

area. Petrol is also more expensive in country areas. If cigarettes can be sold at the same price throughout the State, I do not think it would be very difficult to establish a uniform price for petrol and other commodities throughout the State.

Rumour has it that the Perth-Albany rail passenger service is to be discontinued. I hope the rumour is incorrect because if the service were discontinued it would create many hardships for businessmen, and pensioners and children in particular, who at the present time can leave Albany by train at 6.00 p.m., arriving in Perth at 7.00 o'clock the following morning; they can carry out their business during that day and leave Perth at 6.30 p.m., arriving in Albany the following morning.

If road buses are substituted for the train service, people would have to spend a day travelling to Perth, pay for accommodation overnight, carry out their business during the next day, pay for a further night's accommodation, and leave for Albany the following morning. A trip to Perth or Albany would cover three days and two nights. I believe a transport service such as the Perth-Albany passenger service, which was intended for the benefit of country dwellers, should not be discontinued.

I also wish to bring to the notice of the House the crucial position in which the farming community has found itself in the last few months. With the ever-spiralling costs and the drop in their income, farmers are finding it almost impossible to carry on.

The Federal Government has made available several loans, most of which either carry a very high interest rate or involve very stringent conditions, so that by the time the forms are filled out and the application is approved the farmer has passed his deadline. The Government should face reality and make available low interest loans or easy carry-on finance to help farmers in their present situation; otherwise the cities and towns in the rural sector will collapse because they exist wholly and solely in order to support the rural community.

I now move on to the subject of handicapped, disabled, and crippled people. I extend my thanks to the present Government, the Minister for Health, and officers of the medical and health services for agreeing to carry out—at no cost to the patients or their families—the necessary work on the homes of disabled people who are mentally, medically, and physically capable of living in the family environment which is so dear to us all. However, I do not believe the work should stop there. There are other people in a higher age bracket who have no family or whose family is too old to look after them. I believe motel type accommodation should be made available for them in the outer

suburban areas, with adjoining workshop facilities where they can learn a trade and produce articles which can be sold to the public. These people should have accommodation of their own where they can have their friends around for an evening, and so on, thus enabling them to live a normal type of life.

The paraplegics and quadriplegics at the Shenton Park Annexe are at present producing salable articles. A business has been set up, and I believe it should be sponsored. Perhaps the Government could subsidise these people and give them the opportunity to supply articles on Government contracts. This would enable them to make their own way in life and hold up their heads with dignity because they are supporting themselves. I believe their arts and crafts would enable them to become self-supporting. The assistance given to the paraplegics and quadriplegics at the Shenton Park Annexe could be extended to other disabled people to allow them to be at least partly responsible for their own future.

I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. D. K. Dans.

*House adjourned at 5.40 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 8th April, 1975

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

### QUESTIONS (60): ON NOTICE

1.

#### HOUSING

*Manjimup: Building Blocks and Waiting Period*

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

- (1) What is the total area of land held by the State Housing Commission in Manjimup, and where is this land located?
- (2) How many building blocks does this land represent?
- (3) How many building blocks owned by the SHC in Manjimup are serviced ready for the construction of dwellings, and where are these, if any, located?
- (4) (a) Does the SHC own land which does not require such a drainage feasibility study which he indicated was being undertaken with land on Leman and Lintott Streets;

- (b) if "Yes" will he indicate where such land is located, and explain why such land is not being utilised to enable the current building programme for Manjimup to proceed without delay?
- (5) What is the waiting time for applicants for the various categories of dwellings in Manjimup?
- (6) (a) Has any study been made in Manjimup to determine the demands for accommodation which will be placed on the SHC over the next 12 months, and if so, will he indicate the nature of the study undertaken and the results which were revealed;
- (b) if no study to determine the SHC accommodation needs for Manjimup has been made, will he have a field survey by an appropriate officer of his department undertaken as a matter of urgency in view of the increasing demand for housing in the town as a consequence of the wood chip industry which becomes operative this year, and which will have attendant consequences?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) The commission holds four individual parcels of broad acres totalling 21 acres 1 rood and 27 perches in the Manjimup town-site and these parcels are located on Leman Street, Lintott Street, Graphite Road and Pritchard Street.
- (2) Approximately 82 residential allotments.
- (3) None.
- (4) (a) Yes.
- (b) The commission's holding on Graphite Road does not require a drainage feasibility study, and owing to the delays which have arisen in regard to the Leman and Lintott Street subdivisions a subdivisional design plan has been prepared for the Graphite Road area and this has been presented to the local authority and the Town Planning Board for approval. Whichever subdivision first reaches a stage where development may proceed will be utilised for the immediate building programme.
- The Pritchard Street land is a comparatively recent acquisition and, although it is situated on the outskirts of

the present built-up areas, the Commission is also obtaining the necessary information on which to prepare subdivisional design plans.

- (5) The commission holds applications with earliest listing dates as follows:

4 b.r.	3 b.r.	2 b.r.	1 b.r.
30.10.74	13.2.74	4.12.72	31.1.74

- (6) (a) and (b)—

No formal survey or study has been undertaken by the Housing Commission with respect to Manjimup. There have been a series of discussions with timber companies and the W.A. Chip and Pulp Company, as well as the usual periodic information reports from the commission's branch office in Manjimup.

As a result of the information so gained, it is believed the commission has sufficient data from which to formulate the housing needs of the district and the proportion which should be met by the commission, bearing in mind the wood chip agreement places the responsibility of employee housing on the company.

There are to be further discussions with the company and the local authority in the near future when the commission's tentative programme intentions will be canvassed.

2. *This question was postponed until Tuesday, the 15th April.*

3.

### APPLES

#### *Production and Exports*

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

- (1) What was the total quantity of apples produced in Western Australia in 1974?
- (2) What was the total quantity of apples exported in 1974 to—  
(a) United Kingdom and Europe;  
(b) other markets?
- (3) What was the average price per bushel received by growers for apples exported to (a) and (b) above?
- (4) (a) What is the total production of apples expected to be produced in Western Australia in 1975;  
(b) of this amount what quantity is expected to be—  
(i) exported to the United Kingdom and Europe;  
(ii) exported to other markets;

(iii) consumed on the local market?

- (5) What was the total area of bearing apple orchard in Western Australia in each of the years 1972, 1973, 1974?
- (6) What is the total area of orchard expected to be bearing in the years 1975, 1976 and 1977?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

- (1) 2 764 948 bushels.
- (2) (a) 756 813 bushels
- (b) 374 331 bushels

1 131 144 bushels

- (3) No precise statistics are available. The estimation of such a price is complicated by stabilisation payments, Governmental assistance, pooling and contract arrangements with individual shippers. A shippers' representative's estimate is \$1.30 per bushel on a bare fruit basis.

- (4) (a) 2 950 000 bushels
- (b) (i) Up to 800 000 bushels
- (ii) 300-350 000 bushels
- (iii) 700 000 bushels

Hectares

- (5) 1971-72 4 578
- 1972-73 4 299
- 1973-74 3 960
- (6) 1974-75 3 700
- 1975-76 3 400
- 1976-77 3 100

\* Departmental Estimates.

#### 4. APPLES *Costs Survey*

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

- (1) When was the last survey of costs within the apple industry carried out?
- (2) Will he table a copy of the findings of this survey?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

- (1) The Bureau of Agricultural Economics carried out an apple and pear industry survey in 1972.
- (2) This is a Commonwealth Government report and is available from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Canberra. I will make available a copy for the Members' perusal.

#### 5. CURRENCY DEVALUATION *Effect on Savings*

Mr DAVIES, to the Premier:

What action has the Government taken to undertake a special study of the plight of all people on fixed incomes who see the

fruits of a lifetime's work in saving for retirement destroyed by the falling value of money?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

Preliminary arrangements have been considered. Subject to the availability of a particular departmental officer who is at present engaged on another special project, the study referred to will be commenced as soon as possible.

#### COURTS

##### *Assistant Bailiffs: Industrial Award*

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

Under what industrial award do the assistant bailiffs of the local court fall?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

As far as known, the bailiff is not a respondent to any industrial award and the assistant bailiffs employed by him do not have any common rule award conditions applied to them.

#### 7. COURTS

##### *Sheriffs and Bailiffs: Conditions of Employment*

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

- (1) Is the Supreme Court sheriff paid a fixed salary?
- (2) Does the same apply to the District Court bailiff?
- (3) What are the employment conditions of a local court bailiff?
- (4) What are the conditions of employment of an assistant bailiff of the Perth local court (including the salary paid)?
- (5) Is it a fact that the assistant bailiffs of the local court have to pay premiums out of their income for insurance policies to cover money which is collected in the course of their duties?
- (6) What allowance for a motor vehicle is given to assistant bailiffs of the local court?
- (7) Is it a fact that extra fees paid by the recipient of a process as a consequence of second and third visits by the assistant bailiff are taken as income by the bailiff and not by the assistant bailiff who has incurred the expense of the extra visits?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.
- (3) Local Court bailiffs are appointed by the Minister under Section 16 of the Local Courts Act. Such bailiffs may be suspended by the magistrate of the Local Court or suspended or dismissed by the Minister.

Remuneration is by way of fees prescribed under the Local Court rules for service or execution of process.

- (4) (a) Assistant bailiffs are appointed by the bailiff with the approval of the magistrate.
- (b) Statutory conditions relating to such appointments are that the bailiff shall be responsible for the acts and defaults of an officer appointed to assist him. The bailiff has power to dismiss.
- (c) Conditions of employment as to salary, allowances, etc. are a matter of private arrangement between the bailiff and his assistants.
- (5) to (7) Answered by (4) (c).

## 8. BUILDING SOCIETIES

### *Loans: Insurance Policies*

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is it a fact that prospective borrowers who obtain a loan from any building society for the purpose of building a house are denied such loan if they are not prepared to take out an insurance policy recommended by the particular building society to cover such loan?
- (2) If "Yes" will he give a full and complete reason why this is so?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Yes.
  - (2) It is common practice for all building societies throughout Australia and, in fact, most lending authorities to require a mortgagor to take out fire insurance with one particular nominated insurance company.
- Societies must be completely satisfied with the financial standing of the insurance company concerned, and allowing mortgagors to nominate any company would require a society to continuously satisfy itself of the financial stability of a large number of insurance companies.

The system of nominated insurance not only provides simplicity in administration but ensures the

continual cover over all securities, giving protection to a borrower if he is remiss in making an annual premium payment.

The model rules pursuant to section 8A (1) of the Building Societies Act for terminating building societies and some registered rules of permanent building societies require that the society shall insure and keep insured mortgaged property with an insurer it selects.

## 9.

## POLICE

### *Illegal Abortion: Raids*

Mr HARTREY, to the Minister for Police:

In view of his answers to my question 11 on the notice paper of 26th March, 1975—

- (a) that sources of police information are confidential; and
- (b) that no evidence of criminality was discovered as a result of nine searches of the private homes of nine private citizens,

did he instruct the police to ask their legally anonymous informants why they gave false information to a member of the W.A. police force (section 90A of the Police Act 1892-1972 refers)?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

No. Although the searches produced insufficient evidence to justify prosecution, the information on which the warrants were obtained could not be considered false.

## 10.

## MINING

### *Parallel Range: Nomenclature*

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

- (1) Would he confirm that the name Parallel Range as appearing on Figure 45 on page 113 of the Department of Mines Annual Report 1973, was submitted amongst others to the Lands Department Nomenclature Committee at a date subsequent to October 1970 by one Jean-Paul Turcaud but was rejected by that committee for official recognition?
- (2) If he does so confirm would he please indicate the date when the said committee was first apprised of Turcaud's interest in the said name (e.g., date of Turcaud's initial correspondence to the committee re the name)?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) By letter dated 6th November, 1972 a Mr P. J. Bridge advised the Nomenclature Advisory Committee of the names inserted on a map by Prospector Jean-Paul Turcaud in early 1971.  
The first letter from Mr Turcaud was dated 18th June, 1974.

## 11. MINING

### *Paterson Range: Discoverer*

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Apropos my question 4 of 20th March last and his answer to part (4) thereof (as amended on 25th March, 1975) does he know that to have accepted the offer from Newmont Pty. Ltd., Turcaud would have been required to sign an agreement stating that he did not discover the Paterson Range deposit in which the said company is interested and in return in substance the company would have been prepared to pay Turcaud a large sum of money?
- (2) If his answer is "No" would he please investigate the matter in the interests of insuring that in this instance the natural resources of the Crown are properly allocated, without the strong suggestion that not all is well?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr MENSAROS) replied:

- (1) and (2) No.

## 12. PENSIONERS

### *Concessions: Reduction or Removal*

Mr YOUNG, to the Premier:

- (1) Have any concessions previously given to any class of pensioners in Western Australia by way of—
  - (a) free travel;
  - (b) motor vehicle registration;
  - (c) any other concession,
 been reduced or removed by the present Government?
- (2) Is it the Government's intention that any such reduction or removal will be made?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The question of pensioner concessions is presently under review in a comprehensive way, by a special committee, with a view to seeing what anomalies exist and what improvements can be made.

It is most unlikely that concessions will be reduced or removed, as the intention of the review, in accordance with the Government's 1974 election policy, is the reverse of this.

## 13. WORKERS' COMPENSATION

### *Pneumoconiosis: Applications*

Mr HARTREY, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) How many new applications have been made by—
  - (a) miners disabled by pneumoconiosis;
  - (b) dependent widows or families of diseased miners previously so disabled,
 for payments out of the Mine Workers' Relief Fund since 1st January, 1975?
- (2) What was the number of such new applications made in the years 1971, 1972, 1973 and 1974?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr MENSAROS) replied:

- (1) (a) Three.
- (b) Eleven.
- (2) Year ended 31st January, 1972:
  - (a) 47.
  - (b) 16.
 Year ended 31st January, 1973:
  - (a) 56.
  - (b) 10.
 Year ended 31st January, 1974:
  - (a) 31.
  - (b) 18.
 Year ended 31st January, 1975:
  - (a) 19.
  - (b) 20.

Note:

- (1) The board's statistics are for years ended 31st January in each year.
- (2) The term "pneumoconiosis" is not used in the Mine Workers' Relief Act.  
Benefits are payable for "silicosis", "tuberculosis" or "silicosis with tuberculosis".

## 14. SEWERAGE SCHEMES

### *Establishment by Local Authorities*

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

- (1) How many local authorities have made use of the provisions of the Health Act to construct sewerage schemes?
- (2) What local authorities are these and which of these currently operate under this section of the Act?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(1) 16.

- (2) (a) Town of Narrogin  
Denmark Shire  
Corrigin Shire  
Northam Shire  
Wagin Shire  
Katanning Shire  
Mandurah Shire  
Wanneroo Shire  
Town of Gosnells  
Town of Kalgoorlie  
Carnarvon Shire  
Cunderdin Shire  
Dumbleyung Shire  
Boulder Shire  
Kent Shire  
Dalwallinu Shire;
- (b) Town of Narrogin  
Town of Kalgoorlie  
Carnarvon Shire  
Cunderdin Shire  
Dumbleyung Shire  
Boulder Shire  
Kent Shire  
Dalwallinu Shire.

# 15. WATER SUPPLIES AND SEWERAGE

## *Queens Park-East Cannington*

Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What finance has been spent on each of the various projects designed to provide a sewerage service for the Queens Park-East Cannington area during the last five years?
- (2) What projects and what is the estimated cost of each currently in progress for providing sewerage service and reticulation to these areas?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) and (2) The only finance spent on reticulation has been by a private developer in an area at the corner of Luyer Avenue and William Street.

The rising main for the Cannington main pumping station was commenced in 1973-74 and with the pumping station will be completed in 1975-76, at an estimated cost of \$1 065 000.

The Kewdale main sewer is currently under construction. In 1974-75 expenditure will be \$770 000 and a further \$783 000 is programmed for 1975-76. The estimated cost of this main is \$2 303 000.

Firm proposals for reticulation sewers have not been approved at this time as local authority town planning schemes will be involved.

# 16. LOCAL GOVERNMENT

## *North-West: Enrolments*

Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Local Government:

What are the number of electors enrolled for each ward of the following local authorities—Murchison, Cue, Yalgoo, Sandstone, Upper Gascoyne, Halls Creek and Wiluna?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

This information is available only from the councils concerned. I will ask each of these councils to let me have the required particulars and will inform the member when they are received.

# 17. KWINANA POWER STATION

## *Retrenchment of Tradesmen*

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Electricity:

With respect to his answer to question 92 of 26th March regarding employment at the Kwinana power station—

- (a) despite the terminology used, would it be correct to interpret his answer to part (2) that forty of the employees would not in fact be "stood down", but would be transferred within the commission and thus would not lose any continuity of service with respect to leave and other entitlement;
- (b) would he read the reply to my question 89 to his colleague the Minister for Labour and Industry of 26th March, particularly part (1) and the first three lines of part (3);
- (c) (i) consequent on (b) above, will he have the State Electricity Commission arrange for the nine employees it claims it cannot continue to employ, to receive employment in another department or instrumentality;
- (ii) will he also see that such arrangement is, as a transfer within the Government service, without loss of continuity with respect to leave and other entitlements?

Mr O'Neill (for Mr MENSAROS) replied:

- (a) Employees at Kwinana were specifically engaged for work on that construction project and this work is now reaching completion.

Forty of the present employees will be offered work on other SEC construction projects and subject to acceptance of the offers there would be no loss of continuity of service with respect to leave. Other entitlements would be subject to award conditions applicable to the new employment.

(b) Yes.

(c) (i) and (ii) The redundancies will occur over a period of months and it is probable that natural losses over this period will account for the nine employees in question. However, should this not occur endeavours will be made to place these persons in other Government employment.

18.

### TEACHERS

#### *Promotion without Transfer*

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

Would the Minister consider (and subsequently advise me) the establishment of negotiations with representatives of the W.A. State School Teachers' Union and the W.A. Council of State School Organisations with a view to solving the problem of short duration of teachers in country areas due to a large degree to the fact that promotional opportunities for teachers can usually be realised by a readiness to move on?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

The Education Department is aware of the problems which arise in country areas as the result of transfers occasioned by promotional opportunities. Any amelioration of these problems must come as a result of negotiations between the Education Department and the Teachers' Union.

The Education Department is assessing the factors which contribute to the problem, determining the consequences of delayed transfers and considering the priorities which must result from the considerable increase in the salaries budget.

The department has already stipulated a period of service before transfers are possible and the matter will continue to receive full attention.

19.

### HIGH SCHOOLS

#### *Discipline: Dettman Report*

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

Would the Minister please advise what steps have been taken to implement the recommendations of the Dettman report on discipline in secondary schools?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

The discipline report was regarded as a significant document and has drawn considerable attention within school staffs and the community.

