument of your party's hypothesis.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: The member should certainly not talk about his being a decentralised party.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: So what we would have would be members of Parliament accountable to parties; members who would not represent an electorate or the interests of electors. The interests of the electors would come second to the interests of the party they represented. At least the present system provides accountability to electors and, therefore, members are required to represent constituents.

It has been suggested that we could have a system of electorates in Western Australia which were all the same size in terms of votes—one-vote-one-value, if we like. It has been argued at length that the geographic nature of Western Australia is such that we cannot have such a system.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: What about your electorate, where you have 6 000 electors, and my electorate, where I have 22 000. How can you justify the existence of the Senate on that basis?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Due to the geographic nature of Western Australia it is virtually impossible to have a one-vote-one-value system for the Legislative Council. Mr Dowding's province, which is almost as big as mine, together with mine, and Geraldton, Kalgoorlie and others might make one province. Mr Dowding might at least understand the difficulty in representing a remote electorate. But the point remains that if we had a one-vote-one-value system, the people in the remote areas would be disadvantaged again because the great majority of seats would be held by city interests.

I am putting forward these arguments because that is what I am here to do. I am elected by people in remote areas. I am accountable to them. The interests of my electors would be seriously disadvantaged by any suggestion by the ALP for "reform" of the upper House. I am here to do what I am elected to do; I am accountable to my electors.

In representing my electors, I would like now to turn to a few matters in relation to my province.



When I first spoke in this House I spoke about the Lower North Province being on the threshold of a great development era. This era has taken longer to arrive than we had hoped it would, but it is becoming a reality. We are seeing a whole range of new developments taking place. Mr Leeson has already mentioned goldmining and I will comment later on his remarks.

There is a large goldmining industry in the Lower North Province, and members would be aware that the price of gold has skyrocketed to a point where it is now profitable and worth while for mining companies to become involved once again in the goldmining industry. The Mt. Magnet area has the Hill 50 operation which is now in the process of being reopened. I understand that something like 70 new homes will be built in the Mt. Magnet area in the next few months. The nickel mine at Laverton, with the assistance of the Lancefield mine, is opening up. Menzies has the Porphyry mine. At Meekatharra, the Englestone and Whim Creek mines are examples of new developments. Drilling is taking place around Cue at Big Bell. This was a huge show in its day. There is hope that the mine will reopen at Day Dawn. Right throughout the electorate there are dozens of small prospectors and miners who are developing small shows and who are making for themselves not a bad living.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: But not when the new Mining Act comes into operation. It will be the end of them.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: When Mr Leeson spoke in this debate I was disappointed to hear him criticise the North Kalgurli company. In my opinion, it was of great assistance to the area by providing a custom mill at a time when no-one wanted to be seen in Kalgoorlie. It was an act of faith in the town, and because times have turned to the good, Mr Leeson criticised the Government for not spending more than \$500 000.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: That is not true.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I shall quote from the *Kalgoorlie Miner* of Saturday, 16 August as follows—

North Kalgurli Mines Ltd and a Goldfields MP are at odds over a claim that the company had tricked the State Government on a \$500 000 loan.

Further on, Mr John Jones, the chairman of the company said—

"The remarks made by Mr Leeson are not only unjustified but are surprising in view of several detailed discussions on the matter between the company, Mr Leeson and his parliamentary colleagues," Mr Jones said.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: Everything I say appears in the paper.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: It is either Mr Leeson or the Mayor of Kalgoorlie (Mr Finlayson) being quoted.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: I suppose that sort of thing would shock you.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: It shocks me to see someone being quoted on the front page of the paper criticising Mr Leeson.

When Mr Leeson was speaking on the Address-in-Reply debate he suggested the State Government had discriminated against the goldfields residents because they voted for Labor members. I had a bit to do with the campaign in the Kalgoorlie area prior to the last election and most of the running by the Labor Party was done by Mr Grill. He based his campaign on things the Government had done, except that he confused the electors into believing he was responsible for all that was accomplished. We had page after page of how Mr Grill had got the Government to do all these things. Mr Leeson said that the Government had ignored the goldfields because they elected Labor Party candidates.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: He was talking about electricity charges.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: He was talking about all sorts of things.

I would like to quote an article from the *Kalgoorlie Miner* dated Wednesday, 3 September, because it indicates the extent of rumour-mongering and just how this paper is prepared to accept the nonsense it prints. I quote from the front page as follows—

Two MPs told this week in Kalgoorlie of current strong speculation that the Federal Government is considering a tax on gold mining. Senator Ruth Coleman—

That great expert on the goldmining industry. To continue—

—and the MLC for South-East Province, Mr Ron Leeson—

Mr Leeson knows a bit about gold. We lived next door to each other at Fimiston. To continue—

—both Labor members, said that they had heard from reputable sources of a possible tax on gold.

Senator Coleman said that she had heard from Liberal Party officials that a tax on gold was an area that the Government would have to seriously examine.

She would be disturbed about this if she was associated with the gold mining industry, Senator Coleman said.

I ask: Firstly, would a Liberal Party official tell Senator Ruth Coleman that the Liberal Party Government intended to put a tax on gold? Secondly, why on earth does the *Kalgoorlie Miner* continue to peddle these rumours? It is obvious that a Federal election is coming up.

A question was asked by the Hon. Phil Lockyer with respect to such a tax on gold and the answer he received indicated no consideration was being given to such a tax.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Can you guarantee that?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Can the honourable member guarantee that the sky will not fall down?

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Yes I can.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: The Federal Government has no intention of having a tax on gold. I do not know why the Opposition peddles such rumours.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: The Government did not even make inquiries.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: My recollection of the answer is that the information from the Federal Government indicated there was no intention to impose a tax on gold. I have ascertained this by speaking with other people also.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: Do we have that officially from you?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: No.

I would like to refer to—

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Before you leave gold: Do you agree that the electors need to know whether it is on or not?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: We have said constantly that there will be no tax on gold. The Federal Government has said that constantly, and Mr Robinson was in Kalgoorlie recently and said it also. The member for Kalgoorlie also said it. How often do I have to say it? How often does it have to be said before Mr Leeson and Senator Ruth Coleman stop peddling these rumours?

*Sitting suspended from 6.01 to 7.30 p.m.*

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Before the tea suspension I was talking about the rumour-mongering in the Labor Party about a gold tax being introduced by the present Federal Government, and I was suggesting that is not the case. In fact, during the tea suspension I managed to get hold of an extract from *The West*

*Australian* of 3 January 1974. During that time we were inflicted with the Whitlam Government. I would like to quote from that newspaper as follows—

Kalgoorlie and Boulder yesterday pleaded for their lives to the Federal Treasurer, Mr Crean, and the Minister for Minerals and Energy, Mr Connor... When he brought down the Federal Budget last year Mr Crean said that the gold industry's exemption from taxation would be abolished.

This decision caused anger in Kalgoorlie and worried the State Government.

The State Government at the time was the Tonkin Government. It changed its mind. Then we had a change of Government. In fact, it is obvious that in Western Australia when we have Liberal Governments we tend to get some common sense in the field of mining and when we have Labor Governments the opposite applies.

When I was speaking about the goldmining industry, I was speaking about my Province of Lower North and its future in relation to the mining industry. I now turn to the subject of nickel. It is very pleasing to me, as an ex-resident of Laverton, to know the Windarra mine is being reopened. One reason it is being reopened is to treat nickel to the concentrate stage, and the other is to open the Lancefield goldmine and treat the ores at the mine.

It is also pleasing to know the town of Leinster is continuing to expand. It is the site of the Agnew Mining Company's mining operations. It is a beautiful town and the company is to be congratulated on the way it has used transportable homes. All the homes are transportable, and unlike Mr Brown I have nothing against them.

The Hon. J. M. Brown: Do you live in one?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Not now. I did, though.

The Hon. J. M. Brown: Do they have a normalisation programme at Leinster?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Not yet.

The next matter I wish to speak about is uranium. As members will be aware from previous debates, the Yeelirrie deposit is located right in the middle of Lower North Province. I have mentioned before that I was looking forward to the deposit and the mine being developed at Yeelirrie and a town of some 2 000 people being established. At the present time the area is quite short of population.

Recently I visited the Western Mining Corporation's pilot plant at Kalgoorlie which will

test the Yeelirrie ores and find out the best way to treat them when mining gets under way. Western Mining showed great faith in Kalgoorlie in building the pilot plant there. It will not be used only for uranium. As I understand it, it will work out the best way to treat other ores when other companies decide whether or not to develop mines. Mr Leeson will support the Western Mining plant because of the employment it will provide in the Kalgoorlie district.

The next ore is copper. Agnew Mining Company is currently developing its Teutonic Bore deposit between Leonora and Leinster. Golden Grove, located near Yalgoo, is looking more and more promising.

One of the main reasons I think mining activities in areas such as the Murchison and the north-eastern goldfields are good is the services they bring to the people already living there. The sorts of services which are now being provided as a result of the mineral developments emphasise the importance of this industry to my province.

The road from Leonora to Leinster is being sealed through Teutonic Bore. The road from Mullewa to Yalgoo has been sealed and the sealing is continuing to Mt. Magnet. Great Northern Highway is being upgraded; passing bays are being made and the crests are being widened. The Leonora-Malcolm road will be sealed in the not-too-distant future.

Another service is being provided. The Hon. Tom McNeil was talking about television in his area. There are people in my province who do not get television at all. When I was last speaking here, Carnarvon was the only town in my area which had television. The Intelsat Four system will mean a variety of towns throughout the Lower North Province will be getting television shortly. Exmouth is the first on the list, and it will be getting television this month. Meekatharra, Cue, Mt. Magnet, Yalgoo, Leinster, Laverton, Leonora and Menzies will all be getting television either through the Intelsat Four system or by transmitters from the existing microwave links.

Another industry which I hope will develop considerably in the not-too-distant future is tourism, which is the world's number one industry. A recent survey of the Gascoyne area showed that \$6 million a year is spent by tourists in the Gascoyne at Exmouth, Carnarvon, Shark Bay, and Gascoyne Junction. That is of enormous benefit to the economy of the Gascoyne region.

I am hoping the Murchison will also realise the benefits tourism can bring. The current interest in gold prospecting with metal detectors, the magnificent wildflowers, and historic buildings to

my mind are all wonderful tourist attractions. I would like to commend the current Honorary Minister assisting the Minister for Tourism (Mr Ian Laurance), who was prepared to take a trip through the Murchison area to investigate its potential tourist situation.

The Hon. R. T. Leeson: Do you believe the Gascoyne River should be dammed?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: The Hon. Mr Berry is not here to answer that, but I think it would not be a bad idea. I intend to mention the floods in Carnarvon. I do not know that a dam would solve the problem. The main problem is evaporation. Large expanses of water do not take long to evaporate in that area. A dam probably would not solve the flood problem. I was interested in Lang Hancock's solution, which would use a nuclear explosion to create a very deep hole to eliminate the evaporation problem. I will not stand up here to say I support that idea.

