

Mr Jack Watkins, who was probably the most outstanding man in the industry, said—

As far as the Stockton is concerned, we had a conference with Mr Wallwork about the quota of men on the coal. He said that he had no power to give us an answer—

Mr T. H. Jones: That is right.

Mr SIBSON: To continue—

—but that he would refer all the facts direct to the Minister. We presume he referred the matter to you Mr Kelly but up to now we have not had an answer.

I support Mr Shannon when he said that we had plenty of support from the McLarty/Simpson team. I cannot say the same thing about this Government. Mr Simpson always kept his promises.

Mr Harry Squance, who was then the district treasurer, said—

When Mr Simpson was in office he came down to Collie to meet the Miners Union. He always brought the company officials down with him. Mr Kelly said, on taking office, that he was going to continue this system. It has not come about however, if the Miners Union wants anything now it is necessary to run down to Perth. Then the company representatives are not present. Personally I think there should be company representatives present.

Mr T. H. Jones: I was secretary then. In 1955 I was secretary. What about quoting me?

Mr SIBSON: I am trying to find it.

Mr T. H. Jones: You have probably lost it.

Mr SIBSON: I will keep looking. Mr Latter was the president at the time.

Mr T. H. Jones: I was secretary, too. What about quoting me?

Mr SIBSON: I will find it in a minute. I am having a little trouble locating it. In the meantime I would like members to hear what the president said. Mr Latter was a most outstanding man for many reasons, and he said—

The mine workers here in Collie expected more from the Labor Government than they did from the Liberals. This was to be expected for the Miners Union gave financial support to the Labor Party for a number of years. In fact the union helped to put the Government into power.

On this page is reference to Mr Wallwork's resignation.

Mr T. H. Jones: You have not quoted me. That is what I want to hear.

Mr SIBSON: The member for Collie is impatient.

Mr T. H. Jones: You do not have much time left. I want to make sure we hear what I said.

Mr SIBSON: Here it is on the front page! It is what Mr Tom Jones, the then secretary said.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired.

Adjournment of Debate

Mr T. J. BURKE: I could not possibly follow that, so I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Question put and passed.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [11.03 p.m.]: I presume the honourable member has made his speech, in view of the ruling given previously! I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 11.04 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 15th August, 1974

The SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (37): ON NOTICE

1. EDUCATION POLICIES

Reference to Educationists

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Premier:

(1) Further to my questions (1 of 6th August, 1974 and 49 of 13th August, 1974), would he please indicate if the Liberal Party education policies enunciated at the hustings were referred to any professional educationists (being persons not referred to in the above questions) prior to being publicly announced by him?

(2) If "Yes" would he name the people concerned?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) and (2) As the Member knows, the committee had a number of professional educationists in different fields as members.

At the same time, it purposely also had members who were not professional educationists, but who had other qualifications and practical experience.

The committee, however, has heard many professional educationists as expert witnesses in connection with deliberations on various sections of the policy, and prior to its public announcement.

2. EDUCATION POLICIES

Endorsement by Government Parties

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

Would he please indicate whether the education policies enunciated by the Premier at the hustings as the programme of the Liberal Party, have now been endorsed by both the Government coalition parties?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

Whilst in the written policies there might be minor differences in emphasis and definition—the short answer is yes.

3. LAND

Tourist Complex: Cape Naturaliste

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

- (1) Is he able to verify a recent Press report that a tourist complex is to be built in the Cape Naturaliste area?
- (2) Is it correct to presume that the land upon which such a complex is to be built is privately owned?
- (3) Was any of the land involved the subject of consideration for purchase by the previous Government on the recommendation of bodies interested in conservation for national park or reserve, and if so, would he table a plan to show the relevant areas?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) The department noted the Press report 26th July, 1974 in *The West Australian* but is unable to verify the information.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Yes.

Plan of Sussex locations 1 340, 1 341 and 517 totalling 1 198 acres 3 roads 2 perches is submitted for tabling.

The plan was tabled (see paper No. 156).

4. KANGAROOS

Destruction by Poisons

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

- (1) Is he aware of a report in the 11th August, 1974 edition of the *Sunday Times* that the Pastoralists

and Graziers Association has deferred a decision to poison kangaroos?

- (2) Was he aware that the association had made such a decision?
- (3) In the event of the members of the Pastoralists and Graziers Association proceeding with the decision to poison kangaroos, would supplies of poison for the purpose be obtainable from the Agriculture Protection Board, and would the board release such supplies for this purpose?
- (4) In the event of pastoralists having to obtain supplies of poison for the above purposes from sources other than the APB, is there any restriction in obtaining suitable types of poison?
- (5) Would the formalities involved in obtaining supplies of poison in the quantities required for the purpose of poisoning kangaroos on pastoral properties indicate to the appropriate authorities that such a programme was being undertaken?
- (6) What is the official policy of the APB and the Government in regard to the poisoning of kangaroos in the pastoral areas?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) No.
- (4) Subject to availability—No.
- (5) The Agriculture Protection Board would not necessarily be aware of any such programme.
- (6) Agriculture Protection Board policy is to maintain a kangaroo control programme which involves population management by shooting.

Reduction of excess numbers by poison baiting is recommended only for Kimberley wallabies.

5. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Travelling Allowances

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

- (1) Is it a fact that the total annual mileage and travelling allowances for officers in the animal division of the Agriculture Department are being reduced?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) what is the present total allowance available to such officers;
 - (b) by how much will it be reduced;

(c) are similar reductions being made in other branches of the department?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

- (1) and (2) No reduction is anticipated in the animal or any other division but the position will not be known until the Budget is approved.

6. WATER SUPPLIES

Harris River and Thompson's Brook Dams

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Will he advise the programming for the construction of a dam on the Harris River at Collie?
- (2) Will he also supply similar information for the Thompson's Brook dam via Donnybrook?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) and (2) Some preliminary investigations have been carried out regarding dams on the Harris River and Thompson's Brook. There are as yet no programmes for construction.

7. EAST PERTH AND SOUTH FREMANTLE POWER STATIONS

Conversion to Coal Fuel

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Electricity:

What is the anticipated cost involved in converting the East Perth and South Fremantle power stations back to coal burning stations?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

\$245 000.

8. RAILWAY EMPLOYEES

Travel Concessions to Widows and Dependants

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

Will he please advise the travel concessions available to widows and dependants of former railway employees and if any times are laid down by the department to use the concessions?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

The conditions governing the issue of travel concessions to widows and dependants of former railway employees is rather complex and involves a rather lengthy reply.

This is being formulated and will be forwarded to the Member as quickly as possible.

9. COLLIE DISTRICT HOSPITAL

Extensions

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) When were the extensions to the Collie District Hospital officially opened?
- (2) Are the new additions being used?
- (3) If (2) is "No" will he advise the reasons for the long delay in utilising the new section?
- (4) Will he arrange to have the reasons for the delay investigated by an officer of the department with a view to ensuring that the new section is available for use without any further delays?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Friday, 22nd March, 1974 by Mr T. H. Jones, M.L.A.
- (2) Only the administration area and the X-ray darkroom are in use.
- (3) Problems associated with mechanical and electrical services are the main reasons for the delay in occupying the building.
- (4) The matter has already been investigated and action taken to complete all work as quickly as possible.

10. POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

"Otherwise in Lawful Custody": Definition

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Police:

Will he state each of the situations coming within the phrase "otherwise in lawful custody" appearing in line 5, clause 2 of the Bill to amend the Police Act currently before the House?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Where in respect of an offence punishable on indictment or summary, conviction of a person, has surrendered, is in the custody of the court, after conviction is imprisonment where the initialling court action was taken by means other than arrest, i.e., summons, is serving sentence in default of payment of a fine or other judicial monetary commitment, for serving a sentence for contempt of court.

11. RAILWAYS

Examiners Depot: Collie

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

Will he give favourable consideration to have the railways examiner's depot at Collie transferred to the disused locomotive

roundhouse in view of the present congestion in the area and the expected additional haulage of railway traffic at Collie?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Consideration is presently being given to using a portion of the roundhouse for wagon repairs which will mean the transfer of some wagon repair staff to the new area. This will leave the existing facilities for the exclusive use of examiners.

12. *This question was postponed.*

13. POLICE

Ronald Horgan Incident

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Did he read the *Sunday Independent* newspaper report of Sunday, 11th August, 1974, in connection with Ronald Horgan?
- (2) Has an investigation been carried out in connection with the alleged incident?
- (3) If "Yes" will he table the report?
- (4) If "No" will he have the matter investigated and table the report?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) An investigation is being carried out but has not yet been completed.
- (3) No.
- (4) Answered by (3).

14. ROADS

Causeway Approaches: Lighting

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it planned to light the new approaches at the eastern end of the Causeway?
- (2) If so, when is it anticipated the work will be proceeded with?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Alternative systems of lighting are at present under examination. Some lighting will be installed in the next two months with the balance implemented early next year.

15. SEWERAGE

Koongamia

Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is the sewerage scheme for the Koongamia area completed and operable to the extent of permitting dwelling houses to be connected thereto?

- (2) If not, what areas remain to be completed, and what is the anticipated completion date?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Generally the construction in 85% of the area is completed and operable.
- (2) The remaining 15% (the southern section) will be combined for engineering reasons with an adjoining area the subdivision of which is under consideration.

16.

SEWERAGE

Armadale-Kelmscott

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

Would he please supply the following information in relation to the Armadale-Kelmscott sewerage plant—

- (a) the annual cost of running;
- (b) the type of plant it is;
- (c) the capacity of the plant;
- (d) the number of residences currently connected to it?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (a) Westfield plant \$60 677 for 1973-74.
Kelmscott plant \$20 275 for 1973-74.
- (b) Westfield plant—an extended aeration plant presently in course of conversion to a conventional activated sludge plant.
Kelmscott plant—an imhoff tank and biological filter serving the district hospital and environs.
- (c) Westfield plant—present capacity 7 000 persons. When converted to activated sludge—14 000 persons and activated sludge with incineration—52 000 persons.
Kelmscott plant—equivalent of 1 500 persons.
- (d) Westfield plant—approximately 1 500 residences at the 31st July, 1974.
Kelmscott plant—approximately 350 residences at the 31st July, 1974.

17.

SEWAGE TREATMENT

Sollinger Method

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

- (1) Is he aware of the Sollinger method of treating sewage so as to produce protein and methane gas, which is being developed recently?

- (2) What steps are being taken to study the possibility of the introduction of the method to Western Australia?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Methane gas has been used as a power source at Shenton Park treatment works since 1961. Protein extraction has been researched for some time but not the sollinger method.
- (2) This will be investigated.

18.

POLICE

Aborigines: Appointment

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

- (1) Has he considered the appointment of Aboriginal police assistants?
- (2) What concrete action has been taken with respect to this matter?
- (3) What status and remuneration would such assistants receive?
- (4) What training would be afforded such assistants?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) to (4) Following an approach by the Premier, the Minister for Lands, north-west missions and tribal elders, this matter is under consideration.

A senior police officer is at present on inspection of north-west stations, and is looking at this proposal.

19.

WATER SUPPLIES

Storage Systems: Capacity

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

- (1) What is the storage capacity for each of the water storage systems under his jurisdiction?
- (2) What is the maximum daily flow rate possible from each of these systems?
- (3) What known sources of water will be available to the metropolitan area in the next two decades?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

The question is answered on the basis that the Member refers to dams which are under the control of the Metropolitan Water Board. However, the Member will appreciate that there are many other schemes operated by the Public Works Department for the supply of water to country areas.

(1) Hills reservoirs	cubic metres
South Dandalup	208 210 000
Serpentine	177 300 000
Canning	93 400 000
Serpentine	
pipehead	3 864 000
Churchman Brook	2 182 000
Victoria	859 000
Total	485 815 000

Metropolitan service
Reservoirs 1 599 496 cu m

- (2) (a) A maximum daily output from the combined hills reservoirs that can be sustained is approximately 950 000 cubic metres.
- (b) A maximum daily consumption supplied to date was 1 101 200 cubic metres on the 17th January, 1974. This included a draw of 124 600 cubic metres from the service reservoirs.
- (3) (a) Ground water supplies.
- (b) Streams not presently regulated.
- (c) Increased regulation of existing resources.
- (d) Desalination processes—although it is unlikely that these will compare economically with (a), (b) and (c).

20.

WANNEROO ROAD

Upgrading

Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is he aware that the present condition of big sections of Wanneroo Road at present being upgraded constitute a dangerous traffic hazard and a major inconvenience to hundreds of motorists?
- (2) Has the upgrading programme fallen behind schedule?
- (3) If it has, why has it?
- (4) Have there been any difficulties in securing the necessary co-operation between the Main Roads Department and the Stirling City Council to ensure the upgrading is completed as quickly as possible?
- (5) What action is available to the Minister to hasten the upgrading?
- (6) Will he take that action?
- (7) Is it true that recent work has been financed by the Main Roads Department in the absence of funds from the Australian Government?

- (8) Has the Stirling City Council delayed taking advantage of the MRD funds at any time?
- (9) If "Yes" to (8), what was the reason for the delay?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

This major construction work on Wanneroo Road is being carried out by the Stirling City Council to whom most of these questions should be directed. However, I understand that—

- (1) Sections of the road are at present being upgraded and inevitably there must be some inconvenience to motorists.
- (2) It is possible that delays have occurred due to wet weather and some uncertainty in respect to funds in the 1974-75 financial year.
- (3) Answered by (2).
- (4) No.
- (5) None. There has been continuing liaison between the Main Roads Department and the City of Stirling.
- (6) Answered by (5).
- (7) Yes.
- (8) Commencement of the work was delayed whilst plans were being finalised and services relocated. However, funds available to the end of the 1973-74 financial year have been fully expended by the City of Stirling.
- (9) Answered by (8).

21. GAS CHROMATOGRAPHS

Number in Use

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Premier:

Does he know how many gas chromatographs incorporating electron capture detectors are in use by each of the various State Government instrumentalities, and, if so, would he supply the information?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

Government Chemical Laboratories	4
Public Health Department ..	1
Department of Agriculture ..	1

22. BREAD

After-hours Baking Permits

Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Did he on the evening of 9th August, 1974 issue to bakeries permits to bake bread outside of the hours prescribed for such baking by the Bread Act and/or its regulations?

- (2) If so, what bakeries were given such permission?
- (3) Whom did he advise that he would allow such action to be taken as outlined under (1)?
- (4) At what time was this fact conveyed to those bakeries concerned?
- (5) (a) Was the Chief Inspector of Factories advised of the Minister's decision;
(b) if not, why not?
- (6) Did he or any of his departmental officers advise the Secretary of the Bakers Union of his decision, and if not, why not?

Mr O'Connor (for Mr GRAYDEN) replied:

- (1) In accordance with the provisions of the Bread Act, authority was granted on the 9th August for the making and baking of bread within a radius of 28 miles (45 kilometres) of the GPO Perth, during any hour of any day except Sunday.
- (2) The authority applied to all bakeries within the 28-mile radius.
- (3) Advice of the approval to bake outside normal hours was conveyed to the Secretary of the Bread Manufacturers (Perth and suburbs), Industrial Union of Employers of WA and to my departmental head during discussions on the afternoon of 9th August.
- (4) It is understood that the facts were made known to the members of the union referred to in (3) above at a meeting of those members on the afternoon of 9th August.
- (5) (a) The Chief Inspector of Factories and Shops was advised of the decision in the early evening of that day. It was not possible for the Chief Inspector to be advised earlier as he was engaged on duties outside the office during that afternoon.
(b) Answered by (a).
- (6) The Bakers' Union was officially advised of the decision by a departmental officer on the morning of Monday, 12th August.