The department, recognising this interest, preferred to encourage teacher initiative through seminars and discussion groups rather than to impose a series of structured situations. This policy has proved its worth and there is no doubt, as a result of discussions, an analysis of published information, and an inter-change of views, that teachers in general have a stronger and healthier attitude towards this problem.

The Education Department has accepted the recommendations of the report and, in many instances, has been successful in implementing such new provisions as:—

(a) Social workers have been employed for the first time. The availability of these workers is not substantial but further opportunities will be taken according to supply.

(b) Teachers have been allowed to devote more time to their professional duties which inevitably must effect a greater understanding of children's problems. Every school now has clerical assistance so that more of the routine duties are taken from teachers.

(c) The number of schools which have established staff councils has increased. Both administrative and teaching staff welcome the opportunities for broader sharing in decision making. Inevitably this has resulted in a much better appreciation of the disciplinary problems in the school.

(d) The department has not endeavoured to legislate for, or to prescribe for, school councils in which both parents and the community play an important role. It is noticeable, however, that as a result of the discipline report,

parents are now willing to accept a greater role in the discipline of their children and to establish a true working relationship between children, teachers and parents.

- (e) The report has been studied during the process of teacher education and it is significant that not only have the most favourable pupil-teacher ratios and the best class sizes been established this year than in any other previous year, but also, wherever possible, newly graduated teachers who are in their first appointment have reduced teaching loads to allow of adjustment to possible disciplinary problems.
- (f) With an improved staffing formula many schools now have what are referred to as "floating" teachers who are responsible for special remedial work and who, by establishing a sense of achievement, remove much of the frustration leading to disciplinary problems.
- (g) Experimental situations are being created in alternative patterns of administration by schools-within-schools, such as Hamilton Senior High School.

## 20. EDUCATION

### *Fees: Abolition*

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

- (1) Has the Government considered the removal of all fees or voluntary donations and other forms of parent subsidisation of the "free" education system?
- (2) If so, has a decision been made, and what is the decision?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) The education system in Government schools in Western Australia is "free" because no fees are charged for tuition or instruction. Any contributions which parents might care to make are purely voluntary for the purpose of providing amenities which they would desire that their children enjoy.

The Education Department takes active measures to limit the extent of these contributions and to assure that no child is deprived of opportunities in the case of indigent parents.

## 21. RAILWAYS

### *"Prospector": Additional Services*

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

- (1) Why were arrangements not made to provide *Prospector* rail service between Perth and Kalgoorlie on Easter Saturday, particularly having regard to the fact that normal rail passenger service between these centres on a Saturday (west-east interstate service) was suspended?
- (2) During the continuation of suspension of interstate rail services would he please investigate the feasibility of having a *Prospector* service the Perth and Kalgoorlie section on Saturdays?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) It was considered that patronage would not warrant the provision of a special *Prospector* service between Perth and Kalgoorlie on Easter Saturday March 29.

The normal service ex Perth Terminal at 3.00 p.m. Sunday March 30 only attracted 44 passengers, (18 intermediate stations, 26 Kalgoorlie).

- (2) The running of a special *Prospector* service on Saturday April 12 is not considered warranted.

## 22. RAILWAYS

### *"Prospector": Meals on Good Friday*

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

Would he please advise the nature of the main course of meals served on *Prospector* rail car services between Perth and Kalgoorlie and Kalgoorlie and Perth on Good Friday (28th March last), a day traditionally observed by many people as a "non meat" day?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Meals were served on two *Prospector* services between Perth and Kalgoorlie and Kalgoorlie and Perth on Good Friday, March 28, viz.

- (a) Ex Perth terminal 10.30 p.m.  
27/3/75 (breakfast);  
Ex Perth terminal 3.00 p.m.  
28/3/75 (dinner).
- (b) Ex Kalgoorlie 11.30 p.m.  
27/3/75 (breakfast);  
Ex Kalgoorlie 2.15 p.m.  
28/3/75 (dinner).



Breakfast main course on both services consisted of leg ham with scrambled egg and tomato. In addition, the following items were included in the meal:—

Fruit juice  
Compote of apple  
Bread roll with butter and jam  
Tea, coffee

Dinner main course on both services consisted of:—

Roast lamb  
or  
Veal cutlets  
with potatoes, beans and carrots.

In addition the following items were included in the meal:—

Dessert  
Cheese and biscuits  
Bread roll  
Tea, coffee

Fish was deleted from the menu in December, 1974 after tests disclosed that it was not reconstituting satisfactorily. When the menus for Good Friday were being prepared fish was considered but in the light of past experience was not included.

## 23. HEALTH

### *Electric Kettles: Lead Release*

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

- (1) Are there any regulations or standards governing the sale of electric kettles in Western Australia restricting the amount of lead released into the water?
- (2) If so, would the Minister provide details?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Food and Drug Regulation A.06.002.

## 24. SMALL BUSINESSES

### *Closure*

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) How many "small businesses", excluding Tom the Cheap stores, have closed down "because they could not make a profit" since 1st July, 1974?
- (2) How many such businesses closed down in January and February 1975?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) Occupiers of factories, shops and warehouses are not required to disclose the reason for closure of a business when notifying the factories and shops branch of cessation of business.

## 25. FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT

### *Inquiries under Section 65*

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) In the past ten years how many times has a Minister for Labour directed an inquiry by a magistrate as provided under section 65 of the Factories and Shops Act?
- (2) Would he list briefly the details?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Nil.
- (2) Answered by (1).

## 26. MINISTER FOR LABOUR *Advisory Committees: Meetings*

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) How many times has the Minister for Labour Advisory Committee met since 1st July, 1974?
- (2) How many times has the Minister for Labour Safety Advisory Committee met since 1st July, 1974?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Once—31st July, 1974. A further meeting has been arranged for Monday, 14th April, 1975.
- (2) Nil. This committee is only called together when major occupational safety legislation is contemplated.

## 27. WATER SUPPLIES

### *"On Farm" Extensions: Priorities*

Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Has the priority order of extensions to the "on farm" water services established by the Tonkin Government on 22nd January, 1974 been altered by the present Government?
- (2) If the priority order has not been changed when can it be expected that action will be taken to complete the extension of water supplies in the Westonia and Mt Hampton districts which were listed as highest priority and the comparatively easiest to construct from an engineering and supply point of view?
- (3) What progress has been made in feasibility studies of the other two high priority determined areas of West Midland and the Eradu sand plain?
- (4) What approaches have been made by the present Government to the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance for the above-mentioned schemes?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Preliminary engineering studies have been completed, including cost estimates, and have been referred to the Department of Agriculture for an economic review.
- (3) Answered by (2).
- (4) Any approach for financial assistance is dependent on completion of economic review referred to in answer to (2).

## 28. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

### *Pilbara Plan: Japanese Acceptance*

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Premier:

- (1) What is the Government's policy on the Pilbara which, according to a statement made by him in Tokyo on Monday, 31st March, received general acceptance from Japanese steel industry leaders?
- (2) In what way is his plan to be implemented on a much more specific basis and within more clearly defined guidelines than exist at present?
- (3) What was the outcome of his discussions on future Japanese steel production and the tonnages and types of Western Australian ore the Japanese mills would require in the future?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) A policy of maximisation of the economic utilisation of all types of iron ore reserves of the Pilbara.

Under such a policy, based on a sensible rationalisation of development to ensure optimum economic benefit from the total resource, there will be progressive expansion of processing, in addition to the use of all types of ore capable of economic utilisation through various techniques.

Also, under this policy, there will be the maximum well planned growth and use of the existing infra-structure which is a critical factor if the best economic long-term results for the region are to be achieved.

- (2) The policy for development is quite clear, and each project—both existing and potential—will be negotiated to conform with this policy.

It would be unrealistic to endeavour to lay down the precise requirements for each of the projects at this stage, as they vary considerably in type, quality and economics of development.

They are therefore logically negotiated on a progressive basis within the policy.

- (3) The Japanese have given me their confidential preliminary estimates of their domestic steel production and iron ore requirements over the next few years.

These figures are the subject of further refinement.

The nature and location of the Western Australian component of iron ore will depend heavily on the results of the Marra Mamba tests which are being undertaken in Japan on a commercial scale over the next few months.

## 29. FLUORIDATION OF WATER SUPPLIES

### *Potent Meiotic Mutagen*

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

- (1) Is he aware that in studies extending previous findings on somatic cell mitosis, researchers Georgiana Jagiells M.D., and Ja-Shein Lin, of the International Institute for the Study of Human Reproduction at Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons, have concluded that fluoride "can be a potent meiotic mutagen" in the oocytes of various species of mammals?
- (2) As the findings resulting from the investigations which were published in the October 1974 issue of the Archives of Environmental Health (Vol. 29 pp. 230-235) in an article entitled "Sodium Fluoride as Potential Mutagen in Mammalian Eggs", obviously reopen the much debated issues of whether fluoride in drinking water is associated with any increase in human congenital anomalies and it seems that the present work strengthens the evidence for such a relationship, will the Minister for Health have the article studied and in due course report the result to Parliament?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Yes.

## 30. FLUORIDATION OF WATER SUPPLIES

### *Link with Heart Failure*

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

- (1) Did the Minister for Health obtain a copy of the paper compiled by three British scientists and read at an international conference on water supply which

was held in London last August and which he had given an undertaking to endeavour to obtain?

- (2) If the Minister for Health failed to obtain the paper referred to what was the reason?
- (3) Did the Minister for Health obtain from the United States a copy of the submission by Dr Edward Groth to Dr Lloyd Tepper of the American Food and Drug Administration, which was reported to be "a devastating case for reopening the files on fluoridation"?
- (4) If a copy of the submission was not obtained what was the reason?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) No.
- (4) It has been ascertained through the office of the Scientific Counsellor of the Australian Embassy, Washington, that the United States Food and Drug Administration is not involved in a review of fluoridation following submissions by Dr Groth. Further, the FDA considers the newspaper report to which the Honourable Member originally referred to be misleading. No further inquiry is proposed.

### 31. TOWN PLANNING

#### *Private Properties: Reservation*

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

- (1) Further to my question 70 of Wednesday, 26th March, will he advise the approximate number of privately owned properties which are subject to reservation under part 5 of Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act?
- (2) How many owners of properties subject to reservation in accordance with part 5 of the Act have been advised of the reservation on their land?
- (3) When reservations have been placed on private property, is the owner notified and, if so, in what manner?
- (4) Is a register of properties to which reservations apply maintained within his department?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) As indicated in my reply to question 70 of Wednesday, 26th March, the information is not

recorded and no estimate is available. The position changes frequently and the administrative effort required to maintain such a record is not warranted.

- (2) and (3) When minor amendments to the scheme are made, owners may be notified directly of the effect on their property. Otherwise the only advice is through advertisement of the planning proposals as provided for in the Town Planning and Development Act and the Metropolitan Region Scheme Act.
- (4) No. See answer to (1) above. However, as provided in clause 42 of the scheme, an owner may obtain from the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority a certificate setting out the manner in which property is affected by the scheme and the purpose, if any, for which the land is reserved under the scheme.

### 32. GOVERNOR STIRLING HIGH SCHOOL

#### *Enrolments*

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

What is the present enrolment at Governor Stirling Senior High School?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

Year 8	437
Year 9	423
Year 10	396
Year 11	204
Year 12	157

Total	1 617	at the end of March, 1975.
-------	-------	-------------------------------

### 33. MUNDARING SCHOOL

#### *Demountable Classroom*

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

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the unsatisfactory accommodation available for students at Mundaring Primary School?
- (2) Is it proposed to position a demountable at the school; if so, when?
- (3) What has been the reason for delay in making a demountable available for the school?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) Yes.  
(b) There are a number of schools which have a higher priority for the provision of a demountable classroom than

does Mundaring and, as a result, it is not possible at present to indicate when the school will be provided with such a classroom.

- (3) There is a limited number of demountable classrooms available.

34. HIGH SCHOOL AT SWAN VIEW

*Establishment*

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

Is it his Government's intention to build the Swan View High School this year in readiness for the 1976 school year?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

No. Priority in the utilisation of available resources must be given to other schools.

35. NARROWS BRIDGE

*Traffic Survey*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Transport:

In connection with the information contained in paragraphs 56 and 98 of the MRPA submissions and the report on objections which indicate that at present 73% of the daily traffic using the Narrows Bridge by-passes the central business district,

- (a) on what date was the traffic census on which the finding was based carried out;
- (b) who conducted the census;
- (c) at what points and at what times were the traffic counts taken;
- (d) would he tabulate the figures for by-passing and central business district traffic at each census point;
- (e) how was each traffic class identified;
- (f) what proportion of each class of traffic in (d) consisted of commuter traffic;
- (g) how was the commuter traffic identified;
- (h) will he please detail the assumptions on which the prediction was made that 77.5% of the traffic by 1989 or thereabouts will by-pass the city?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

The information sought by the Member will take some little time to prepare in the form requested. As soon as it is available I will forward it to the Member.

36.

NARROWS BRIDGE

*Traffic Capacity*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Transport:

Replies to parts (2) and (3) of question 8 of 27th March, 1975 indicate that the peak capacities are based on the assumption that traffic flows are equal in both directions.

- (a) Accordingly, would he advise if the Main Roads Department's traffic survey of October 1973 disclosed that the peak northbound traffic was well over twice the southbound traffic flow at the same time;
- (b) would the fact that the flow in one direction at peak capacity result in the flow in the opposite direction being well under capacity;
- (c) if so, what allowance to the theoretical capacity should be made for this effect;
- (d) what is the adjusted theoretical capacity in vehicles per day allowing for the factors in parts (2), (4), (5) and (6) of the question;
- (e) if present trends continue, in what year will the predicted traffic flow exceed the adjusted theoretical capacity referred to in part (7) of the question?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (a) to (e)—

The questions are based on an incorrect premise. The answer to parts (2) and (3) of question 8 of March 27, 1975 are related to the fact that the total twenty-four hour flows are similar in both directions.

37.

KWINANA FREEWAY EXTENSION

*Traffic Flow*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Transport:

Referring to replies to question 45, parts (1), (2) and (3), on 26th March, 1975, and 8, part (2) on 27th March, 1975 the figures provided by the Minister of 80 000 vehicles per day at the Narrows Bridge in 1979 and a growth rate of approximately 8% per annum indicate traffic volumes of 86 000 in 1980, 93 000 in 1981, 101 000 in 1982, 109 000 in 1983, 118 000 in 1984 and 127 000 in 1985, would he advise whether

the present trends predict that Narrows Bridge traffic will exceed the "theoretical capacity" in 1985?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

This situation is unlikely to occur by 1985 as the distribution of traffic between peak and off peak periods is likely to modify with the growth of the region.

38. **NARROWS BRIDGE**  
*Traffic Capacity*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) In connection with questions 8 and 59 on 27th March, 1975, would he indicate if his department is familiar with the recently revised standards for traffic flow figures for various types of road design in Britain?
- (2) Should the capacity of the Narrows Bridge be reduced to 5 700 vehicles per hour because of the proximity of the Judd Street and Mitchell Freeway interchanges?
- (3) If "No" what reduction in capacity is expected because of the proximity of these interchanges?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) None.

39. **NARROWS BRIDGE**  
*Traffic Capacity*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Transport:

As the roadway on the Narrows Bridge has neither median strip nor side clearance and having regard for the fact that the standard working capacity for such roads in Britain is 3 600 vehicles per hour, and the maximum working capacity is 4 800 vehicles per hour, what reduction to the theoretical capacity of the Narrows Bridge should be made to allow for the fact that the roadway does not have a median strip or side clearances?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

The British capacity figures quoted do not relate to this situation.

40. **NARROWS BRIDGE**  
*Traffic Capacity*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Transport:

As the Main Roads Department's document "Possible Use of Tunnel" states that the capacity of a three-lane road was reduced

from 4 800 vehicles per hour to 3 600 vehicles per hour because of grades of 2.5% and 5% truck volume, what reductions should be made to the Narrows Bridge capacity to allow for grades of the approach roads and truck volume?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

The figures quoted in the Main Roads Department's report refer to the possible design considerations which could apply to a tunnel situation and should not be confused with the operations of an existing facility.

41. **KWINANA FREEWAY**  
**EXTENSION**  
*Traffic Flow*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Transport:

In view of the replies to parts (2) and (3) of question 45 on 26th March, 1975, when the predicted traffic flow on the southern extension of the Kwinana Freeway exceeds saturation point, what action is contemplated with regard to the excess vehicles?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

This situation is unlikely to occur within the foreseeable future. It is therefore not appropriate at this time to determine a particular solution.

42. **PENSIONERS**

*Concessions and Benefits:*  
*Inquiry*

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Premier:

- (1) When is it expected that the State Government inquiry into pensioner concessions and fringe benefits will be completed, and to whom will the report be presented?
- (2) Who are the members of the committee making the inquiry and what interests do they represent?
- (3) Why was no member of the W.A. Pensioners League placed on the committee?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) By the end of the second week in May. The report will be presented to the Minister for Education, Cultural Affairs and Recreation and the Minister for Health and Community Welfare.
- (2) Mr P. N. Gorton, Chairman, Deputy Director, Department for Community Welfare;  
Mr G. Robinson, Secretary, Department for Community Welfare.

- Mr J. Haines, State Treasury.  
 Mr P. C. Firkins, Director,  
 Chamber of Commerce.  
 Mr W. Harwood, President,  
 Council of Social Services of  
 W.A.  
 Mr T. Kannis, Commonwealth  
 Liaison Consultant (to all  
 Pensioner bodies).  
 Mrs E. Griffin, a Canning Coun-  
 cillor.  
 Mrs J. N. Shearer, State President  
 of the Country Women's  
 Association of W.A.  
 Mr J. Coleman, Secretary of the  
 Trades and Labor Council  
 (Mr Coleman withdrew early  
 in March because of unfore-  
 seen commitments).

- (3) No member of the W.A. Pen-  
 sioners League was placed on the  
 committee due to the fact that the  
 inquiry is concerned with all pen-  
 sioners, including the aged,  
 civilian and war widows, separ-  
 ated widows and their dependant  
 children, and the various groups  
 of disabled pensioners. Accord-  
 ingly, it was not practical to have  
 all the various institutions repre-  
 sented on the committee. Neither  
 was it considered desirable that  
 preferential treatment should be  
 given to particular organisations  
 as all pensioners should have  
 equal opportunity to put forward  
 their views to an independent  
 body.