Carnarvon suffered severe damage in the last flood, but, as Mr Lockyer pointed out, the way the growers responded to the adversity they suffered was tremendous, and in most cases one would never know there had been a flood in recent times. It demonstrates the resilience of the growers in Carnarvon.

I wanted to mention a few aspects of my province tonight. The future looks very bright indeed for people in Lower North and I think they have every reason to feel very optimistic about their future.

I now turn to the question of Noonkanbah, which has exercised the minds of members for quite a long time. I want to put forward the proposition that the ALP is involved in this business in an endeavour to use the people of Noonkanbah to further its centralist and ideological aims.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: That would have to be absolute rubbish.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I want to suggest this is one of the overriding issues in the whole dispute—the ideological and centralist aims of the ALP.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: I thought you were worth something better than that.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I would go so far as to suggest the ALP and its socialist allies are seeking nothing less than a state of continuous turmoil in that region. It is part of their strategy and I will offer reasonable proof that they are actively creating turmoil in the Kimberley. There is plenty of evidence around.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Why haven't you brought it to the courts?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am bringing it to the Parliament now.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Under privilege.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I suggest when we talk about the ALP's centralist policies and what it has in mind for Noonkanbah, we need to look at what its Federal members are saying about the issue, because with the tightly knit centralised political unit of the ALP we do not have to go further than its Federal spokesman to find out what they are all about.

After the 1977 election, when the Australian electorate in its wisdom gave the ALP the second greatest hiding it has ever had, the ALP decided to formulate new policies. The left wing of the ALP formulated new policies for 1978 and beyond. A submission was put forward to the ALP national executive in 1978 by 29 of Labor's 64 members of Parliament. Of those 29 I will mention the name of one particular person; that is, Mr Stewart West, the ALP spokesman on Aboriginal affairs. The submission was presented to the national conference in 1978 and it claimed that the Labor movement needed to explain more clearly and advance its socialist objective. The task, it added, was "to define the social changes necessary to achieve this objective". I would like to quote from the submission. It said—

Parliamentary reform cannot succeed without a parallel commitment to involvement in social and political movements outside Parliament . . . (such as) the struggle against war . . . and racism, (and) the ecological movement . . . they influence Parliament and are an essential ingredient in the whole process of defining a new strategy for the Labor movement".

The Hon. Peter Dowding: What is significant in that?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: We have the ALP left wing putting forward the suggestion that the ALP must become involved in extra-parliamentary activities; it must become involved with various minority groups, the struggle against racism, war, and the ecological movement.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: What is sinister about it?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I did not say there was anything sinister about it. I am simply quoting what the left wing of the ALP said.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: All I am saying is that the left wing has suggested the ALP must become more involved in extra-parliamentary activities, such as the struggle against racism, war, and the ecological movement.

I am suggesting that this is just what they are doing at Noonkanbah; they are getting involved in what they consider to be a racist movement.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Why should they stay out of it?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am suggesting their involvement in the Noonkanbah issue is an essential ingredient in the whole process of defining a new strategy for the Labor movement. Noonkanbah is just a stepping-stone towards greater centralisation of power in Australia.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: The community asked for help because your job was oppressing them.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I suggest that they and their trade union allies have attempted to incite racial conflict in the Kimberley—

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask members to cease these interjections. If they persist it is my intention to take some action.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Thank you, Sir. I was suggesting that the Australian Labor Party and its trade union friends have attempted to incite racial discord and then perversely they use that very discord to further their centralist aims. Members of the Labor Party say that because there is so much trouble they have to take over; and yet they created the trouble in the first place.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Will you answer a question—

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am not here to answer questions from Mr Dowding. I am here to make a speech.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the honourable member to cease interjecting. His interjections are out of order and I will not tolerate his constant questioning of members on their feet.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: The Labor Party members—and they would not argue about this—want to centralise activities in Australia; they want a unitary Government system in Canberra; they want the power to reside there. I am suggesting that they are using the Noonkanbah Aborigines and the situation in the Kimberley as a means to an end—the end being the centralisation of the lives of everybody in Australia. In this case it is the lives of Aboriginal people, but in the long run it will be the lives of all Australians, and the Labor Party wants to run

everyone's lives from a central Canberra bureaucracy.

In fact, I will quote from a speech made by a Federal colleague of members opposite. What I have said was admitted by Mr West when he visited Perth recently, and also when he visited Noonkanbah. He admitted that Labor is trying to integrate the Aboriginal programme. Where does Labor want to integrate the programme? In Canberra. It is not surprising that Mr West was one of the signatories to the document of the left wing seeking to ferment trouble within extra-parliamentary groups.

He tells us how he will achieve his aim in a speech made to the Labor lawyers' conference on 5 July this year when he said—

A Federal Labor Government would solve this dispute—

That is, Noonkanbah. To continue—

—by resuming the land under its power under section 51 . . . of the Constitution.

He also added that he was favourably disposed towards all Aboriginal affairs, powers, and responsibilities being administered in Canberra.

The Hon. H. W. Olney: Australians voted to give the Commonwealth that power in 1967.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: What I am suggesting is that the ALP wants to use the Constitution to take over all Aborigines, to the exclusion of State Governments. Mr West also said that a Federal Minister should control all aspects of Aboriginal affairs. He made the point that he did not think the Western Australian Minister was the right person to do it.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Certainly not; none of this Cabinet.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: It seems to me that Mr West has very little knowledge of the competence of Western Australian Ministers, because none of them would have anything to do with his scheme. He calls his scheme "Labor's Integrated Aboriginal Land Rights or Land Access to Aborigines Programme." The programme calls for the negotiation of what is termed a treaty of commitment with the Aboriginal people. We have heard about that before.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: And you will hear about it again, I dare say.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: The Labor Party platform appears to contain a total acceptance of the platform of the Aboriginal Treaty Committee, which is based in Canberra. That platform was set out in an advertisement in *The National Times* of 25 August 1979. That is the newspaper

which refused to print Mr Withers' letters when he pointed out that some of the information the newspaper was printing about Noonkanbah was not correct. I have a copy of the advertisement which appeared in that newspaper, and when one looks at the signatories to it it is interesting to note that the majority come from Canberra or New South Wales and are public servants.

It is not surprising that Eastern States people are interested in what is going on at Noonkanbah, because I understand Federal Labor members are doing their very best to centralise the whole issue.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Anyone with a conscience would be interested in it.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Here we go again! Fancy you talking about a conscience.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Are you saying you haven't a conscience?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: The main point to remember about this is that the overwhelming desire of Mr West—the fellow who put his name to that left-wing document—and his centralist friend, is to concentrate power in one Government; that is, the Government in Canberra. They want to control the lives and destinies of Western Australian Aborigines and, ultimately, of all Western Australians. I will quote again from what Mr West had to say to the Labor lawyers' conference—

In effect, we believe the treaty plus Commonwealth constitutional powers can be the source from which Federal responsibility and power is derived.

This drive to centralise is no recent state of mind within the ranks of the ALP or some of its publicly-funded allies—Federal bureaucrats, Labor politicians, and what-have-you. In fact, the interesting thing is that these people have the most to gain, particularly their Federal bureaucratic allies.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Federal bureaucrats?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Yes.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: And publicly-funded?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Yes. They are the sort of people who might support the activities of members opposite because they can gain more power.

I want to refer to some utterances made by Professor Colin Tatz, who is the chairman of a committee of the Canberra-based, publicly-funded Institute of Aboriginal Studies. Recently in an article in *The Weekend Australian*, Professor Tatz pointed out just how long this centralist yearning to take control of Aboriginal

affairs has existed within Labor ranks. In the article he tells us of a letter written by Kim Beasley in 1949 to the then Prime Minister (Ben Chifley). I would like to quote that letter, as follows—

As Commonwealth representatives at international conferences are continually being held responsible for Aboriginal policies pursued in Australia by the State Governments, it is desirable that the Commonwealth should assume responsibility for them. . .

I cannot see the logic in that. That foreigners are ignorant of our Federal system is no reason to justify further centralisation.

The Hon. H. W. Olney: Why did the Liberal Government seek a constitutional amendment in 1967 to give it the power to legislate for Aboriginal people?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: The Government has that power. I suggest it already has the power to acquire large amounts of land in Western Australia, and it should not have the power.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: They have that power.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Yes, and I suggest it should not be used. Members opposite are saying it should be used and that huge quantities of land should be acquired.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Only because of the irresponsible behaviour of you blokes.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: That is absolute nonsense.

The ALP from time to time turns to institutions and academics to bolster its arguments. I want to refer to the Aboriginal Treaty Committee, to which I referred earlier. I need only refer to the speech of my colleague, Mr Withers, in this Chamber on 19 August, and to the letter he wrote to the editor of *The National Times* on 1 August this year in which he pointed out several elementary errors of fact in a committee advertisement on Noonkanbah which appeared earlier in that newspaper.

The chairman of this committee is, of course, Dr Coombs. Dr Coombs has been a life-long friend of the socialist centralist cause. In fact, his history throughout his time in public affairs has certainly been one of support for centralist motives, and his activities in the banking sector in the late 1940s and his attempt, along with that of Mr Uren, to regionalise Australia under what could be called the post-World War I doctrines of the Labor Party are well known.

So we have people like Dr Coombs, very active in this Aboriginal treaty movement, being involved in that sort of activity.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Is that bad?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I do not believe in centralism; Mr Dowding should understand that by now.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Is it bad that Dr Coombs was involved in this?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am suggesting that he is involved because of his centralist activities. If Mr Dowding refers back to where I started, he will know what I am talking about.

The Hon. H. W. Olney: Dr Coombs has a very long history of involvement.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Yes, in things which are centralist.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I want to return again to what Professor Colin Tatz said, and I remind members he is associated with the Institute of Aboriginal Affairs, which is a publicly-funded organisation. I want to quote from an article which appeared in *The Weekend Australian* in which Professor Tatz said—

Justice for the people of Aboriginal race does indeed transcend State borders. And I believe it won't be very long before that matter of justice transcends into national boundaries. When that happens the Federal Government will have to choose between the very deep, very troublesome, very painful blue seas of international forces and the local racist, short-term self-interests of a couple of premier devils.

I stress the last sentence of that quote. That came from the pen of a so-called academic.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: What do you mean "so-called"; he is an academic.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: All right; that makes it even worse. He advises a body which is supposed to give advice to the Federal Government on Aboriginal affairs, and that is his attitude. He talks about the short-term self-interests of a couple of premier devils—and that coming from the pen of an academic who should know better than to put that sort of accusation in a public newspaper.

It is to the thinking of people such as Dr Coombs and Professor Tatz that members of the Opposition look for support and guidance for their centralist aims.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: You would not allow anybody to speak, would you?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am not suggesting they cannot speak. Professor Tatz is supposed to be giving advice to the Government, and that is the sort of emotive, outlandish speech that he uses. Even Mr Dowding would agree his speech was outlandish and emotive.

I suggest further that Dr Coombs and Professor Tatz are not the only—or even the principal—actors in this great scenario. In fact, we come to a fellow of whom we have heard much in this House of late; I refer to Stephen Hawke.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: A 21-year-old young man.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Well, he has certainly done very well for himself in his short time.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: What does he do?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Mr Dowding knows better than I do. There is no doubt in anybody's mind that Stephen Hawke, because he belongs to the ALP and abides by its policy, is an undoubted socialist.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Have you evidence that he is a member of the Labor Party?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: No, but I am informed he is.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: My information is that he is not.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: If he is not, I apologise.