23.

ELECTORAL

National Alliance Policy

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Deputy Premier:

- (1) Did the National Alliance prior to 30th March, 1974 General Election announce any specific policy or policies relating to education?

- (2) If (1) is "Yes" is the announcement in printed form and may a copy of same be made available to me?
- (3) If the announcement is not available in printed form, would he now state the essential features of that policy as given at the hustings?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The announcement is available in printed form and an extract will be made available as requested.
- (3) Answered by (2).

24. *This question was postponed.*

25. TOURISM

Departmental Officers: Overseas Visits

Mr CARR, to the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Are any officers of the Department of Tourism currently overseas or going in the near future?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) who are the officers concerned;
 - (b) where are the officers going;
 - (c) what are their duties;
 - (d) who is bearing the cost;
 - (e) how much, if any, is it costing the State?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes. Present planning is for three officers of the department to visit the United States of America between the 4th of September and the 16th of September.
- (2) (a) The Director—N. J. Semmens, the Manager, Advertising and Promotions—Mr A. J. Starcevic and Promotions Officer—Mr R. Blanchard.
- (b) Present planning includes presentations to the travel industry in Honolulu, San Francisco, Seattle and Los Angeles.
- (c) The officers will be presenting a promotional programme designed to promote Western Australia as an attractive tourist destination. The promotion has been designed in conjunction with the private sector of the travel industry and participants are, the Australian Tourist Commission, Sheraton Hotels, Qantas and Avis Rent-a-Car. The centre-point of the programme will be a multi-image, audio-visual presentation recently produced by the department.

Timing of the programme has been designed to capitalise on the 1974 America's Cup Challenge by the Royal Perth Yacht Club of WA Inc.

- (d) The cost of the programme is being shared between all participants.
- (e) Estimated cost to the department is approximately \$3 000.

26. FIRE BRIGADES BOARD

Financial Contribution by Insurance Companies

Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Chief Secretary:

- (1) With reference to recent newspaper advertisements in which tariff companies insuring home owners against fire risk alleged policy holders were liable to provide three quarters of the funds needed to support the WA Fire Brigades Board and its activities, can he—
 - (a) state whether this is true;
 - (b) further state whether it is true that the insuring company and not its policy holders are liable to provide the funds?
- (2) If (1) (b) states the correct position, what action will he recommend in view of this advertising?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

On the basis that the question refers to tariff companies insuring against fire risk the answers are as follows—

- (1) (a) Yes. WA Fire Brigades Act was amended in 1972 during the term of the Labor Government to increase the insurance companies contribution to 75%.
- (b) The legislation WA Fire Brigades Act, section 37 (1) (a), (b) and (c) states that contributions be paid to the board by—
 - (a) the Treasurer of Western Australia;
 - (b) the local authorities whose districts or portions thereof are constituted fire districts; and
 - (c) the insurance companies that are insurance companies within the meaning of this Act, jointly.
- (2) The matter of contributions is presently under review.

27. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Uranium Enrichment Plant

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

What efforts are being made by the Government to press for the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant in Western Australia?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

The Government is pressing for the development of the uranium resources of this State in every way possible and the Federal Government is probably the greatest single obstruction to such developments. I have asked the Federal Opposition to move to disallow the uranium regulations, which negate all incentives for such development.

Specifically, the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant in Western Australia—with present technological knowledge—would require a huge amount of electrical power and the consumption of a very great part of our indigenous fuel. Hence such a development requires detailed consideration which is being given to the question now.

With the fuel resources known to be available in Western Australia, it is only gas from the north-west shelf which could be presently considered practicable for a uranium enrichment plant.

The member for Clontarf is aware that a detailed study is currently in progress to establish those industries which might be attractive in the Pilbara when gas is brought ashore.

Further consideration will be given to the possibility of a uranium enrichment plant when the results of the Pilbara study are available and have been examined in detail.

Existing uranium enrichment plants employ gaseous diffusion technology and consume very large amounts of energy. Typically, an economically sized gaseous diffusion enrichment facility would require some 2 000 MW of electric power and would consume over a 30-year lifetime some 4.8 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. The Government is watching closely progress with the new centrifuge technology and other alternative techniques for enrichment which would require less power for its operation.

28. NEWMAN-MEEKATHARRA ROAD

Upgrading

Mr MAY, to the Premier:

- (1) Has he received a petition signed by 1500 people regarding the upgrading of the Newman-Meekatharra section of the Great Northern Highway?
- (2) If so, will he advise whether it is the intention of the State Government to complete the sealing of the Newman-Meekatharra section over the next three years?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Yes, under date 20th July, and which was acknowledged on 23rd July in the following terms—

I acknowledge your 20th July letter to which you attached a large number of signatures submitted by way of petition for an improvement in the road conditions between Newman and Meekatharra.

I am having the representations studied as quickly as practicable, and I hope to write to you further in the near future.

In the meantime, however, I should let you know that the State Government had already committed itself to a programme of up-grading the road over the next three years, and for which purpose we had already decided to allocate \$2.5 million for the current financial year 1974-75—that is, the period from 1st July, 1974 to 30th June, 1975.

No doubt you have read of the decision by the Commonwealth Government to take away from the State Governments a considerable amount of funds which would normally be allocated to us for road purposes and designate this as money for "National Roads".

At the same time, the Commonwealth Government is endeavouring to impose conditions on the States whereby their total road programmes will be under a very strict Commonwealth approvals system.

In fact, the Commonwealth is seeking to approve the programmes even if the money is actually raised by the States and local governments, independent of the Commonwealth road funds.

Needless to say, we are objecting very strongly to this provision because it will slow down the programme of road works. Also, we believe it is quite

incongruous for people so far away from the local scene to be dictating the WA road programmes to the State Government.

As the Newman-Meekatharra stretch of road will be incorporated in one of the roads which the Commonwealth has declared a "National Road", it follows we now have to pursue the matter with the Commonwealth to see if we can obtain an assurance from them that they will adhere to our programme of upgrading for the Newman-Meekatharra section.

Also, we want to find out from them whether they intend to duplicate the road building and maintenance organisation we have established and utilise their own Commonwealth works organisation.

They would be very foolish to do that. Not only would it cost more, but we would lose a lot of the experienced teams which have been developed by Main Roads Department and by their contractors, over a long period of years.

It is not only a question of engineering expertise. It is equally a question of knowing how to keep work teams supplied with materials, equipment, and above all, the personal needs of the workmen.

Let us hope the Commonwealth not only agrees to the programme we have already sought to implement ourselves, but also agrees that we can press on with the work, using the existing organisation developed by the WA State Government.

I shall get in touch with you again as soon as practicable, as I want to see work proceeding immediately to get the maximum benefit from 1974-75 road funds.

(2) See answer to (1).

29. EDUCATION

Navigation and Seamanship Courses

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

- (1) In what States are educational facilities established that provide basic navigation and seamanship courses for fishermen?
- (2) When did this course commence in Western Australia?
- (3) How many students have—
 - (a) enrolled in each year since inception; and

(b) passed the course in each year?

- (4) What are the criteria for entry by students to the course and would the Minister advise who determines eligible students?
- (5) (a) What has been the Government's financial involvement and extent;
 - (b) are funds provided from any source and, if so, to what extent?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Western Australia.
- (2) 1971.

			Enrolled	Passed
1971	24	22
1972	24	22
1973	24	22
1974	22 (not yet available).	

- (4) Applicants are selected by the counselling service of the Technical Education Division.
- (5) (a) Staff salaries and equipment.
 - (b) The fishing industry provides scholarships for selected students and Commonwealth tertiary education allowances are also applicable.

30. DAIRY INDUSTRY AUTHORITY

Public Comments

Mrs CRAIG, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is it a fact that certain members or other officers of the Dairy Industry Authority have made public views of the authority before the Minister has either—
 - (a) made an announcement in regard to the recent price review; or
 - (b) been advised of the above?
- (2) If so, what action does he intend to take?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

- (1) Not known. The announcements made on 6th August and their publication in *The West Australian* on 7th August were made on my instruction.
- (2) Answered by (1).

31. IRON ORE

Direct Reduction Plants

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Will he advise if any negotiations have taken place with companies, either overseas or Australian, regarding the establishment of iron ore direct reduction plants in Western Australia?

- (2) If so, which companies are involved, and when can a definite announcement be expected?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) There are several groups contemplating steel production in one form or another and two are actively investigating alternative methods of direct reduction but neither is at the stage of making firm commitments with the Government.
- (2) It is not policy to disclose negotiations of this nature before they are concluded.

32. ENERGY CONFERENCE

State Representation

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Is he aware that the world energy conference to be held at Detroit, Michigan, USA from 23rd to 27th September, 1974, will discuss a vast variety of energy-related activities including major steel mills, major facilities for supplying coal, natural gas, and petroleum products?
- (2) Is he further aware that the conference will discuss industry's endeavours to ease the economic and environmental impacts of meeting energy requirements?
- (3) If (1) and (2) are in the affirmative, and taking into consideration the major importance of the conference, will he advise if either he or the Commissioner for Fuel and Power will be attending the conference?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.
- (3) The Commissioner for Fuel and Power was invited to attend the World Energy Conference. However, problems with the economy in Western Australia and urgent matters directly concerning the commission have made it impossible for him to accept. Arrangements have been made to secure copies of the proceedings of the conference so that the technical information will be available to the staff of the commission.

An important part of the benefit to be derived from such international meetings as the World Energy Conference is the opportunity for personal contact with senior management and specialists in the energy field, and the loss of this opportunity is to be regretted. However, opportunity will be

taken at a more convenient time for the commissioner to make such contacts on a later trip.

33. POLICE STATION *Wiluna*

Mr COYNE, to the Minister for Police:
What proposals are being considered towards the rebuilding or upgrading of the Wiluna police station?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Apart from recent alterations to provide an additional office, there are no proposals at present under consideration.

34. BUSSELL HIGHWAY *Realignment*

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

- (1) In the Environmental Protection Authority's 1973 annual report there is reference to the possibility of realignment of Bussell Highway due to mineral sands mining at Capel. Do Main Roads Department proposals envisage a deviation of this highway through State Forest No. 2 on the northern side of the Ludlow River?
- (2) Is it envisaged that some road widening of Bussell Highway through State Forest No. 2 south of the Ludlow River will be necessary within the next five years?
- (3) Could traffic time profiles from the Main Roads Department permanent count station No. 1104P be tabled for the years 1969-70, 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) Yes. I hereby table the documents.
The documents were tabled (see paper No. 157).

35. MINERAL CLAIMS *Ludlow Tuart Forest*

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

- (1) What is the date of application, area, current status and name of miner in respect of the following mineral claims in the Ludlow Tuart Forest—
Mining Claims Nos. 1 000, 1 001, 1 002, 1 024, 1 025, 1 026, 2 011, 2 012, 2 013, 2 015, 2 022, 2 028, 2 030, 2 031, 10 692, 11 448, 11 683?
- (2) Have any objections been lodged in respect of these applications?

- (3) Has a Warden's Court hearing been conducted in respect of any of these applications; if so, under what date and what was the recommendation of the mining warden?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) I ask that the answer to (1) be tabled.

The answer was tabled (see paper No. 158).

- (2) Yes.

- (3) Yes. Numbers 1002H and 1024H were recommended for approval by the warden on the 29th December, 1972, and 15th August, 1973, respectively.

36. TRAFFIC

Revenue from License Fees and Fines

Mr SIBSON, to the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) What has been the amount of money collected for—

(a) motor vehicle license fees; and

(b) traffic fines,

in the metropolitan area and in the country areas where traffic has been taken over by the police for the years 1969-70 to 1972-73?

- (2) What has been the total amount collected for the years 1969-70 to 1972-73 in Western Australia in—

(a) traffic license fees;

(b) drivers' and riders' license fees;

(c) traffic fines?

- (3) What number of motor vehicles have been licensed in the areas where police control traffic for the years 1969-70 to 1972-73?

- (4) What number were licensed by local authorities for the year 1972-73?

- (5) What has been the cost annually per motor vehicle of police control of traffic for the years 1969-70 to 1972-73?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1)—

	(a) Motor vehicle license fees	(b) Traffic fines and infringements excluding police country areas
	\$	\$
1969-70	7 424 184	1 131 234
1970-71	7 984 662	1 328 896
1971-72	9 451 367	1 618 620
1972-73	10 161 696	1 722 539
Total	35 021 909	5 801 289

Figures re fines police country areas not obtainable.

- (2)—

	(a) Traffic license fees	(b) Drivers license fees	(c) Traffic fines and infringements excluding police country areas
	\$	\$	\$
1969-70	12 499 283	1 157 193	1 674 678
1970-71	13 120 540	1 258 970	1 912 870
1971-72	14 673 500	1 480 630	2 241 258
1972-73	15 127 229	1 547 286	2 293 923
Total	55 420 554	5 448 138	8 122 038

Figures re fines police country areas not obtainable.

- (3) Number of motor vehicles (including tractors, trailers and caravans) licensed in areas where police control traffic:

1969-70	319 020
1970-71	358 615
1971-72	388 359
1972-73	424 817

Total 1 490 811

- (4) Number of motor vehicles (including tractors, trailers and caravans) licensed by local authorities for year 1972-73: 171 121.

- (5)—

\$
1969-70—5.12
1970-71—5.24
1971-72—5.33
1972-73—5.62

It must be realised that a number of vehicles are outside police control.

37. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Bauxite Mining: Darling Escarpment

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

- (1) Has the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation examined the constitution of the soil left as a residue from Alcoa mining for bauxite in the Darling scarp?

- (2) If "Yes" what is the purpose of such research and what implications do the results contain?

- (3) If "No" has this resulted from a change of intention as such a study was announced in 1971?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) The following comments have been received from the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation. CSIRO has examined the composition and properties of the clay material (the pallid zone) underlying the

bauxite. Close liaison is maintained with relevant departments of the Government of Western Australia and with the operating mining company.

- (2) The purpose of the research is to determine the water transferring properties and amounts of water and soluble salts stored in the clay material, together with the physical and other properties which may affect the growth of vegetation.

The implications of the results of the research are that in some parts of the Darling Range increases in salinity of tributary streams could follow bauxite mining operations in the catchment areas. Successful reforestation should, in time, reverse such changes.

From laboratory analysis of a limited sample of the clay material, it may be tentatively concluded that it poses no physical limitations to plant growth, and that other factors such as nutrient deficiency and depth of material are more likely to be limiting.

- (3) Answered by (1).

QUESTIONS (4): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. KANGAROOS AND WALLABIES

Destruction by Poisons

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

In reply to part (6) of question 4 on today's notice paper, the Minister for Agriculture said—

Reduction of excess numbers by poison baiting is recommended only for Kimberley wallabies.