#### 43. SHIPPING

##### *Grounding and Oil Spillage*

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

- (1) How often in the past 12 months  
 has a tanker grounded on a sand-  
 bank off the metropolitan  
 beaches?
- (2) What is the Government doing to  
 deal with the problem?
- (3) Would alteration or elimination  
 of the Garden Island Causeway  
 have any effect on the route to  
 be taken which might obviate  
 such mishaps?
- (4) In the case of any oil spillage,  
 would detergents be used and if  
 so, what would be their chemi-  
 cal composition?
- (5) Is the Minister convinced that  
 the effect of detergents on the  
 ecosystem would be less deleteri-  
 ous than that of oil?
- (6) What research evidence is avail-  
 able to substantiate the evidence  
 to (5)?
- (7) What are the penalties for the  
 discharge of oil in Western Aus-  
 tralian waters?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Once.
- (2) The State Government Pollution  
 Committee has met and discussed  
 the above grounding and laid  
 down guide lines to be followed in  
 any future incidents.
- (3) No.
- (4) Yes. The detergent presently held  
 in stock is BP1100X and the  
 chemical composition is not  
 known.
- (5) Yes.
- (6) The detergent is acquired from  
 the Commonwealth Government.  
 Undoubtedly the necessary re-  
 search was carried out by them.
- (7) The Prevention of Pollution of  
 Waters by Oil Act provides for a  
 maximum penalty of \$50 000.

44.

#### DOG ACT

##### *Requests for Amendment*

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister  
 for Local Government:

- (1) Has the Minister received re-  
 quests from the local govern-  
 ment authorities to amend the  
 Dog Act urgently?
- (2) Which local government bodies  
 have made the request?
- (3) Is it the Government's intention  
 to amend the Act in this session  
 of Parliament?
- (4) If (3) is "No" what action is con-  
 templated by the Government?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Many councils and other organi-  
 sations have made representations  
 for the Dog Act to be amended.  
 However, records indicate that  
 only two councils have referred to  
 the question of urgency.
- (2) Town of Canning and Shire of  
 Mundaring.
- (3) Details of proposed amendments  
 have not yet been finalised but it  
 is hoped that amending legisla-  
 tion can be introduced in the  
 second half of the present session.
- (4) Answered by (3).

45.

#### RECREATION

##### *Financial Grants*

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

What is the relationship of the  
 \$75 595 stated in *The Sunday  
 Times* of 26th January, as being  
 granted to voluntary youth and  
 recreation organisations and the  
 \$290 000 for recreation facilities  
 in Western Australia, announced  
 by the Australian Minister for  
 Tourism and Recreation in *The*

West Australian of 27th January (that is, is one figure contained in the other or are they quite separate amounts)?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

Separate amounts. \$75 595 State funds for equipment and special projects. \$290 000 Commonwealth capital work funds.

#### 46. PEEL INLET Power Boats

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

- (1) Has he received any submissions asking for the reduction of the speed limit for power boats in the Peel Inlet and ancillary waters?
- (2) If so, from whom have the submissions been received?
- (3) What action has the Government decided to take with respect to such speed and the danger of erosion?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Yes, two.
- (2) (a) In June 1970 an approach or submission was received from the north west ward ratepayers' association, Murray district, for the imposition of a 5 m.p.h. speed limit in the Murray River.
- (b) In February 1974 a submission was made to the Harbour and Light Department by the Mandurah licensed professional fishermen's association for the introduction of a speed limit of 8 knots in all of the waters of the Peel Inlet with the exception of the water ski areas.
- (3) A speed limit of 8 knots was introduced in October 1963 in both the Murray and Serpentine Rivers and this limit still applies in these waterways.

#### 47. WELLINGTON DAM Additional Structure

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

- (1) Does the Government intend to build a dam below the present Wellington Dam?
- (2) Is the Government aware of the survey of flora and fauna which amateur naturalists are undertaking?
- (3) Is there any intention on the part of the Government to undertake the survey, so as to estimate the deleterious effects that such a project referred to in (1) would have?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) The matter is still under investigation.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) An environmental study will be an integral part of the investigation referred to in (1).

#### 48. GOODS

##### *Submission on Litter*

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

- (1) Has the Minister or any of his colleagues received a submission from the Australian Council of Soft Drink Manufacturers, recommending that legislation should be introduced to impose a tax on manufacturers of goods that could become litter?
- (2) If so, will he table the submission and what action does the Government intend to take?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes, I hereby table the submission.

The Director of Environmental Protection convened an *ad hoc* committee comprising representatives of the W.A. Chamber of Manufactures and the Keep Australia Beautiful Council (W.A.) together with professional advisers to consider this submission and general matters relating to possible taxation of materials likely to form part of the litter.

That group has now completed its report and on Wednesday, 9th April, 1975, it will be submitted to the Australian Environmental Council Standing Committee for its consideration. Members will be interested to know that the standing committee is meeting in Perth on this occasion. I wish to emphasise that at this time it has not been endorsed by the Government since the group of experts assembled as the standing committee has been directed to assess it in an Australian wide context.

*The submission was tabled (see paper No. 128).*

#### 49. STATE FORESTS

##### *Bibbulman Walking Track*

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

- (1) Is the Bibbulman walking track ready for use by the general public?
- (2) If so, are booklets available and what restrictions are placed upon users of the track?

- (3) If (1) is "No" what has occasioned the great delays and when will the track be ready for public use?
- (4) What alterations have been made to the route of the track since the idea was first mooted and what conditions of use have been altered since that time?
- (5) Will trail cycles (powered) be permitted to use the track?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Not in its entirety, but some of the marked sections have been used.
- (2) Booklets are not yet available.
- (3) There is no basis for suggesting that great delays have occurred. The track will be completed as soon as possible and this date will depend on the completion of negotiations with other authorities involved and the availability of staff and finance.
- (4) Two major alterations have taken place, in the northern section the track has been moved from catchment areas and in the Manjimup area the track has been shifted to pass through more attractive countryside.
- (5) No. As the name implies, it is to be a walking track.

(3) Guidelines have been drawn up by the National Health and Medical Research Council. The question is also to be considered at the next meeting of the National Therapeutic Goods Committee which departmental officers will attend later this month. The outcome of these discussions will be considered by the Food and Drug Advisory Committee with a view to recommending appropriate legislation if the need is established.

(4) No.

(5) Answered by (4).

(6) Yes. When results of the deliberations under (3) become available.

#### 51. PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

*W. H. O'Brien: Prosecution*

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

Why have there been delays in the prosecution of W. H. O'Brien under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act (Geraldton Court)?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

I am advised that a principal witness is not now available to give evidence. This is not a Police prosecution.

50.

#### HEALTH

##### *Pseudo-medical Advertisement*

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

- (1) What evidence is there to support the claims by advertisers that concentrated protein and vitamin preparations possess the curative and regenerative properties claimed for them?
- (2) Has the question of misleading pseudo-medical advertisements been discussed by any State instrumentality or committee or by the National Health and Medical Research Council?
- (3) If (2) is "Yes" what have been the results of the deliberations?
- (4) Has the Minister discussed the question of such misleading advertising with the Minister for Consumer Protection?
- (5) If (4) is "Yes" what was the outcome of such discussions?
- (6) If (4) is "No" will the Minister undertake to discuss the matter with that Minister?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) The Member will have to be more specific.
- (2) Yes.

52.

#### JANDAKOT WILDLIFE SANCTUARY

##### *Government Assistance*

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) Is there any intention on the part of the Government to assist the Jandakot wildlife sanctuary to remain operational?
- (2) If "No" what is the rationale for such a decision?
- (3) If (1) is "Yes" what action is contemplated?
- (4) Has an approach been made to the Government for assistance to the sanctuary?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) (a) The Jandakot wildlife sanctuary is a commercial venture.
- (b) There is doubt that caring for sick or injured fauna provides any long-term benefits to the conservation of species of our wild fauna. Some advisers hold the view that the detrimental effects would outweigh any benefits and available funds can be better spent on other conservation projects.



- (3) Answered by (2).  
 (4) A few people have written to me and my predecessors suggesting some assistance be provided. Each approach has been declined.

### 53. TEACHERS' TRAINING COLLEGES

#### *Environmental Courses*

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

What are the details of the environmental courses offered in each of the W.A. teachers' colleges, including title, scope, year and whether optional or not?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

The information requested by the Member is contained in the handbooks of the colleges concerned, copies of which are tabled herewith.

*The handbooks were tabled (see paper No. 129).*

### 54. ANIMAL PROTECTION SOCIETY

#### *Recognition as Charitable Institution*

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Chief Secretary:

- (1) What is the impediment to recognising the Animal Protection Society as a charitable institution?
- (2) How soon will a decision be made?
- (3) Who makes the decision and what avenues of appeal are open to the society?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) The application of the Animal Protection Society was referred to the advisory committee in accordance with Section 11 (1) of the Charitable Collections Act 1946. In considering the application the advisory committee were not satisfied that the Animal Protection Society existed for a "charitable purpose" within the meaning of that term as used in the Charitable Collections Act 1946 and requested that a legal opinion be obtained.
- (2) A meeting of the advisory committee is scheduled for April 17, 1975, when I anticipate the application will be further discussed.
- (3) The final decision is made by the Chief Secretary in accordance with Section 11 (3) of the

Charitable Collections Act 1946 which does not allow any proceedings whatsoever as a result of any refusal.

### 55. TOWN PLANNING

#### *Metropolitan Region Scheme: Review*

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

Has the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority ever been requested by the Minister to review completely the metropolitan region scheme as provided for in section 25 (e) of Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

No.

### 56. UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

#### *Music Examinations Board Scheme*

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Treasurer:

- (1) Is it a fact that the University of Western Australia intends to withdraw from the Australian Music Examination Board scheme?
- (2) Is it also a fact that the decision was a result of the refusal of the Western Australian Government to give financial aid?
- (3) Is this part of the Government's decision to go it alone and have as little as possible to do with the rest of Australia?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) and (3) Answered by (1).

### 57. SWAN VALLEY

#### *Government Study: Report*

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

In reference to the Minister's reply to my question 3 of Wednesday, 19th March, concerning the Government's study of the Swan Valley, will he table a plan showing the area which he refers to as the Swan Valley and the total area being studied on an inter-departmental basis by the Town Planning Department?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

The agricultural study is concerned with that area north of the town of Midland in the Shire of Swan which is suitable for horticultural and viticultural purposes.

After discussion with my colleague the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning I am advised that it is not possible to table at this stage a plan showing the total area to be studied since investigations aimed at defining the actual area are still being carried out.

58.

**SWAN VALLEY***Government Study: Views of Shire*

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

- (1) In reference to the Minister for Agriculture's reply to my question 3 of Wednesday, 19th March, concerning the Government's study of the Swan Valley, and in view of his department's claimed desire to include the public and individuals directly concerned in decisions of the Town Planning Department, will he ensure that those people resident within the area covered by the proposed Swan Valley study shall immediately be asked for their opinions in regard to future planning for the area?
- (2) (a) Has the Swan Shire Council been asked to indicate their wishes for the area;  
(b) if "Yes" on what date?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Yes, as soon as basic survey data and information relating to the intensive horticultural/viticultural use of the area has been compiled.
- (2) No, see (1) above.

59.

**CULTURAL CENTRE  
PLANNING COMMITTEE***Members and Meetings*

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

- (1) Is there a Government body known as the cultural centre planning committee?
- (2) Who are the members of this committee, and what "interests" do they represent?
- (3) Upon what dates has the committee met in 1974 and 1975?
- (4) Does it make interim reports, and if so, will the Minister table these reports?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Members are as follows:—  
Mr S. B. Cann, Principal Architect, Public Works Department, Perth, Chairman.

Dr D. Carr, Metropolitan Regional Planning Authority.

Mr K. N. Birks, Treasury Department.

Mr H. Barton, Education Department.

Mr F. Norton, Western Australian Art Gallery.

Mr F. A. Sharr, Western Australian Library.

Dr W. D. L. Ride, Western Australian Museum.

Mr T. B. Fitzhardinge, Mr G. E. Summerhayes, W.A. Chapter, Royal Australian Institute of Architects.

Professor F. Callaway or his deputy, Western Australian Arts Council.

- (3) Last meeting was held on 6th December, 1973.

- (4) Yes. Not at this stage.

60.

**POWER STATIONS***Certificated Engine Drivers*

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) How many power stations in country centres operating under the SEC have a certificated engine driver as required by law?
- (2) How many have not?
- (3) What centres do not employ certificated drivers in power houses?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr MENSAROS) replied:

- (1) Seven.
- (2) One.
- (3) Marble Bar  
Nullagine  
Gascoyne Junction  
Yalgoo  
Cue  
Denham  
Hyden  
Kulin  
Newdegate  
Pingrup  
Lake Grace.

**QUESTIONS (6): WITHOUT NOTICE**

1.

**HEALTH***Fish: Heavy Metals Contamination*

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

- (1) How many samples of—  
(a) wet,  
(b) canned,  
fish were tested for contamination by heavy metals since June, 1974?
- (2) What are the details of the distribution of wet samples by location at which they were caught?

- (3) What are the results of the testing which has taken place in 1973, 1974, and to date in 1975?
- (4) If the Minister will not give these results, when will he do so?
- (5) How have the procedures been modified since the testing that was carried out in 1973 or in the early part of 1974?
- (6) Does the Minister approve of the heavy penalties mooted by the Australian Government for the sale of fish contaminated by mercury?
- (7) What action is the Government taking to protect the public from the ingestion of heavy metals?

Mr RIDGE replied:

The Minister for Health thanks the member for Morley for notice of this question, the answer to which is as follows—

- (1) Local: Wet 186, Canned 8, Imported: Wet 124, Canned 4.
- (2) Locations, Local: Busselton, Eucla, Mandurah, Safety Bay, Abrolhos Island, Albany. Imported: Japan, Denmark, Norway, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Holland, Scotland.
- (3) The results of the tests on Western Australian fish have been tabled in a report on mercury content of Western Australian fish. Results not included in this report will also be tabled.
- (4) Answered by (3).
- (5) Initially the survey was commenced by the Public Health Department; it is now conducted jointly with the active co-operation of the Fisheries and Wildlife Department.
- (6) No.
- (7) (a) Continuous monitoring of fish for heavy metal content—in particular, mercury.
- (b) Discussion and liaison with the Fisheries and Wildlife Department and co-operative action in sampling and analysing.
- (c) Contact and discussion with wholesalers, distributors, and retailers and fishermen's representatives.
- (d) Enforcement of the food and drug regulations of the Health Act.

## ROADS

### *Britain: Vehicle Flow*

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Transport:

Does he know the capacity in vehicles per lane per hour of a medium grade single carriageway two-lane road in Britain? As the Minister replied on Thursday, the 27th March, that he did know, he would have no problem in answering the question.

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

What is the question?

Mr O'Neill: Do you know.

Mr O'CONNOR: The answer is, "Yes". I have already given that answer.

3.

## MEAT INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### *Inquiry: Submissions*

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

I refer to the meat industry inquiry and the organisations from which submissions were invited, and I ask—

- (1) Would the Minister advise whether any organisations or departments made submissions or alterations to their submissions to the committee after the 24th January, 1975, and if so, would he list who these organisations, individuals, or Government departments were?
- (2) Which were the three organisations which were able to expand further on their written submissions as recorded on page 4 of the report?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

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

- (1) and (2) I am advised as follows by the Chairman of the Meat Industry Advisory Committee—

Certain organisations which provided written submissions by the required closing date of January 24 also sought to give oral statements. These organisations were:

Tip Top Meats.

United Beef Breeders Association.

Pastoralists & Graziers Association.

The Committee met representatives of these organisations on February 14.

The Committee found it necessary to finalise its deliberations on February 21 in view of a request by the Government that its report in printed form be available by February 28.

The Public Health Department provided useful information to the enquiry, particularly in the area of non-export abattoirs. The Department indicated however in a letter of January 6 to the Committee that it did not propose to make a submission on meat inspection. Two papers on meat inspection were received from the Health Department on February 21 and February 24, but were not accompanied by a covering letter indicating that they were to be regarded as a late and formal submission.

4.

#### ROADS

##### *Britain: Vehicle Flow*

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Transport:

As the Minister has again replied that he knows the answer to my question regarding the vehicles per lane per hour of a medium grade single carriageway two-lane road in Britain, will he now inform the House?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Where there are no median strips and no accessways onto it, there are 6 000 vehicles per hour on a highway with two lanes each way.

5.

#### TOWN PLANNING

##### *Metropolitan Region Scheme: Review*

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

Would he please clarify the answer to question 55? Perhaps it is my loosely worded question which requires me to seek the clarification. I asked the Minister whether the MRPA had ever been requested by the Minister to review completely the metropolitan region town planning scheme. I was referring to any Minister who has held that position, and not only to the present incumbent. Does his answer refer just to himself or to all Ministers who have held that position?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

I am happy to clarify the answer for the honourable member. The "No" applies to all Ministers who have held the position, the reason being that the scheme is under constant review and no Minister has found it necessary to apply that requirement.

6.

#### NONEXPORT ABATTOIRS

##### *Number*

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

- (1) How many nonexport abattoirs were operating within Western Australia in 1965?
- (2) How many nonexport abattoirs are operating at present?
- (3) How many abattoirs operating at present do not have meat inspection carried out on the premises of the abattoirs?
- (4) How many of the present nonexport abattoirs are either relatively new constructions or have been extensively upgraded?

Mr RIDGE replied:

The Minister for Health has supplied the following reply—

- (1) 250.
- (2) 54.
- (3) 19.
- (4) 54.

#### SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES TRIBUNAL BILL (2nd)

##### *Second Reading*

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [5.16 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This measure seeks to establish a tribunal with jurisdiction to inquire into and determine—and I emphasise, "and determine"—the salaries and certain allowances payable to Ministers of the Crown, the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet, officers and members of Parliament, stipendiary magistrates, special division officers of the Public Service and certain holders of full-time statutory offices.

The tribunal is also to inquire into and report to Parliament, through the Minister, on the salary and allowances which in the tribunal's view ought to be paid to judges of the Supreme and District Courts.

I will explain this point as I proceed, but I would emphasise that in one case it will be "determination" but in the latter case it is to be on the recommendations by the tribunal.

As a consequential measure the Bill also provides for the repeal of the Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act, 1967.

The means by which the salaries and allowances payable to the holders of such offices are presently reviewed and determined are—

**Ministers and officers and members of Parliament:** Determined by the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal at three-yearly intervals under the provisions of the Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act.

**Magistrates:** Determined usually by agreement under the provisions of the Public Service Arbitration Act after negotiations between the Public Service Board and the Civil Service Association. If agreement is not reached the Public Service Arbitrator may hear a claim and issue an award.

**Special division officers of the Public Service:** Determined by the Public Service Board. Officers have a right of appeal against the board's determinations under the provisions of the Public Service Appeal Board Act.

**Statutory officers and other senior officers in instrumentalities:** Determined by the Governor after review by an informal statutory Salaries Review Committee which was set up in 1971.