In my opinion Stephen Hawke is a centralist, not necessarily because he is a member of the ALP, but because of his activities in the Kimberley. He is associated with and is in fact setting up an organisation in the Kimberley which is called the Marra Worra Worra. That organisation is designed to represent all Aboriginal communities in the Fitzroy area.

The Hon. H. W. Olney: He is decentralising them, isn't he?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: No, he is centralising them. Traditionally, the tribes have been individual, self-organised groups.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Anyone who knows the Fitzroy area would know that is so.

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: You are only a tourist.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Mr Hawke, through the Marra Worra Worra seeks to control the Aboriginal people; he seeks to control their attitudes to land and mining and their contact with outsiders. I will read from the Kimberley Land Council newsletter No. 3, which sets out the aims of Marra Worra Worra.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Ask the Aborigines.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Why do you not listen?

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Have you ever asked the Aborigines?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Have you?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Of course. I speak to Aborigines very readily. In fact, many of the people in my electorate are Aborigines.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: In the Fitzroy River area?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: No.

I am quoting from Stephen Hawke, who said in *The West Australian* on 21 August 1980, when he was referring to Mr Withers' speech in the House—

The organisation mentioned in the letter was the Marra Worra Worra group, a council of members of the communities of Aboriginal reserves in Fitzroy Crossing.

[Mr Hawke has been working to establish the group for some time.]

I want to tell the House what the organisation is doing. We will obtain an indication of that from newsletter No. 3 of the Kimberley Land Council. Mr Dowding might tell me that has nothing to do with what the Aborigines think; and if that is the case, it supports my argument. I quote from the newsletter as follows—

Marra Worra Worra wants to see a number of changes in the Fitzroy area:

Land—Traditional land to be handed back freehold to traditional owners. Massacre memorials to be erected where massacres occurred.

Mining—No mining on Aboriginal land. Sacred sites must not be disturbed.

Problems in town—White attitudes to Aborigines and white man running with Aboriginal woman.

Police—More co-operation and understanding needed.

Visitors—Must approach communities through Marra Worra Worra.

That is very significant.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Why?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Anybody who wishes to speak to an Aboriginal group within the Kimberley has to go through this central bureaucracy being set up by Stephen Hawke—the Marra Worra Worra.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Does that relate to the Fitzroy River area? It is not the whole Kimberley.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Does the restriction suggested by Stephen Hawke apply to the elected members of Parliament? Does it mean if the Hon. Bill Withers wants to speak to his constituents in the Fitzroy Crossing area, he has to go to Stephen Hawke or the Marra Worra Worra before he can speak to them?

The Hon. Peter Dowding: He does not have to go to Stephen Hawke. He should ask the Aboriginal community out of courtesy.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Stephen Hawke is suggesting an umbrella organisation which would oversee all the communities within the Kimberley region. That is happening now.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Are you suggesting seriously that Mr Withers would have to go to these people before he could interview people in his electorate?

The Hon. Peter Dowding: It is common politeness.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask honourable members to listen to the honourable member who is making his speech, and to cease interjecting. Every member has an opportunity to speak in this House, and every member will have the protection of the Chair. The Hon. Norman Moore has the protection of the Chair at this moment.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I appreciate your assistance, Mr President. Mr Dowding said—

#### *Point of Order*

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: On a point of order, Mr President. I understood you had ruled that the proper mode of address to another member of this House was "the honourable". Perhaps this honourable member could remember that.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is no point of order. However, I draw the attention of all honourable members to the fact that they are to address every other member of this House with the prefix of "honourable".

#### *Debate Resumed*

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Thank you, Mr President. I stand corrected; and I do apologise to the honourable member. I recall, when I first came here, for the first week or two the Hon. Mr Hetherington did all in his power to make sure he was not called "the honourable".

The Hon. R. Hetherington: I would still prefer that.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: By interjection, the Hon. Mr Dowding said it was a good thing that anybody visiting Aboriginal communities in the Fitzroy area had to go through this Marra Worra Worra.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: I said it was a good thing if they asked the community.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am talking about the organisation, the Marra Worra Worra. According to the Kimberley Land Council document, visitors must approach communities through the Marra Worra Worra.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: If that is the only way, we abide by it. Why don't you?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: This organisation is asking for some unique, middle-man role between an elected representative and the people he represents. This organisation set up by Stephen Hawke will decide who the Hon. Bill Withers can talk to—

The Hon. Peter Dowding: If the community wants it.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: The Hon. Mr Dowding cannot tell me that the Hon. Mr Withers will not be able to contact the Aboriginal people—

The Hon. Peter Dowding: What if the community wants that? Can you answer that?

The Hon. P. G. Pental: They would be wanting apartheid.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I agree with that.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: You have to ask permission to go into the home of any person, or is that not what you think?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: The situation of conflict that exists in the Kimberley at present has brought together all the people of whom I have spoken. There is Dr Coombs, Mr Hawke, Professor Tatz, and all the other people with a centralist bent. I have suggested they have a vested interest in creating turmoil. It is obvious to me that no amount of tolerance, civility, or compromise by the State Government would have any effect on their thinking. In fact, I suggest they are bureaucratic and ideological predators who will stop at nothing to attain their goal of centralising all activities in Australia.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Come on!

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I was rather interested to read the reports about the delegation from the National Aboriginal Conference taking



their complaints to the United Nations. I suggest that is just international forum shopping on a grand scale. Who do the representatives of the Aboriginal people of Noonkanbah—the National Aboriginal Conference—want to decide their fate? In other words, to whom do they want to take their case?

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Anybody but Charles Court.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: They took it to the United Nations—that organisation which consists of such sterling advocates of democracy as the Soviet Union, East Germany, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Yugoslavia.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: The United States of America.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: France, Germany, England.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: They are countries which, in the name of official policy, have dispossessed and pauperised the majority of their citizens.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: That is exactly what is happening here.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: No doubt delegates from such enlightened countries as Tanzania, Mozambique, Angola, and Ethiopia are the sorts of people who will be making judgments upon the laws of Western Australia—passing judgment on legislation enacted by a Labor Government. The Aboriginal Heritage Act was enacted by the State Labor Government in 1972.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Your manipulation of the Trustees of the Museum—that is what they are passing judgment on.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: The National Aboriginal Council, and the publicly-funded Mr Philip Vincent of the Aboriginal Legal Service, have chosen a very good forum in which to present their arguments!

The Hon. R. Hetherington: The public funding seems to upset you. If they are funded publicly, do you think they should not criticise the Government?

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: It helps if they realise where the money is coming from.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: The Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife tells us he cannot answer such questions. That is secret government.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: Those people are taking the case to the United Nations, and they are presenting it to the enlightened nations I named. This present State Government has upheld what the Tonkin Government made law.

The Opposition has failed to recognise this, and it has failed to support the legal course which could be followed. That is one of the great tragedies of Noonkanbah. The Opposition is not honouring its own legislation.

By abrogating its duty to honour its own legislation, the Opposition has contributed willfully to strengthening committed centralists and others who seek the support of foreign allies in their drive to gain monopoly control over the lives and destinies of Western Australians. This is just a step in the direction towards gaining centralised monopoly control through a centralised administration in Canberra.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: There is only one Government controlling our lives and destinies with an iron fist, and that is your Government.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I will conclude with a further point in relation to the Aboriginal people, but not concerning Noonkanbah. Recently I visited Wiluna, which is part of my electorate, and I spent two or three days there. I was very distressed to see the amount of drinking that is taking place amongst the Aboriginal people in Wiluna.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: I can tell the honourable member why.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. Peter Dowding: I can probably tell you a whole lot of things.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member will have an opportunity at some later stage.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Because of the Government's—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will cease these interjections, otherwise he will find out very early in his parliamentary career that they will not be tolerated. If he is endeavouring to ensure that I put something into effect in a moment, he is going the right way about it.

The Hon. Norman Moore.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: The situation in Wiluna has improved considerably in recent times. The situation now is that the Aboriginal people are not on unemployment benefits, but they are being paid a wage for working for the community. They have a system of chits which are issued to the Aboriginal families each day so they can buy provisions through the local store. On Thursday or Friday of each week the difference between the amount of their wage and the amount taken out in chits is given to the people in cash. The cash is then spent in one great big "swill" in one night, two nights, or however

long it takes them to spend it. Then on Monday they are back to using chits, and they have no cash.

Whilst some improvement is taking place in Wiluna, the situation is still most distressing. The people are literally drinking themselves to death. That is just what I saw when I lived in Laverton. It was worse there because in Laverton the Aboriginal people have access to wine, particularly port and muscat. In Wiluna they have beer only. The publican has decided that there will be no port, muscat, or spirits of any sort available for the Aboriginal people. That is a wise decision.

I am of the opinion we have almost reached the situation in which many people in the Aboriginal community, particularly in some of the outback areas such as the central reserves, Laverton, Leonara, and Wiluna, and perhaps Jigalong—I am not so sure about Jigalong—are drinking themselves to death. That is a most distressing thing to see. The Hon. Mr Dowding might be able to tell me a similar story.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: I will.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: The fact is that we see people lying under trees, first thing in the morning, absolutely out of their minds with the effects of their having drunk a flagon or so of muscat the night before. I would go almost as far as to suggest the rescinding of Aboriginal drinking rights. If something is not done to prevent the Aboriginal people in some parts of Western Australia from drinking so much they will eventually drink themselves to death. That is certainly not in the interests of them or anybody else in this country.

The Hon. H. W. Olney: They used to get wine in Carnarvon even before drinking rights were granted.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I understand that. If something is not done soon, we will not have an Aboriginal problem.

I support the motion.

**THE HON. G. C. MACKINNON** (South-West) [8.13 p.m.]: I rise to support the motion. I have given a lot of serious thought to whether I should speak on this occasion, but I was finally convinced that I should. Over the years, I have listened to so many speeches on the Address-in-Reply that I decided perhaps I should be allowed to "get my own back". Whatever the reason, I have decided I should avail myself of this opportunity.

I want particularly to congratulate the new members who have come into the House. I trust they will enjoy their time here as much as I have.

I never wanted to be anything else but a member of Parliament. Indeed, my sole ambition was to be Leader of this House, which I achieved for a short period. I am one of the few people who have actually accomplished their ambition. The fact that I fell prey to the system, as Mr Dans pointed out, is beside the point.

I convey my congratulations to those who have retained their positions or received preferment to the Cabinet and other positions.

As you are aware, Sir, I was elected a member of this House in 1956 which means I have been a member for 25 years—a quarter of a century. The only other member who was in this House at that time and is still with us, is the Hon. Norm Baxter. The Hon. Roy Abbey became a member shortly after 1956; but, of course, he is no longer with us. He is just visiting us now.