In the course of a poisoning campaign, how does the Agriculture Protection Board or the Minister differentiate between Kimberley wallabies and kangaroos and other creatures?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

I would ask the honourable member to place his question on the notice paper. As a matter of fact, he having been a Minister for three years, I am surprised he is asking so many questions!

2. W. W. MITCHELL & ASSOCIATES

Engagement by Government

Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the public relations firm which is known as W. W. Mitchell & Associates, and which is presently engaged in publicly defending the company called Landall

against serious charges of malpractice, been engaged by the present Government since it took office?

- (2) If "Yes", on what tasks were W. W. Mitchell & Associates engaged?
- (3) What amount of money has, to this date, been paid to W. W. Mitchell & Associates for their services to the Western Australian Government?
- (4) How was the company chosen to fulfil the function it performed for the Western Australian Government?
- (5) Were other similar firms approached, consulted, or informed of the Government's need for certain services, to ensure that the required services were obtained as efficiently as possible?
- (6) Is it true that for many weeks prior to the 30th March election W. W. Mitchell & Associates were engaged on behalf of the then Opposition in performing public relations tasks?
- (7) Did the arrangement which existed then continue after the 30th March?
- (8) If "Yes" to (6) and (7), is the same person or organisation responsible for paying W. W. Mitchell & Associates for their services?
- (9) If "Yes" to (8), can the Premier name that person or organisation?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

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

- (1) I do not know of any work being done by W. W. Mitchell & Associates for the firm referred to and, in any case, I regard it as irrelevant to any activities for the Government. The honourable member would know from the answer given to question 1 on Wednesday, the 31st July—and without his deliberate attempt at a sinister inference—that W. W. Mitchell & Associates have been engaged to do work by the present Government.
- (2) On the preparation of specialist material and a report on possible reorganisation and improvements to the Government's information services.
- (3) \$1 390.

(4) Because the principal in the firm of W. W. Mitchell & Associates has had considerable experience in the specialist fields involved.

(5) See answer to (4).

(6) No.

(7) to (9) See answer to (6).

3. DRIVERS' LICENSES

Age Limit

Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Transport:

I apologise for not having given prior notice of this question. The reason I did not do so is that I could not get through to the department. It is a simple question, as follows—

(1) Is it the intention of the Government to have the age at which a person can hold a driver's license raised from 17 to 18 years?

(2) If the answer to (1) is "Yes", when will the alteration take place?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) and (2) The Government has given no consideration to this matter.

4. INDUSTRIAL STOPPAGES

Threat to Newspapers

Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Premier:

(1) Is the Premier aware of the industrial dispute threatening to prevent the publication of tonight's edition of the *Daily News* and tomorrow morning's issue of *The West Australian* newspapers?

(2) Is it true that the industrial unrest is due to the company refusing to negotiate with the union representing certain tradesmen employed in producing newspapers?

(3) What action does the Premier intend to take to ensure that tens of thousands of Western Australians are not inconvenienced by any stoppage which affects the production of newspapers?

The SPEAKER: I am not at all sure whether this question comes within the province of the Premier. We had a query about a similar matter the other day and I am not certain about this question. My determination as to whether it should be answered will rest largely on one question: Is the Premier able to answer?

Sir Charles Court: I will give an answer, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I will call on the Premier.

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

The honourable member did not give me any notice of this question beyond placing it on my table just before you, Mr Speaker, took the Chair. However, in the meantime I have endeavoured to have some inquiries made, both through the appropriate Minister and otherwise. The answers to the question are—

(1) Yes.

(2) Not to my knowledge.

(3) It is understood that a party to the dispute has requested the Industrial Commission to call a compulsory conference. It is also believed that measures have been taken to ensure that a paper will be produced tomorrow.

PLANT DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall—Minister for Agriculture) [2.53 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Two fairly small amendments are proposed in the Bill currently before the House. The first deals with the deletion of the definition of "under-secretary", a position which has not existed in the Department of Agriculture for quite a number of years.

The second makes provision for a schedule to the Act prescribing the maximum charges which can be imposed each season by fruit-fly baiting committees. It is stressed that these are the maximum charges to be permitted under the Act, the actual fee being determined by the locally nominated committee.

Under the existing provisions of the Act, charges are detailed for each and every spraying and for each attendance. In practice, however, baiting committees make a charge on a seasonal basis and the new schedule has been prepared with this in mind.

The existing charges permitted under the Act were prescribed some 15 years ago and are now, of course, out of keeping with costs associated with the running of baiting schemes. Most committees today find that the present maximum charges will not cover their operating expenses, and consequently Government financial assistance has been sought in a number of cases.

The schemes in operation at present are quite labour intensive; labour costs amounting to about 75 per cent of the total operating cost. For this reason, and to assist local committees in overcoming

their present financial difficulties, the new scale of fees, which is approximately double those detailed in the Act at present, is considered to be quite reasonable and equitable.

It is emphasised in introducing this Bill that the responsibility for the control of fruit fly rests with the individual householder or farmer. These community schemes are introduced on the basis of a referendum carried out in the district at which a 60 per cent majority voting in favour of the scheme is needed for the scheme to be introduced. Since the scheme takes over from the individual his responsibility for the carrying out of fruit-fly control, it is appropriate for the cost of the scheme to be met by the particular individuals rather than from general revenue. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned on motion by Mr H. D. Evans.

FUEL, ENERGY AND POWER RESOURCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR MENSAROS (Floreat—Minister for Fuel and Energy) [2.55 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill has been drafted to amend the Fuel, Energy and Power Resources Act, 1972, to provide certain powers to control fuel supplies in emergency situations. It has been framed to provide that, in the best interests of the whole community, present and future sources of fuel, energy, and power are protected in cases of emergency.

If serious oil embargoes should be applied in the future, or if other circumstances should lead to a serious curtailment of supplies, it may be necessary for the Government to introduce a form of rationing, and to formulate emergency regulations. The Bill provides for the maintenance, control, and regulation of energy supplies and services so as to secure the well-being of the community.

At present, the Government does not have powers to implement such regulations and this Bill has therefore been introduced to provide legislation for such action to be taken should the need arise at any time in the future.

Western Australia depends to a very great extent on fuel oil and other petroleum products. It is particularly dependent on imported crude oil.

The Fuel and Power Commission, in 1973, requested that the Fuel and Power Advisory Council form a committee to investigate the need for, and extent of, fuel supplies which should be maintained in Western Australia as protection against any interruption to supplies. Following the Middle East oil embargoes later in

1973, the terms of reference of this committee were broadened and it was named the Emergency Fuel Supplies Committee.

This committee, which consists of representatives of private industry and Government, has considered the various aspects of the problems which would arise in a fuel crisis. The committee is in the process of formulating detailed plans and procedures which will be followed in the event of emergency conditions arising.

The Fuel, Energy and Power Resources Act, 1972, makes it a function of the Fuel and Power Commission to ensure that supplies of suitable fuel and power are available for use in Western Australia in the manner best calculated to further the public interest in all respects. Having regard for the provision of the existing legislation, it is considered appropriate by the Government that emergency powers relating to maintenance of supplies of fuel should be provided by this amendment to the Act.

This Bill makes provision for the Governor to declare a state of emergency in any part of Western Australia provided he is satisfied that by reason of embargoes, disruption of supplies, or for any other reason, the supply of fuel to the community is restricted. The Bill provides that the Governor may make emergency regulations to provide or secure supplies and services needed by the community, or by any substantial part of the community. He may also make regulations to prevent supplies or services being disposed of in a manner prejudicial to the attainment of the objects of this amending Bill.

Naturally, a host of detailed regulations, directions, and orders will be necessary to deal with any developing emergency and it would be impractical to include all of these specifically in the legislation. The Bill simply provides power to make the regulations that would be necessary. To be effective in any crisis it is necessary to act swiftly, and the powers contained in the Bill are very sweeping. However, they cannot be invoked until there is a declared state of emergency.

There are several safeguards in the Bill to ensure that the powers to be created will not be abused in any way prejudicial to the public interest. They are—

(a) A direct appeal to the Minister is specifically provided.

(b) Any regulation, direction, or order will be subject to section 36 of the Interpretation Act which requires that it be laid before the Parliament of Western Australia within six sitting days after its creation. Parliament would therefore have the opportunity to consider, disallow, or vary any regulation, direction, or order.

(c) No prosecution can be initiated without the prior approval of the Minister for Justice.

Any order by the Governor declaring a state of emergency shall, unless earlier revoked, continue in force for six months. The emergency regulations may make provision for the following—

(a) Ascertaining the holdings of fuel.

(b) Controlling and regulating fuel supplies so as to secure a sufficiency of those supplies essential to the well-being of the community, or their equitable distribution, including a permit or rationing system.

(c) The determination of user priorities, the prohibition of specified uses, and the allocation of supplies.

(d) Requiring suppliers to submit returns.

(e) Engaging persons, for reward or otherwise, to assist in the maintenance, control, and regulation of supplies and services.

(f) Generally, for ensuring that all the resources of the community are available in a manner calculated to serve the best interests of the community.

The amending Bill provides for the imposition of penalties for noncompliance with the provisions of the legislation. Any retaliatory, discriminatory, or intimidatory action at any time, in whatever way or manner, against anyone taking part in an emergency supply or distribution operation would be an offence under the Act and would attract appropriate penalties.

Western Australia, and in fact the whole nation, has had adequate warning through the Arab oil embargoes in 1973 of the possible effects of any restriction of supplies. I believe that the regulations provided for in this Bill are necessary to allow the Government to exercise control over any future fuel supply emergency, thus serving the best interests of the whole community. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr May.

TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR RUSHTON (Dale—Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning) (3.06 p.m.): I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill proposes to amend the Town Planning and Development Act, 1928-1973.

The Bill has two principal aims: first, to increase the number of members of the Town Planning Board by one; second, to rectify a situation which has come to light concerning the dedication to the public use of land required for road widening purposes. The Bill also proposes an amendment to a previous drafting error.

The Bill provides for an increase in the number of "other members" of the Town Planning Board—that is, members other than the chairman—from three to four. As the term of office of the other members of the board is two years, provision is made for the term of the new member to expire on the same day as that of other members. This will prevent overlapping of terms and will allow the term of all the new members to start on a common date.

The amendment provides that the additional member shall be chosen from a panel of names submitted by the Local Government Association.

At present, Mr A. E. White—who retired at the end of last week as Secretary of the Local Government Association—is a member of the Town Planning Board, but not because of his local government duties. He owes his appointment to the board to the fact that he was considered to be a person qualified "in the matters to be dealt with by the board".

Recently, the Local Government Association submitted to me that it was reasonable for there to be a member on the board specifically representing local government. The board agrees with this submission and considers it appropriate to have such a member because of the type of business handled by the board. An additional factor is that, because the board meets weekly, it has at times experienced difficulty in finding a quorum of three from a total of four members. An additional member will alleviate this difficulty.

The second principal purpose of the Bill is rather more technical. Where, in the past, the Town Planning Board has imposed a condition in its approval of a subdivision that a road be widened, it has been the practice of the Office of Titles to dedicate such road widenings on diagrams or plans of survey under Section 295 (5) of the Local Government Act. It would appear that this may not be strictly correct in that Section 295 of the Local Government Act refers only to roads and not to road widenings. It is seen necessary to correct this situation and the Bill seeks to do this not only in respect of future cases, but also in respect of past dealings. Discussions have been held between my departments, the Commissioner of Titles, and the Local Government Association of W.A. (Inc.), as a result of which it was considered that an amendment to Section 28 of the Town Planning and Development Act would be the most appropriate course of action.

An alternative to amending the legislation would be to require the subdivider to transfer the required road widening to the Crown, but this is a more cumbersome procedure which would involve the subdivider in additional expense, and would not cover past dealings.

The Bill has been prepared to include an amendment to drafting in Section 23. The purpose of it is to correct an error in paragraph references which, hitherto, has had to be overcome temporarily by a footnote.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Taylor.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: NINTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 14th August, on the following motion by Mrs Craig—

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

May it please Your Excellency: We the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of the State of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to address to Parliament.

MR T. J. BURKE (Perth) [3.10 p.m.]: I would like to welcome new members. To those on this side I wish a long and satisfying period in Parliament, and to those opposite, a short and merry one. However, if there is any member opposite who would like a more satisfying life, I have application forms in my office.

Mr Sibson: What are the application forms for?

Mr B. T. Burke: To join a good party.

Mr T. J. BURKE: One of the most significant decisions in recent times was made public in the *Weekend News* of the 25th May under the heading, "Burnt bushes may be park paradise". This referred to a proposal by the City of Perth to repeat King's Park—for that is what it amounts to—between Perry Lakes Stadium and Reabold Hill towards the coast. This is endowment land which would otherwise have been sold by the City of Perth—at prices which few people can afford these days—to provide green carpets, reticulated road verges, and all the other luxuries which people in that area have come to expect.

The significance of this decision is probably more easy for us to realise, having inherited King's Park from our forebears. It was men such as Lovekin and Forrest who decided that Perth should be blessed in this way in order that present and future citizens of Western Australia can reap the benefits of this magnificent area of land. I am certain from an historical viewpoint that the significance of this latest decision will be appreciated by future generations.

Since Dr Beard came to King's Park, its use has increased to an extreme degree. Nearly every Sunday it is crowded, and great use is made of the area. Residents of the metropolitan area benefit through the provision of this park, as well as tourists and probably every other resident of Western Australia. Providing a second similar reserve towards the coast will take the pressure off King's Park. It will provide for people living in areas between the central city and the coast, and for those living in developments up and down the coast. This will allow greater use of King's Park by people living between the central city and the scarp.

Mr Mensaros: I am glad that you like my idea.

Mr T. J. BURKE: Yes, I notice that the Minister for Industrial Development was involved in this, and I thank him for any contributions he made. I believe it will be seen in time, if it is not recognised now, as one of the most significant decisions—in fact an unselfish act—made by the people living in the endowment land area. Whether these people are in fact unselfish, I do not really know.

Another recent decision made by the City of Perth was to provide an olympic pool at Floreat Park. I do not want to criticise the Minister for Industrial Development if he had a part in this, but I do believe the decision was not justified. The council wishes to establish an olympic pool a quarter of a mile from probably the most magnificent beaches in the world. It is not justified.

The timing of the announcement of this decision in relation to the plan to establish another King's Park makes the latter decision suspect. To my mind we were fed the second King's Park proposal because it was also desired to provide an olympic pool for these people living a short distance from the beach at a cost of \$500 000.

Mr Clarko: The pool will have a different function. The schools want to take the children to enclosed pools.

Mr T. J. BURKE: I fully appreciate that, but this gets down to a question of priorities. The schools in this area are in close proximity to the beach. The point I am making is that if we consider other parts of the Perth Council domain, we must realise there is a lack of facilities in other areas. I agree with the comments of the honourable member in regard to the provision of a pool for school children, but the point I want to make is that the endowment lands area has been pampered for too long. I would have liked this Parliament to agree to the request of the City of Perth to amend the City of Perth Endowment Lands Act last year or in 1972 to allow moneys from the sale of the endowment lands to be expended in any part of the city council area. I do not think

the expenditure of endowment lands money to provide an olympic pool at Floreat Park is justified.