**Judges:** Fixed from time to time by amendment of the Judges' Salaries and Pensions Act.

The ministerial, parliamentary, judicial and other positions which I have referred to, comprise the most important offices remunerated by the Crown and, in the Government's opinion, it is unsatisfactory that there should be such a marked divergence in the methods by which the remuneration for these offices is fixed.

Not only are there major differences in the constitution and jurisdiction of the present salary-fixing authorities but, more importantly, there are substantial differences in the frequency of reviews and the operative dates of salary adjustments.

The establishment of a single tribunal to inquire into and determine, or report upon, appropriate salaries and certain allowances payable to each group, is proposed as the most effective means of achieving the degree of co-ordination desired. In this respect, it is to be noted that the Commonwealth Government has recently established a Remuneration Tribunal to review the salaries of members of the Federal Parliament, judges, first division officers in the Commonwealth Public Service and statutory office holders.

It is proposed that the tribunal shall make, at the one time, determinations in respect of the holders of these various offices and submit a report in respect of judges, at intervals of not more than one year, so as to avoid the time lags that have characterised the past.

The last determination of the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal was made in 1974 and in order to give effect to the concept of annual determinations it is

proposed that the new tribunal's first determination shall be made as soon as practicable after the first day of July, 1975, but not later than the thirty-first day of August, 1975.

The Bill is arranged in two parts. The first and principal part deals with the establishment and functions of the tribunal, to be known as the salaries and allowances tribunal.

The second part deals with the consequential necessity to repeal existing related legislation—the Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act, 1967, as amended, and termination of any determination in force under that Act.

The tribunal is to be constituted by three members appointed by the Governor, one of whom shall also be appointed by the Governor to be the chairman of the tribunal.

The term of office of persons appointed to the tribunal is to be for three years, except that when it is first constituted, one or more of the original members may be given terms of less than three years in order to provide for some continuity. A person who occupies an office within the tribunal's jurisdiction is to be ineligible for appointment to the tribunal. I emphasise that any person who occupies an office within the jurisdiction of the tribunal is to be ineligible for appointment to the tribunal. There are obvious reasons for this provision.

The members of the tribunal will themselves be remunerated by fees and allowances fixed by the Governor-in-Executive-Council.

Determinations are to take effect from such date as the tribunal determines and are to have the force of law notwithstanding any other provision in any other law of the State.

By contrast—and this will explain what I emphasised earlier in my comments—the tribunal's report on the salaries and allowances to be paid to judges of the Supreme and District Courts is to be furnished to the Minister who in turn will be required to table that report in both Houses of Parliament within five sitting days, but before the remuneration of judges can be varied a Bill will have to be passed by Parliament to authorise any changes.

This approach preserves the long-standing constitutional convention that the Parliament fixes the salaries of the judiciary but in doing so the Parliament will, in future, have the benefit of the recommendations of the same tribunal which is to determine the salaries of Ministers of the Crown, officers and members of Parliament and other senior officials.

I might mention that consideration was given to the judges being subject to the same determination, but the judges, themselves, preferred that the final decision

should be that of Parliament even though the tribunal will make the recommendation. Consideration was also given to an alternative method whereby the recommendation of the tribunal should be laid on the Table of the House for a given period, and would not become a determination until that period had expired.

Mr Davies: This matter has been discussed with the judges?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Again, the judges preferred—in fact, they were most insistent—that the final decision should be made by Parliament. This will mean that every time a recommendation comes forward in their case, and in their case alone, Parliament will have to deal with a Bill to give effect to the recommendation. I want members particularly to note the difference. Judges will be subject to a recommendation and then a Bill, whereas the others will be subject to a determination such as we have under the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal at the present time. It will be recalled that the determinations of the tribunal have been effective from the date they are declared to be effective.

It is to be noted that although the tribunal's jurisdiction is divided into two elements—firstly, to make determinations in respect of offices other than judicial offices and, secondly, to make reports to Parliament in respect of judicial salaries and allowances—provision is made for the tribunal to perform those two functions at the same time.

The jurisdiction of the tribunal in relation to Ministers of the Crown, the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet, and officers and members of Parliament is to embrace all allowances, fees, and other emoluments. This means that the tribunal's jurisdiction is to be as broad as that of the existing Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal.

The Bill also contains the special provisions which are required to preserve the right of members of the Legislative Assembly to be remunerated in the period which commonly occurs every three years between the dissolution or expiration of the Legislative Assembly and the holding of the next election. Members will recall we had to pass some special legislation in respect of this hiatus which does occur.

Turning now to the tribunal's jurisdiction in respect of magistrates, special division officers of the Public Service and statutory office holders, it is to be noted that only allowances of an annual nature are to be subject to its determinations.

It is felt that travelling and other occasional allowances are more closely allied to general conditions of service and that accordingly any such allowances should continue to be fixed and reviewed from time to time as at present.

The statutory offices over which the tribunal is to have jurisdiction are to be specified in regulations made by the Governor-in-Council from time to time.

It is the intention to prescribe all full-time or career statutory offices where the office is sufficiently important to warrant its salary being fixed by the tribunal. Obviously, offices like Commissioner of Railways, Commissioners of the Rural and Industries Bank, Chairman and members of the Public Service Board, Commissioner of Main Roads, Commissioner of Transport, Commissioner of Police, industrial commissioners, and many other like offices will be among the statutory offices prescribed as ones over which the tribunal has jurisdiction.

The Bill provides for the appointment of a person nominated by the presiding officers of Parliament to assist the tribunal in determining the remuneration of Ministers, the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet, and officers and members.

Similarly, a person nominated by the Chairman of the Public Service Board is to be appointed to assist the tribunal in determining the remuneration of magistrates, special division public servants, and the prescribed full-time statutory office holders.

In this respect it is considered that the tribunal should be assisted by persons familiar with the various offices particularly as the tribunal is to be constituted of persons who are not themselves holding an office within its jurisdiction.

It seems obvious that it is in everyone's interest to ensure that the tribunal is as well informed as possible.

The establishment of the tribunal will remove the present rights of special division officers to appeal to the Public Service Appeal Board against salary determinations.

However, it must be remembered that the present appeal right is against the fixation of a special division officer's salary by the Public Service Board.

As the remuneration of special division officers is now to be determined by a completely independent tribunal and not by the Public Service Board, the need for appeal rights is diminished and in any event, it would be difficult to justify a right of appeal for only one of the groups whose remuneration is to be fixed by the tribunal.

The Government believes that the establishment of a single tribunal with the functions I have outlined will prove to be of major benefit and will eliminate the dissatisfaction and concern often felt in the past because of the accidents of timing and inconsistencies of approach which are inevitable when the remuneration of separate groups of officials is being determined by more than one authority.

When members study the legislation they will appreciate that at present the people who are to be brought under its control have their remuneration and other emoluments of office determined by a whole host of different statutory and other bodies. All sorts of anomalies creep in. For instance, we had the situation which I had to explain to Parliament when the judges' remuneration legislation was last before us. At that time the remuneration of magistrates had been fixed independently without any regard for relativity, and they were actually being paid at a higher rate than the District Court judges. Parliament corrected that situation. That sort of anomaly will now be removed.

It is also felt that if there are regular reviews the steep increases in salaries which occur in some of these positions from time to time will be avoided. Those steep increases sometimes bring criticism because they are not understood.

I also want to make the point that at one of the Premiers' Conferences the Premiers discussed the multiplicity of wage, salary, and allowance fixing tribunals throughout Australia. It was undertaken by the Premiers, and the Prime Minister, that we would have a look at some of the tribunals to see whether we could start to reduce the number. Even at that time the Commonwealth was feeling the disadvantages of various tribunals making independent determinations and creating anomalies which were immediately seized upon as precedents by somebody else in the various brackets of salaries and allowances. It became very difficult to resist the flow-on which occurred. Admittedly, we are not dealing with a great mass of people in this Bill but the number of precedents which can be established are often quite embarrassing in the total salary and wage fixing arena.

I undertook at that time, and I made it public on my return, that we would look at the matter, and this particular grouping was the first of the practical results of that review.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Jamieson (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

## **PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

**SIR CHARLES COURT** (Nedlands—Treasurer) [5.32 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to make provision for an additional office of Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet, and to provide for the remuneration of the holder of such office at the rate payable to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the

Legislative Assembly, pending the final determination by the salaries and allowances tribunal, the formation of which is proposed under the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal Bill which has just been introduced and explained.

Notice has also been given of the Constitution Acts Amendment Bill. This related legislation is necessary to ensure that payment of any allowances or expenses to the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet would not mean forfeiture of his seat under the "office of profit" doctrine.

An arrangement whereby a member of Parliament is Secretary of the Cabinet has been in operation in Victoria since 1947. The occupant is remunerated under the Victorian Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act, at rates equal to those applicable to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in that State. The Victorian arrangement works well and is shown to have many advantages.

I might add that the Minister for Works and I have both had a chance to consider this particular office at work in Victoria where it is well developed and well established.

The Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet will not be a member of the Cabinet. He will be required to attend all meetings of the Cabinet for the purpose of carrying out the necessary secretarial duties.

Cabinet has not previously had the services of a secretary or anyone in attendance at its meetings for the purpose of carrying out secretarial duties. The collation of Ministers' submissions, the preparation of agendas, the recording of resolutions and decisions, and the distribution of the papers to the responsible Ministers and subcommittees, has been carried out in the past under the direction of the Under-Secretary, Premier's Department, who was not required to attend Cabinet meetings. These tasks will now be carried out by the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet, thereby providing greater security, and an improved service is anticipated as a result of his attendance at Cabinet meetings.

Within the Parliament it will be the responsibility of the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet to ensure the flow of Bills and speech and Committee notes thereon for the more efficient operation of the legislative business of Parliament. This will be achieved by his steering the projected legislation through the various stages of Cabinet approval, party approval and placement on the parliamentary notice paper, and acting as a clearing house for second reading speech and Committee notes, ensuring they are on hand and distributed at the appropriate time in Parliament. His office will also be the clearing house for answers to parliamentary questions, ensuring timely delivery in the House.

The office of Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet will serve as a valuable training ground for future membership of Cabinet.

The office will provide a strong link between Cabinet and members of the Parliament. It will also provide greater liaison between Cabinet and the parliamentary wing of the party in Government.

I should add that this makes the duties of the Parliamentary Secretary sound rather more simple than they will be, but the only criticism I have heard of the position is that the secretary is not paid very well for what he does.

Mr Taylor: Another criticism I could make is that it is three years too late.

Sir CHARLES COURT: We regard this office as desirable, regardless of which Government is in power. It will improve the actual machinery of Cabinet and the workings of the Parliament.

Mr Jamieson: I gather that this is an interim measure to cover his salary until provisions of the other Bill come into operation.

Sir CHARLES COURT: That is so.

Mr Jamieson: You did not mention that.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I said that this measure would operate until the first determination made by the salaries and allowances tribunal. I was inclined to tie the salary for this office permanently to the office of Deputy Leader of the Opposition, but as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows, the previous Government ran into a slight problem when the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal took strong exception to Parliament nominating a salary for one of the lesser officers and the legislation had to be withdrawn and redrafted. However, I have discussed this matter with the present tribunal, and the chairman and members are quite happy with this interim measure. It would be unreasonable to reconvene the tribunal to make one determination which Parliament is quite capable of doing. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Jamieson (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

## CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [5.37 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act Amendment Bill (2nd) and the Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Tribunal Bill, both of which I have just introduced, make provision for the remuneration of the holder of the proposed new office of Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet.

Section 38 (6) of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act provides, as a general rule, that if a member of Parliament accepts any office of profit under the Crown, he forfeits his parliamentary seat.

That section also provides for a number of exceptions from the operation of the general rule, one of the exceptions being that a member of Parliament who is also a Minister of the Crown does not forfeit his parliamentary seat by reason of his also holding that office of Minister of the Crown.

Members will recall I explained that the holder of the office of Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet will not be a Minister of the Crown, and thus it is necessary to add to the exceptions in section 38 to ensure that the holder of the office of Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet may receive remuneration in addition to his basic parliamentary salary without forfeiting his parliamentary seat, and the Bill so provides.

Members will appreciate that this is a consequential measure.

Mr Jamieson: Is it the intention of the Government that the Parliamentary Secretary is a member of this House, or could he be a member in another place?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Our intention is that he will be a member of this House.

Mr Jamieson: It is not specified.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I do not think it is desirable or necessary to specify this while we have two Chambers. The Government of the day may want some flexibility about this matter. However, as far as our Government is concerned, we have not given consideration to an appointee from the Legislative Council.

Mr Davies: Can I take that to mean that you are thinking of abolishing one Chamber?

Sir CHARLES COURT: No, I am just being very frank with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Jamieson: I feel this should be specified, as it is with ministerial positions. The legislation provides that a minimum of two Ministers shall be members of the Legislative Council. I believe the specification is necessary.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I personally believe it is necessary to remain flexible. However, we can consider this matter when the measure is debated in the House. I have known many of the appointees to the position in the Victorian Parliament, but I just cannot recall whether any of them came from the Legislative Council. I believe one of the present Ministers in the Victorian Government was in the Legislative Council and was a Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Jamieson (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).



## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: EIGHTH DAY

*Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 27th March, on the following motion by Mr Old—

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.

*To which Mr A. R. Tonkin had moved an amendment—*

That the following words be added to the motion—

; but we regret to have to inform your Excellency that this Government has consistently and wilfully withheld information on many matters of public concern which the people have a right to know and which it is the duty of the House to debate publicly.

**MR DAVIES** (Victoria Park) [5.41 p.m.]: Before moving his amendment on the 27th March, the member for Morley put forward a very detailed argument as to the reason that the Opposition considered such an amendment was timely and necessary. Perhaps in some aspects he dealt with this matter in a light-hearted manner, although it was a serious subject. However, I do not believe his approach detracted in any way from the importance of the amendment or from its contents. Indeed, the member for Morley went to a great deal of trouble to detail something like 30 occasions on which he felt that information which should properly have been given to this House had been withheld.

Last Thursday week, at 2.15 p.m., the Premier rose to reply. He used words which were almost identical with the words he had used the previous Thursday at 5.08 p.m. when dealing with another amendment.

**Mr Blaikie:** Consistency!

**Mr DAVIES:** The Premier said—

One would be entitled to treat this amendment with the contempt it deserves.

The previous Thursday the Premier said—

The amendment before the House just does not deserve any consideration at all.

I do not believe the Premier listened to the member for Morley if he felt the amendment deserved no consideration. The way the Premier reacted to both amendments indicated that the Opposition had hit the Government on a very sore spot.

Indeed, subsequent debate on the amendment now before the House indicated that the Premier was not interested in replying to the debate; he was more concerned with the character assassination of the member for Morley. The Premier spoke for only 15 minutes, and during this time there were as many interjections and interruptions as there were words from the Premier. He said he felt the amendment deserved to be treated with contempt because while the Opposition was in Government it had failed to reply to debates, and that motions and amendments had been treated with contempt.

It is time we laid this ghost to rest. On one occasion during the term of the previous Government a motion was moved by the Opposition and due to lack of liaison between the Whips, some confusion arose as to the manner in which the debate was to be handled. On that occasion the Minister who was to have replied to the motion understood that a number of Opposition members wished to speak. However, no other Opposition member rose to speak, and in the hiatus that developed, the motion was put before a reply was given. Apologies were tendered at that time, and I do not believe it behoves the Premier to keep referring to this one instance. To the best of my knowledge, it is the only occasion that such a situation developed. So let us put that ghost to rest once and for all. The attention given to amendments and to motions by the previous Government, of which I was member, was sincere in every respect.

We discussed the Opposition's amendments and motions and made certain they were given full and proper attention. I think possibly the only time the debate was not carried to its ultimate was when, by mutual consent between the leaders, because of the time factor and similar problems, we did not fully debate a particular measure. But the Opposition was just as happy to accept the situation as was the Government.

**Mr Young:** You gagged a motion once, too.

**Mr DAVIES:** Well, we learnt from the then Opposition: For what we did then, there was a precedent because when the then Opposition was in Government it changed the way that things were done. I think we were entitled to do that, just as during this session we seek to debate a motion before the Address-in-Reply debate is over. But in quoting a precedent members opposite are going back to something which occurred almost 20 years ago in entirely different circumstances.

Although the Premier was most derogatory and, on occasions insulting in his remarks—he was not asked to withdraw the remarks on any occasion, so whether or not he was insulting probably is only my opinion—he made no attempt to justify the stand the Government had taken on

the matter of secrecy. There is not the slightest doubt that this Government has set new standards in withholding information from the Parliament. Indeed, I would have thought the Government would take some action to emulate the newly-elected—temporary or otherwise—Leader of the Federal Opposition (Mr Malcolm Fraser) who has indicated he believes we should not withhold from members of the public information to which they are rightly entitled.

Mr Nanovich: Why do you not talk about Salvo? Your Government did not release any information on that project.

Mr DAVIES: I should like to quote to the House the opening remarks of Mr Malcolm Fraser in an address to the seminar run by the Australian Institute of Political Science at its summer school held in Canberra in January, 1972. When dealing with the topic, "Who runs Australia?" Mr Malcolm Fraser had this to say—

I want it to be clearly understood that I believe a well-informed public is vital to good government and that view qualifies all my subsequent remarks.

Mr O'Connor: Did the Government of which you were a member ever refuse to table files?

Mr DAVIES: I will come to that in due course. The member for Morley, as I have mentioned, indicated some 30 items which caused him concern and which he felt should have been made known either to the Parliament, so that they could be debated, or to the public at large. I am not going to go over all of them; however, I think I might briefly remind Parliament of a few of those issues.

I refer firstly to last year, when the Government refused to table a report on the disgusting Forrest Place incident. Despite the fact that it was asked in many ways and given the opportunity on many occasions to do so, the Government refused to publish that report. It did not publish the police report on the Exmouth protest, an inquiry which was concerned particularly with the swapping of numbers by policemen to confuse the public. As I recall it, it was a disgraceful business; however, we were never able to follow it through to its ultimate conclusion to see whether justice had been done either to the Police Force or to the public. The report was not made available to us and as a result we were never able to discuss it.

Mr O'Connor: The policemen were charged with swapping numbers and were found guilty.

Mr DAVIES: But we did not know whether the action taken was justifiable. Surely on a matter of such importance, the Parliament or the public are entitled to know the contents of the report. Decisions are made and action taken on reports of which we have no knowledge.

How can we decide whether the action taken is of sufficient severity if we do not know the circumstances?

Mr Sibson: Have you not confidence in the Police Department?

Mr DAVIES: It is not a matter of confidence; it is a matter of the responsibility of members of Parliament to make proper decisions. We are trying to make decisions on something about which we know nothing; that is just about what it gets down to.