One of the most notable features about this House at that time was that six members represented the area which impinged on Kalgoorlie. They were the Hon. George Bennetts, who died a little while ago; the Hon. John Cunningham, who was very friendly with the Hon. George Bennetts—he was a Liberal and is still alive; the Hon. Jim Garrigan, deceased; the Hon. Bill Hall, who was one of the best Chairmen of Committees under whom it has been my pleasure to work, a great man to whom to chat; and the Hon. Eric Heenan. Some members of this House might applaud the fact that the Hon. Eric Heenan was the only solicitor in the House in those days. He was a member of the ALP. The Liberal Party did not have a member of the legal profession in this House. On most occasions when we were discussing matters of law, it was generally Eric Heenan and myself who entered into the debate. For some peculiar reason I took over the role of being the legal expert to the Liberal Party in the House in those days.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: The Hon. Eric Heenan is still very fit and returns to the Esperance celebrations every year.

The Hon. G. C. MACKINNON: Eric Heenan is a very nice fellow. The Hon. John Denis Teahan was a member at that time, also. A peculiar situation developed in that whenever a debate touched upon the goldfields or Kalgoorlie area, we had to sit quietly while six members made their contributions, because not one of them could be left out of the *Kalgoorlie Miner* next day. They were all Labor members, but that did not affect the situation.

The Hon. Frank Joseph Scott Wise felt it was an awful waste of time; but, nevertheless, that is the way it was. The Leader of the House in those

days was the Hon. Gilbert Fraser who is a man of very dear memory to me. He was a very close friend of the Hon. Keith Watson, both of whom began their careers as messenger boys with the Post Office. Both those men had very successful lives.

In case there are some members present who feel despondent about their preferment in political life, let me say that at the end of nine years as a member of Parliament, I felt exactly the same way. The Hon. Des O'Neil and I went to Tasmania for a holiday believing we had no future in politics and should get out. The Hon. Desmond O'Neil had been a member of Parliament for six years and I had been a member for nine. While we were in Tasmania we received a message from the Premier (Sir David Brand) telling us to come home immediately, because we were going to be made Ministers.

At that time I was considered to be something of an expert on industrial law, so I was made Minister for Health! Sir Desmond O'Neil was made Minister for Industrial Relations and Labour and Industry! He knew absolutely nothing about those portfolios. The other remarkable aspect of the matter was that we received the message in a very small telephone box into which we both fitted.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: It must have been a long time ago!

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: We were required to rush back to Perth, so we sent our wives to Sydney and made the journey home in the back of an Electra. It was a very uncomfortable journey. We expected people to be waving flags to greet our return, but nobody was around. Nobody wanted to see us. We thought the Premier would want to see such bright young fellows; but he did not. There was only dog's meat in Sir Desmond O'Neil's fridge, so I think we went to a barbecue. We decided to go down to Bunbury; but my mother did not want us. She could see us taking over the grandchildren.

So we sat around doing nothing for the weekend. On Monday night when we were drinking in a bar in a rather disappointed state, we received a message telling us to be at our respective offices at 10 o'clock on Tuesday morning. We could not get there quickly enough. I took over my portfolio from the Hon. Ross Hutchinson and I have forgotten from whom Sir Desmond O'Neil took over his portfolio. It may have been the Premier who held the job before him for a short time.

Both Sir Desmond and I had the same experience. We were introduced to the heads of

our respective departments who then walked out and we were left to our own devices. It is funny how some situations run in the family. At that time I was appointed as an Honorary Minister, because there was no provision for two extra Ministers. The Act had to be amended before we could be appointed as Ministers.

The Hon. Tom McNeil: With a constitutional majority.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I agree with the member; with a constitutional majority. My nephew has had the same experience. Once the amendment was passed, there was no argument about the matter. I am not sure whether the same situation will apply in the case of my nephew.

I remember having to travel around a good deal and I felt I was very hard done by as I still was being paid a salary of £600.

I should like particularly to mention the people who were members of this House at the time I was made a Minister. They were: the Hon. Roy Abbey; the Hon. Norman Baxter; the Hon. George Brand; the Hon. Leslie Diver, one of your predecessors, Sir; the Hon. John Dolan, who had come in at the by-election; the Hon. Victor Ferry; the Hon. James Garrigan; the Hon. Arthur Griffith and the Hon. Clive Griffiths; the Hon. Eric Heenan; the Hon. Jack Heitman; the Hon. James Hislop; the Hon. Edward House, whom I shall mention later on in connection with another matter; the Hon. Ruby Hutchison who finally retired to make room for the Hon. Lyla Elliott; the Hon. Arthur Jones who died quite tragically and was a member of the NCP; the Hon. Fred Lavery; the Hon. Leslie Logan; myself and the Hon. Neil McNeill; the Hon. Tom Perry; the Hon. Herb Robinson; the Hon. Harry Strickland; the Hon. Claude Stubbs; the Hon. Ron Thompson; the Hon. Sydney Thompson; the Hon. Jack Thomson; the Hon. Keith Watson; the Hon. William Willesee; the Hon. Francis Willmott; and the Hon. Frank Wise.

I mention those names, because I want to refer to the members who left this House at the last election. They are the Hon. Claude Stubbs, the Hon. Ron Thompson, The Hon. George Berry, the Hon. John Tozer, the Hon. Roy Cloughton, the Hon. Grace Vaughan, and the Hon. Don Cooley. All those ex-members conjure up memories of different events which were of importance to this House and, I hope, to this State. They were of particular importance to me.

One of the first events which occurred after I became a Minister was the amendment of the Fisheries Act which was in disarray at the time. A year or so previously a report was brought down

by a Select Committee, which subsequently became an Honorary Royal Commission, in 1964. The Hon. Norm Baxter was the Chairman of that committee and the membership comprised the Hon. Sydney Thompson—a National Country Party member—and the Hon. Ron Thompson—a Labor Party member. The Hon. Clair Mattiske was originally a member, but he had withdrawn and no other Liberal member wanted to be appointed to the Select Committee. Subsequently I was pleased I was not appointed because I became Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife some time after the committee was set up.

At the time I introduced amendments to the Fisheries Act, which is currently credited with being the most efficient and strongest Fisheries Act in the world and which has led to the saving of the rock lobster industry and the establishment of a number of other industries, I told the Hon. Ron Thompson what I proposed to do. I went to him, because I believed that this place ought to form the basis of compromise and consensus of opinions. Many of the things the Government was proposing to do fitted in with the report I have mentioned. That report was a very good one.

I spoke to the Hon. Ron Thompson about the matter. In the event, the Bill passed through both Houses without a dissentient vote. It was a particularly tough piece of legislation. It contained the sorts of penalties which are the bane of lawyers and judges—it had minimum penalties. Those minimum penalties were tough. For a first offence the minimum fine was \$500 and for a second offence it was \$1 000. Nevertheless, such was the influence of the Hon. Ron Thompson that the Labor Party accepted the Bill and it passed through both Houses. On subsequent occasions over a period of six years, and later on over a period of a year and a half, if there was any matter about which I was concerned, I had no worries about going to the Hon. Ron Thompson and talking to him about it. That did not alter the fact that we had some good arguments on the floor of the House.

I should like to stress that point, because I would like to return to it a little later when I say a few words in general about the future of this particular Chamber and the trend one sees developing, not just in political life, but indeed in most aspects of social life, of almost perpetual confrontation. I shall elaborate on that a little later.

The next person I should like to mention is the Hon. Claude Stubbs. He was particularly active at a time when it became my lot to try to resurrect the programme for the fluoridation of the water supplies in this State. It was an

interesting exercise, because it had been tried and it had failed once previously. The National Country Party was opposed to the fluoridation of the water supplies and it voted, as party policy, to that effect at its conference.

The programme started in the southern part of the territory of the National Country Party to try to convince the hierarchy of the NCP that fluoride was a good thing. We were successful in our endeavours at a town called Tambellup and the Hon. Ted House was a great help in this regard. He resurrected the issue at the NCP conference, with the assistance of a group of young university members of the NCP.

I am a little loath to mention this, but we received help also from a leaked document.

Leaked documents are almost standard procedure these days. However, on this occasion a leaked document came into my possession. It was a very confidential report prepared by the ALP. Two of the signatories to the report were the Hon. Joe Berinson and the Hon. Claude Stubbs. I have forgotten the name of the third signatory.

It was an excellent report and it is a pity if in fact it has been lost, because it dealt with the views of these gentlemen. One cannot say it represented the views of the ALP; but it represented the views of these gentlemen in regard to this type of legislation. It also gave their views with regard to referendums.

I found the report to be extremely interesting. Although couched in different words, the comments in the report concerning referendums added up to the classic definition of a referendum which is "an appeal from those who ought to know to those who have not got a chance to know".

The report gave short shrift to the prospect of a referendum, and came down unanimously in favour of the fluoridation of water supplies. Mr John Tonkin had been successful in persuading the conference that it should not be accepted, and the report was discarded. I approached the then Premier (David Brand) to see whether I should use the information. There was a slightly different attitude in those days because he said, "No", and that was the end of it. It happened a long time ago so I do not mind mentioning it now.

When the final vote came on the fluoridation of water supplies the ayes comprised Roy Abbey, George Brand, Vic Ferry, Arthur Griffith, Clive Griffiths, Eric Heenan, Jack Heitman, Dr Hislop, Ted House, Les Logan, G. C. MacKinnon, Neil McNeill, Claude Stubbs, Jack Thomson, Keith Watson, Frank Willmott, and Herb Robinson. That goes to show that people from the Labor

Party do cross the floor. On that occasion it took a great deal of courage. I do not think John Tonkin would mind my saying it, but they were voting against the almost bigoted belief of their leader. He was a leader who was not disregarded lightly; he was a leader held in high regard, but the members of the Labor Party crossed the floor despite John's expressed wish, because with total sincerity they believed in the fluoridation of water supplies.

I have always had a soft spot for both Eric Heenan and Claude Stubbs from that day to this. I think it was a narrow success and it was won by one vote only. Jack Thomson voted against me, and if I remember correctly Norman Baxter voted against me. Others who voted against the question were John Dolan, Ruby Hutchison, Harry Strickland, Ron Thompson, Bill Willesee, Frank Wise, and Jack Garrigan. The measure was passed in such a way—quite deliberately—that it was impossible to change once it became law unless those opposing it had a majority in both Houses. That has not happened yet.

It was on that occasion that Ross Hutchinson, the Speaker in the Assembly, was put under some pressure. A person who was opposed to the measure took out his upper and lower plates, and clapped the full denture on the floor of the House. The Speaker did not take a happy view of that action.

George Berry was mentioned earlier. He brings to mind the programme which this House initiated for the cropping of kangaroos. The system was greeted with howls of derision from people in pastoral areas who claimed that only the kangaroos on their properties should be shot, and no-one should worry about the kangaroos on anybody else's property.

It is strange how some things become politically possible. A quite minor development made the tagging and cropping programme possible with the invention of a simple plastic tag about as long as a pencil and with one end serrated. There was a hole in the other end of the tag through which the serrated section could be pushed. It was able to be used on carcases by pushing the plastic tag through the skin. It could only be removed by ripping it out, and any tampering obviously was visible. That one small technical advance made it possible to produce a programme of cropping for kangaroos.