I call on all city councillors, apart from those who obviously will support the plan—councillors of the coastal wards—to lobby their members of Parliament to encourage the Government of the day to amend the City of Perth Endowment Lands Act to allow this \$500 000 and any other money from the final sale of endowment lands to be expended in other areas. I make this plea to councillors representing the Central, North Perth, North and other wards. I suggest that the endowment lands money should be used to provide the minimum facilities only in the endowment lands area, although I agree that it has been taken for granted in Floreat Park and City Beach that the minimum is underground lighting, reticulated verges, and an overabundance of green grass.

Mr Young: That is not true.

Mr T. J. BURKE: It is a fact.

Mr Young: It is not true.

Mr T. J. BURKE: If the honourable member wants to tell Parliament that it is not true, let him go ahead and say it. However, it is a fact, and he knows that if one visits the area one will see that the road verges are reticulated.

Mr Young: It is not true. What about the underground lighting? Who paid for that?

Mr T. J. BURKE: The honourable member and I could visit the area together to clarify this. We could then come back to the Parliament to tell members that I was right.

Mr Mensaros: What about having your speech printed and distributed in the North Metropolitan Province—that would be a good exercise.

Mr T. J. BURKE: I am concerned for people living in East Perth. I remind certain members that many of the people now living in City Beach grew up in East Perth.

Mr Young: I am one of them.

Mr T. J. BURKE: These people realise that East Perth could do with a lot of improvement.

Mr Young: Definitely.

Mr O'Neil: A new member for a start!

Mr T. J. BURKE: The money to be used to provide an olympic pool at a cost of \$500 000 could be used to upgrade the central city area, or it could be used to overcome the problems of rear lanes, health, and dust pollution.

Mr Bertram: And flooding.

Mr T. J. BURKE: We have many real problems in the central city area. I am serious when I call on the councillors of the City of Perth who are supposed to represent the Central City, North Perth, and North wards, not to allow themselves

to be bribed into accepting a pool at Floreat Park for the sop of a second King's Park.

Mr Young: How much of East Perth is seweraged?

Mr T. J. BURKE: The septic systems in City Beach seem to work quite well.

Mr Young: How much of East Perth is seweraged?

Mr O'Neil: The answer is 100 per cent.

Mr T. J. BURKE: The sand in the City Beach area ensures that the septic systems work efficiently. As long as a reasonable alternative is available, it is probably not necessary to deep sewer City Beach.

Sir Charles Court: Next time your Prime Minister is making a speech on the subject of sewerage, just remind him of that, will you?

Mr T. J. BURKE: I will for sure.

Mr Clarko: After seven years in Sandringham!

Mr T. J. BURKE: To last seven years in Sandringham I would have to learn to live with sand in my shoes and sand in my bed. I think I have made my point—any member who cares to wander around the Perth electorate will see that much essential work has to be done. This is the domain and responsibility of the Perth City Council. I am sure anyone who investigates conditions in the Perth electorate will agree with me that the money should not be spent on a pool at Floreat Park.

Mr B. T. Burke: Hear, hear!

Mr T. J. BURKE: Another serious matter I wish to discuss again concerns local government. I am referring to the problem of parking and public transport generally for Perth and its people. I am afraid the local authority in this city will have to come to grips with the parking problem. In my opinion the proliferation of parking areas is permitting the use of this most expensive toy—the modern motorcar—to overwhelm the people and the City of Perth. City streets are jammed with cars pumping forth poisonous fumes; and we can also equate the misuse of the modern motorcar with the carnage on our roads.

There is a viable alternative to the use of the modern motorcar, and that is an improved public transport system. But a public transport system can never become a viable proposition unless we control the use of the motor vehicle and subject the oil and automobile lobbies to a realisation of the real needs, and not the superficial needs, of the people. Steps have already been taken. In the last Parliament we moved to integrate the rail and road transport systems, and I am very pleased that the present Government is proceeding with that idea. I am also pleased that the Government has extended the clipper service in the city. I believe it could be extended further; in fact, if I had my way

any person living in my electorate would be serviced by these buses, because this is the ideal form of transport within the city.

However, in the meantime we must come to grips with the situation and get on with the job of providing Perth and Western Australia with a fast, modern, highly integrated, and preferably free transport system.

Mr Sibson: Surely it could not be free.

Mr T. J. BURKE: I have in mind a rapid transit system which would go to Bunbury.

Mr Sibson: That is not what I said; I said that surely it could not be free.

Mr T. J. BURKE: I did not say it would be free; I think if the member for Bunbury had been listening he would have heard me say that it should preferably be free.

Mr Sibson: Someone must pay for it.

Mr T. J. BURKE: If we removed the motor vehicle from the city streets probably the cost of providing a free transport system would be offset; because, as I have already pointed out, the motorcar is a pollutant and it costs the community a great sum of money and time. It costs us a great deal in hospital charges and other costs which are difficult to assess, but are recognised. Perhaps such a transport system could not be provided free of charge, but the more use made of it by the people of Perth the cheaper it would be for them.

We all recognise the alternative. Any day of the week one can wander down to the city and find a traffic jam in Hay Street and another in Murray Street. I think there is a break between 9.00 and 11.00 a.m. and perhaps another between 3.00 and 4.00 p.m., but at almost any other time one finds traffic crawling through the city. When travelling to and from work one can hardly gain any pleasure from sitting behind the wheel of a motorcar in a traffic jam breathing poisonous fumes—and all this on hire purchase.

As far as I am concerned personally and parochially—and perhaps this is a little selfish of me, but I think it is a realistic view—the people I represent in the central city area are getting fed up with having to breathe poisonous fumes pumped forth by the cars in the city area driven by other members of this House and by all the people who come to the city; and we are fed up with trying to sleep through the screeching of brakes. If we do not receive co-operation I will have to give consideration to leading a movement to set up road blocks.

Another mode of transport which is becoming quite popular throughout the world today is the push bike. When I was in the United States in 1971 this fact was brought to my attention, and I was advised

that on the west coast of America people had to wait six months for the delivery of a push bike. The Federal Government there, in co-operation with the States, was at that time in the process of providing bike tracks, and it was cutting swathes alongside major roads and highways and marking them as "Bike Only Areas". The people in America were taking full advantage of this because of the health aspect, because it helped to reduce pollution, and because more often than not on their overcrowded roads—particularly in Los Angeles—they were able to get where they were going a great deal faster than they could in a motorcar. This is also happening in Europe.

I understand the same thing is occurring in South Australia and Victoria. In Victoria only recently the Government announced that provision would be made for bike riders to use the Botanical Gardens in the City of Melbourne. It would be fairly easy to do that, and I feel it would be a logical step for us in Western Australia to take. I think it should have great appeal to the Government, and that perhaps it might make a move in co-operation with local authorities, even seeking assistance from the Federal Government, to provide bike tracks and to encourage the riding of push bikes.

I see push bike tracks being developed along the banks of the river, along the beaches, along major freeways, and also through areas of vegetation. I believe this is well worthy of consideration, and I would encourage the Government to give some thought to it. Probably apart from the health aspect the most important motivation I can see is that the push bike is pollution free.

Mr Speaker, as you are aware I have many flat dwellers in my electorate, and I wish to talk about those flat dwellers and the owners of flats. The member for Balga and myself have given consideration to the formation of a tenants' association, and we have received quite a strong response. As we see it there is a need to organise flat dwellers in an attempt to control unscrupulous landlords who, without real justification, increase their rents; and also to ensure that the landlord to whom the rent is paid keeps his property in a good state of repair.

The flat dwellers in my area comprise young people, old people, single people, and married couples; some live in flats by choice and others are forced to do so by reason of economic factors. They will agree to a tribunal or a group of people being established—we would prefer of course the Commissioner for Consumer Protection, but would accept the Real Estate Institute, the Employers Federation, or even a group of flat owners—to arbitrate in respect of rent increases in the hope that this would infuse some sort of ethics into unscrupulous

landlords who take advantage of any opportunity to increase rents completely regardless of the people living in their flats.

We have no objection to or complaints about reasonable increases in rents or reasonable profits being made, but we feel that something should be done to control unscrupulous landlords who, motivated by greed and the deification of the holy dollar, daily take advantage of the flat dwellers in my electorate and in other parts of the State.

I am afraid that if the Government will not take action in this regard I will take advantage of the opportunities as they arise in this House to call upon all Western Australians living in flats or other rented accommodation, either through desire or necessity, to join with me in forming a tenants' association, and we will bring pressure to bear on the landlords and refuse to pay increased rents.

If the people get together block by block of flats, then if the landlord says he is going to put up the rent and the whole block refuses to pay the increase, I feel that would be a sure way of achieving our aim.

Finally I issue a warning: We on this side of the House are fearful that profit motives will outpace pollution controls in Western Australia. We are fearful that the Premier might use his power and position to dominate the Minister I shadow. That Minister, the Premier, or any other member in this House who forgets the environment in anything he espouses will be reminded that profit is an unworthy motive if it affects the quality of life which is the right of all Western Australians. We are responsible for improving the quality of life and for safeguarding the environment and controlling pollution. Any member who by action or omission fails to do this should not be here.

MR McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall—Minister for Agriculture) [3.30 p.m.]: As we are drawing near to the end of the Address-in-Reply debate, I take this opportunity to say a few words. I join with other members in congratulating you, Mr Speaker, on your appointment as Speaker and know that you will do a very good job. I congratulate all new members on their election. I have heard them speak and I think they acquitted themselves very well. The remarks and criticisms levelled across the Chamber from members opposite indicate that there is a great deal of confusion on the other side of the House and I will endeavour to clarify some of those issues so that there is no more confusion and we can continue with this session of Parliament with clear minds. Members opposite have asked whether the name of the party I represent is the Australian Country Party or the National Alliance. Just let me explain the situation.

Mr T. H. Jones: Do you know?

Mr McPHARLIN: I will explain it. I did not think there were so many slow learners on that side of the House.

Mr Skidmore: We just wanted to know what we should call it.

Mr McPHARLIN: There was never a constitutionally formed party called the National Alliance. There is and has been for a long time a constitutionally formed party called the Australian Country Party. This is still the case; it has never changed. We had an electoral agreement and that is all there was to it. There was a courtship.

Mr T. H. Jones: You did not invite me to the wedding.

Mr McPHARLIN: The member for Collie seems to be quite disturbed about this situation because he did not receive his promised invitation to a marriage.

Mr T. H. Jones: Look in *Hansard* and you will see that you promised to invite me to the wedding. Now you are denying that there was even a marriage.

Mr McPHARLIN: I agree that I promised to extend the member an invitation but the wedding never took place; it was only a courtship.

Mr T. H. Jones: Only a courtship!

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections at the one time from all over the House. I have already said during this session of Parliament that I believe interjections are of value because very frequently they add colour and life to a debate. However, three or four interjections at the one time is bad for the dignity and decorum of the House. I wish the House would try to exercise a little discretion and common sense and gentlemanly parliamentary conduct. I call the Deputy Premier.

Mr McPHARLIN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I indicated earlier that there were some slow learners on the other side of the House and you seem to support my contention.

Mr T. H. Jones: You referred to me; that is why I answered you.

Mr McPHARLIN: I did say there was a courtship.

Mr T. H. Jones: But no marriage.

Mr McPHARLIN: I wanted to spare the member for Collie the pain of being invited to a marriage which did not take place, because he has already had the experience of a divorce. The Democratic Labor Party divorced the Australian Labor Party a long time ago, and members opposite have hated the DLP ever since. In this context, I should like to draw the attention of the House to a remark made the other evening by the member for Northam. I am only sorry that he is not in his seat.

Mr T. D. Evans: Are you referring to a debate which took place this session?

Mr McPHARLIN: I am referring to the remarks of the member for Northam.

Mr T. D. Evans: Then you are out of order because there is no member for Northam.

Mr McPHARLIN: The member for Northam said that members of the Country Party aligned themselves with a heap of rubbish; namely, the Democratic Labor Party. If that is the way members opposite refer to people—because that is what they are referring to; they are describing people as a heap of rubbish—it is very poor thinking.

Mr T. D. Evans: It refers to policies, not people.

Mr McPHARLIN: They are people.

Mr T. D. Evans: No, it is their policies.

Mr McPHARLIN: Members opposite refer to people as a heap of rubbish.

Mr B. T. Burke: How did you describe people who voted for the Whitlam Government at the last election?

Mr McPHARLIN: I want again to correct the member for Northam when he referred to the discontinuance of the superphosphate bounty.

Mr Jamieson: There is no member for Northam.

Mr B. T. Burke: I wonder which side of the House has the slow learners?

Mr McPHARLIN: I am sorry; I am referring to the member for Avon. As a matter of fact, he nearly was not the member for Avon, either.

Mr Jamieson: Oh, that is not true.

Mr McPHARLIN: Does the honourable member know by how many votes the member for Avon won?

Mr Jamieson: Plenty.

Mr McPHARLIN: But does the honourable member know?

Mr Jamieson: He won by some hundreds of votes.

Mr McPHARLIN: He won by 73 votes and he was a very worried man, as was the member for Collie at one time. The member for Avon said that the superphosphate bounty amounted to something like \$300 million a year. This illustrates how little he knows about the matter, because the bounty amounts to no more than \$70 million a year. The total expenditure provided for in the last Federal Budget was \$11 480 million, yet the Federal Government miserably deleted the expenditure of \$70 million in an area where people are in need of support. That the member for Avon should assert that the superphosphate bounty amounted to \$300 million a year shows that he is completely off the beam and does not understand the situation. I make those correc-

tions now, because his remarks were quite misleading. I do not think his remarks were intentionally misleading but they do indicate that he does not understand the situation.

I should like to comment briefly on the demonstration in Forrest Place because there has been a considerable amount of criticism of what took place there.

Mr T. D. Evans: You did not finish telling us about the demise of the National Alliance. You did not tell the whole story.

Mr McPHARLIN: I told the member that we are the constitutionally formed Country Party.

Mr T. D. Evans: Yes, but you did not tell us about the demise of the National Alliance.

Mr McPHARLIN: I told the honourable member, but perhaps he did not hear; perhaps he was not listening. I mentioned that we are and always have been the constitutionally formed Country Party and that there has never been a change.

Mr T. D. Evans: Why did you go to the people under the banners of the National Alliance?

Mr McPHARLIN: We worked with another group of nonsocialists because of the actions of the socialist parties in this country. One of the overriding driving forces of nonsocialist parties is to unite to retard socialist philosophies being implemented which are detrimental to the way of life in this country at present. However, we do not regard people on this side of the House as rubbish.

Mr McIver: That statement was booming them up.

Mr McPHARLIN: Well, that will make good reading in *Hansard*.

Mr T. D. Evans: He is not worried about that.

Mr T. J. Burke: Before you proceed, could you explain why the June issue of the *Liberal Comment* had the caption "Liberal-National Alliance" under all the photographs?

Mr McPHARLIN: No, I cannot explain that; I did not know why that was printed. I had nothing to do with it.

Mr McIver: When I referred to a figure of \$300 million recently, I said that it was only an approximate figure. I said it was open to correction.

Mr McPHARLIN: The honourable member should read *Hansard*; he would see that statement printed there.

Mr McIver: But I did not know the exact figure; I said it was only an approximation.

Mr McPHARLIN: It was an approximation, all right; \$300 million against \$70 million is really very approximate. The member was a mile out!