I refer to another report concerning the Police Department; namely, the report on prostitution. I bet the Minister thought we would never raise the matter again. But we will raise it again and again and again because the issue has all the worst elements of gangsterism and of corruption that are known to exist; there exists the makings of a situation in Western Australia which in every aspect could be most undesirable.

Mr O'Connor: Why did you not do something about it when you were in Government?

Mr DAVIES: We were doing something about it.

Mr O'Connor: You did nothing.

Mr DAVIES: As the Minister knows full well, we started a report on the whole business.

Mr O'Connor: It was just a fob off.

Mr DAVIES: The Minister for Police is getting back to the old, "Why did not you do something?" This Government believes we were in office for three years too long, but things were already happening.

Mr O'Connor: The public thought so too, because it got rid of you.

Mr DAVIES: Presumably, we did not have the tie-ups that are available to some members of the Government and presumably this is something the Government just does not want to see brought out. We cannot tolerate a situation which is the embryo of gangsterism. I believe we should know what the police think of the situation. We should be acquainted with all the facts as the police know them so that we can properly express ourselves and take any action we consider necessary. But the Government decided to withhold that report.

Mr O'Connor: You must be reading the speech made by the member for Morley; he said everything you have said.

Mr DAVIES: Although it may be distasteful to the Minister for Police—

Mr O'Connor: Tedious repetition!

Mr DAVIES: —I am putting some new aspects on some of the matters mentioned by the member for Morley and which are of concern to him. If you think it is tedious repetition, Sir, I am quite certain you will tell me so very promptly.

The Minister for Immigration has now reappeared, so I will mention that it was a matter of regret that he tabled only some extracts from a Public Service report, but did not table the entire report. Here again, we are making decisions based on half-baked assumptions, and it is dangerous to do that.

Then there was the report of the Law Society on the Fuel, Energy and Power Resources Act Amendment Bill. I wonder if that report came from the group of eminent communists referred to by the Minister for Industrial Development. Was it the Law Society which was described by that Minister as being rife with communists?

Mr Jamieson: Yes.

Mr DAVIES: It is probably the most conservative organisation in the whole of the State, and yet its report on the fuel and energy Bill was not made available to us. The Premier refused even to table the opinion of an independent counsel who had been asked to investigate the Bill. Why does one ask a person to study a Bill? To prove or disprove one's point. Does one ask a person to say one is right, or does one ask him to say one is wrong? If we ask a person to say we are right, then surely the Government should have been in a position to say, "Here is the report of an independent counsel; we are pleased to table it." What can we assume from the fact that the report was not tabled? The only assumption I can come to is that the report did not agree with the action being taken by the Government. But, again, that may be a completely erroneous conclusion, because we do not have the information before us; we can only assess the situation as it appears to us and base our assessment on the known actions of the Government and what we know of the manner in which it operates.

We are still waiting to see further reports on the SEC management structure. Several reports were compiled in respect of rates, management, and the future organisation of the SEC—three or four reports—which have not seen the light of day. Yet I understand from the Governor's Speech that shortly we will be asked to make an assessment of legislation which will be introduced in this House to re-organise the State Electricity Commission. How in the name of all that is holy can we make an accurate assessment of that legislation and ascertain whether or not the Government is doing the right thing by the people of Western Australia if we do not have the same information which the Government has? Again we are being asked to make a judgment on something we may imagine we know a little about, but which we may know very little about; or on something that we may know about only by rumour. All these things make it very difficult indeed for a Parliament to operate.

There are some other matters I could mention quickly: the refusal of the Government to table a report regarding the subject matter of a police lecture at Kent Street High School, and its refusal to table documents relating to mining in the Wanneroo Lake area. The latter documents were supposed to be available at the Minister's office. What is the point of making that offer when a person who takes advantage of it knows full well that he will not be able to use what he reads? I think that is worse than not allowing a member to see the papers at all, because he is completely gagged. He must give an undertaking that he will not divulge anything he reads in the documents.

There has been a refusal to provide Parliament with regular results of Swan River sample analyses. Surely to goodness the results of those analyses should not be hidden from Parliament. Every weekend *The West Australian* shows an analysis of the air we breathe, so surely there is nothing wrong with making available to Parliament an analysis of the water in which we are likely to swim or on which we are likely to sail.

I do not believe the Government can have anything to hide in regard to this matter because the Swan River Conservation Board has done an excellent job. Therefore the refusal of the Government to provide Parliament with the analyses makes one wonder what is happening to the river today. If after many years of good management of the river by the board, the Government cannot say, "This is the state of the river" surely it is placing the board in the position of being suspect.

Of course, there is also the report of Magistrate Syddall on the Laverton incident. That situation will be righted in due course now that the Government has reluctantly and belatedly agreed to a Royal Commission. I hope that commission will get under way shortly, because if it does not the people who will be needed to advise the commission will be dispersed all over the State and we may never know what occurred.

I refer also to the fining of members of the Stock Exchange. Surely we are entitled to know who the offenders were. If I were caught driving while drunk or committing any other crime I am sure I would receive headlines in the newspaper, so why should not the people concerned with the Stock Exchange? If I am an investor on the Stock Exchange why should not I know who are the people who have been suspect in the past and who are to be watched in the future? What has the Government done in regard to that? Nothing at all; it is interested only in protecting the guilty.

I have already referred to the SEC management report and the subsequent events which led to the increase in rates.

Another matter of great interest to us is the report of the Royal Commission which inquired into the State Government Insurance Office. Having set up the Royal Commission when we were in Government, surely we are entitled to know its findings and recommendations. We must reluctantly assume that we have not been informed of the recommendations produced by this unbiased investigation because they are not in line with the thinking of the Liberal Party and, perhaps, the Country Party, National Alliance, or whatever it currently calls itself. Even if the Government says it will not carry out the recommendations of the Royal Commission, at least it should let us know what the recommendations are. There has been a wealth of these instances over the years; they have gone on, and on, and on.

Probably we can expect them to go on, and on, and on. Despite the fact that we debated the question of secrecy for several hours last Thursday week, when a question without formal notice was asked by the member for Ascot, secrecy was still the main issue in the answer given by the Minister. When questions were answered that afternoon, they were certainly answered in a hurry, because the Ministers on that occasion, I think, created an all-time record for answering questions and handing in information. However, that is by the way.

This question dealt with the use of tear gas in prisons, and it was as follows—

Pursuant to my question of Wednesday, the 26th March, concerning the purchase of an extremely potent brand of tear gas by the Department of Corrections, will the Chief Secretary indicate—

- (a) (1) What quantity of the gas has been purchased and at what cost?

A number of other questions without notice were asked, but keeping in mind that we had been debating the question of secrecy, the amazing answer was—

- (a) (1) I am not prepared to answer the first part of this question since it is an obvious breach of security that maximum security prisoners be made aware of the number of canisters held.

The member may be assured that the amount is adequate for the protection of staff in the event of a major disturbance.

That question and answer appear on page 551 of this session's *Hansard*. What an amazing answer! We are not allowed to know what quantity of tear gas we have in this State! Do members think it likely, if warders were to use six-guns for the control of prisoners, that the prisoners would stand still and count the number of bullets that had been fired and if six were

fired they would then say to themselves, "They can't have any more bullets left in the chamber, so we can now move in."? Thinking along similar lines do members consider that the prisoners will count the number of tear gas canisters that are used and once they have established that they have used all the canisters they are allowed to use they will then say, "We are in the clear now, because they do not have any more tear gas canisters left."?

The information contained in that answer was absolute nonsense and was displaying unnecessary secrecy. This will not have a major effect in the underworld; the information as to the number of canisters of tear gas that are held in Fremantle Prison will not infiltrate among undesirable in Fremantle or other prisons. In any event, who knows how much tear gas is needed effectively to quell a riot and who is to know whether one can or 200 cans is sufficient to quell a riot? All I can say is that this is typical of the Government's desire to maintain secrecy and to go to unnecessary lengths to withhold information which could quite easily, and without detriment, be given to the Parliament.

I am quite sure that you, Sir, will recall the instances I am about to recount to the House, because you were a member of the Ministry at the time. On a number of occasions during that period members of the then Opposition sought information on the price that was then being paid for fuel oil. Whether it was because of pure stubbornness, embarrassment, or the fact that the Government did not know, the Government consistently refused to make known the price that was being paid at that time for fuel oil to generate power.

When we became the Government we made the information public and, so far as I can judge, no damage whatsoever has resulted to any section of the public, to those engaged in the oil trade, to industry, to fuel producers, or to energy resources. Therefore I fail to understand why the Government at that time held back the information for so long.

Mr Bertram: Obsession.

Mr DAVIES: As the member for Mt. Hawthorn has just said, apparently it was just an obsession.

I return now to deal more personally with the refusal of the Government to table a report on the Forrest Place incident which happened just over 12 months ago. You will recall, Sir, that I, among others, endeavoured to have that report tabled, but I was told that if I were interested it would be made available to me in the Minister's office.

However there was a condition attached to its being made available. The condition was that I had to keep the information confidential because the Minister himself told me that he felt there were some matters mentioned on the file that could embarrass the Opposition or some individuals.

As it was perfectly obvious that the report was not to be made available I telephoned the Minister's office one morning and left a message that I would be in to look at the report about 3.00 p.m. or 4.00 p.m. that day. I think I gave about three or four hours' notice of my intended call. It must be borne in mind, of course, that after I had looked at the file the information I gleaned from it had to be kept confidential.

I arrived in the Minister's office on time and was handed a file which I read from cover to cover. I found it very interesting, but it was not the file dealing with the Forrest Place incident. Therefore in what position am I now placed? After giving an undertaking that I would not make public any of the information I saw on the file dealing with the Forrest Place incident, can I now say, "Very well, as far as I am concerned, I gave no undertaking in regard to this file which I have perused, and therefore anything I have gleaned from it I can make public."?

Mr O'Connor: Did you mention to anyone that it was the wrong file?

Mr DAVIES: No, it was a similar file, but it was not the file I was after.

Mr O'Connor: Did you ever make any mention of it to anyone?

Mr DAVIES: Yes, I did. However, let me finish my story. As far as I am concerned, and because of any reflection that may fall on the staff, any information I gleaned from the file I perused I will keep confidential.

I pointed out that I could find no report, the nature of which I expected to find, on the file. I was told that I had been given the wrong file. A hasty search for the correct file was made. I was told to come back next day, despite the fact that the file was supposed to be made available to me in the Minister's office and I had given three or four hours' notice of my intention to inspect it. I had to go back the next day, because the file was not available to me as arranged.

That is the type of situation which one gets into when one tries to do the right thing. Eventually I was handed a thinner file attached to which was a note signed by the Commissioner of Police to this effect, "This appears to be the file which Hon. R. Davies wants to look at". I hope I am not breaching any confidence when I say there was not a solitary note in that report which I felt was an embarrassment to the Opposition, the Government, or the Police Force.

Although I can go further into this matter I shall not do so; in view of the undertaking I have given and the difficult position in which I find myself I shall not say anything further. A similar thing could happen to any member who takes advantage of the offer of a Minister who says, "You can come to my office and look at

the file." By looking at such a file the member concerned is bound by secrecy and has to go into cahoots with the Government. I shall treat with contempt any similar offers made to me in the future because by looking at the file I would be placed in a worse position than if I had not looked at it.

Mr Laurance: Why can't we all be as perfect in every way as you are?

Mr DAVIES: The honourable member should not try to be sarcastic. I am not prepared to do anything which compels me to go into cahoots with the Government in its secrecy. I am not prepared to assess a situation on rumours, lack of information, or half-baked information.

Mr Harman: Why do you put up with a Minister who sends you a report on a confidential basis, and at the same time makes it available to the Press?

Mr DAVIES: I was rather stunned by that incident. In cases like that I would be inclined to quote from the Press report only, and hope it is accurate. What was disappointing in the reply of the Premier was that he did not lay down any criteria under which information would be made available to Parliament. I would expect him to say, "These are the circumstances under which we can consider making information available to Parliament." However, the Premier ignored completely the whole intent of the amendment to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply, and the instances which were quoted by the member for Morley. The Premier got down to character assassination of the worst form, and he gave us more of the old record which we have heard from him time and time again.

We on this side are disappointed with the Premier's reply. As far as I am concerned I would ask: Is any damage likely to ensue to the State? That should be the main criterion. If an inquiry is instituted into the Police Force, a public utility, a school or the like there must be people who are suspect. Therefore the report should be made public, provided the person making the report is given some protection against libel action. Why should the Government institute an inquiry, obtain a report, and not make it public?

We do not know how many reports the Government has considered; we do not know what decisions it has made as a result of them; and we are not in a position to criticise the decisions it makes. As a matter of fact, its decisions are completely unchallengeable, because we do not know the basis on which they are made.

I shall wind up my contribution to the debate on this note: The action of the Government has made the work of a member of Parliament particularly difficult. It is irresponsible for a member to act on a rumour; it is difficult to assess a situation on half-baked information; and it is

impossible to make decisions with no information available. For that reason how can we as members of Parliament effectively do the work for which we have been elected to do, if the necessary information is not available to us?

We have to look either at the introduction of a committee system of Parliament, or the appointment of a committee of Parliament to assess such reports and determine whether the Government is right in withholding them. Such a committee could review reports which the Government refuses to table.

After all, we have been elected to represent the people, and we are unable to do that in situations where we are not given all the information. For that reason the member for Morley is to be congratulated not only on the research he has undertaken into this question—as he invariably undertakes similar research when he speaks on other subjects—but also on his timing in bringing the matter before Parliament. He should be congratulated for not being afraid to speak out and put the Government on its toes. It is a matter of considerable regret that the amendment to the motion has not been accepted in a far better frame of mind. I say it would be much more preferable for members of Parliament to be given more information. I most wholeheartedly support the amendment.

**MR BERTRAM** (Mt. Hawthorn) [6.14 p.m.]: It gives me great pleasure to support the amendment.

#### *Point of Order*

**Mr JAMIESON**: Before my colleague continues his contribution to the debate I rise on a point of order to question whether the amendment or even the motion is in order. The motion is addressed to a person who is no longer the Governor of this State. Before we proceed with the amendment I think the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply should be amended in some form.

On the opening day of this session of Parliament you, Mr Speaker, made the following statement to the House—

I attended His Excellency the Governor in the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the Speech which His Excellency was pleased to deliver to members of both Houses of Parliament.

A motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply was then moved by the member for Katanning in the following terms—

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

Among other things, the member for Katanning set out in his motion—

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.

His Excellency was defined very clearly as the Governor in the statement which you, Mr Speaker, made to this House in the early part of the debate.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

#### *Speaker's Ruling*

**The SPEAKER**: In relation to the matters raised by the member for Welshpool as to whether or not the motion is out of order, I would like to state at this juncture that I believe it inappropriate, when an amendment is under discussion, for this point of order on the motion to be raised. It would be appropriate for the honourable member to bring it forward at the conclusion of the discussion on the amendment. It is my intention at this stage to proceed with the amendment. The member for Mt. Hawthorn may proceed.

#### *Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed*

**Mr BERTRAM**: This is an important amendment. For those people who would like to know its text I would indicate that they can find the precise wording, as moved by the member for Morley on the 27th March, at page 520 of *Hansard*.

Some little time ago a Minister of this Government talked about the possible collapse of democracy. Let me say that the collapse of democracy is more likely to occur as a result of secrecy—and particularly undue secrecy—than as a result of the matters of which he spoke at that time.

Secrecy as we know, but which we should remind ourselves from time to time because of the import, is the product of inefficiency, of distrust, of fear—on this occasion the fear of the electors—and of fraud. It has been said that secrecy is the badge and hallmark of fraud.

If there is secrecy—and more particularly undue secrecy—whether on matters of a parliamentary nature or some other nature, then if one has any common sense and experience, one will immediately sit up and take notice because we know from experience that this is the signal which indicates fraud.

What is fraud? Without going into the precise definition I suggest that fraud is the attempt by a person to depict a position to be true when it happens to be false.

**Mr Hartrey**: With the object of obtaining pecuniary gain.

**Mr BERTRAM**: Deceiving the listener.

**Mr Hartrey**: No. There must also be an intent to defraud.

**Mr BERTRAM**: Yes; and causing the listener to suffer as a consequence.

The present Government—more particularly the Premier, because we on this side take the view that he is, in fact, a one-man Government for all practical purposes—

Mr O'Neill: What a lot of rot.

Mr BERTRAM:—is obsessed with this question of secrecy. It is a word he appreciates and often uses, which is not surprising. It fits him and therefore he wears that cap. Even today legislation was introduced into this place because, amongst other things, of a desire on the part of the Government to bring about more secrecy evidencing obviously a distrust in members of the Civil Service—

Sir Charles Court: What legislation is that?

Mr BERTRAM: —in an area immediately surrounding the Cabinet room and matters relating to it.

Sir Charles Court: What legislation is that? How stupid can you be!

Mr Sibson: We can't understand you.

Mr BERTRAM: If the honourable member will look at *Hansard* later on and read the Premier's introductory remarks on a Bill or two he introduced this afternoon, he will see that the Premier used the word "secrecy".

Sir Charles Court: Of course he does. Everyone does. Security is different from secrecy.

Mr BERTRAM: Notwithstanding the very obvious lack of support it received from the people in the metropolitan area, the Government nevertheless became the Government only just over 12 months ago, yet the member for Morley virtually off the cuff was able to list, I think, 18 items of suppression of one kind or another.

Mr O'Neill: The member for Victoria Park said the speech was well researched, but you say he spoke off the cuff.

Mr BERTRAM: Members opposite know the member for Morley is an excellent member, but the Premier denies that fact. However, we will come back to that later.

Mr O'Neill: So do most members of the Opposition.

Sir Charles Court: I was in good company.

Mr BERTRAM: I will forecast that, all things being reasonably equal, he will be a Minister before he is very much older.

Mr Sodeman: Is he going to swap sides?

Mr BERTRAM: When I talk about things being reasonably equal I am not speaking at this stage about malapportionment or gerrymandering blatantly practised in this State. If this were not so, he would be a Minister now. However, I am not dealing with that subject at the moment, but an opportunity will arise for me to do so later.

If a serious allegation is made against a person, and that person has an answer, then, like all reasonable people, that person would be the first to begin to carve up the case to destroy it because there was an answer. However, on this occasion the Government has elected not to do that and of course this spells out the whole story. No attempt has been made to answer what happens to be an extraordinarily serious allegation that the Government is one of secrecy and practises the suppression of facts. In effect it practises secrecy against the electors of the State. The Premier has not attempted to answer the case at all. I suggest that readers of *Hansard* start at page 521 and read the Premier's contribution—if that is what it was—and satisfy themselves on this matter. They need not accept my word on the subject. If they read the Premier's speech they will satisfy themselves that the member for Morley came in for the usual low-level personal abuse and vilification to which members on this side are subject whenever the Premier is mindful of practising that technique, but, more particularly, when he finds himself unable to answer a case.