Unfortunately, the cropping programme was ruined almost totally by American conservationists who regarded the destruction of kangaroos differently from the way we regard that destruction. They have a different system of

government in America and the lobbyists and protectionists got in and made it almost impossible to continue with a sensible cropping programme either in Australia or in South Africa, where the same sort of principle with regard to animal cropping takes place. Unfortunately, that move was aided and abetted by Senator Murphy, currently Judge Murphy, and I had one or two interesting arguments with him.

I suppose that attitude was understandable to anybody who did not know the Australian country, and did not know of the build-up of kangaroos. It is my sincere hope we will have a breakthrough in the United States with regard to the selling to them of kangaroo products, when we will be able to get our cropping programme back onto a reasonable basis.

It seems the height of absurdity that a very good protein source such as kangaroo meat should be fed only to domestic pets. A good source of protein such as kangaroo meat should be used in a more sensible way. Certainly, the skins should be used for a whole host of extremely useful purposes.

I knew John Tozer before he became a member of Parliament and, indeed, before he became active in the north of this State. He was the Shire Clerk at Harvey when I first became a member of Parliament. My next association with him was when I was Minister for Health. When the development commenced in the north, we made it a practice in the department to buy land wherever any development was taking place. We were about the only department that took that course of action, and we were the only department which actually had adequate holdings of land. Indeed, the then Minister for Industrial Development—now Sir Charles Court—was able to borrow a house in Port Hedland from the Department of Health for John Tozer. I contacted him again at that time.

Roy Cloughton is one of those people whom one is not always pleased to see come but sorry to see go. One becomes attached to certain people. Roy was a person who, if he decided to make a speech, researched the subject with great thoroughness. He was not the easiest fellow to listen to, but if one wanted to know about a subject from the ALP point of view, one only had to read his speech.

I had considerable contact with Roy Cloughton while I was Minister for Cultural Affairs, and he took a great deal of interest in the Art Gallery. I was involved in the expenditure of a \$1 million advance to build a showplace in order to display a few paintings. I think Roy probably took more

interest in that, from the Opposition point of view, than anybody else. He was an active and valued member of the Museum Board during the three years I was responsible for its activities.

I remember Grace Vaughan as a healthy protagonist. Of course, she and I had many arguments and yet like so many of those people with whom one associates here I finished up quite fond of her. Whatever can be said about her, it cannot be said that she was not colourful. She was unusual and, again, I was sorry to see her go—not that I am sad to see Phil Pandal here.

I suppose I have to be careful what I say about Don Cooley because he is registered as a voter in Augusta, part of my electorate.

Mick Gayfer, whose Christian names, incidentally, are Harry Walter and not "Mick", has reminded me that Don Cooley used to give us "Larry Dooly" while laughing most of the time. It is claimed he had only one speech which centred on the fact that all Liberals should have been drowned at birth. He made that speech fit on every occasion.

I want to thank those members who have seen fit to comment about me during the course of their speeches. I thank them for their remarks. I am aware Des Dans mentioned that John Tonkin had lasted out the system. He finally wore everybody down, whereas I did not last out the system. I appreciate the comments from Des Dans.

I could suggest to Sandy Lewis that he might have made his comments spread over more than one page, but I take it he did his best.

I have already mentioned the members who spoke of me and I appreciate very much indeed what they had to say.

I mentioned earlier that I wanted to come back to the matter of confrontation. It tends to be forgotten that parliamentary councils—or whatever you like—developed because people got sick and tired of hitting each other with clubs. That was the only way arguments were settled. If a group of people down the road had more women or cattle than another group, the second group would move in with their clubs and take what they wanted. That type of living got a bit tedious because the other crowd would usually come back and take similar action.

Somewhere along the line somebody had enough sense to come to the conclusion that it was a short-sighted attitude, and that they ought to get together and talk about it. They agreed that somewhere along the line they could trade their cattle and reach some sort of amicable arrangement. It seems that was a good idea and it

gradually was accepted throughout most of the world—certainly in our part of the world amongst British-speaking people. Perhaps that was because we were more violent than other people and argued and fought more and, for that reason, we had to do something.

People went through the robber Barons period, and settled for discussion. It seems to me that we have almost returned to the routine of confrontation, and what one member described as "programmed aggression". It seems this attitude of programmed aggression or confrontation—call it what one will—surely is leading us back to where we came from. Sooner or later, if tempers get as realistic as they sometimes appear to be, someone eventually will throw a book and it will be on again. It seems to me there must be a stage where we decide to stop this confrontation—either by interjection or by whatever—where we cannot accept that the other person has a point of view. We have to stop before it is too late.

Twice in my time here we came perilously close to civil war. That may appear to most members as being a wild and exaggerated statement, but feelings were so high that both sides regarded members on the other side as being totally stupid. No-one was credited with having a modicum of decency and any sort of ethical conduct had been almost totally forgotten. Indeed, that still happens all too frequently.

I believe it behoves someone to sound a warning, and perhaps, as someone who has been as guilty of such conduct as anyone else, I believe I am in the position to sound that warning.

It is not easy to stop and turn back. I accept that we are all under pressure. We are under pressure from our leaders and from the consensus group in our own parties "to give them hell" and that sort of thing. Nevertheless, somewhere along the line we have to stop the total confrontation and talk.

I know this attitude of confrontation has become almost fashionable. On our side we wish to confront the unions, and the unions wish to confront the capitalists or the bosses. Such confrontation gets us precisely nowhere. We may have a temporary victory on occasions. I understand that today the ACTU has declared war on the major mining companies and the Western Australian Government. Bob Hawke is an intelligent person and a Rhodes scholar, and he has been associated with industrial turmoil for most of his life. I do not know whether he still has any influence in the ACTU, but of course he knows that such confrontation is useless.

If one stopped to think for 10 minutes, one would realise that I could quite easily discuss some of the behaviour we witnessed here tonight. Neither side was blameless, and neither side was fully to blame.

Mr Moore is an intelligent, sensible fellow. He knew jolly well what he was saying would draw the sort of comment it did. He had already seen the irascible behaviour of which Mr Dowding is capable, and Mr Dowding did not disappoint him. That was exactly what could have been expected. Wisely Mr Dowding thought that discretion was the better part of valour on that occasion. I am glad he thought that way for all our sakes—any other action would have reflected on all of us.

I have done things which have made people extremely angry and they have said things they probably did not mean to say. The things they have said on occasions were so silly that they could not have meant to say them. I mean that kindly; they made remarks off the top of their heads. The remarks were made in anger because I goaded them into anger.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Very good you were at it, too.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I was an expert. Nevertheless, I believe it behoves me to say one or two words about the subject—softly softly, catchee monkey! I will comment about Mr Dowding, because I am quite sure he will not mind my doing so. I mean my comments kindly. Mr Dowding has set himself an awful handicap—he has put himself back a few hundred yards in the race. I know from what people tell me that he is a very intelligent fellow and he knows he has put himself back—maybe that is where he wants to run from.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: That is being a bit provocative. As you indicated, you were a master at it, and I am being very controlled.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I know that the honourable member is. I had every intention tonight to say a number of nasty things, but I decided not to. I am trying to be extremely nice or not say anything at all.

I want to touch on the running mate to "compromise and consensus"—I want to say a few words about "communication". It seems to me that part of the problem of the constant compromise situation in which we find ourselves socially is due to a lack of communication. At this moment in the history of the world the technical ability to communicate has never been better. We can put a man on the moon and talk to him. Messages can whiz around the world. However, our ability to get the story over to the people in

the electorate has never been worse. There is so much for people to look at and listen to today. I was interested that Mr Moore is so anxious to have television up in his area. I should warn him not to bother—it is a ghastly mistake!

The Hon. N. F. Moore: I have a suspicion that I agree with you.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The people there will get their television, and they will stop reading and stop listening.

Governments and departments are blamed for not communicating, but almost without exception such blame is wrongly placed. Just recently I read complaints that the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Board does not let anyone know what it is doing. For some years now the board has put out a forward planning book showing what it intends to do for the next five years. The book is updated every year, so that at any time a member of the public can find out what the board plans to do for the next five years. And yet the board is accused of not telling the public what it proposes to do. The problem is that nobody reads what the board puts out.

An interesting example of this kind of thing happened in my own street where I approved the extension of the waste water treatment drainage. After such an extension is approved and the forms are signed by the Minister, the plan is advertised in the local Press and in *The West Australian*. According to the law those advertisements were published and the plans, as advertised, were available at the shire office for perusal.

All members know that procedure must be followed for any planning proposal. The plan may have to lay on the Table of the House or of the local authority for three months, six months, or whatever the period is as prescribed by law. However, no-one reads the classified advertisements, except perhaps the contractors who may wish to tender for jobs.

To come back to the situation in my street, I walked out of my house one morning and there was a man with a theodolite and another man driving pegs in. One of the neighbours asked me what was happening and I said, "Perhaps the road is to be widened." I was then told by one of the men that sewerage was being laid on. I had forgotten that I had approved this plan. As it happened, nobody objected because this was a fairly established area and the septic tanks were starting to pack up.

This sort of thing happens all the time, a plan is advertised, but when some activity commences, a survey is undertaken and the residents are inclined to say, "Whatever it is I am against it".

By that time all the conditions have been met, the builder has let the contracts, money has been borrowed, and all of a sudden the community wants to stop the development. This happens whether the proposal is for a building, a drain, or a new bridge. You know, Mr Deputy President, that a number of members of this House were involved last year in objecting to a whole series of planning proposals right at the death knock.

What is the solution? The solution must be to stop abiding just by the law. Certainly it is my belief that every member of Parliament of both Houses ought to be advised about what is happening. New developments should be put out as Press releases. In other words, there must be a concerted effort to publicise any kind of planning change because just abiding by the law has proved to be insufficient.

I do not believe that the addition of a head public relations man to the Government's staff will alter the situation one little bit. There has to be a totally different approach in regard to making planning information available to the public. We see this problem arise on many different issues. At present in my home town of Bunbury there are objections to the Borden chemical glue plant. A little while ago there were objections to the edible oil plant, and before that, objections to the extensions of the harbour. The Government and Government departments are then accused of secrecy. These accusations are totally unfounded because all the laws have been abided by and all the advertising carried out, but nobody takes a bit of notice.

A classic example with regard to communications is the problem besetting the South-West Province and some of the Lower Central Province as a result of a new upsurge in mining pegging. It does not matter what meeting one attends in the south-west now, the farmers pin one down about the activities of mining companies on their properties.

We can tell these farmers over and over again that the Act under which the pegging is carried out is the Act under which their grandfathers worked; that is, the old Mining Act because the new Mining Act is not yet in force. However, they have heard of the new Mining Act. It has been reported in the Press, and that is all they know about. They have heard about members complaining of the new Mining Act and they think the whole system has been changed.

This is not the case in Boyup Brook, mainly, I think, because the local member (Mr A. A. Lewis) has gone to great lengths to explain the

facts to his constituents. It is not the case in Collie because the people of Collie are used to mining.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: The same great member!