Mr McIVER: That figure was quoted by the Federal Minister for Agriculture, Senator Wriedt.

Mr McPHARLIN: Well, it is completely wrong.

Mr McIVER: That is between you and the Federal Minister.

Mr McPHARLIN: The member for Avon should check his figures before he makes statements like this to the House.

I have heard accusations about what happened in Forrest Place but I have not yet heard anybody give any reasons why the demonstration erupted into violence. As I have said before, I do not condone violence; I think it is wrong. But what were the reasons behind the violence?

Mr T. D. EVANS: Do you think the reasons justify the end?

Mr McPHARLIN: No, but the farmers were disturbed. How often over the past 50 years have members seen farmers as disturbed as they were on this occasion? I do not think members have ever seen them as disturbed as this since the days of the depression.

Mr T. H. JONES: Who organised them?

Mr McPHARLIN: We have some fairly good evidence that there were organised stirrers present at the meeting and they were not members of the farming community.

Mr JAMIESON: That is the only thing you have said so far that is right.

Mr McPHARLIN: I believe the honourable member would have a good idea who the stirrers were.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Were you there?

Mr McPHARLIN: No, I was not there; I was at Albany.

Point of Order

Mr JAMIESON: Mr Speaker, I take a point of order. The words, "You would have a good idea who the stirrers were" are objectionable to me. They impute that I was associated with the people who disrupted that meeting and I ask that they be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: I am afraid I cannot agree with the honourable member's point of order. The words used did not have a direct association with the member, unless he can tie them to something the Minister said.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: Mr Speaker, I rise to speak on the same point of order. I draw your attention to the Standing Order which states that if a member regards words as offensive to him, he can ask that they be withdrawn. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has indicated that the words used are offensive to him and I also ask that they be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Deputy Premier to withdraw the remarks in question as they are offensive to two members of

the Opposition. I do not wish to try to be as precise as possible on giving decisions on points of order on matters such as this, because I do not want the situation to arise—although I am the servant of the House—where every member can rise to his feet on a foolish issue to ask that words be withdrawn.

However now that the Leader of the Opposition has added weight to the point of order raised by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to have these words withdrawn, I ask the Deputy Premier to withdraw the words. This will now lead me to take similar action on future occasions and, because of this, I ask members to use some restraint before raising similar points of order. The Deputy Premier.

Debate Resumed

Mr McPHARLIN: To maintain the dignity and decorum of the House I withdraw the words.

Mr J. T. TONKIN: You have no option.

The SPEAKER: From the Chair I say that I hope every member will feel that way in the future.

Mr McPHARLIN: I was saying that nobody has ever seen farmers stirred up to the degree they were on this occasion. There were reasons for their being stirred up and they had mounted before that time. Some of the reasons were that the Federal Government had withdrawn certain concessions enjoyed by members of rural communities by way of taxation deductions on water storage, fencing, and so on. In addition an announcement had been made that there would be a discontinuance of the superphosphate bounty. Further to that the Prime Minister had been invited to attend a meeting of farmers at Subiaco, but he did not reply.

Mr T. D. EVANS: He did reply.

Mr McPHARLIN: Later.

Mr T. D. EVANS: He replied before the meeting; be honest.

Mr McIVER: Don't hide behind that!

Mr McPHARLIN: Three weeks before the meeting was held the Prime Minister was invited to attend, but he did not reply before the meeting. All these factors led up to farmers thinking that they were not being given a fair crack of the whip.

Mr McIVER: Some of them had to fly down to the meeting in their own private planes.

Mr McPHARLIN: When the meeting took place there were vociferous people present and among them were farmers. Some inane remarks were made from the platform and several members in this House were involved in that.

Mr T. D. EVANS: How do you know? You were not there and could not hear what was said.

Mr McIver: And the Farmers' Union was disgusted with what happened.

Mr McPHARLIN: All the factors I have mentioned added weight to what took place. So there were reasons for the farmers feeling the way they did. Normally people do not erupt in this way and take that sort of action because there is no reason for it. How many times in the last 50 years have members seen farmers as vociferous and as wild as they were on this occasion?

Mr May: That does not make it right.

Mr McIver: Many of them have never suffered hardship.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr McIver: They have never suffered hardship; most of them are members of the younger generation.

Mr McPHARLIN: The member for Avon would not know.

Mr McIver: I would know more than you.

Mr McPHARLIN: Following that meeting a State Minister at the time—the Minister for Police—was reported in the *Daily News* of the 26th March as making the following statement—

"I have a lot of respect for farmers in general—but this was just scum from the scrub," he said.

"Their pigs are better behaved than they were."

Here we have a responsible Minister, a member of the party to which those on the other side of the House belong, and which was then in Government referring to people as "scum from the scrub".

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.03 p.m.

Mr McPHARLIN: Before the afternoon tea suspension I was referring to published comments which had been made by a responsible Minister in the previous Government, when he referred to the country people as "scum from the scrub". If that report is correct—and I did not see at any time where the previous Minister denied having said that—then it is an indictment of him in speaking about country people in that way, because he was referring to them as scum. I repeat: It is an indictment of him.

The person responsible for that statement should at least be prepared to clarify it, if it was not intended that way. In all justice he should make it perfectly clear what the statement did mean. After the report appeared in the Press many people were resentful of that statement, and many are still resentful.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: I do not think that person meant any malice in that statement. I think he was trying to be poetic and striving for alliteration.

Mr McPHARLIN: I am surprised at that comment.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: If one says, "scum from the scrub" that is alliteration.

Mr O'Neil: Only just.

Mr McPHARLIN: The Leader of the Opposition, who was Premier in the previous Government, usually makes useful contributions to debates, but I am afraid the comment he has just made is not up to his usual standard.

Mr B. T. Burke: You should put him in the corner, and inflict a penalty of 100 lines on him!

Mr McPHARLIN: Some criticism was made by the member for Warren when he was speaking in the debate on the Supply Bill. He levelled some criticism against the Government for increasing the slaughtering charges at the abattoirs. Surely as the previous Minister for Agriculture he realises that the Government does not desire to be forced into the situation where it has to increase charges. A Government does not like to increase charges, but sometimes it is forced into doing so.

I shall give the previous Minister for Agriculture some reasons which compelled the Government to increase the charges. I might point out that the increases were kept down to the absolute minimum. I have before me a list of the extra costs which have been imposed on WA Meat Export Works and Midland Junction Abattoir; these have been brought about by wage and salary increases under industrial awards and agreements.

I shall mention only a few of the larger increases, although there is a large number of them. Under the Federated Clerks Union award the extra cost to WA Meat Export Works was \$26 000, and to Midland Junction Abattoir \$33 000. Under the general officers' agreement the extra cost incurred by WA Meat Export Works was \$68 200, and by Midland Junction Abattoir \$40 500. Under the Meat Employees' Union award the extra cost to WA Meat Export Works was \$160 000, and to Midland Junction Abattoir \$382 000. So the increases go on, but I shall not mention the smaller amounts.

There was the annual leave loading of 17½ per cent granted under a Public Service Board administrative instruction, and this applied to all awards and agreements. The extra cost to WA Meat Export Works under this determination was \$30 000, and to Midland Junction Abattoir \$48 000.

Mr Moller: All those increases have been announced in the Press.

Mr McPHARLIN: I am aware of that. I am now pointing out how the Government was forced to impose the increased charges. Surely, the previous Minister for Agriculture would know what happens in such cases. As a result of the granting of

service pay WA Meat Export Works incurred \$200 000 in additional costs, and Midland Junction Abattoir \$331 700.

As a result of the national wage and basic wage case the extra cost to WA Meat Export Works was \$144 000, and to Midland Junction Abattoir \$190 800. In all, the increases resulted in \$695 200 in extra costs to WA Meat Export Works, and \$1 117 500 to Midland Junction Abattoir. So one can see that a vast amount of money has to be found to meet the increases.

Before the Government made any recommendations in this regard or agreed to any submissions to increase the charges, it examined and explored every avenue with a view to keeping the charges down to the minimum. Of course, that course of action was followed by the Government. It agreed that the Treasury should inquire into the matter, and endeavoured to keep the costs down to the minimum by making a special grant of \$300 000 to each of those abattoirs so that the charges would be kept as low as possible. I doubt whether this was made public; however, the Government did that, because it was very concerned about the need to keep costs down.

The increased costs were not brought about by the abattoirs or the Government; they were as a result of the increases in wages and salaries which were imposed on the industry. So, the Government had no alternative but to increase the charges to cope with the situation.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: You are now taking a very different attitude from the one you took when you were not in government.

Mr McPHARLIN: I do not like to increase charges.

Mr J. T. Tonkin: We as the previous Government were blamed for the increases which were imposed during our term.

Mr McPHARLIN: The other evening the member for Warren blamed this Government for the increases. Just the same, there is no alternative.

Mr Moiler: You have said that you do not like it; obviously your opinion did not count for very much in the Government!

Mr B. T. Burke: Is it true there is an inner Cabinet of one?

Mr McPHARLIN: One important announcement appeared in the Governor's Speech: it is that the Government is making a review or having a submission prepared in an endeavour to retain the superphosphate bounty.

This is an endeavour to offset the drastic price rise which occurred on the 30th June. That rise was well over 100 per cent. Previously, of course, a submission had been made to the Industries Assistance Commission on new land farmers, but another submission is being prepared now

in an endeavour to have the superphosphate bounty retained. It was initiated before the price rise of the 30th June and the fact that an increase of nearly \$19 has been made to the price gives added weight to the request regarding the retention of the bounty.

I know the Prime Minister is an exceptionally busy man and does not get enough time to study in detail the impact of the removal of subsidies such as the fuel subsidy and the superphosphate bounty. I feel that if submissions are made and, through the Minister in the Federal House, they get to the Prime Minister, he will reconsider the matters. After the meeting in Canberra the other day I gained the impression that he just does not have enough opportunity to study these matters, but if we made a submission, it will be brought to his notice and, I hope, he will give consideration to it. A submission will certainly be made because I believe we have a much stronger case now since the price has been increased well over 100 per cent and applies to farmers not only in Western Australia, but in Australia as a whole.

Surely in a Budget of nearly \$11.5 billion, an amount of \$65 million to \$70 million is just chicken feed. Surely with a Budget of that size, the Prime Minister could make a readjustment to allow the bounty to remain. In any case the State Government will be submitting a proposal in an endeavour to assist the farmers who are already suffering from a downturn in the prices of their commodities.

Mr H. D. Evans: Would you not have thought that before the last Federal election the Liberal-Country Parties would give a firm decision on what they would do? They preferred to hang around and wait for the decision of the commission.

Mr McPHARLIN: I am not responsible for what the Federal party does. However, I know that it would support any submission now because of the increase in the price. I am only hoping that we can get through to the Prime Minister on this subject of the retention of the bounty. I will not delay the House any longer. I support the motion.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [4.13 p.m.]: Before I get onto the main theme of the few remarks I intend to make I wish to say that I did not get involved in the rather friendly discussion between the member for Ascot and the Minister the other night, but I have had an opportunity to look at some papers since then. I believe one must be very careful in one's actions, particularly in view of what occurred yesterday in the Parliament when an early suggestion was made that some witch hunting could be in progress. I think we should be clear in our minds as to what originated the trouble.

It seems to have been the result of a letter sent by the member for Ascot to the Minister on the 21st May. The honourable member included a rather cynical remark. I have no doubt—indeed, having been a Minister I know—that similar cynical remarks are often made because it is a fact that at times certain files cannot be found for weeks, particularly when they involve public works and have been sent to, for instance, the Medical Department.

Mr O'Neil: Never in the Public Works Department!

Mr JAMIESON: It is possible to chase such a file for weeks and it is no wonder that a person might say such a remark in a cynical way.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would like to remind the member for Welshpool that this was the subject of an amendment to the Address-in-Reply. The question before the Chair is a motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply so I do hope the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will not refer directly to the Landall question.

Mr JAMIESON: No; that will not be referred to. I am merely drawing attention to the fact to show how a comment in a letter can be viewed in two different ways. In his letter, the member for Ascot said, in part—

In the past on a number of occasions the departmental file relating to the subject has appeared to disappear from time to time and in view of the time lapse since February 7th I am naturally beginning to wonder whether this has happened again.

Of course, the Minister reacted immediately by wanting information about the files which disappeared.

I suppose similar situations have occurred dozens of times, and on this occasion I believe the theme being developed by the Minister is overshadowing the real purport of the letter, which was another matter altogether. I therefore hope the Minister will not become involved in witch hunting because there is nothing more objectionable in our community when there is no reason for it. True, no civil servant, or anyone else, should be disloyal to the Government of the day, but I have every faith in civil servants. I found them very loyal to me and I am sure members of the present Government will find them loyal to them, although certain disturbing reports are coming back from some quarters in regard to some activities within the Government. However, we will develop that theme at a later date. Nevertheless, the civil servants are not being disloyal in that they are not disclosing anything departmentally. They are merely expressing an attitude.

Mr Grayden: There is an allegation about missing files, and we are going to find out all about it.

Mr JAMIESON: The letter does not say anything about that; that is the point.

Mr Bryce: Read the letter.

Mr JAMIESON: That is the point of my reading the portion of the letter. This is where the witch hunting can develop.

Mr Grayden: The honourable member has a photocopy of a letter which is from a departmental file.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr JAMIESON: I am sorry, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The House will realise that the point I mentioned to the member for Welshpool is indeed—

Mr Jamieson: Manifesting itself.

The SPEAKER: Yes. Therefore I would ask him to get onto another subject.

Mr JAMIESON: Yes, Mr Speaker. Having said what I have said, I feel all I need to do for the time being is to refer the Minister to a statement that will probably be made by Mr Cameron some time today.

Mr Grayden: Who is he? This is a serious matter and it will go much further.

Mr JAMIESON: If I start to develop my argument any further I will get into more trouble with the Speaker. I merely intended to draw attention to the fact that something stated cynically is being developed into a witch hunt within the Civil Service.

Mr Grayden: It is far beyond witch hunting.

Mr O'Connor: Who is Mr Cameron?

Mr JAMIESON: A Federal Minister.

Let me now deal with the National Alliance about which we heard a little this afternoon.

Mr McPharlin: Not again!

Mr JAMIESON: I am rather intrigued because having studied the National Alliance policies and those of the Liberal Party, I find that they do not coincide at all, particularly on education. As my colleague points out, one would swear that the education policy of the National Alliance had been taken directly out of the policy of the ALP and not that of the Liberal Party. When any question is raised on the difference in policies, members opposite overcome the problem by saying that they are no longer members of the National Alliance, but are now members of the Country Party again and therefore the Country Party's policy prevails. However, I am not able to obtain any great detail concerning the Country Party's policy, particularly for the last election, because there was no Country Party then. Consequently we are at a disadvantage when trying to compare the policy of the Liberal Party with that of the other section of the Government.

Mr McPharlin: I could easily clarify that.

Mr JAMIESON: We cannot get a copy of the policy from the library and we find it extremely difficult to get a copy anywhere else.

Mr McPharlin: I did not think you would be interested.

Mr JAMIESON: I am an interested student of everyone's policy. I might even have a look at that of Karl Marx if I get an opportunity to do so.

Mr Rushton: I bet you have done that.