There are many examples available. The Premier made no attempt at all to answer the case, but he provided plenty of personal abuse. Reference to the first column on page 521 of *Hansard* will show that the Premier said—

And the Opposition will hear it again because when it treats the parliamentary institution frivolously . . .

And so it goes on. It seems the Premier is concerned about the parliamentary institution and its dignity. Of course, we on this side of the House are not concerned about expressions of concern or expressions of intention; we are concerned with performance.

I remember only too well when a member of the then Opposition who is now in Government, and who used to sit in this very seat, I think, was abusing Standing Orders and carrying on notwithstanding our objections. Everybody in the House who knew anything at all, who had ears to hear and eyes to watch the performance, was aware that the objections taken by myself and other members were thoroughly well founded. However, the member concerned treated the House with complete disdain and with a complete lack of reverence, and in a most undignified manner. The then Opposition moved against all sorts of rulings by the then Acting Speaker, or Chairman of Committees—I forget precisely who was in the Chair—and delayed the House and put on a great performance. All the decencies of the House were abused and yet here we have the Premier talking about treating the parliamentary institution frivolously. The abuse went on for some time on that particular occasion.

The member for Morley will recall the case very well because it will be remembered that he gave a considered judgment on the whole performance, and it was a brilliant episode and effort on his part and far better than the humbug which the then Opposition carried on with. So, it does not lie in the mouth of the Premier to resort to this sort of tactic.

It was the Premier who acquiesced in the action taken in the New South Wales Parliament when the Premier (Mr Lewis) tore up tradition and convention and instead of appointing to the Senate someone he should have appointed, put in one of his own mates notwithstanding the overwhelming will of the people expressed only shortly before to the contrary.

It is heartening to observe, as you would be aware Mr Speaker, that recently a new leader of the Federal Opposition was appointed—Fraser to replace Snedden. If I understood clearly a news item recently published he, amongst other things, is to try to do something about improving the Liberal Party-Country Party—or whatever it is called—coalition Opposition in Canberra.

Mr McIver: It is to be changed again soon.

Mr BERTRAM: Mr Fraser is the leader but the knives are still being sharpened. It seems he is to discipline his team so that the House of Representatives may go back to orderly conduct and orderly proceedings within the Chamber. He has also announced something which would not surprise those who are discerning: he will cease the absolutely tight and close direction of the Liberal Party members of the Senate. He is to allow them—so he alleges; time will tell—to do their own thing and make up their own minds and function as a Senate. I would say he was probably talking with his tongue in his cheek at the time, but that is what he said. Of course, it was a clear intimation that for some time past the Liberal and Country Party members in the Senate have been directed mercilessly by their Caucus.

I would not know what relevance this has to the motion but it will be observed that, in the Premier's alleged answer to the motion moved by the member for Morley in a very efficient manner, the Premier said—

I can tell the honourable member that if he talks too much in the back bench, it will kill his chances for the front bench.

Well, I could point to one or two members sitting opposite who could say, "Yes, that is precisely the Premier's mentality." They have suffered in consequence of this type of thing. It is no good any of them walking away because the cap might fit them. There are a few members in this House

who would say that, for their own good, they had a bit too much to say about ideas of their own.

Mr Harman: They are talking so much they cannot hear you.

Mr BERTRAM: That is so. They therefore were not safe men. This is the thought. Well, on this side of the House, so far as I am aware, members of Cabinet, and the shadow Cabinet, are not ousted because they have minds of their own. I would suggest there is a fair amount of evidence to show that the contrary applies. Because that is the way the Premier operates, it does not follow that that is the way we on this side of the House operate.

It is only a matter of time before the inevitable will occur and the member for Morley will be a member of the Ministry, and he will be a good one. Amongst other things, he will lead his department rather than be led by it. I think that is fairly obvious.

Mr Sibson: Does the member for Mt. Hawthorn want to be his deputy?

Mr BERTRAM: In addition to the 18 points—or thereabouts—which have been listed by the member for Morley—the 18 points of secrecy; the 18 points of suppression of facts; and the 18 points of denial of information to this place and to the people—there are others. One in particular which I think worth while mentioning was raised just prior to the tea suspension by the member for Victoria Park.

For years, under the last Liberal-Country Party regime—when the Country Party was known as the National Alliance or the National Country Party—this Parliament and the people were denied the right to certain information to do with the price of oil. When there was a change of Government the information was found and the member for Victoria Park, previously a Minister in the Tonkin Government, simply does not understand why the information should have been suppressed. The information was then given to the public and nobody has been hurt so it would appear there is no evidence to suggest that anybody would have been hurt previously.

Then there was the scandalous affair in Forrest Place when the members of the Liberal Party and the National Alliance-Country Party threw cans at the Prime Minister and other people, and put on a shameful performance. There is a report on that incident, which the member for Victoria Park has seen and he says it, too, is innocuous.

Members on this side of the House, having some responsibility, have no objection to the suppression of reports and information in proper cases, but we do not trust the present Government any more than the man in the street does at this time.



The State Government Insurance Office report—I think it was Judge Heenan who was the commissioner in that case—apparently was handed to the Government months ago but that still has not come to light. It will be interesting to learn what justification is given for the suppression of that report when it ultimately becomes public property, if in fact it ever does.

Then we have the position that the suppression of reports and information creates a first-class shemuzzle, resulting in gross unfairness and injustice. We have an example of this in the Skull Creek situation. On the 5th January a certain incident took place at Skull Creek in Laverton. On the 27th March, after a delay of almost 12 weeks, it was agreed that a Royal Commission be appointed.

Mr O'Connor: You are out of touch. An investigation was made, as you should know.

Mr BERTRAM: It is true that an investigation was made. A report was prepared by Magistrate Syddall, but, not having seen the report and not knowing what is in it, we are not complaining about it. On this occasion the report was said to have been suppressed on the ground of confidentiality. There may be other reasons.

Sir Charles Court: Do you not think that is a sound ground?

Mr BERTRAM: The idea was, of course, that there would be no Royal Commission because, as I have already told this Parliament, the Premier had a particular obsession against a Royal Commission. He has now backed off and there is to be a Royal Commission.

Magistrate Syddall went around and got down to the grass roots, as it were. I do not know where he went; he may have gone to the hotel bars. He picked up information which perhaps would not normally be acquired by a Royal Commission—probably information of a confidential nature. I do not know whether or not that is so but, putting two and two together, that is my guess. I will argue it and the Government can say whether I am wrong. Magistrate Syddall picked up confidential information which in other circumstances he would not have been given. He would say, "You are safe; no harm will come to you", and on that basis he would receive information.

There will now be a Royal Commission. I imagine the Royal Commission will sight the Syddall report. If I were a Royal Commissioner I would ask for that first of all because it would provide a good basis on which to work. Amongst other things, the Royal Commission will establish the substance and factual accuracy of the Syddall report.

Mr O'Connor: Do you think the Syddall report will be helpful to the Royal Commission?

Mr BERTRAM: I would hope so.

Mr O'Connor: Then it will be a waste of time. You have just killed your argument.

Mr BERTRAM: I know that delay occurred—I am not worrying about that—but the fact is that people who gave information on a strictly confidential basis, as acknowledged by the Premier because it appears he took over from the Minister for Police, will now find that they will be called before the Royal Commission unless some legislative action is taken to protect and exclude them; or the Royal Commission, having Magistrate Syddall on oath in the witness box, will ask, "What is the name of this fellow?" And will not the magistrate be obliged to answer? I imagine he will be obliged to answer, unless we take legislative action to protect him.

So here we have a shemuzzle arising from an obsession on the part of the Government for keeping things secret—give any sort of reasoning, it does not matter so long as we have secrecy. That is the repercussion in this case. It has backfired.

Moving now to another segment of the story, we have a double standard situation. A man named Flatman recently sought to obtain the transfer of a liquor license. According to the provisions of the Liquor Act and the practice of the Licensing Court, amongst other things it is necessary when such an application is made that references be supplied to the Licensing Court by the applicant, and the Licensing Court requires a report concerning the suitability, character, and reputation of the applicant.

Mr O'Connor: Do you blame the Licensing Court for this one?

Mr BERTRAM: In the Flatman case such a report was delivered to the Licensing Court. Only a few days ago I asked the appropriate Minister whether he would be good enough to supply that report.

Mr Laurance: You seem to be very critical of the Chairman of the Licensing Court.

Mr BERTRAM: I am not critical of him. When was I critical?

Mr Laurance: Just now.

Mr BERTRAM: If the honourable member had been listening, he would know I was being critical of the Government. I am demonstrating that the Government has double standards.

Mr Skidmore: Ill-informed people usually seek to remain ill-informed.

Mr BERTRAM: The Government has double standards. It would not produce and table that report. Readers of *Hansard* will not have to look further than *Hansard* No. 3 for this year, commencing at page 297, where there is a question of mine in which I asked the Minister to table the report; and the Minister said he would not do so. Had there been any dynamite

or adverse comment of significance in that report, it is reasonable to assume the man would not have received the license; but as a matter of fact he was given the license. So on the probabilities there is everything to suggest the police report contained nothing which was adverse to the applicant. I am not talking about the certainties; I am talking about the overwhelming probabilities that the report was innocuous and in fact helpful to the applicant.

Mr O'Connor: Do you know how many convictions of any kind the applicant had?

Mr BERTRAM: I would imagine he had none. That would be my belief. How many does the Minister think he had?

Mr O'Connor: The same number as you think he had.

Mr BERTRAM: The report was almost certainly innocuous but this Parliament and the people were not permitted to see it. Yet the same Minister who prevented us from seeing that report, innocuous though it was, on the 5th September last year tabled another document—paper No. 212—which was loaded with adverse comments so far as the maker of that statutory declaration was concerned.

Mr O'Connor: At the request of one of your members.

Mr BERTRAM: Will the Minister in future table whatever papers we request?

Mr O'Connor: I will decide that.

Mr BERTRAM: Double standards again. I am indebted to the Minister for his assistance. The statutory declaration which was laid on the Table of the House for the world and the Press to see is incriminatory and highly condemnatory of the declarant; namely, one Dorothea Flatman of no stated address. Her statutory declaration was made on the 5th September, 1974. I do not want members to accept what I am saying as to its nature. It would be much better if members could read it for themselves, but as they cannot do so I will read one or two excerpts from the statutory declaration.

Mr O'Connor: Do you want a pair of binoculars? You had better not read the extracts.

Mr BERTRAM: I will read from about half way down paragraph (2) of the declaration which all members can read if they look at tabled paper No. 212. It reads—

... that at these interviews I sought Mr Tonkin's assistance in (1) Toleration by the Government of Prostitution that I explained and Proved to Mr Tonkin that all girls under my control—paid taxes—had properly conducted medical checks. That I further warned the Premier of the distinct possibility of the invasion of stand-over merchants from the Eastern States should the premises be closed and the girls forced out onto the streets.

Before Mrs Flatman said that, under the provisions of section 106 of the Evidence Act, 1906, she said—

... that I am the one and same person referred to by way of questions to the Hon. the Premier and the Hon. the Minister for Police by certain members of the Labor Opposition in the Legislative Assembly—where it was alleged that I had stated to a Liberal member of Parliament that I would make known publicly the names of members of Parliament who visited my premises for purposes of prostitution.

The declaration then continues. We have a man who appears to be the husband of this lady, and who has a clean bill of health, almost certainly confirming the facts in the declaration. His report is suppressed, and this declaration, dynamite though it is, tabled for the world to see. This is a confession almost of guilt, and if not, certainly one of irresistible inference of guilt.

I submit that as evidence, Mr Speaker, of the double standards to which I have referred. Nothing has emerged from the debate to answer the allegations of secrecy. The Government has made not the slightest attempt to express an intention to reform, review, or generally to face up to the many avenues of secrecy which are available to this Parliament. It has used devices available to it to preserve secrecy unnecessarily.

As you are very well aware, Mr Speaker, Standing Order 2 deals with matters which are *sub judice*. In my opinion this particular Standing Order is roughly about 100 years out of date. It is subject to abuse and it is a thoroughly unsatisfactory Standing Order because it can be invoked to gag this Parliament. This Standing Order protects perhaps one or two litigants, but whilst doing so it denies justice to the other one million odd residents of Western Australia.

Mr Young: The member for Ascot in particular.

Mr Skidmore: He is not the only one.

Mr BERTRAM: I will give examples if members desire, but I do not feel I should do that at the moment.

When the Tonkin Government introduced legislation to appoint an ombudsman, it sought to extend his powers to the activities of the Commissioner of Police, the assistant commissioner, and the Police Force. The Liberal Party-National Alliance opposed that concept. I believe this provision is practised in New Zealand, although I cannot be dogmatic about it.

The legislation was passed with this embargo on the ombudsman, and this device has enabled secrecy to continue without any inhibition at all in the area of law enforcement.

It is a fact that for many years members of the Public Service have been prevented from giving information to the public, but this should not mean that the practice continues for another 100 years. Why does not the Government give some leadership?

During the term of the last Liberal Party Government, we saw much evidence of the dead hand of defeatism. The Government did nothing unless great pressure was exerted. Why does not the Government do something about this matter of secrecy? We have had the present Government in power for about a year, but already we can see this defeatism, the cold dead hand of conservatism, and the attitude of inhibiting legislation only when there is overwhelming pressure. Let the establishment stay where it is and hang the cost.

For many years the Leader of the Opposition fought for the appointment of an ombudsman. In spite of great resistance, the ombudsman was appointed in 1972. We now find many other States of Australia have appointed ombudsmen, even some of the Liberal Party State Parliaments. The Australian Government hopes to appoint an ombudsman.

To give us an idea of what is happening, let us compare the attitude of the State Government in regard to secrecy with that of the Australian Government. Although this may not be precisely within the terms of the amendment, I would like to quote a statement made by the Prime Minister in November, 1972, to compare the attitude of conservatives, called Liberals, on the one hand, with the attitude of the Labor Party on the other. In his policy speech on freedom of information, the Prime Minister said—

A Labor Government will introduce a Freedom of Information Act along the lines of the United States legislation. This Act will make mandatory the publication of certain kinds of information and establish the general principle that everything must be released unless it falls within certain clearly defined exemptions. Every Australian citizen will have a statutory right to take legal action to challenge the withholding of public information by the Government or its agencies.

That is a statement of intention, and the intention has been carried out. Policy statements made by conservative Governments are very general and extremely difficult to interpret specifically. We see plenty of intention of action, but very little practical application. The Australian Government is giving effect to its stated policy. By the repeal or the amendment of some regulation, Australian public servants already have a measure of freedom to disclose information—a measure never previously dreamt of. Although this

freedom was given months or years ago, we have had no administrative earthquake; the practice is working out well.

In the very near future there will be introduced into the Australian Parliament legislation to ensure that there shall be freedom of information.

**THE SPEAKER:** The member has five minutes.

**MR BERTRAM:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. There are other examples, not of just hollow promises, but of performance by the Australian Labor Party. For example, let us look at some of the things which have occurred in regard to the question of secrecy of information since the Australian Government was elected to office on, I think, the 2nd December, 1972. The detail I have before me was prepared in October, 1973; and at that time the Australian Government was drafting a freedom of information Act. Incidentally, I should remind members that the Tonkin Government also took steps towards allowing members of Government departments some freedom to give information. Another action on the part of the Australian Government was that the Prime Minister was at that stage holding weekly Prime Ministerial Press conferences when he was in Canberra, and at which most Cabinet decisions taken that day were announced.

I also refer to the public release of reports made to the Government, in many cases before Cabinet has considered them; the tabling in Parliament of the reports, and in some cases the minutes, of meetings of Commonwealth and State Ministers; the practice of giving details of the existence and composition of Cabinet and inter-departmental committees; the decision of Cabinet to amend the Crimes Act to remove from it all but the most serious cases of release of confidential information; and discussions—even at that time, less than 12 months after becoming the Government after a 23-year hiatus—on the amendment of Public Service regulations to allow public servants the right of public comment.

I go on to refer to the move for more uniform libel laws, and plans to extend the number of Government information centres to cover all capital cities and major regions. Those examples are taken from a list drawn up fairly quickly in or about September-October, 1973, when the Whitlam Government had been in office for only a short time. There is performance.

We on this side of the House do not expect to make very much headway—if any—in this debate; but our duty, which we are in the process of discharging, is to let the people of this State know that we are not satisfied any more than they are satisfied, and we give an undertaking that we will if at all possible before the end of this Parliament introduce legislation which will do something about removing the present absurd, completely out-of-date, and completely unacceptable situation on the matter of undue secrecy.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

## Ayes—19

Mr Barnett	Mr Fletcher
Mr Bateman	Mr Harman
Mr Bertram	Mr Hartrey
Mr Bryce	Mr Jamieson
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr Skidmore
Mr Carr	Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr Davies	Mr J. T. Tonkin
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Moller
Mr T. D. Evans	

(Teller)

## Noes—25

Mr Blaikie	Mr Nanovich
Mr David Brand	Mr O'Connor
Mr Clarke	Mr Old
Mr Charles Court	Mr O'Neill
Mr Cowan	Mr Ridge
Mr Coyne	Mr Rushton
Mr Craig	Mr Shalders
Mr Crane	Mr Sibson
Mr Grayden	Mr Sodeman
Mr Grewar	Mr Stephens
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Watt
Mr Laurance	Mr Young
Mr McPharlin	

(Teller)

## Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr May	Mr Mensaros
Mr Taylor	Mr Thompson
Mr McIver	Dr Dadour

Amendment thus negatived.

*Debate (on motion) Resumed*  
*Point of Order*

Mr JAMIESON: I raise again the point of order I raised previously in circumstances which you, Mr Speaker, thought were somewhat different as there was before the Chair an amendment to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply.

However, it is very clear from the *Votes and Proceedings* that the Address-in-Reply is directed to His Excellency Air Commodore Sir Hughie Idwal Edwards, V.C., K.C.M.G., C.B., D.S.O., O.B.E., D.F.C. The motion cannot go forward from this Chamber in that form at the moment. So I would suggest it is out of order and that it could fall within the category of being null and void unless it is amended; and I would not like it to fall into that category because then we would have to have another opening of Parliament and another Governor's Speech. I doubt whether the Government would like that, either. However, I think it is up to you, Sir, to give us some guidance. I feel it is out of order for us to continue to debate something we cannot achieve. We cannot reply to His Excellency; there must be someone else to reply to, but it is not for me to make that determination. I simply draw your attention to the fact that the motion before the House at the moment is void. I seek your guidance and ask for your ruling.