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Mr Lewis is saying that Collie is in his electorate also. However, the people of Collie are used to mining, as are the people of Greenbushes.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Same thing!

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It is becoming monotonous! I can recall that when I was a boy and tin mining activities commenced, the farmers got over the problem by the simple expedient of pegging their own farms. Under the old provisions they did not need to do anything else; that protected them from other tin miners.

However, mining is a new experience in Busselton and other areas. The problem is aggravated because a number of old properties have pre-1890 title deeds which give the original owners rights to the minerals. Further complications arise because of recent years some owners have signed agreements with mining companies to allow certain mining exploratory work, but in the intervening period, they have forgotten the existence of such agreements. The result is almost total turmoil in the farming community in the south-west of this State; that is to say, running from Waroona right down to Augusta. This turmoil is apparent at any gathering of farmers.

It is almost impossible to explain, because it is an emotional matter. These people believe their properties are being walked on, willy-nilly, and that we as a Parliament have made it legally possible for this to take place. As I say it is almost impossible to convince them they are wrong.

Others believe that a simple title deed gives them absolute rights over their land, and to explain to them the ramifications of a title deed does not tend to render one popular. I recall getting Peter Beeson to do it last year at a meeting on soil salinity in the south-west. He was quite explicit that a title deed allowed a person to use his land in conformity with the law, no more and no less. The people did not like that, either. In fact, people in the south-west are becoming aware of the limitations of an ordinary title deed.

It seems ludicrous that in this day and age there should be misunderstanding as to the legal ramifications of a simple title deed; nevertheless, such misunderstandings exist in a very widespread way. People believe they can sell the minerals under their land, despite the fact that the minerals do not and never have belonged to the people who possess the title deed to the land.



The Hon. P. H. Wells: The mining companies know who owns them.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Of course they do. Mr Wells has raised an interesting point, which is another aspect I should mention. At times, I have approached the Minister and told him about a problem. He has almost always pointed out that the mining companies with which we deal are reputable bodies; nobody would argue about that. The fact of the matter is that the mining companies let out a lot of their work to contractors, and this is where problems sometimes arise. It might be a local firm doing a survey or a little exploratory drilling; they may drill only some 10 feet or they may undertake some pegging work.

Often, small companies are established on the spur of the moment to take advantage of a particular situation, and sometimes they are not "reputable".

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Surely on that argument, if the Aborigines obtain freehold title they would not have the mining rights anyway.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Mr Lewis is fully aware of the situation; he knows that as well as I do. Indeed, this is one of the aspects which confuses the situation, because people say, "Aborigines own the lease, yet they are talking about having mining rights."

The Hon. H. W. Olney: They had them before 1788.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: For several centuries, by historic occupancy, my family owned a piece of one of the islands off the west coast of Scotland. Then the British came and purchased the land shooting rights and moved my great great grandfather's family off the land. We were fresh out of title.

The Hon. H. W. Olney: You should have taken a stand.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: We did not have any lawyers up there to fight a battle on all sorts of funny grounds. My family moved to Australia and secured 80 acres of land on the outskirts of Melbourne; in fact, it is probably still there. My grandparents had to leave that land because of drought and rabbit plagues, and they were fresh out of title, too. I would not mind a few land rights myself, because 80 acres within spitting distance of Melbourne would suit me very nicely.

That sort of historic accident is no argument and for a QC to say things like that makes me believe we should introduce a special Act to strip him of his QC!

I am half joking about my family history. I went back there last year and had a look around, and as a matter of fact I am eternally grateful I actually got out of the place. Indeed, if I were forced to live in Aberdeen, with that radioactive granite, I would get the Hon. Lyly Elliott to come over and lecture them on the evils of radioactivity so that my family would move from that place, too. Whilst I was there, they had seven inches of snow; I cannot understand how anybody still lives there. However, they do, quite happily, as we all do in the place in which we are born.

I do not know how far we can go back and claim ownership of property. I gather from my reading of the history of Aborigines that in fact two waves of Aborigines came to this country. I am not quite sure what happened to the first wave. I do not know whether they were assimilated in the old-fashioned, friendly way, or whether it was by the more robust method of chopping off their heads.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: You are talking about tens of thousands of years ago. We are talking about 50 years ago.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: My great grandfather did not come out here tens of thousands of years ago, and he was dispossessed. I am not fighting that battle because I live in a good, healthy, capitalist society which allowed me to succeed, and I have succeeded.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: It sounds as though you have abolished pensions, or something.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That is the absurd sort of statement which merely proves that whatever one talks about is a total waste of time with Mr Dowding. It pre-supposes I am utterly and completely stupid, which I am not and, if I take the remark at its face value I am entitled to pre-suppose Mr Dowding is utterly stupid, which he is not.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: You did not provoke that, did you?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: No. That sort of comment gets us nowhere.

In order to cut off any possible repetition of that sort of interjection, I reiterate my support for the motion, and sit down.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. M. McAleer.

# **ABORIGINAL HERITAGE AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**

## *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. D. J. Wordsworth (Minister for Lands), read a first time.

## *Second Reading*

**THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH** (South—Minister for Lands) [9.08 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972 was enacted because of a growing public awareness of the need to protect and preserve those Aboriginal objects and places which were of special importance and significance to living Aborigines and the Australian heritage.

The legislation had the support of all parties and was therefore worded in an all-encompassing way, with the object of achieving as much protection as was possible, particularly in preserving Aboriginal objects and places which were an integral part of our history and so important to our heritage.

Under the Act wide powers were conferred on the Museum Trustees and the Aboriginal Cultural Material Committee, but at the same time provision was made for the wider role of Government and the obligation of Government to take into consideration the public and national interest when determining whether Aboriginal objects and places should be protected or otherwise.

To this end, the Act contained a provision that enabled the Government, through the responsible Minister, to give to the trustees, or to the committee, directions of a general or specific character as to the exercise of any function under the Act and, further, that the trustees or committee should give effect to any such direction.

In practice, sections of the community have chosen to disregard the existing overriding role of the Government and as the Act additionally confers wide powers on the trustees and the committee, this leaves many of its provisions open to varying interpretations and dispute.

As a consequence, the original purpose for which the Act was introduced has been largely lost and sections of the community, in a highly organised campaign, are now using the Act for political purposes to further their claims for land and mineral rights. It is therefore proposed to make a number of amendments to the Act.

The proposed amendment to section 5 of the principal Act will, to some extent, tighten the provisions relating to the places to which the Act will apply.

The alterations are moderate ones. However, it is hoped that in practice the interpretation of this section will more nearly approximate the original purpose for which the Act was introduced and result in the Act being confined in its application to Aboriginal places and objects of importance and significance, and worthy of preservation.

The Bill seeks to obviate difficulties being experienced in the current Act and make possible prompt, sensitive Government decisions having full regard for the urgent need to protect and preserve Aboriginal places and objects of importance and significance to living Aborigines and the Australian heritage, and for the wider public and national interest.

Provision is made for the Museum Trustees to make recommendations, relative to the proper care and protection of places to which the Act applies, to the responsible Minister for decision after consideration by him of the recommendations of the trustees and the wider public and national interest.

Any decision by the Minister to impose conditions on, or wholly or partly withhold consent from the owner of any land, including a lessee from the Crown, a holder of any mining tenement or privilege, or any privilege under the Petroleum Act in relation to the land on which the Aboriginal site is located, will be subject to appeal to the Supreme Court.

An amendment is included to ensure that, prior to an Aboriginal site being recommended for declaration as a protected area, notice shall be given to interested persons who shall have the opportunity to have their representations considered by the Minister who, in doing so may, if warranted, take into account the wider public and national interest.

If, upon considering the representations, the report of the trustees, and any further information that the Minister may require the complainant or the trustees to provide, it appears to the Minister that it is in the general interest of the community to do so, the Minister may recommend to the Governor that the Aboriginal site be declared a protected area.

The principle of this important amendment is supported by the Museum Trustees who have stated they believe that they should not be put in a position of being the arbiters "in regard to the general interests of the community" and that protected area proposals should be in the form of

recommendations from the trustees to the Minister, upon which the Minister would make a decision. The proposal then would be submitted to the Governor-in-Executive-Council for approval and declaration.

Provision is also made for a declaration of a protected area to be varied or revoked. However, any Order-in-Council varying or revoking such a declaration shall be published in the *Government Gazette* and, as with a regulation under section 36 of the Interpretation Act 1918, shall be subject to disallowance by either House of Parliament.

Another section of the Act will be amended to ensure that the role of the Aboriginal Cultural Material Committee will be substantially advisory to the trustees and that the powers and functions currently given to the committee will be given to the trustees. The trustees have stated that, in principle, the role of the committee should be advisory to the trustees. With the consent of the Minister, powers and functions can be delegated by the trustees.

The current penalties for breach of provisions of the Act are stringent ones, providing as they do for fines and up to 12 months' imprisonment. It is felt that additional property forfeiture provisions which could involve forfeiture of pastoral or freehold properties, or mining tenements, are unnecessary. In the case of a pastoral or freehold property, entire families could be affected and, in the case of a company, large numbers of shareholders, although they may have in no way been involved in the original breach of the Act. It is felt, therefore, that a maximum 12-months' prison sentence for serious breaches of the Act should be an adequate deterrent.

These amendments should serve to eliminate much of the uncertainty and disputation which has occurred recently in respect of Aboriginal sites.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. Peter Dowding.

#### ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

**THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF** (Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [9.16 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, 16 September.

Question put and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: ORDINARY

**THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF** (Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [9.17 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

#### *Mental Health Act: Application*

**THE HON. H. W. OLNEY** (South Metropolitan) [9.18 p.m.]: I do not want to spoil what has been quite an interesting day, but I want to raise a matter of some importance. It is a matter of importance to significant sections of the community which have been fairly active in canvassing some members of the House, if not all the members. I refer to the widespread expression of concern which has emanated from a number of organisations relating to the provisions and present state of the Mental Health Act.

It is believed by a number of quite vocal and well-organised organisations in the community that this Act operates in such a way as to deny civil liberties and human rights. There are a number of particular aspects of the Act about which concern has been expressed, and without going into them all in detail, I will refer particularly to the definition of "mental illness" which involves the finding by a psychiatrist that a person is suffering from some defect of mental health.

In the Act there is no definition of what is meant by "mental health" and therefore it is left to the psychiatrist concerned to determine what is meant by the mental health of a particular patient. There are no objective criteria prescribed in the Act and although this may not be possible, concern is felt that with changing views in the medical profession, the application of this Act could be uneven and could vary from case to case.

Another matter of concern is that mental patients, once they come within the ambit of the Act, have no choice as to the type of treatment to be administered to them. There is a diversity of medical opinion as to the suitability of a number of forms of treatment. I refer particularly to electroconvulsive therapy.

Other matters complained of which are permitted under the Act involve the interference with the mail of patients and the control of property of people who have come within the ambit of the Act.

I respectfully suggest that it may be something the Attorney General could take up and that the whole question of the rights and liberties of

individuals so far as they are affected by the Act could be referred to the Law Reform Commission for consideration. It is a matter on which there should be opportunity for public input. I am aware that perhaps two years ago the Attorney General referred to the Law Reform Commission matters concerning security patients under division 6 of part IV of the Mental Health Act. As yet that reference has not been acted on and no report has been forthcoming.