Mr JAMIESON: I have not. I have not even opened one page, nor have I looked at Mao's little red book, but I have heard a lot about it. I suppose the Minister thinks I have it under my pillow the same as he has that virtuous book of his.

However, that is a different kettle of fish. The point I want to make is the obvious confusion which existed in the party denominations of the members for Narrogin, Katanning, Merredin-Yilgarn, Moore, the Deputy Premier, and the Chief Secretary at the time of the election. The only member who is present in this Chamber under his true colours, of course, is the Chief Secretary because he nominated very clearly as a member of the Country Party.

Mr McPharlin: But you must realise this was an electoral agreement.

Mr T. D. Evans: Than the Chief Secretary did not take part in the agreement?

Mr JAMIESON: The other members I have mentioned covered themselves fairly well. The member for Narrogin nominated as Country Party-National Alliance. I agree that might be right; the Country Party section of the National Alliance. The member for Merredin-Yilgarn nominated purely as National Alliance. The member for Katanning covered himself by nominating as Country Party-National Alliance. The member for Moore was straight-out National Alliance. However, in the case of the Deputy Premier he did not nominate as Country Party-National Alliance; he was "The National Alliance".

I could imagine that he is "The National Alliance", especially after talking to some Country Party members. It seems he did the right thing by nominating in that way. However, the scheme did not work and it has fallen apart. The members have reverted to the Country Party.

Mr Skidmore: Are they all in the one party now?

Mr JAMIESON: I am not sure about that, but it is their worry. I now revert to the matter with which I was attempting to deal when you, Mr Speaker, so properly interrupted my line of argument. I refer to the comparison between the platforms of the Labor Party and the Liberal Party, federally. We have heard the Premier, from his hollow, complaining about the

attitude of the Australian Labor Party, and its policy of centralism in wanting to get rid of the States. It is high time, other than having a blank cheque, that we saw the Liberal Party's platform.

The Federal Liberal Party platform, of which we can get a copy—disorientated though it is—sets out the objectives of the party. Not in any part of the Federal platform is there any mention of rights of the States. By comparison, the platform of the Labor Party, from the very beginning, mentions the co-operation of the States, and the part they shall play in the Commonwealth. However, in no part of the Federal Liberal Party platform are the States regarded as being important. They are completely disregarded. One has to go to the "we believe"—which looks as though it was written by Billy Graham when he was in this country—before one really finds there is some co-operation with the Commonwealth, and that there should even be States. There are three or four pages of "we believe". As I said, in the Federal platform the States are completely disregarded and the Commonwealth is the beginning and end of all government.

To me, it seems to smack of rancour and hypocrisy, when the written word cannot even demonstrate any interest in the well-being of the States, or how they shall be part of the overall form of government.

Mr Rushton: Has the honourable member read the speech made by Gough Whitlam at the Chifley Memorial Lecture? He wanted to do away with State Governments and local government.

Mr JAMIESON: All politicians have probably said similar things, and then changed their minds. It is a pity that there are not a few more cemeteries in the territory of the member for Dale because that is the area of his thinking. It is with the dead.

It is interesting to summarise, statistically, the situation which occurred during the last election and work out where the voting went. We have said previously—and quite often—that there is a form of gerrymandering in this State and it has existed for a long time under the present voting system. The gerrymander exists to such an extent that at the last election—disregarding the two seats which were not contested by the principal parties, and leaving 49 seats—Labor polled 49.32 per cent of the vote to gain 22 seats. The Liberal Party polled 41.44 per cent of the vote to gain 23 seats, and the Country Party gained its six seats with 8.66 per cent of the vote.

The point I want to make is that it took 2.24 per cent of the overall vote to win each Labor seat; it took 1.97 per cent of the total vote to win each Liberal seat; and it took 1.33 per cent of the total vote

to win each of the six Country Party seats.

Mr Stephens: You will have to spread your supporters over the State.

Mr JAMIESON: I have disregarded two seats; I am talking about 49 seats.

Mr Old: You are talking about six Country Party seats.

Mr JAMIESON: I am only mentioning those seats on which we can take statistics. The point is that although $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent may not seem to be much, with the 211 370 electors involved in the 49 seats, Labor had to average 500 votes per seat more than did the Liberal Party to win each seat. That indicates the overall disproportionate representation which exists. If we were represented on the same basis as the Liberal Party, with 1.97 per cent of the total vote per seat, we would have gained another four seats, and that would have made a difference to the situation.

I suggest the position is unhealthy. It is being maintained and propped up by the Liberal Party and the Country Party. The fight put up at the last referendum is an indication that the Liberal and Country Parties do not want equality of voting. I think those parties should take a feather from Steele Hall's cap because he indicated very clearly that the people living in the country, after properly examining the position, said they did not want disproportionate voting.

I am sure people living in the country do not consider themselves to be any better than their city cousins. A bank manager at Mt. Magnet certainly would not consider himself to be any better, surely, than his counterpart living in Karrinyup where the voting strength is about one-fourteenth of that at Mt. Magnet.

The vital element in a democracy is that one must allow it to operate properly. If it is interfered with, and special conditions are created, the whole thing will get out of perspective.

It is of no use saying some electorates take up half the State. Special assistance and consideration must be given in those cases, but it seems to me to be fundamentally wrong that they should be given any greater advantage over other people in the voting strength in this House. This matter badly needs to be adjusted and it should have been adjusted as a result of a decision of the people of Australia. However, no doubt they were confused by the efforts of the various political parties during the referendum campaign and they finished up surrendering the right to determine a proper democracy.

Mr Clarko: It was a democratic decision, though.

Mr JAMIESON: The honourable member is arguing on that; I am not.

Mr Clarko: The majority of the people said they did not want it. Your Federal executive also wants one-vote one-value with the same number for each State. Is it wrong there?

Mr JAMIESON: I am not arguing on that.

Mr Clarko: I thought you were arguing about one-vote one-value.

Mr JAMIESON: This is where a little knowledge is a dangerous thing.

Mr Clarko: I would be happy to discuss my knowledge of politics with you.

Mr JAMIESON: I would not be happy to discuss it with the honourable member because I think I would be lowering myself.

Mr Coyne: Was it not the people of metropolitan regions who really caused the rejection of the referendum?

Mr JAMIESON: No-one can tell me anything about referendums. I know the score. We saw what happened on the nexus referendum when the major political parties in Australia were "done over" by the efforts of the DLP. It seems that if someone can stir up enough fear that there is some danger in the situation people will vote "No" regardless of the fundamental reason for the referendum. That particular situation is very obvious in the history of politics in the Commonwealth of Australia.

The only way to overcome the problem—as I have said on a number of occasions, and I have also mentioned it to the Prime Minister several times—is to conduct a referendum in association with every election. We should not have a referendum only once every 15 years or something like that. If we repeatedly hold referendums, people will begin to know more about the system. In the State of California, which has a population greater than that of the whole of Australia, the people have no trouble. At normal election time they are often faced with referendums on 22 items, of which they will pass five or six and reject the rest. The people are no more intelligent than our voters but they are used to making these decisions.

In Australia, the Commonwealth issues a booklet which means nothing to people. One side writes the case for voting "Yes", saying something diabolical will happen if people do not vote that way, and the other side writes the "No" case which is equally exaggerated. The people become confused and we are unable to get a proper answer from them. If we asked them individually, I think we would find the majority would decide there was justification for certain amendments at times.

I would like to move on to the matter of road funds, about which we have heard a great deal in recent times. I have had arguments—sometimes heated, sometimes more amicable—with the Federal authorities in regard to road funds. However, there is one point I must make in this Parliament and it must be taken up by the Government.

Mr O'Connor: By the way, I give you credit for the way you stood up to the Commonwealth.

Mr JAMIESON: I do not know whether I will be mentioned in the annals of my party for that but I accept the compliment.

In the very near future we must overcome the problem of not being able to argue with the Federal bodies, or indeed with our fellow States, on the basis of the activities arising from our own efforts with both State and local government funds. Our history in this regard is very bad. This is the worst State. I am not saying special consideration should not be given to us. I would put nobody ahead of myself in arguing about area and mileage of roads, but we must be able to make comparisons.

In the *Report on Roads in Australia*, published by the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads in 1973, table 14.7 gives some figures measuring taxable capacity and road finance effort. The figures are worth relating to the House. They show that in 1971-72 road expenditure as a proportion of all local government authority expenditure was 39 per cent in New South Wales, 42 per cent in Victoria, 23 per cent in Queensland, 51 per cent in South Australia, 41 per cent in Western Australia, and 33 per cent in Tasmania. However, in the States which have the lowest figures—that is, Queensland and Tasmania—local government income is well above that in other States, and local government authorities provide water supply, transport, sewerage, and a dozen and one other things. Therefore the figures for Queensland and Tasmania relate to far greater sums of money. The point I make is that Western Australia is disproportionately low in comparison with other States.

On the basis of local government authority road expenditure effort *per capita* in 1966-67 equalling 100 in all States, the rural effort was 133 in New South Wales, 96 in Victoria, 106 in Queensland, 60 in South Australia, 46 in Western Australia, and 58 in Tasmania. The urban effort was 118 in New South Wales, 100 in Victoria, 96 in Queensland, 80 in South Australia, 48 in Western Australia, and 95 in Tasmania. With figures such as those, it is very difficult for a Minister from this State to face up to the Commonwealth and argue for funds on the basis of effort.

Mr Rushton: Do you believe that is a true comparison of all the factors?

Mr JAMIESON: I believe it is a true comparison. In relation to highways and so on we can argue with the Commonwealth Government for the provision of funds for special contingencies such as distance and area, but we cannot argue on the basis of effort because there is no reason why the country cousins in a town

in Victoria or New South Wales should be obliged to make a greater effort than those in the towns in this State.

I have not made a very thorough investigation of the matter, but it appears our local authorities have been more bent upon improving the facilities and amenities in country towns than have the local authorities in comparable country towns in the Eastern States. I admit that swimming pools, libraries, and so on are essential, but it does not seem to me to be right that the people in a town of comparable size which is a comparable distance from a capital city in New South Wales should have to make this extra effort while the people in the country towns and the metropolitan area of Western Australia shirk their responsibility.

Unless we can equip the Minister with figures to show we are making our best effort—bearing in mind that Western Australia does not have by any means the lowest income *per capita*—it will be very difficult to convince the hardheads in the east that we are being unjustly treated.

I suggest that before very long some fundamental thinking will have to take place to overcome this very obvious problem. Any member who is interested in the report of the Bureau of Roads will find it is readily available in the library. It sets out the figures for the comparison of efforts of the various States.

The other day I asked the Minister for the effort of local government in Western Australia. Unfortunately he did not help me very much—he gave a lower figure than the one which is quoted here for Western Australia. He said that other figures were not available. No doubt the figures in this report were supplied by the Bureau of Statistics.

Mr O'Connor: Which Minister did you ask?

Mr JAMIESON: I asked the Minister for Urban Development and Local Government about the effort of local government in this State.

Mr Rushton: What do you feel about South Australia where local government does not look after a very big part of the State.

Mr JAMIESON: We would have to revert to rural effort on the part of the Government.

Mr Rushton: We carry the lot throughout the whole State.

Mr JAMIESON: This would have to be taken into consideration, but the general tenor of the report is that the main reason the States are so very slow is that they have relied overheavily on Commonwealth roads legislation and funds to get them through. Perhaps the picnic is over. They have amenities in advance of their country and city cousins in the other States.

We have to get down to the hard task of convincing people of their responsibility to meet their obligations in this regard, and not to think that the money is some sort of Government handout. Obviously the Commonwealth Government must get the money from somewhere, and eventually the people will be taxed to provide funds for roads in the same way that they are taxed to provide other things.

Mr Rushton: You cannot pick out little segments and compare them—you have to compare the lot.

Mr JAMIESON: That is effort, and it is a single segment. As I said before, we can remove the other details in regard to roads and the arguments put up about the area to be covered, and the like. Of course, we have a good case there, but we do not have a case when we start to compare effort. Unless we are prepared to help ourselves, we cannot expect someone to come along to help us. We should help those who help themselves.

I made a note that I wanted to do a little parish pumping. The wetter portion of the Canning Shire comes into my electorate. I hope the Government will press ahead with drainage, sewerage, and the like in this area as quickly as possible. This winter has shown us that many areas are inadequately drained and sewered. If we can dry these areas out completely so that they may be used for housing and other buildings, advantages will flow to the Government, local authorities, and various Government instrumentalities such as the Railways Department and the Main Roads Department. With a denser population in these areas, transport and other necessary services will operate far more efficiently. I would like to be able to say to my electors that the Government intends to look into this problem.

I feel I must say a few words about the road toll. Whilst I was Minister for Traffic Safety, I was very loath to become too excited about improvements in the road toll figures. I am sure by this time the present Minister will appreciate my comments. One feels everything is going along all right for a while, but then there is a rash of accidents and the Minister administering this department finds he is in trouble again. This trend was apparent to such an extent that our advertising advisers for the last State election were always concerned that before a certain advertisement appeared in the Press a further splurge of accidents would occur. I am happy to say that we avoided this problem but on some occasions it would have been disastrous to have run some of our advertisements in the Press.

On my trip overseas I spoke to many experts about this matter. No-one seems to have found a way to overcome the problem although every country has attempted

to minimise the accident rate in its own particular way. A minor exception to the general inability to solve the road problem is that of some small countries which have been able to achieve a fair amount of success with divided roadways and other protections far too expensive to be countenanced in this country.

So many factors have to be taken into account; road engineering is important, as well as the maintenance of vehicles. We endeavour to look after all these problems, but eventually it comes down to the fact that every driver must accept a moral responsibility to take care on the roads. I hope the Minister does not lunge into too many traffic blitzes. We have seen this pattern before of blitzing, no blitzing, and then blitzing again. It certainly achieves something, but most fatalities occur on roads where there is very little chance of continual surveillance. I am sure the Minister is aware that no matter what supervision is undertaken, there is no easy way to overcome the problem. It is just not possible to have a policeman watching every driver.

I would like to speak about the Commonwealth Constitution Convention, and I intend to say a few words about the Premier. The Premier has often said that he wants to co-operate with the Commonwealth—he does not want confrontation. He wants to discuss matters rationally with Commonwealth representatives and to come to mutual arrangements. I was a delegate at the convention, and I wonder how the Premier can reconcile this philosophy with his outbursts there. Until the Premier rose to speak, the convention was going along fairly well. The delegates were all quite pally, and it looked as though something would be achieved. However, the Premier came on the scene and burst the whole bubble to such an extent that my colleagues from Queensland spoke to me and said, "Where did that conservative so-and-so come from? We thought that Bjelke-Petersen and Chalk were bad enough."

If any member cares to examine the transcript of the convention he will see exactly what happened. Immediately the Premier, the then Leader of the Opposition, spoke, he drove all the Federal delegation into one camp. We could not tell Labor delegates from Liberal or Country Party delegates because they were all talking with the one tongue. They had been driven into taking this stand.

We will probably be speaking more about the convention in a few days' time, but it is obvious that if a convention of this type is to succeed, there must be give and take on both sides. There was no suggestion of any give on the part of the Premier at all. He said, "We are going to do this and that. It is undesirable that we should

even talk with the Commonwealth." Of course the convention could not succeed whilst delegates thought like that.