*Speaker's Ruling*

The SPEAKER: I have taken notice of the point of order raised by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I believe the

motion to be in order. In some explanation of this stand, I propose to make a few general observations and then to quote extracts from relevant Acts.

Firstly, I would like to say that the governorship of this State is a continuous thing. When a Governor is absent or ill his deputy takes over his duties; that is, his deputy represents Her Majesty the Queen because he assumes the governorship of the State.

The various Acts which I will quote later support my general observations that governorship of a State is a continuous thing and was a fact envisaged by those who drafted the several Acts. Governors have been absent from the State or have been ill on innumerable occasions since the history of State government began. It has happened in recent times in regard to the governorship of Sir Hughie Edwards, VC.

Although this is perhaps only a small reason, I mention for the information of members that this contention is pointed up by the proclamation which summoned Parliament together to meet for business; it was signed by the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator, in the absence of the Governor and it was countersigned, as is customary, by the Premier or his deputy—in this case, by the Premier.

This proclamation summoned the House together, yet only a few days prior to the sitting of Parliament, Sir Hughie Edwards, VC, returned to the State in time to give his Speech to Parliament. That is not mentioning as yet the name of Sir Hughie Edwards, as the member for Welshpool indicated, though it is printed in *Votes and Proceedings*.

I merely want to point out this one salient fact: The governorship of a State is a continuous thing. So, in effect, the name of Sir Hughie Edwards, VC, as named in *Votes and Proceedings* and in the terms of the motion is incidental to his duties as Governor of this State. As he retired, his duties were taken over by his deputy, the Lieutenant-Governor.

In order to illustrate this continuous governorship, which I think all of us would admit to be a fact—we would all concede that the Governor's name is incidental—I propose to refer to three Acts relating to Parliament, which are contained in a booklet on the desk of each honourable member titled, "*Acts, etc., Relating to Parliament*". The first Act from which I should like to quote is the Constitution Act, which gives a definition of "Governor". It reads—

"Governor" means the person for the time being lawfully administering the Government of Western Australia, or the lawfully appointed Deputy of such person.

I mention at this point that the framers of the Constitution Act envisaged circumstances where the Governor may be ill or

may retire, and accordingly made allowances for such circumstances. The Interpretation Act makes the following definition—

"Governor," or "Lieutenant-Governor" means the Governor of the State, or other the officer for the time being administering the Government of the State:

I refer now to Letters Patent which, as members will appreciate, constitutes the office of Governor of the State of Western Australia and its dependencies in the Commonwealth of Australia. Part XIII of Letters Patent reads as follows—

XIII. In the event of the office of the Governor becoming vacant, or of the Governor being incapable, or of his departure from the State, Our Lieutenant-Governor, or if there be no such Officer in the State, then such person or persons as We may appoint under Our Sign Manual and Signet shall, during Our pleasure, administer the Government of the State, first taking the Oaths hereinbefore directed to be taken by the Governor and in the manner herein prescribed; which being done, We do hereby authorise, empower, and command Our Lieutenant-Governor and every other such administrator as aforesaid, to do and execute, during Our pleasure, all things that belong to the Office of Governor according to the tenor of these Our Letters Patent, and according to Our instructions as aforesaid, and the Laws of the State.

In the light of those extracts and the fact that the name of the Governor is incidental in the motion, and as the important thing is that the motion be conveyed to Her Majesty the Queen and the governorship of the State be continuous and that no action should be taken to prevent it from being continuous, I rule the motion in order.

#### *Debate Resumed*

MR CRANE (Moore) [8.27 p.m.]: I speak tonight in reply to the Governor's Address. In doing so, I will discuss some of the problems concerning my electors in the electorate of Moore. Firstly, however, I should like to comment very favourably on the remarks made by the member for Katanning. I do not propose to go over the same ground covered so ably by the member for Katanning relating to decentralisation and the problems of the carriage of freight and the excessive freight charges borne by rural areas.

This has always been a pressing problem and I feel sure that our Government, which has pledged itself to be concerned with the problems of these people, will honour its promises. I thank the member for Katanning for bringing forward this matter; I will not take the time of the House by going over that issue again.

I should like to speak briefly tonight on other problems affecting rural areas. I refer firstly to hospitals and suggest to the House and the Government that perhaps, instead of spending a lot of money on extending the Royal Perth Hospital, we should seriously consider appointing a hospitals commission which could examine the proposed expenditure and would take into account the needs of the State as a whole. Many rural areas are sadly in need of improvements to their hospital facilities.

I note in the Governor's Speech that the Government proposes to initiate amending legislation in regard to death duties. I welcome this proposal and have no doubt that people in the rural areas, particularly those in business in the country and in the towns will also welcome the legislation. Many of these businesses are family concerns to whom the added burden of death duties is an unnecessary iniquity.

Moving on, I wish, briefly, to touch upon the superphosphate bounty, the withdrawal of which has caused a great deal of hardship in this State. However the full impact of this hardship has not yet been felt and will not come upon us for another 12 months. Whilst speaking on this subject I also wish to mention that the Industries Assistance Commission, was established by the Federal Government to review those matters which I would describe as being those on which members of Parliament do not have the courage to make a decision.

I am not particularly happy with the Industries Assistance Commission, because it could be used as a pigeon-hole in which to put aside something that could mean a great deal to people, but upon which a Government is reluctant to act. I would suggest that the Industries Assistance Commission should always be given a maximum of six months in which to arrive at a decision on any matter that is referred to it, because then it could not be used as a pigeon-hole, as I have suggested.

Speaking on the superphosphate bounty, we are immediately confronted with the problem of superphosphate itself. I have evidence of a serious cost anomaly in the price of superphosphate to Western Australian farmers. This is having a serious effect on Western Australia, particularly when it is considered that the use of superphosphate in this State is most necessary for agricultural production, and the viability of most farms depends on the supply of superphosphate at a reasonable price.

I will now outline the price structure of superphosphate relative to our Christmas Island supplies. I mention Christmas Island because that is the nearest source of rock phosphate to Western Australia. It is estimated that Christmas Island, as

far as rock phosphate supplies are concerned, has a life of 20 years ordinarily, and a life of 40 years if we can treat the mineral content of the rock, which I believe we can do. So it can be seen that Christmas Island will play an important part in the supply of rock phosphate to Western Australia for many years to come.

This rock is available at an estimated cost of \$7 a tonne f.o.b. at Christmas Island, or an estimated \$12 a tonne c.i.f. Fremantle. It is also estimated that \$25 a tonne is the cost of processing this rock phosphate. One tonne of rock phosphate, when processed, produces 1.65 tonnes of superphosphate. Therefore the approximate cost of superphosphate should be \$24 a tonne. However, an anomaly is found here. This morning I made a check and I found that the cost of superphosphate in Western Australia is approximately \$55 a tonne, which indicates a difference of \$31 a tonne.

I now ask this question: Who receives the extra \$31 the farmer is paying? I understand that \$37 million is being invested by the Federal Government, jointly with Broken Hill South, to develop the Duchess deposits of rock phosphate in Queensland. It is well to bear in mind that a percentage of these deposits in Queensland is not of high phosphate content, or as high as the Christmas Island rock phosphate, and therefore to keep the phosphate content up to 22 per cent more rock per tonne is needed.

I have been given information that the f.o.b. price at Townsville of rock phosphate from the Duchess deposits is \$33 a tonne, plus an estimated shipping cost of \$18 a tonne to Fremantle, and if we add to this the estimated \$25 a tonne processing charge, we arrive at a price of \$76 a tonne, bearing in mind that the phosphate content of this rock is not high enough to have the same conversion rate as the Christmas Island rock phosphate.

Another question I ask is one which we should ponder very carefully. The question is: Has a deal been made between the Federal Government and the Prices Justification Tribunal to keep the price of superphosphate in Western Australia high? As you know, Mr Speaker, it is \$55 a tonne. Is it purposely being kept high to justify the development of the Duchess deposits? The Western Australian farmers are being penalised by being asked to pay \$31 a tonne more for superphosphate than the price at which it should be available to them.

Another interesting point is that the Federal Government is very anxious that Christmas Island rock phosphate should be transported to Australia in Australian ships. At present only 10 per cent of it is being transported in Australian ships, but it is estimated that if Australian ships were

used to bring this rock phosphate to Australia instead of using cheaper shipping lines which are being used at present, the additional cost to Western Australian farmers would range between \$1.2 million and \$5 million, which is tantamount to saying that the Western Australian farmer must subsidise the Australian shipping line to that extent. This is another anomaly which is known and I believe it should be avoided at all costs.

Mr Davies: Did you give this information to the inquiry that was held into the matter? These are very enlightening figures. The inquiry was held here some weeks ago.

Mr CRANE: If I may continue and, in summing up, I come to three conclusions. The first is that Western Australian farmers are paying \$31 a tonne levy on superphosphate. The second is that the Federal Government and the Prices Justification Tribunal appear to be working in collusion to keep the price of superphosphate high in Western Australia to equalise costs in the Eastern States and to make the Duchess deposits development seem more viable. The third conclusion I arrive at is that there is urgent need in Western Australia for a new and honest competitor in the manufacture of superphosphate who will sell his product to the industry at a price it can afford to pay.

Also, in summing up, I would remind members that we are a Government which supports free enterprise, but not to the point where it results in a monopoly situation and leads to unbridled greed. These are four strong charges that I have made tonight, but I believe the figures I have quoted must be known and must be explored.

Sir Charles Court: Do you know what proportion of Christmas Island rock is used in Western Australia, compared with, say, the product of the Middle East and Nauru rock?

Mr CRANE: I am sorry I cannot supply those answers to the Premier at the moment, but I shall make inquiries and will let him know the information when I obtain it.

Sir Charles Court: Also, I was wondering whether you know the figure for Nauru rock phosphate.

Mr CRANE: No, I have been unable to obtain the figure for Nauru rock phosphate. The figure would probably be interesting and I could ask a question of the Minister for Agriculture tomorrow with a view to obtaining it. I may ask that question tomorrow or the next day in case I am too late to place it on the notice paper for tomorrow. So much for superphosphate.

I would now like to touch on several other matters, the first being the provision of housing in the country. This is a problem which has seriously affected my electorate. A housing problem exists in many

country towns, and this is brought about by the fact that the employers must pay additional wages to induce the people to work in country towns. It amounts to a loading imposed on country people.

As a result of the loading placed on country employers, the employees automatically become disqualified for housing provided by the Housing Commission, because of the additional wages they receive; in other words, their wages are too high to enable them to qualify and the commission will not provide them with housing. This is an unfair burden on the country people.

I suggest the Government should look seriously at the question of increasing the level of income eligibility for houses provided by the commission; and also at the possibility of country businessmen becoming guarantors to the State Housing Commission for houses erected in country towns. This is a very important point; and I hope the Minister for Housing, who is listening very intently, will explore this avenue.

Farm housing is a serious problem, because in this regard the same type of security for the lending of other housing finance is applicable. For that reason many people on rural properties have to live in inadequate buildings, and in many cases in very substandard buildings.

The economy of the nation is a matter which has always worried many people. I think Governments must take a more serious attitude to the economy and the policies espoused by economists. I would suggest that from a rural point of view the greatest enemy the rural industry faced over the last few years was Dr Coombs, because of the economic policies which he was instrumental in introducing. These have had a disastrous effect not only on the rural industry but also on the economy as a whole, and they have placed the nation in a very serious position.

I would recommend very strongly that members of Parliament, in particular Ministers of the Crown who after all have also been elected by the people to represent them, bear in mind their responsibilities to their electors. However, the electors do not appoint the advisers to the Government, and those advisers carry on irrespective of the Government in power. We should have the courage to make the decisions which we undertook to make when we faced the electors at the last election. I recall what Sir Winston Churchill said on one occasion when he was talking about economists. He said that if we laid them end to end they would not reach a conclusion. I am quite sure he was right, because the economists never seem to come up with the same answer.

I believe there is an urgent need, particularly in Western Australia, for the establishment of a rural bank—one which can serve the rural industry, and not be a

mere piggy-bank. There is a very real need in this country for a rural bank, and such a bank could offer three types of loans.

Firstly, there is the long-term, low-interest loan which has been talked about, but about which we never seem to do anything. Next there is the need for short-term finance. We should bear in mind that the person we help over a six-month period will remember us better than the person we help over a 15-year period. Thirdly, there is need for the provision of emergency finance, particularly during seasonal disasters and market disasters, such as the one facing the beef industry today.

At the present time the State Government should look very seriously at introducing a system whereby sufficient money can be made available to subsidise the interest that is payable by beef producers. When the Federal Government offered, I think, \$20 million at a rate of interest of 1½ per cent, it might just as well have taken a blunt knife and cut the throats of these poor producers who are trying so desperately to survive, because that high rate of interest will not benefit anybody. It will help to put the beef producers further into trouble.

On the whole we need to have a serious look at interest rates. People who think they are making a fortune out of investing a little money should bear in mind that inflation is taking away the interest as quickly as the invested money earns. I say that high interest rates are a contributing factor to inflation.

I hope that it will be possible to subsidise the interest rates payable by the beef producers who are in dire straits. On a \$1 million loan if we subsidise 5 per cent of the interest the amount involved would be only \$50 000; this is the amount that will enable beef producers to obtain \$1 million in assistance.

Still on the subject of beef, I am very concerned at the recent sale of 40 000 tonnes to Russia. It is all very well to make a sale, but in this case I understand the price to the producer represented a little less than 10c per pound. That means the beef producer in Australia is subsidising the housewife in Moscow for the beef she purchases. I suggest that if we think there is a need to provide a subsidy, charity should begin at home. Many people in Australia could and would eat more beef if the price were subsidised. I understand also that the Australian Government is paying approximately \$3 million for the shipment of that beef to Russia. This also represents a subsidy to some people. It should be borne in mind that there are people in Australia who can make as good use of this money as people in other countries.

One question which arises is: Did we offer such lucrative terms to people overseas who have been purchasing beef from

Australia for a long period? I do not know whether the Federal Government has made such an offer, but it is a pertinent question and bears answering.

I now turn to another problem which country towns face; that is, unemployment. There seems to be a growing band of people who do not have the slightest intention of obtaining employment. They are the loafers who are quite prepared to draw on social service for their upkeep; and these people are not confined to any particular colour or creed. These are just the people who do not want to work.

I am sure we all agree that people should not be paid a great deal of money if they are not prepared to work for it. In my view social service payments to fit and able people, who are not endeavouring to obtain employment, should be cut back to the absolute breadline.

Mr Harman: How would you do that?

Mr CRANE: I know that in this regard an anomaly exists. This has caused the Government a great deal of trouble in trying to determine who is and who is not employed. I suggest that identification is the only way to make such a determination. I am aware that many people do not like being compelled to carry identity cards, but I would suggest that each person be provided with a passport, which he has to produce when he collects his social service payments. By this means we would prevent people from making a racket of social service payments.

Recently a problem arose in Moora with Aborigines. The incident was reported in the newspapers, but unfortunately it was not reported correctly. One great need in country towns is consideration by the Government to increasing the number of police officers. For some time the people of Moora have been asking for the appointment of more police officers there.

I am not placing the blame on the Aborigines or the whites for what happened in the recent incident at Moora. I am saying there has been an increasing incidence of crime at Moora and, I believe, in other country towns; for that reason steps should be taken to nip the problem in the bud.

In my young days when a boy started to play up the local policeman would give him his No. 10 boot in the backside. If the boy went home and told his father about being kicked he would get another one for good measure.

Nowadays if a policeman raised even a finger against a youngster he would face a threat of being sued. As a result of this trend today we find a greater incidence of delinquency and less regard for law and order.

I would like to make one comment about the Aborigines. Someone the other day referred to wool harvesting. I have been a farmer for many years and I hope that one day a successful wool harvesting

machine will be introduced, but I fail to see how we will ever get away from the person who pushes the hand piece. I hope we do, but I do not think it will be possible any more than I believe the day will ever be reached when our hair will be cut by anyone but a barber.

I would remind members that many years ago the Aboriginal people were very good shearers and they still can be. They are kind to animals, and, as many old-timers will agree, they do not knock animals about as much as the white people do. If social service payments were not so easily obtainable I am sure we could encourage Aborigines to take their place on the shearing stands and in this way we could help them make a much more useful contribution to the economy of the State, to their families, and to their own well-being. They would be fed well and, as a result, they would be better citizens and workers.

In the Governor's Speech reference was made to the Ord River and I would like to touch briefly on this subject. I know a tremendous amount of money has been spent in the area, but I would suggest that perhaps the CSIRO and the Department of Agriculture should very seriously consider the growing of rice in that area. I know that immediately people will say the magpie geese will eat the rice, but I feel the experience at Humpty Doo was a rather slapstick affair. If we consider the potential market for rice in the islands north of Australia we must realise that the growing of rice on the Ord would be worth consideration. An intensive breeding programme would be necessary to develop the varieties which would grow under the irrigation system up there. I believe that such a programme would be a money spinner and that we would thus make use of an otherwise useless \$40 million or \$50 million hole in the ground.

Speaking of our customers north of Australia brings me to a subject which is rather touching at the moment and with which I wish to deal, briefly. The situation is rather sad and unfortunate. I refer of course to the atrocities and slaughter in South Vietnam.

Mr Bryce: It has been going on for 10 years.

Mr CRANE: I realise that, but I would remind members that without friends the people of South Vietnam at present face the world. I also remind members that in the autumn of 1940 it was Britain and her Commonwealth countries which without a friend faced a foe for a brief time when Europe was overrun. Some of us remember this vividly although the younger members may not. For a time Britain and the Commonwealth countries stood alone in defence of democracy. Churchill summed up the situation when he said that the old lion stood at bay with only her cubs at her side.



We know what it is like to be alone with no-one to help us. Now those in South Vietnam are experiencing this situation because the free world has deserted them. I object to the fact that while this slaughter is continuing the Australian Government has had here and harboured representatives of North Vietnam. This is almost tantamount to saying they are jolly good fellows. I object to such a situation while the slaughter is continuing.

The agreement made in Paris was that those in the north stay in the north and those in the south would remain there. A demilitarised zone was established and we were told that we could trust the communist. Let me assure members that we can trust the communist to be a communist, but that is about as far as our trust can go. I object to the fact that these people have been harboured in Australia.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CRANE: I would like to ask: where are the people who marched a few years ago in objection to the slaughter of innocent men, women, and children?

Mr Bryce: Where were you then?

Mr CRANE: Where was Dr Cairns who led and talked of moratoriums?

Mr Bryce: Where were you?