I suggest this is a matter of considerable importance to many people in the community and is one upon which urgent action is required. As it is strongly rumoured the Government will be introducing amendments to the Mental Health Act, there should be adequate opportunity available for those who have a particular interest in this matter to make a contribution before the amendments are introduced.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 9.20 p.m.*

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### LEGISLATIVE REVIEW AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

#### *Education Department Instructions*

200. The Hon. H. W. OLNEY, to the Attorney General:

- (1) Are administrative instructions issued by the Education Department subject to scrutiny under the Legislative Review and Advisory Committee Act?
- (2) If not, will the Attorney General examine appendix E of the *Teachers Handbook and Administrative Instructions* published in the *Education Circular* of August 1980 and determine whether any aspect of it touches on the "rights or liberties previously established by law or inherent in the traditional freedoms of Her Majesty's Subjects in Western Australia" referred to in answer to question 154 on 3 September 1980?
- (3) Will he give consideration to widening the scope of the Legislative Review and Advisory Committee Act to embrace all forms of governmental regulation and instruction likely to affect the civil and political rights of individuals?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) No. The committee has two functions: the regular review of all regulations, and to examine and report on any Act, regulation, or statutory instrument which is specially referred by either House or myself. The administrative instructions in question are not contained in Acts, regulations, or statutory instruments.
- (2) Appendix "E" referred to deals with what might occur when police visit a school and contains advice to teachers in that regard. It does not amount to an "instruction" and, as such, is not considered to be within the ambit of the matters referred to in (1).
- (3) No. Such a course is not considered practical. It would be unusual to have an administrative instruction affecting basic rights or liberties. If this should happen, there are other ways the matter may be dealt with—as by reference to the Parliamentary Commissioner.

## SMALL BUSINESSES

WA *Small Business Services Pty. Ltd.: Establishment*

201. The Hon. TOM McNEIL, to the Minister representing the Minister for Industrial Development and Commerce:

- (1) Has the W.A. Small Business Services Pty. Ltd. been established?
- (2) Who are its members?
- (3) What are its terms of reference?
- (4) What Act does it operate under?
- (5) Assuming it was established to promote and protect the viability of small businesses, does the Minister believe the company should be empowered to limit the construction of major shopping developments which threaten small businesses already established in both metropolitan and country areas?
- (6) If not, why not?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

- (1) The board of the new Small Business Advisory Services Co. has been formed but the company has not yet been formally established.
- (2) Members of the board of directors are—

Chairman—Mr M. C. Williams—small business proprietor

Director—Mr W. Lapsley—representing Australian Institute of Management

Director—Mr P. McIntyre—representing Perth Chamber of Commerce

Director—Mr N. Shilkin—representing Confederation of W.A. Industry

Director—Mr I. Bolto—representing Farm Machinery Dealers Association

Director—Mr R. Manners—representing Federated Chambers of Commerce

Director—Mr R. Stone—representing Retail Grocers & Storekeepers Association

Director—Mr A. Kingsley—representing Department of Industrial Development and Commerce.

Director—Mr J. Smith-Gander—representing Education Department Technical Education Division.

- (3) Terms of reference are currently being drawn up by the Crown Law Department.
- (4) Under the Companies Act.
- (5) The company will not be empowered to limit construction of shopping complexes, but has been asked to report to me on the effects of these complexes on small business and make consequent recommendations.
- (6) Not applicable.

### FUEL AND ENERGY: OIL

#### *Offshore Rigs*

202. The Hon. D. K. DANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

- (1) How many offshore oil drilling rigs were operating off the Western Australian coast at 30 June 1980?
- (2) How many are operating at present?
- (3) How many onshore oil drilling rigs were operating in Western Australia at 30 June 1980?
- (4) How many are operating at present?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF, replied:

- (1) 6.
- (2) 4.
- (3) 3.
- (4) 4.

### COURT: LAW COURT BUILDING

#### *Accommodation*

203. The Hon. J. M. BERINSON, to the Attorney General:

- (1) What is the anticipated completion date of the District Court building?
- (2) What will be the total floor area of the building?
- (3) What sections of his or other departments are to be accommodated in the building, and approximately what floor area has been or will be allocated to each?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) August 1981.
- (2) 24 000 square metres.

- (3) Apart from an area of 227 square metres on the 15th level which will be utilised by the Premier's Department, occupancy of the building will be limited to use by the Supreme Court (Criminal), District Court, and Magistrates' Courts and peripherals such as facilities for police, prosecutors, legal practitioners, court reporting, and Sheriff's office.

Two levels—9-10—are reserved for future expansion. The building is planned for requirements until the year 2000.

Principal areas of occupancy comprise—

Administration and court offices:  
2 774 sq. metres.

Court rooms and ancillary facilities:  
10 665 sq. metres.

Judges' and magistrates chambers,  
including library and support staff:  
3 652 sq. metres.

Practitioners' facilities—robing,  
library: 913 sq. metres.

Approximately 6 000 sq. metres is taken up with parking, plant, and general facilities.

### TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

#### *Turnover: Country Agencies*

204. The Hon. TOM McNEIL, to the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

Will the Minister advise the Totalisator Agency Board turnover of each individual country agency for the past seven months?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

The Chief Secretary advises that the Totalisator Agency Board is operated as a commercial enterprise and consequently, in line with other commercial enterprises, only the financial information in annual reports is generally made available. This serves to protect the legitimate commercial interests of the TAB, the welfare of which is of great importance to all parts of the racing industry.

## STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE

### *Contribution to Treasury*

205. The Hon. J. M. BROWN, to the Minister representing the Treasurer:

What were the annual contributions to the Treasury from the State Government Insurance Office for the years 1975-1976 to 1979-1980 inclusive?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

The annual contributions to Treasury from the State Government Insurance Office represent the assessed tax calculated in accordance with the Federal Income Tax Assessment Act with due allowance being made for losses in previous years and accepted practice in relation to transfers to reserves. For the period in question, the only payment made by the State Government Insurance Office was \$2 353 798 in 1979-80 in respect of transactions for 1978-79.

## RECREATION

### *Football Finals: Telecasts*

206. The Hon. TOM McNEIL, to the Minister representing the Minister for Recreation:

The Western Australian Football League has stated its opposition to a live telecast of the final series being beamed to all country areas as it believes this will have a detrimental effect on the attendances; however, noting—

- (a) record attendance of 30 184 at this year's first semi-final;
- (b) owing to work being carried out on the new stand, 27 000 final round reserved seats being unavailable; and
- (c) the disappointment of the thousands of football patrons who were turned away at last year's Grand Final;

will the Minister make representations to the Western Australian Football League to give permission for a live telecast of the final series to be beamed to all country areas?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

The Western Australian Football League already beams a live telecast of

the final series to certain areas—for example, north of Moora to the Pilbara, including Geraldton, the Kalgoorlie-Norseman area, and Albany and the Lower Great Southern. There is some restriction on signals that can be picked up in areas close to Perth; for example, Mandurah.

- (a) The attendance of 30 184 mentioned has been exceeded many times and is, in fact, lower than that of 1979.
- (b) Re 27 000 seats being unavailable, this is inaccurate. For the second semi-final 3 000 more seats will be available than for 1979. 6 000 more seats will be available for the grand final than were available in 1979.
- (c) Turning away of football patrons on a grand final day can be determined only on the day itself. In this year, the grand final day clashes with that of the Victorian Football League for the first time in many years.

## HOUSING

### *Government Employees' Housing Authority*

207. The Hon. H. W. OLNEY, to the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) In how many towns in the north west of Western Australia does the Government Employees Housing Authority provide accommodation for government employees?
- (2) How many government employees are housed in accommodation owned or leased by the GEHA—
  - (a) in the north west; and
  - (b) in the whole State?
- (3) What is the average rate of rental paid by GEHA tenants in each of the following towns—
  - (a) Carnarvon;
  - (b) Karratha;
  - (c) Port Hedland;
  - (d) Broome;
  - (e) Derby; and
  - (f) Kununnurra?
- (4) What is the average market rental charged for nonsubsidised private accommodation in each of the above towns?

- (5) What formula does the authority use for calculating its rentals, and how often are they reviewed?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

- (1) 49—includes missions and stations:

- (2) (a) 872;  
(b) 2581.

- (3) Rentals paid by Government Employees' Housing Authority tenants in the north-west vary according to the type and size of house—includes towns listed.

As from 19 September 1980 for the Education Department and from 12 September 1980 for all other departments, the scale of rentals will be as follows—

Type of House	Rental per week \$
123-125	33.50
179-180	37.00
Recent	40.00
Mining Co.	40.00
3br duplex	37.00
2br duplex	31.25
Old transportable	37.00
New transportable	40.00
TAR & new mission	23.00
Old mission	15.00
Special	29.00
4-bedroom	42.50
Minimum	17.00
Substandard	11.00
Single 3 bedroom	12.50
Single 2 bedroom	18.25

- (4) This information is not available, but economic rentals for recent constructions have been assessed as follows—

Hedland	\$154.10 per week
Kununurra	\$171.86 per week

- (5) Under the Government Employees' Housing Act the rentals are determined on the basis of the accommodation and facilities that the houses will provide and the quality thereof as compared with houses outside the metropolitan region let by the State Housing Commission and the rents fixed for them.

## VEGETABLES

### Potatoes

208. The Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What was the return to potato growers from the pool over the summer period 1979-80?  
(2) What was the wholesale price charged to merchants over that period?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) No. 1 pool—marketed from mid October to end December—

1st advance	\$140 per tonne
2nd advance	\$16 per tonne
Balance to be declared at end of season—approximately	end October.

- No. 2 pool—marketed from January to end March—

1st advance	\$125 per tonne
2nd advance	\$53 per tonne
Balance to be declared at end of season—approximately	end October.

- (2) New and No. 1 grade potatoes: \$240 per tonne from beginning of No. 1 pool on 15 October.

## FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

### Kalgoorlie

209. The Hon. J. M. BROWN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) What are the staff numbers employed by the Town of Kalgoorlie electricity undertaking?  
(2) How many staff will be employed by the State Energy Commission following the takeover?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) Forty-four people are presently employed in the electricity undertaking. However, there are 12 vacancies.  
(2) Fifty-six.



## FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

*Accounts: Bi-monthly*

210. The Hon. J. M. BERINSON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

In respect of the decision by the State Energy Commission to render accounts to consumers more frequently—

- (1) What is the anticipated financial benefit to the SEC in a full financial year, and how will this accrue?
- (2) What, if any, benefits other than financial are anticipated?
- (3) Approximately how many additional accounts will be rendered by the SEC in a full financial year, and of these how many will be delivered by post and how many by hand?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) and (2) The introduction of the two-monthly accounts system was made mainly in the interests of consumers. Approaches have been received from a number of organisations to have a shorter billing period introduced. Under the previous billing system, payment for a substantial part of energy used by consumers was not received for three or four months after the start of the quarter. The expected net savings associated with the introduction of the two-monthly billing system are estimated between \$400 000 and \$600 000 per annum.
- (3) Approximately 800 000 additional accounts in a full year, of which 85 per cent will be mailed and 15 per cent hand delivered.