Sir Charles Court: Your Prime Minister said that certain things were not negotiable.

Mr JAMIESON: The Prime Minister said that certain things were not negotiable. The Premier drove the Commonwealth delegates into the one camp.

Sir Charles Court: Nonsense.

Mr JAMIESON: I advise members to read the transcript and make up their own minds—the Premier did just that.

Sir Charles Court: How do you explain that the Liberal and Country Party delegates at the Federal level went along with everything I said?

Mr JAMIESON: The Premier made the convention a joke.

Sir Charles Court: I must be more powerful than I thought!

Mr JAMIESON: Until we can talk on even terms on these matters, we will get nowhere with the Commonwealth convention. When the original convention took place, there was no Commonwealth, and the States all wanted to come together. Now they are not so sure.

If people start putting in barbs right, left, and centre the convention will break up without achieving anything. I suggest there are many things we need to achieve because our Constitution is not perfect; and unless we can get together during the convention over a period of time—and time is the essence; it will be a long time and not a short time—we will get nowhere.

That is another problem in respect of the present Premier; he wants everything done yesterday and not tomorrow. Of course, this approach just will not succeed. He must take people along with him and demonstrate that his efforts are made on behalf of the State. I am sure that if members study the speeches made at the convention by the Premier of Victoria (Mr Harmer) and others they will find that those people clearly indicated they were aware that it would take time. However, not so our present Premier; he is only prepared to make his own show, and to use the convention as a staging camp to do some antisocialising or something like that. On the last occasion he ended up driving the whole of the Commonwealth delegation into speaking with one voice. I had to look in the book afterwards to find out the political affiliation of the members of that delegation because I just could not tell at the time. That type of action achieves nothing.

However, when it came to the stage of appointing committees to do the work I am happy to say that the committee with which I was associated experienced no such antics. Certain people, such as Mr

Killen from Queensland, were rather vocal, but everyone was prepared to work in an effort to achieve results on behalf of the people of Australia, and no-one pushed his own particular theories and desires. A convention such as this is not designed for that type of activity, nor should it be so designed; it is designed only to achieve a better Constitution for us to work under.

I would like to touch briefly on another matter if I have time before I conclude.

The SPEAKER: You have nine minutes.

Mr JAMIESON: I would like to conclude by dealing with morality in politics. Immorality in politics is one of the problems with which we are faced in the world of today. We have just experienced probably the greatest ever scandal in politics. I refer to the American Presidency; and probably the moral issue involved was the most damning factor which caused Mr Nixon's ultimate resignation. He was involved in something into which he was forced by the very nature of his own kind of democracy, and by the very nature of the fact that he was responsible for millions of American dollars in campaign funds and for the obtaining of information regarding his opponents' proposed line of action. People supported him because they knew they would be guaranteed something in return for their support.

If that sort of thing continues for long we might find that in Australia we will be faced with similar problems. The problems of conducting election campaigns—whether it be on the part of the Labor Party, the Liberal Party, or the Country Party—are ever-increasing in this State, and if people contribute towards the campaign they could come along afterwards looking for some return for their effort. This is wrong. In my opinion sooner or later we will have to get around to adopting the attitude of the Scandinavian countries, and finance election campaigns from the public purse. If we do not we will reach the stage where people are involved in unsavoury financial situations of the type which culminated in the resignation of President Nixon.

This does not occur only in the upper echelon because we have seen it happen in other echelons. We have seen it occur in the case of the City of Stirling resulting in a Royal Commission being appointed to inquire into the disposal of effluent in that city.

Mr Clarko: A waste of money.

Mr JAMIESON: Obviously they did not get rid of all the effluent.

Mr Clarko: No, he is out of the room at the moment.

Mr JAMIESON: The situation is that that is only one of the instances which have occurred.

Whilst I do not wish to indulge in moralising, I think the time is fast approaching when all parliamentary candidates—both

State and Federal—should upon nomination be required to make a declaration of their holdings and assets so that the facts are readily available in the Electoral Department to anybody who wishes to study them. These details should be available so that people may ascertain that their parliamentary representatives are not likely to be putting their fingers into the public purse, or even into some private purse, as a result of their position. I think it is vital that we do this to keep us all on a reasonably high plane, because in the past we have experienced that people have been inclined to indulge in that sort of activity.

I feel that we in this Parliament are paid a reasonable salary for the job we do—whether we be Ministers or ordinary members—and if a member needs a greater income than that in order to sustain his standard of living whilst he is a member of Parliament, then he is in the dangerous situation of being liable to favour things he might not otherwise agree with.

The **SPEAKER**: The honourable member has four minutes.

Mr **JAMIESON**: Thank you, Sir. I suggest that it is not necessary for us to look far to appreciate that such a situation could easily develop in a community like ours, and the sooner we overcome the problem the better it will be.

I would even extend that idea to local government. I think candidates in that sphere should be required to state their occupations and their holdings. I know it has been said many times before, but it is true that many people associated with land agencies are in local government. A disproportionate number of these people are in local government, and obviously they receive some advantage from their position. Of course, they are obliged to declare themselves if they have an interest in matters which are discussed by the council. I am not sure what that means, but it does not help much. It seems that once the councillor declares his interest that is the end of the matter.

Mr **Coyne**: Under that system you would be unable to get councillors in country areas, because only people with private means can afford the time to carry out the duties.

Mr **JAMIESON**: The honourable member has gained the wrong impression. I am not saying that they should not have private means; I am saying that their occupations and holdings should be clearly displayed when they nominate, and any alterations to those details should be available to the ratepayers at the shire offices, just as they should be available in the Electoral Department in the case of members of Parliament.

I think it is time we got down to that system so that in future we will know where we are going and we will not be

relying on subterfuge; and remember that members of Parliament should have a high moral standing in the community. It is high time we faced up to this and stopped running away from it as some members in this Parliament have been doing.

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

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 7th August.

MR SKIDMORE (Swan) [4.58 p.m.]: The Bill before the House was aptly described by the Minister in his introductory speech as a Bill to make metric conversions, where necessary, in the principal Act. We have looked at the proposed amendments to the Act, and in principle we agree with them.

We note that some of the terms which are to be deleted from the Act or varied in the Act are actually still in use in some other Acts. Under clause 3 it is proposed to repeal section 20 of the Act, and this is for the purpose of deleting from the Act the term "bushel". As a consequence, it will be necessary to remove the whole of schedule D, which is proposed to be done by clause 6 of the Bill.

We note also that the National Standards Commission has indicated that the term "bushel" still is a legal unit of measurement under the Commonwealth Weights and Measures (National Standards) Regulations, and that the expressed opinion of the Minister is that this should cease to remain so by the end of 1975. We agree with the proposition that by the end of 1975 the term probably will be redundant.

Clause 4 of the amending Bill seeks to provide for the conversion of the containers used in the brewing industry. I am aware that three of the vessels—the hogshead, the half-hogshead and the barrel—are no longer used in the industry but will still be used in the Commonwealth field as a legal unit of measurement. We agree that by the end of 1975, such containers should cease to be used, and therefore, that they should no longer be expressed in such terms in the parent Act. Clause 5 simply proposes to convert 20 miles to 30 km; of course, that is readily explained in metric terms. The Opposition supports the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

**OFFICIAL PROSECUTIONS
(DEFENDANTS' COSTS) ACT
AMENDMENT BILL**

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 7th August.

MR BERTRAM (Mt. Hawthorn) [5.05 p.m.]: This Bill entitles one to wonder whether the Liberal-Country Party coalition perhaps has some inkling of the message which has been coming through for some time from the average person in the street, that he is sick and tired of the blocking, knocking, and obstructionism which the Liberal Party and the Australian Country Party or the National Alliance—whatever its name is—has been adopting in various parts of Australia for the past few years. I refer to the attempt on the part of the Liberal and Country Parties to defeat the will of the people as expressed through their elected Government. This blocking, knocking, and general obstructionism has been manifested in this State in the period between 1971 and 1974 and in the Australian Parliament since December, 1972, and the people are heartily sick of it. The Attorney-General, Senator Murphy, is reported in today's paper as saying as late as yesterday that the Senate Opposition could be accused of "destructive and foolish obstructionism", while a few days ago, Senator Steele Hall accused the Liberal-Country Party Opposition senators of "bloodyminded obstructionism". However, this Bill does not come within that situation.

Mr O'Neill: Does that mean that Senator Murphy is wrong?

Mr BERTRAM: This is what puzzles me; there is something wrong. Has the Government got the message? Is this the beginning of a new era? In effect, what is happening with this Bill is that the Government is saying, "Last year a socialist Government introduced a socialist piece of legislation. We think it is magnificent and now we are going to improve upon it." Mr Speaker, you may not be taken by surprise by this move on the part of the Government and I certainly am not surprised but, nonetheless, there may be a few new faces around the place who are taken by surprise by this move, especially in the light of an answer given by the Premier recently to a question I asked him.

The question was asked on the 6th August and appears at page 284 of *Hansard*. The Premier was asked—

Does he accept the allegation that Liberal-Country Party Governments—

- (a) practice socialism;
- (b) acquiesce on the practice of socialism; and/or
- (c) introduce socialist legislation?

The Premier's reply, which may stagger some people in this place, but which does not stagger me, was as follows—

- (a) and (b) No.

- (c) Certainly not as part of a socialist policy and programme.

So here we have the so-called Liberal-Country Party coalition adopting and cementing into the legislation of this House for all time a classic piece of socialist legislation.

Sir Charles Court: Where does socialism come into this particular piece of legislation? Good heavens!

Mr O'Neill: This is social legislation; do you not know the difference?

Mr BERTRAM: I will explain the difference for the Minister. This is clearly socialist legislation. I can tell members without any equivocation that if the Tonkin Government had not introduced this legislation in 1973, it would not be on the Statute book today and we would not be seeking to amend it now. In fact, it would not have been on the Statute book for another decade.

Mr Mensaros: Did you look up *Hansard* to establish what our attitude was at that time?

Mr BERTRAM: As I understand it, the Minister supported the Bill.

Mr O'Neill: And improved it.

Mr BERTRAM: I am not discussing those who supported the Bill. If the Minister would only listen he would have heard that I was supporting those who originally introduced the legislation. I say here and now that the Act would not have been on the Statute book at this stage, nor for the best part of a decade in the future, had it not been for the socialist Tonkin Labor Government introducing it.

Mr O'Neill: That is an assumption. You keep saying that you need facts.

Mr BERTRAM: On this occasion, as the Minister would have heard, I am expressing my opinion.

Mr O'Neill: That is right; which is a fact.

Mr BERTRAM: That is right. This is clearly socialist legislation put on the Statute book by a socialist Government.

Sir Charles Court: Your premise is that every piece of legislation introduced by a Labor Government must be socialistic.

Mr BERTRAM: That is what the Premier is saying. This is clearly socialist legislation. It has been put on the Statute book to make the rule of the law a reality and not a sham.

Mr Jamieson: The Premier does not know what socialism is.

Sir Charles Court: I do know.

Mr BERTRAM: For those members who are not aware of it, but who have a dictionary in their office such as *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*, I would point out that this is the sort of socialism, in general terms, that we on this side of the House support, and which I imagine that those

on the Government side of the House, in general terms, do not. If members care to look at *The Concise Oxford Dictionary* they will find that the definition of socialism is—

... attempt to apply Christian precepts in ordinary life resulting in some approximation to the alms of.

Mr Clarko: Would the Chinese and Russians agree with that?

Mr BERTRAM: In the meantime we are not talking about the Chinese and Russians.

Mr Clarko: They are socialists.

Mr Taylor: They are human beings, and I do not see how this matches your ideas.

Mr Clarko: You blokes call yourselves socialists, but not at election time.

Mr Jamieson: Have we ever run away from that? Never!

Mr Bryce: I have never seen any of you over there referring to yourselves as capitalists.

The SPEAKER: I point out to the member for Ascot that, by interjecting, he is disorderly, and, further, he is interjecting outside of his chair.

Mr O'Neill: Which is "worse"!

Mr BERTRAM: Just touching on this dirty word "socialism" for a moment—

Mr O'Neill: What about speaking to the Bill?

Mr BERTRAM: I will just finish on this note.

Mr O'Neill: Good!

Mr BERTRAM: The Leader of the Country Party talks of creeping socialism and I take this opportunity to bring him up to date, because it is certainly not creeping. In the world today socialism is an avalanche.

Sir Charles Court: That is the danger!

Mr BERTRAM: There is nothing that will stop it. All the Conservatives can do is to slow it down.

Mr Young: All that can stop it is common sense.

Mr BERTRAM: It is not creeping socialism, and if the Minister cares to study the world scene today he will find abundant evidence to support what I am saying.

I want to place on record quite specifically that the Act we are now seeking to amend was first introduced, by way of a second reading, on the 19th September, 1973, and Royal Assent was given to it on the 6th November, 1973. So it is fairly recent legislation.

Whilst appreciating the move by the Conservatives to make the Act even more effective, I am, to say the least, a little puzzled and not very impressed by the fact that the Bill should be introduced at this time. It has barely arrived and it will occupy the time of the 51 members in

this Chamber and the 30 members in another place at a time when the only evidence before us of any money being paid out under the Act—

Mr O'Neill: In round terms it was about \$5 000.

Mr BERTRAM: That is right. Less than \$6 000 has been paid out under this legislation.

Mr O'Neill: You put a dollar value on socialist legislation then?

Mr BERTRAM: No, I am discussing something else. The amount was \$5 949.56, and 87 certificates have been issued. It is upon those certificates that the payment has been made. So after a few months we have been brought back here to amend the Act when, in my submission, we would have been a great deal better off and would have saved a great deal of time and taxpayers' money had we waited a little longer and explored the possibility of extending the operation of the Act.

As you would be aware, Mr Speaker, the Act, as it now stands, extends only to the lower echelon of courts. As I recall the position, it does not extend to the Supreme Court jurisdiction and I doubt whether it even extends to the District Court. What we should be doing here is to introduce a positive measure, pausing for a little while to observe the fact that, under this Act, we would have paid out, from a budget of \$500 000, an amount of only \$10 000 in a full year. We are now considering whether we can extend this legislation to the jurisdiction of the higher echelon of courts.

Having decided we can do that, at the same time as we are expanding the operation of the principal Act, we can deal with what happens to be fairly minor amendments.

What does the principal Act do? If members look at it, they will find that it provides that if a defendant is successful in one of these lower courts—after he has been charged or convicted, and had the conviction against him quashed—then instead of his having to meet the costs of the prosecution out of his own pocket, as was the case previously, he will no longer be obliged to pay the full amount of the costs of his defence. In fact, if he is successful in the lower courts, the Crown or the Treasury would not reimburse him wholly, but the pyrrhic effect would be that, having been successful in his defence, he would not have to pay a large bill to his solicitor for his trouble. Up to 1973 he would have been obliged to pay such a bill, and this was grossly unfair and detracted substantially from the rule of the law.

So the principal Act is a wonderful innovation to the law of this State. It is wonderful therefore that even with a change of Government, and despite the

fears, the rantings and the ravings—especially of the present Premier as to what he would do about socialism—this piece of amending legislation should in effect be endorsed and consolidated, because after all it is legislation which was introduced by a socialist Government.