## CULTURAL AFFAIRS

*WA Film Council*

211. The Hon. H. W. OLNEY, to the Minister representing the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

- (1) What is the status of the WA Film Council?
- (2) What public funds are made available to the council?

- (3) What controls, if any, are exercised by the Government of the expenditure of the council?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) The WA Film Council is a non-statutory council responsible to the Minister for Industrial Development and Commerce to promote the use of local expertise in the making of films in Western Australia.
- (2) A sum of \$1 million was appropriated to be spent over a period of five years. The council is now in its third year of operation. Apart from the capital sum above the day-to-day operating costs of the council are met through the Department of Industrial Development and Commerce's budget each year.
- (3) No monies are expended without prior approval of the Minister.

## FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

*Charges: Interim*

212. The Hon. J. M. BROWN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) What was the interim charge for electricity at—
  - (a) Norseman;
  - (b) Merredin;
  - (c) Esperance; and
  - (d) Gascoyne Junction;
 when the commission assumed responsibility for the supply?
- (2) What is the interim charge for electricity at Kalgoorlie?
- (3) (a) Is there any difference between the interim charges and the commission's charges for metropolitan consumers;
  - (b) if "Yes", what is the difference, and why?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) The tariffs applied to domestic customers in the following towns at the time of transfer to the commission, together with the then current metropolitan tariff, are shown below—
  - (a) Norseman  
Fixed charge \$5 per quarter  
Energy charge 3.83 cents unit  
Metropolitan  
Fixed charge \$2.04 per quarter  
Energy charge 3.83 cents unit

- (b) Merredin  
First 24 units/month 5.83 cents unit  
Next 4976 units/month 2.71 cents unit  
Metropolitan  
Fixed charge \$1 per quarter  
Energy charge 2.00 cents unit

- (c) Esperance  
First 50 units/month 3.00 cents unit  
Next 100 units/month 5.00 cents unit  
All over 150 units/month 4.00 cents unit  
Metropolitan  
Fixed charge \$1 per quarter  
Energy charge 1.90 cents unit.

- (d) Gascoyne Junction  
Fixed charge \$5 per quarter  
Energy charge 5.5 cents unit  
Metropolitan  
Fixed charge \$1.20 per quarter  
Energy charge 2.30 cents unit

- (2) The tariff offered to the Kalgoorlie Town Council comprises a number of different schedules for different classes of customers.

The tariff applicable to domestic customers is—

The lesser of the interim domestic tariff, or the present Kalgoorlie tariff less 10 per cent.

The interim domestic tariff consists of a fixed charge of \$3.07 per month, or part thereof, and all metered consumption at the rate of 6.95c per unit.

- (3) (a) Yes.

- (b) The current tariff applying to metropolitan customers is—

Fixed charge \$3.07 per month  
Plus all metered consumption at 5.42c per unit.

The difference is due in part to the commission's inability to absorb the large financial losses associated with the Kalgoorlie undertaking in one financial year, and because of the basic difference in the present Kalgoorlie tariff structure and that applying to all other commission customers.

## FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

### *Accounts: Submeters*

213. The Hon. J. M. BERINSON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) How many customer accounts rendered by the State Energy Commission include submeter readings?
- (2) What is the total number of submeters involved?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) This information is not readily available and would require an extensive and time-consuming search of computer customers' records to ascertain the answer.

In view of the above, could the member advise if the question is critical to any inquiry he may have received. If so, I would appreciate a more specific request.

- (2) Total submeters in the system amount to 73 993.

## SEWERAGE

### *Belmont*

214. The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) How long have properties on the southern side of Somers Street, Belmont, been connected to the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Board's sewerage system?
- (2) Could the Minister provide an approximate date on which properties on the northern side of Somers Street, Belmont, will be connected to the MWSS & DB's sewerage system?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

- (1) The sewerage system has been available to properties on the southern side of Somers Street between Belvidere Street and up to lot 109 for about six years.

- (2) The sewerage system has been available to three lots on the northern side of Somers Street and adjacent to Belvidere Street for about four years. The Metropolitan Water Board's development plan 1980-85 does not provide for the servicing of the remaining lots in Somers Street. These lie within separate catchment areas to those already serviced.

## RECREATION

### *Karratha*

215. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Minister representing the Premier:

- (1) On 9 February 1980 at Karratha, did the Premier attend a ball following the opening of the Karratha Entertainment Centre?
- (2) At that ball did the Premier give a trophy to a sporting association?
- (3) If (2) is "Yes", what sporting association?
- (4) If (2) is "Yes," what was the nature of the trophy and the cost of it?
- (5) Who provided the money for that trophy?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) If I remember correctly, I promised a trophy for an agreed purpose. That is the Premier's answer, not mine.
- (3) West Pilbara Cricket Association.
- (4) and (5) This information I regard as a personal matter, in view of the cost being borne by me.

The presentation duly took place at a later date, at my request, and on my behalf, by the member for Pilbara (Mr Brian Sodeman, MLA).

## ROAD

### *Nicholson Road*

216. The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of, the deteriorating condition of Nicholson Road, between Woodloe Street and the Canning River Bridge at Cannington?

- (2) Is the Minister aware that the Gosnells City Council is unable to provide funds for resheeting of this section of roadway in this year's budget because it has other road work commitments higher on the priority list requiring attention?
- (3) As the estimated cost of resheeting is only \$4 600, will the Minister give consideration to the provision of Main Roads Department funds to enable the work to be carried out on the section referred to on this important link road?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) The care, control, and management of Nicholson Road is the responsibility of the several local authorities through whose areas it runs. The responsibility for programming and carrying out improvement works therefore lies with the appropriate local authority.
- (2) and (3) The local authorities are able to decide the priorities for expenditure on their roads and no doubt other projects have been decided by council to have precedence over this section of Nicholson Road.

## LAND

### *Wickham*

217. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Minister for Lands:

I refer to the auction of 15 residential and six duplex sites listed for Thursday, 11 September 1980 at Wickham. In respect of the land—

- (a) what was the total cost of developing and releasing the land, and indicating the separate items for each major type of expenditure;
- (b) upon what basis was the upset price set; and
- (c) upon whose advice was the upset price set?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (a) This itemised detail is not immediately available, but is being obtained through the Townsites Development Committee which handles the servicing of land in this townsite. It will be provided in writing to the member as soon as it is available.

- (b) Upset prices were based on cost of services plus a land price component.
- (c) Upset prices are approved by the Governor on my recommendation. Advice was received from the Townsites Development Committee and the Lands and Surveys Department.

## HOUSING

### Port Hedland

218. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

Since 1 January 1970, in respect of State Housing Commission houses in Port Hedland—

- (1) What have been the rental charges for two and three bedroomed homes?
- (2) On what date did the change in rents occur?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

- (1) and (2) In order to bring the north-west, and Kimberley rents back to equal rents in all other areas, there was a general reduction in all types of accommodation. The general average of reduction was 17.5 per cent and the scheme of standard rents was introduced from 6 October 1975.

Prior to that date the rents varied according to the economic rental of the dwelling unit.

After allowing for the north-west subsidy the net rents for a two and three-bedroomed house from 6 October 1975 are—

	prior 6.10.75 (average)	6.10.75	1.11.76	3.10.77	2.10.78	21.7.80
Top Level		24.40	20.40	23.00	28.00	32.50
2 BR		28.10	23.50	26.50	29.50	35.00
3 BR						

North-west subsidy averages about \$5 per week per unit and is paid by the State Treasury.

In comparison the rents for the same bedroomed houses in the metropolitan area for the periods are as follows—

	prior 6.10.75	6.10.75	1.11.76	3.10.77	2.10.78	21.7.80
Top Level		15.00	18.80	21.50	29.50	32.50
2 BR		16.50	20.70	23.50	31.50	35.00
3 BR						40.00

## LAND

### Point Sampson

219. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Minister for Lands:

I refer to the auction of land listed for Thursday, 11 September 1980 at Point Sampson. In respect of the land—

- (a) what was the total cost of developing and releasing the land, and indicating the separate items for each major type of expenditure;
- (b) upon what basis was the upset price set; and
- (c) upon whose advice was the upset price set?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (a) to (c) The information conveyed in the answer to question No. 217 is applicable to this question.

## NOONKANBAH STATION

### Drill Site: Protected Area Status

220. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Minister representing the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

Is it a fact that the Trustees of the WA Museum, the members of the cultural materials committee, the investigating anthropologists, and the Yungngora community, all seek and recommend protected area status to the land on which the drill site is located at Noonkanbah on the basis of the sacred importance to the Yungngora community?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

The Trustees of the WA Museum recommended that the so-called area of influence be declared a protected area. This area includes land on which the homestead, buildings, shearing shed, and stockyards are located and in the Pea Hill Area where extensive drilling has already taken place. The Museum has recommended that normal activity proceed on the "area of influence" in respect of the use of the station homestead and buildings, the shearing shed and stockyards, and roads throughout the "area of influence". The Museum also indicated that there was no objection to normal activity on the established air strips, water points, trig points, and such things. This also applies to the grazing stock, mustering, and other animal husbandry activities within the so-called "area of influence". In view of the activity which the Museum now says should be permitted on the so-called "area of influence," there is certainly no case for the whole of that area to be declared a protected area and preserved inviolate, but there is for Pea Hill and for a cluster of several sites which have been delineated by the Museum.

No evaluation has been carried out yet as to the effect of drilling on the so-called "area of influence". When the Museum attempted to conduct such an evaluation some weeks ago, its officers were refused access to Noonkanbah Station by the Aboriginal community. I would point out that the proper designation is "P Hill," and not "Pea Hill".

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### LEGISLATIVE REVIEW AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

#### *Education Department Instructions*

60. The Hon. H. W. OLNEY, to the Attorney General:

I refer the Attorney General to the answer supplied to the second part of question 200 answered today.

I ask: Will he peruse paragraph 4 of Appendix E of the *Teachers Handbook and Administrative Instructions* to determine whether the last sentence of that paragraph, in effect, is a direction to school principals not to indicate matters to parents of pupils when a police officer advises them not to do so?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

I will discuss the matter with the Minister for Education within whose portfolio the matter comes. No doubt, he will be able to look at the development.

## RAILWAYS: FREIGHT RATES

### *Wheat*

61. The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I wish to correct an answer I gave in the House to parliamentary question 15 on behalf of the Hon. E. C. Rushton, Minister for Transport:

The answer was subsequently found to be incorrect and I wish to clarify the matter.

The rates for NSW after Government subsidy, should be amended as follows—

\$7.96 should read \$7.06 and  
\$15.66 should read \$15.63.

In dealing with the Parliamentary question on 6 August, Westrail made telephone contact with New South Wales and the unfortunate errors came about when the figures were relayed during verbal interaction between Westrail and New South Wales officers. At the time of answering the question I was confident of its correctness and can only apologise for the fact that it was not.

The Minister for Transport has requested me to make this correction.