Having had a look at the intention of the Bill I should mention quickly that in certain cases under the principal Act a defendant is not, as of right, entitled to his costs. If, for example, by virtue of the provisions of section 669 of the Criminal Code or section 26 of the Child Welfare Act a defendant benefits, then the court at its discretion may deny the defendant any reimbursement of costs under the particular Act. That is perfectly good legislation.

As is not uncommon, when an Act has been operating for a short time, situations which are analogous to the ones mentioned have emerged; so, there is a need to extend and improve existing section 6 of the principal Act. I have no objection to that. It seems to me to be a perfectly meritorious measure, and we on this side of the House support it.

MR HARTREY (Boulder-Dundas) [5.22 p.m.]: I, too, would like to support in the main the propositions that have been put before us in this Bill. I differ somewhat in my views from those of the last speaker who, in his enthusiasm, called this a socialist measure. I am a socialist, and I offer no apologies for being one. I have said that many times in this House, and I do not mind repeating it.

However, this particular legislation was not introduced by subsequent socialist Governments after 1954. The first demand for it came at a mass meeting of the miners on the goldfields, held in the Boulder Town Hall on the 11th April, 1954. There was then a Labor Government in office. Although the Miners' Union, on my motion, carried by a majority of 500 to 28 a resolution that the Labor Government should forthwith introduce this legislation, the Government did not do so.

Mr O'Neil: Were you a socialist in 1954?

Mr HARTREY: I was one in 1954; in fact, I was one in 1943.

Mr O'Neil: When did you become a socialist?

Mr HARTREY: In 1943 when the war was on.

Mr Clarko: You were a bit slow!

Mr HARTREY: I may be a slow learner but for 31 years I have been a socialist; I have remained a socialist ever since. This legislation did finally see the light of day in 1972. I think it is a tribute to the previous Government that it introduced legislation containing this elementary principle of justice. The legislation is not

characteristic of a socialist or a non-socialist community. It is applied in the High Court of Australia, which is scarcely a socialist tribunal, and there is no question of costs being paid by order of the court where a challenge is successful, irrespective of whether it is the case of a convicted criminal being acquitted of the offence, or vice versa. The principle is sound.

I join with the member for Mt. Hawthorn in criticising the Liberal Party for not introducing the legislation in the 12 years immediately preceding 1971. To be honest, I must also criticise its antecedents for not introducing it in the years between 1954 and 1959. However, I am glad it has been introduced.

There is only one suggestion I would make to the Government: It should delete the reference to section 137 of the Police Act. I do not think there is any merit in making it possible to deprive a person of his costs, where the charge is dismissed as being too trivial in nature to justify a prosecution. There are times where over-officious police officers, traffic inspectors, and persons clothed with a little brief authority step forward and lay charges against individuals for trivial matters. In the past that might have been all right, but it is not so today. I do not see why we should take the retrograde step of permitting courts to refuse costs when a charge is dismissed on the ground that it is too trivial. For that reason I will move in the Committee stage for the reference to be deleted from the Bill. Other than that the Bill is just and fair; I have waited for this legislation for years and years. The Bill is in conformity with it; therefore I give it my support.

MR T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [5.27 p.m.]: I would like to indicate support of my colleagues in their general approval of the Bill. I had the honour, as a Minister in the former Government, of introducing the legislation. Whilst I am not exuberant about the contents of the Bill on this occasion—as, in fact, the provisions are too limiting in some way to a successful defendant in recovering costs in certain cases—I do endorse the remarks made by the member for Mt. Hawthorn when he said that the introduction of this Bill was an overt endorsement of this principle by the Government, which supported the introduction of the legislation when it was in Opposition. This is reaffirmation by the Government that it endorses the principle behind this piece of legislation.

I would be happy, after the legislation has run the gauntlet of perhaps 12 months, when experience will be gained as to the actual or likely costs to be met in the future, to extend its provisions beyond the Court of Petty Sessions level, at which level now costs are recovered by the defendant under the provisions of the

legislation before us, to include those areas within the criminal court and, indeed, the District Court and Supreme Court civil levels which are not already provided for under the Sultors' Fund Act and certain provisions of the Justices Act.

I share the belief of the member for Boulder-Dundas that where a person has been charged with an offence under section 137 of the Police Act, and it is the decision of the court that the charge is a trivial one, then the prosecution—having taken the risk of bringing such a charge—should, in fact, suffer the consequences of the charge being dismissed. I believe the prosecution should suffer the consequences in terms of the court, not being given a discretion, but being required to award costs.

I indicate that I also support the intention of the member for Boulder-Dundas to move in the Committee stage for the deletion of that part of the Bill. With those remarks I have much pleasure in supporting the measure.

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Works) [5.30 p.m.]: I thank members who have made contributions to the debate on this piece of legislation. I did assume there would be some opposition to the inclusion of the reference to section 137 of the Police Act; but I hope that following my reply to some of the comments made by members they may deem it fit not to move the contemplated amendment, and be prepared to support the proposition I am putting forward.

The Act came about as a result of a report of the Law Reform Committee as it was then and, in the second paragraph on page 3386 of *Hansard* of the 19th September, 1973, the then Attorney-General, the member for Kalgoorlie, had this to say—

This Bill has been drafted following a report of the Law Reform Committee, as it then was . . .

He then went on to say that it was a part of his party's general policy in respect of law reform; and that may well be. I have not checked statements made prior to the election which put the Labor Government into office.

Mr T. D. Evans: It was part of that policy.

Mr O'NEIL: That is fair enough; but certainly the matter was referred to the Law Reform Committee and, as a result, the legislation was introduced. I want to point out that the parent Bill—if there is such a thing—contained in the savings section a reference to first offenders under the Criminal Code—and nothing else. It was the member for Floreat who pointed out that offenders under section 26 of the Child Welfare Act were in the same category; and so the Government of the day accepted that fact.

In the very brief time the legislation has been in operation those who practise under it have found other areas of our law which should be covered by the savings provision, which is rather strange when we read the following statement by the Attorney-General, who introduced the original Bill—

It is submitted that this Bill, which has been drafted as a result of considerable research and consultation with responsible sectors of the community . . .

One questions the nature of the considerable research and consultation when the original Bill had covered the provisions of the Criminal Code only. The amendment moved by the Opposition extended the provision a little further; and in the very brief time the legislation has been in operation, it has been discovered that a number of other areas should be covered.

Mr T. D. Evans: The answer lies in reading a working paper of the commission.

Mr O'NEIL: What I am saying is that when the then Attorney-General introduced the Bill he said that it had been drafted as a result of considerable research and consultation.

Mr T. D. Evans: The working paper was circularised, but the point raised by the member for Floreat was never brought to attention.

Mr O'NEIL: I am merely saying that although this is relatively new legislation, it is found necessary to make amendments to it.

Mr T. D. Evans: That is characteristic of all new legislation.

Mr O'NEIL: The member for Mt. Hawthorn indicated we should wait a little longer and not worry about patching up this legislation.

Mr Bertram: Correct.

Mr O'NEIL: He said we should wait until we find the evidence which would present itself to us regarding the extension of the provision to higher courts. Well, which comes first—the chicken or the egg? In the very brief time the legislation has been in operation it has been found that some patching up is needed. I understand that the then Attorney-General indicated an intention to keep the operation of the legislation under review with the very object in mind referred to by the member for Mt. Hawthorn; and that is perfectly natural.

Mr T. D. Evans: Is it the intention of the Government, after the expiration of, say, 12 months, to refer it back to the commission?

Mr O'NEIL: That is the perfectly normal thing to do; in fact, the amendments before us at the moment were drafted as a result of the then Attorney-General referring these matters to the Law Reform Commission. The commission's report reached him on the 29th March this year

and I can understand why he did not have an opportunity to do anything about it. He probably did not even read it.

Mr T. D. Evans: He did not see the report. He was not in his office on that day.

Mr O'NEIL: I imagine he would have been very busy! The then Attorney-General referred the various matters contained in the Bill to the commission on the 1st February this year.

Mr T. D. Evans: This Bill contains only some of the matters I referred to the commission.

Mr O'NEIL: Yes; only some of them. In fact the aspect concerning section 137 of the Police Act was not referred to the commission.

Mr T. D. Evans: No, it was not.

Mr O'NEIL: As I said, on the 1st February this year certain aspects in relation to education and sections of the Child Welfare Act were referred to the commission for a report and that report was received by—no; it was submitted to—the Minister on the 29th March and we can understand why he did not have the opportunity to receive or examine it.

Mr May: Barely enough time.

Mr O'NEIL: The commission agreed firstly that the specific matters under the Child Welfare Act should be the subject of the savings provision and the commission reported that it had discovered two further provisions under which the court may refrain from recording a conviction notwithstanding the fact that the charge had been proved. They were in relation to the Education Act and are now covered by the Bill.

In its report the commission said that it had studied the possibility of drafting a dragnet clause—a general provision—which would enable any other points to be covered. This would have obviated the necessity for the Act to come before Parliament for amendment each time it was thought necessary. Quite wisely in my opinion the commission decided not to do that on the basis that some problems could arise in interpreting just precisely what the law meant. In my view it was far better for the commission not to proceed along those lines. It had in fact drafted such a provision, but then rejected it on the basis that it was far better to have in the Act specific reference to each particular case in regard to which the savings provisions of section 6 would apply.

I mentioned I had anticipated some concern in respect of the application of section 137 of the Police Act. This is the provision under which if the charge is dismissed on the basis that it was of a trivial nature then the defendant should be allowed costs. The commission said it should be considered as part of the savings clause because it is not until the case is before the court and the determination is made that a decision can be made as to

whether or not the offence was trivial. As a matter of fact the very words I used in my introductory speech, giving the other side of the story, are the precise words taken from the report of the Law Reform Commission. I said that if the offence were so trivial as to warrant its being dismissed then the action should not have been brought. That expression is taken out of the report.

Mr T. D. Evans: For what it is worth, I would not have accepted the recommendation of the commission on that point.

Mr O'NEIL: It is a moot point. I still want members to realise that it is in the discretion of the appropriate court as to whether or not the costs will be allowed to the defendant. As far as I am able to ascertain it is a fair and reasonable provision. I do not imagine it will make it possible for more trivial charges to be brought against offenders. It is an area which was considered by the commission and after long deliberation it felt that it should be subjected to the savings clause.

Therefore I hope that the amendment is not moved. I would indicate that, representing the Minister in another place, I would not accept the amendment anyway.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Thompson) in the Chair; Mr O'Neil (Minister for Works) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3: Section 6 amended—

Mr HARTREY: I have already given notice of my amendment. I move an amendment—

Page 2, lines 12 and 13—Delete the passage "or section 137 of the Police Act, 1892".

The CHAIRMAN: I would draw the attention of the Committee to the requirements of Standing Order 181 which sets out that an amendment to any motion before the Committee must, for the purposes of record, be in writing.

Mr O'NEIL: As the member for Boulder-Dundas has probably anticipated I propose to ask the Committee to reject the amendment, and I will refer to what I had to say during the second reading debate. Section 137 of the Police Act states—

A justice or justices shall not be bound to convict if the offence proved shall, in the opinion of such justice or justices, be of so trivial a nature as not to merit punishment.

I also mentioned previously that it could be argued if the offence were too trivial to merit punishment the charge should not have been brought. That is the only argument which the member for Boulder-Dundas can raise.

Mr Hartrey: It is the only one I want to raise.

Mr O'NEIL: On the other hand, the trivial nature of the offence may not have been apparent before the trial and the prosecution may have acted reasonably in bringing the charge. The Law Reform Commission commented that on balance it is considered that in such a case an accused should not be entitled to his costs as of right, and that section 137 of the Police Act should be included in the discretionary award of costs section. I rest my case.

Mr T. D. EVANS: The Minister for Works, amongst his other abilities, has demonstrated that he is quickly learning to be a very good barrister: On the one hand this, on the other hand that, and in between the balance is this!

Mr O'Neill: The Leader of the Opposition has often said there ought to be more one-armed lawyers.

Mr T. D. EVANS: The Minister referred to the rationale put forward and I am glad that, during his reply to the second reading, he made the point that the proposed amendment relating to section 137 of the Police Act was not one of the matters which I referred to the Law Reform Commission. Even if the proposal had been put to me I would not have accepted the recommendation. The Minister has said that the law should not concern itself with trivial matters, and my good friend, the member for Boulder-Dundas, will be able to articulate that phrase in Latin.

I emphasise: The law should not concern itself with trivialities, but that is what section 137 of the Police Act states. Under the legislation as it exists, if a charge is brought and found to be of a trivial nature, and it is dismissed, then the court in normal circumstances is required to award costs against the prosecution. I believe that practice would continue; whereas if we accept the provision in the Bill, and if the proposed amendment is defeated, then this sanction will largely disappear, because costs will be in the discretion of the court. I feel the court should not have that discretion.

Mr HARTREY: For the precise reason that I proposed the amendment I am surprised at the attitude adopted by the Minister. He has always impressed me as being fair and reasonable. I do not think he feels there is anything wrong with the amendment but he is opposing it for reasons which do not appeal to anybody on this side of the House.

The member for Kalgoorlie mentioned that I could quote in Latin a phrase he used in English. I can: It is "*de minimis non curat lex*". I am also able to tell a humorous story concerning a surprising use of that maxim! The effect of retaining the present law will be to restrain those officious persons who seek to abuse "a little brief authority", and to discourage

them from bringing trivial charges with immunity.

I am not at all bigoted on the subject, and I am not trying to make it a party issue. My aim is to discourage junior officials from bringing petty and foolish charges against citizens. After all, this Parliament represents the people and its concern is with the rights of the Queen's subjects. To be a Queen's subject is something to be proud of. To be a Government department's abject slave is no matter of pride. This Parliament does not encourage anybody to be the abject slave of anyone else, whether they be bureaucrats in town councils, the Police Force, or Government departments!

Charges of a trivial nature are brought by such people, partly to vindicate their own employment. We will encourage that practice by including in the exceptions this particular section of the Police Act, which was intended to restrain that very thing. I think I am putting forward a fair and reasonable amendment and I hope the Committee will be with me. I appeal to the Minister to reverse his decision.

Mr O'NEIL: I thank the honourable member for indicating this is not a party political issue but a matter of judgment. The judgment was made on the recommendation of the Law Reform Commission, which I am certain would take it as one of its tasks to represent to the Government of the day modifications of the law in the interests of the people. I therefore come down on the side of the Law Reform Commission while the "legal eagles" in the Chamber may not. I am a layman.

I am sure I said it was the Law Reform Commission which found this particular omission from the legislation. I was wrong, and for my error I apologise. The member for Kalgoorlie said he probably did not refer this matter to the Law Reform Commission, and he is wrong. On looking through the file, which I do not intend to quote, I find this was one of the matters which the Under-Secretary for Law recommended the Minister should refer to the Law Reform Commission.

Mr T. D. EVANS: I would not have accepted the recommendation in any event.

Mr O'NEIL: The fact remains that it was referred to the Law Reform Commission which recommended that section 137 of the Police Act was one part of the law which should be placed under the savings clause—clause 6, of the present Act. For that reason, once again I request the Committee to oppose the amendment moved by the member for Boulder-Dundas.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 5.54 p.m.