Mr CRANE: The honourable member knows where I was and where I was 30 years ago when I was fighting in defence of my country and the heritage handed to me, a heritage for which I would fight again.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CRANE: Where is Dr Cairns now? Where are the communist sympathisers? We know where they are.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CRANE: We know where they are all right.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member please resume his seat? The honourable member on his feet must be heard in comparative silence. I cannot have a concert of interjections. It is quite unfair to the speaker on his feet. The member for Moore.

Mr CRANE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will be heard!

Mr Jamieson: Heil Hitler!

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CRANE: We know that South Vietnam has practically gone. We know that Cambodia is well on its way.

Mr Barnett: So are you.

Mr CRANE: Who will be next? Will it be Thailand or perhaps Malaysia?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CRANE: Will it be Singapore? Who will be next? Will it be Indonesia and then do we move further south? Will Darwin be next, and then Kununurra?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member please resume his seat? I must ask members to behave in a more orderly fashion. There is always a temptation for members to argue with other members across the Chamber. Try to refrain from this and behave in an orderly manner, particularly when I have called members to order in a general fashion. In any case, reiterative-type interjections are quite disorderly and I will have to take action if members continue to act in such a fashion. The member for Moore.

Mr CRANE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will proceed. I was hoping—and I am sure we can all hope—we would get consistency from our leaders.

Mr Barnett: And from the Government.

Mr CRANE: We should expect that when people have said that we must end this senseless slaughter they would be consistent; but where are they now? Where is Dr Cairns now?

Mr A. R. Tonkin: In Canberra.

Mr CRANE: Perhaps I should apologise to Dr Cairns because he really has been consistent. Dr Cairns always has been in the past, still is, and I have not a doubt that he always will be, sympathetic to the communist cause. He has shown this by his actions.

Mr Bryce: Rubbish!

Mr CRANE: Never mind about rubbish.

Mr Bryce: He would be as much a communist as you would be a nazi.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

#### *Withdrawal of Remarks*

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I request that those words be withdrawn, because they are certainly highly objectionable to me.

Mr O'Neil: Are you Dr Cairns?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: That has nothing to do with it. The words are objectionable to any decent Australian.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot ask for a withdrawal of those remarks; they have no application to him. But I must say that members should be very careful not to reflect on members of other Parliaments including

members in another place within our own parliamentary structure. From time to time those on both sides of the House have reflected on members in the Federal sphere. I have not taken a stand on the matter, but members must be very careful and watch their behaviour as members of Parliament. So I ask the member for Moore to guard his words and I make the same request to all members. The member for Moore.

### *Debate Resumed*

Mr CRANE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I thought I heard someone say, "Hell Hitler" to me, but that does not matter; perhaps he will say it again outside a little later.

Mr Sodeman: I do not think so.

Mr CRANE: I would remind members that the late Billy Hughes once said that Australia is a white island in a yellow sea. Well, I hope the sea does not turn crimson. I also remind those people who are sympathisers with the communist cause that the communists are moving steadily southwards, and that he who sups with the devil needs a long spoon.

Mr Jamieson: You need a suit of armour.

Mr CRANE: We have only just moved through the Easter period.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Bryce: The Catholics and the Jews have—

The SPEAKER: Order! I am asking the member to come to order.

Mr CRANE: As we know, just before his crucifixion our Lord was betrayed by people who he had every right to believe were his friends.

Mr Jamieson: Liberal, like you.

Sir Charles Court: It is interesting to hear Opposition members tonight.

Mr CRANE: I would remind members opposite, if they will give me an opportunity to do so, that every rocket, every shell, and every bullet that takes the life of an innocent and defenceless South Vietnamese—man, woman, or child—is in itself another crucifixion.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Has the member ever heard me deny that?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CRANE: All that is necessary for the downward scourge of communism to continue is that strong and responsible men do nothing. I hope that world leaders are strong men and that their consciences are not in keeping with their apparent lack of intestinal fortitude. Only history will show whether what I am saying tonight is on the eve of democracy or on the dawn of its awakening.

Mr Bryce: Are you suggesting that South Vietnam is a democratic country?

Mr CRANE: I am suggesting that the South Vietnamese are being slaughtered unnecessarily.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Sir Charles Court: What we read tomorrow should be very interesting.

Mr CRANE: It seems that I have stirred up a bull ants' nest.

Mr Jamieson: You would not know if you had.

Mr CRANE: May I conclude my contribution to the Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech by referring briefly to Sir Hughie Edwards, VC. It is a sad fact that he has retired from office, but how many of us are really aware of what has brought about his retirement. On Anzac Day we remember those who fell during the war in the cause of peace and in the cause of justice. Many monuments have been built in memory of those people. However, no monuments have been built to the wounded who are still with us and who are suffering for the sacrifices they have made. We should remember that they themselves have built their own memorials in having provided the opportunities, the justice, and the freedom we enjoy.

I remind members that Sir Hughie Edwards played his part in the defence of our principles and, as a result, he suffers an illness which has caused him a great deal of concern and forced him to make yet another sacrifice; his high seal of office.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: He fought against fascism and not for it.

Mr CRANE: In conclusion, on behalf of Australia and the free people of the world I thank Sir Hughie Edwards, VC, for the contribution he has made.

Mr Hartrey: So do we.

Mr CRANE: God save the Queen!

MR McIVER (Avon) [9.05 p.m.]: Before I speak to the subject matter of the motion before the House, I would like to report to you, Mr Speaker, that despite the report in tonight's issue of the *Daily News*, I have not formed my own Government; I have not defected from the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia, inasmuch as I have been reported as the MHR for Northam. I also point out that my name is still McIver and not McGiver.

Having said that, I want to make the statement that it is quite clear—and it should be clear to all members of Parliament—the Press in Western Australia is in a farcical situation. I know a little about the newspaper business. In fact when I left school I almost became a lino operator apprentice. I am aware that when reports are prepared they are read by proof readers. The report to which I have referred demonstrates how little our Press knows about Parliament.

I do not take offence at the report. My surname receives some shocking treatment with regard to spelling and pronunciation. Perhaps members of Parliament sometimes get carried away with their own importance and feel that if their names appear often enough in the Press this will appeal to the electors. However, if we examine the situation in a realistic manner we find it does not make very much impression.

I want to refer briefly to the remarks made by the member for Gascoyne in this House just recently when speaking to the Address-in-Reply. I, for one, challenge his remarks and I take strong exception to them. They were the most malicious statements I have heard during the years I have been in this Parliament. They were not the remarks of a member of Parliament, but the remarks of a most malicious, self-opinionated conceited fop. That is my opinion of his remarks. I take strong exception to his statement that members on this side of the House have never done a day's work in their lives. When one looks around the Chamber and observes the calibre of the men who sit here, and knows their educational qualifications and their standing within the community before they entered Parliament, one is most certainly convinced that what I am saying can be substantiated.

When speaking in this Chamber we do make mistakes from time to time. We do get carried away and it is quite evident that the member for Gascoyne in referring specifically to the member for Morley was incensed by his remarks. Perhaps the member for Morley had touched a raw spot, but I cannot allow the remarks of the member for Gascoyne to go unchallenged.

I certainly am not in the group referred to as those who come into this House with their bellies hanging over their belts. During my time in this House I have contributed much to the community which I serve. I most certainly have done eight hours' work for eight hours' pay. The member for Gascoyne has a long way to go in this Chamber. I do not intend to dwell on his statements, but I say, constructively, that his remarks were most unjust and most undignified.

Mr Bryce: Scurrilous; depraved.

Mr McIVER: From time to time I have said that the policies of the coalition Government have been based on hypocrisy and I now wish to speak for a short time to substantiate that statement and to further enlighten the members of this Chamber.

Recently, my home town of Northam had the pleasure of a visit from the now Leader of the Australian Opposition (Mr Fraser). I do not mention this with the intention of speaking in a derogatory manner of any Federal member. I have regard for what you said previously, Mr Speaker—that we

should not reflect on our Federal colleagues, irrespective of the party they represent. However, I think the headlines reveal the hypocrisy.

I refer to the headline in the *Northam Advertiser* of the 13th February, 1975, when Mr Fraser said he was not interested in party leadership. I am aware of your ruling in relation to newspaper cuttings, Mr Speaker, but I will be very brief. Mr Fraser is reported as saying—

"I give Bill Snedden my complete support. There is no contest", Mr Malcolm Fraser, Opposition spokesman on industrial relations, said at a luncheon arranged by the Northam Branch of the Liberal Party at Northam on February 8.

Mr Fraser replied to questions put to him by members of the Northam Branch of the Liberal Party because of previous Press reports, and this appeared in the newspaper—

Fraser would challenge Mr Snedden for leadership of the Liberal Party at the next election.

The point I make in this Chamber tonight is that it was quite evident on the 13th February that Mr Fraser had his sights set on the leadership, and it was no surprise that *The West Australian* of the 19th March, 1975, carried the headline, "Fraser to challenge". I think that substantiates my statement in relation to the hypocrisy of the Liberal Party.

This is not something new. It is something the Liberal Party was born with when it became a political party. The hypocrisy is increasing and it is no wonder the Liberal Party is in such disarray and there is no unity among its members, regardless of the reports in the Press which tries to prop up the Liberal Party. And of course, it is no wonder we have such statements as that of Mr Peacock, who was no doubt a little put out because he was not challenging Mr Fraser. In *The West Australian* of the 20th March we find the headline, "Peacock: I'd fight Fraser". So it looks as though Mr Fraser will be the next one to get the axe.

Where will it finish? The point I emphasise is that this situation is not good for Australia, generally. Governments are only as strong as their Opposition.

Mr Sodeman: Except this one.

Mr Young: He did not want the deputy leadership and he did not want the leadership. Next, he will not want the Prime Ministership.

Mr McIVER: It cannot be denied that it is a shocking situation. I am not interested in who leads the Liberal Party, because no doubt it will be in Opposition for many years in the future, following this.

Mr Sodeman: Well, why mention it?

Mr McIVER: Because I happen to be speaking. It is something the honourable member never does.

Mr Sodeman: He will.

Mr Coyne: Did you not say something about hypocrisy?

Mr McIVER: I raise these matters in relation to Federal members of all parties coming to such an important rural centre as my electorate of Northam. Instead of trying to get on the political bandwagon and belittling the Government or the Opposition of the day, it might be to their advantage to liaise with the local member and discuss with him the various problems of the electorate. I think that would be much more to their advantage and to the advantage of the community and the nation than trying to play politics wherever they go. If the local member for a rural area is not of the same political colour as a Liberal or Country Party member, he never sees them and nobody is interested in conferring with him.

Mr Rushton: Fair go! We went to Northam together.

Mr McIVER: I am speaking about the Federal sphere. I am not reflecting on members of the State Government. I appreciate what the Minister did in Northam. I think he would agree with me, because he could not go to a centre such as Northam and say today, "I am not interested in party leadership", and say in a fortnight's time, "Because of pressure from my colleagues I will take it on." I think I know enough about life to know it must have been in the member's mind all the time. So let us face up to reality and have no humbug on that score.

From my brief reference to the Federal situation, it is quite obvious to all that the Whitlam Government will be in office for many years to come. This brings me to the statement of the member for Moore. For the life of me I do not know why Country Party members pursue the line of criticising the Australian Government for removing the superphosphate subsidy and so on when this country has never had a Government which has helped the rural sector so much.

Mr Stephens: I trust you will develop this argument and give us some examples.

Mr McIVER: I will certainly do that. I do not want to disappoint the Minister or anybody else. I believe when one makes a statement one must substantiate it. I would be the last person in this Parliament to get up and speak for the sake of speaking and waste the time of the House.

We have recently heard from many members of the Government that the removal by the Australian Government of the petrol tax subsidy would cripple the farming industry and cause farmers to leave their properties. But let us look at the facts as supplied by the Bureau of Census and Statistics. I will refer only to Western Australia because this is the Parliament of Western

Australia and this is the State in which we are interested. I will quote from a sheet of statistics supplied by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics the situation in relation to the Federal electorate of Forrest.

Mr Cowan: Did the removal of the fuel subsidy help farmers?

Mr McIVER: No, but it did not affect them adversely, either.

Mr Cowan: You said the Federal Government had done so much to help farmers.

Mr McIVER: If the honourable member wants to be biased and bigoted, it would not matter what I said. Would he just show a little courtesy and listen?

Mr Skidmore: Explain the meaning of the word to him.

Mr McIVER: The figures for Forrest show: Albany nil, Bridgetown nil, Bunbury nil, Busselton nil, Collie nil. The figure for the Federal Kalgoorlie seat is nil. In my area, the Central Province, which is in the heart of the wheatbelt, the figures are: Goomalling nil, Merredin nil, Moora nil. The previous speaker mentioned how the policies of the Australian Government were affecting his electorate. No doubt it will be a shock to him but the figures from the Bureau of Census and Statistics state in black and white—

Mr Sodeman: What is it?

Mr Bryce: The effect on farmers of the removal of the fuel subsidy.

Mr McIVER: This is how it is affecting these farmers—Goomalling nil, Merredin nil, Northam nil, Three Springs—here is something, 1 per cent.

Mr Jamieson: He is not here!

Mr McIVER: Wubin, 1.9 per cent. Then we come to my electorate—Beverley 0.5 per cent, Esperance nil—we have heard a lot about Esperance at times—

Mr Bryce: That's a joke.

Mr McIVER: —Katanning 0.9 per cent, Narrogin nil.

Mr O'Connor: Laverton?

Mr Old: What are these figures please?

Mr McIVER: This is a release put out by the Bureau of Census and Statistics relating to the effect of the removal of the petrol subsidy on rural areas.

Sir Charles Court: How about Halls Creek?

Mr Old: Is that supposed to be freights for those areas?

Mr McIVER: This is an authentic document—

Mr Old: I challenge it.

Sir Charles Court: The figure cannot be nil.

Mr McIVER: The member for Kataning has challenged these figures. This is an authentic document produced by the Australian Bureau of Census and Statistics. If the bureau is wrong, I cannot be held responsible for that. I have the document here if the member wishes to peruse it at any time.

#### *Tabling of Document*

Mr OLD: Mr Speaker, could I ask that that document be tabled?

Mr Jamieson: If you were half awake, you would have one in your possession.

The SPEAKER: The member for Avon has been asked to table the papers. Are they personal notes, or will he table them in due course?

Mr McIVER: No, these are not personal notes; it is common knowledge, Sir. I know these figures did not appear in the *Farmers' Weekly*, but I have them here and I will certainly table them.

Mr H. D. Evans: Ask leave to have the figures included in *Hansard*.

Sir Charles Court: You cannot do that.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Mr McIVER: The second point I want to make is in relation to the hypocrisy of the coalition Government when the Australian Government announced that there would be no export of wheat to Chile. This caused a great uproar and our State Government said, "Good heavens, the Australian Government is forcing another wedge into the rural community of this State." However, the State Government forgot to say that the Australian Government advised—it did not direct—the Wheat Board should look at this matter again because of the possibility of industrial eruption if the wheat was sent to Chile.

Let us cast our minds back to the time of the Federal Liberal Party Government. When President Allende of Chile was elected, the then Government did not advise, it directed. If the member for Katanning wants this document tabled, he can certainly have it tabled. Also, I will supply him with the dates of the debate in the Federal Parliament. There was no mention of this matter in the rural newspapers of this State. If ever the farmers needed to export wheat to Chile, or to anywhere—when quotas were at their most stringent—it was at that time. Where were the Country Party and Liberal Party voices at that time? They were absolutely silent. However, now that the Labor Party is in power, we hear that the Australian Government is crucifying rural producers and the farmers of Western Australia. What a lot of humbug. It is quite evident that the smokescreen which has been put up by the State Government is dying away, and the people are learning the real truth.

I have often wondered at the different political philosophies of farmers with holdings adjacent to each other. One man with

a small acreage will support the Labor Party, another the Country Party, and a third the Liberal Party. They all face the same challenges and the same market problems. How is it that the policies of the Australian Government affect only the farmers who support the Country Party or the Liberal Party, while the farmer who supports the Labor Party carries on with his work, pays for his superphosphate and his increased rates without any objection?

Mr Sodeman: What a ridiculous statement.

Mr McIVER: Why is it ridiculous?

Mr Sodeman: Do you mean that farmers who support the Labor Party have not objected to any of the causes and effects you have just mentioned? Not one has objected—goodness me!

Mr McIVER: It is quite obvious that the honourable member did not follow the text of my comments.

Sir Charles Court: I think he did.

Mr McIVER: I referred to three farmers with adjoining acreages, and I asked why the policies of the Australian Government do not affect the Labor man, and yet they affect the other farmers who do not support Labor philosophies.

Sir Charles Court: You said that the Labor man did not complain.

Mr McIVER: He does not. Further to the Premier's interjection—

Sir Charles Court: You have a couple of staunch supporters who farm in your electorate and who certainly do complain.

Mr McIVER: Many farmers in my electorate have told me they are quite happy with the present situation.

Sir Charles Court: You amaze me.

Mr McIVER: If the Premier would like these names supplied, I would be only too happy to supply them on a confidential basis.

So the smokescreen that was used to try to cover up what the Liberal Government did during its 12-year term has just gone by the board.

The member for Moore quoted figures for superphosphate produced from Christmas Island rock phosphate. His energies, and the energies of those who support him, would be far better spent looking at the figures of the producers of superphosphate in the various centres of this State; namely, Albany, Perth and Geraldton. The honourable member should investigate whether the increased price of superphosphate is justified. I have received some very good information in relation to the acids used in the manufacture of the product. I have been told that the prices of the ingredients of superphosphate have not increased for five years. And yet, these producers tell the farmers that the increase in the price of superphosphate is due to the increased cost of production.

The Government should be looking at these production figures rather than belittling the Australian Government. If the Premier and his Cabinet investigate whether the increased prices are justified, they will be working for the benefit of their constituents and the people who support them.

On the 9th May, the Federal Minister for Agriculture (Senator Wriedt) will address a meeting in Northam.

Mr Young: Is this an invitation?

Mr McIVER: As I was informed of this meeting, I wrote to the various farmer organisations in my electorate. Up to the present time I have received only one reply. If the farmers of Western Australia are as concerned as the member for Katanning would have us believe, one would have thought I would need to hire two halls to accommodate all the farmers with complaints. All I have had to date is one telephone call. Here is a golden opportunity to tackle the man who makes the problems for them; to challenge the policies of the Australian Government. One would assume from the lack of interest that things are not too bad in the rural sector.

Mr Sodeman: Why would they write to you when they know you are of the same colour as the Federal Government and support its policies?

Mr McIVER: Rubbish! I wrote to the farmer organisations as the member for the district. Good heavens, where did the Liberal Party get him from?

Mr. T. D. Evans: The question is: Where is he going?

Mr McIVER: I am not the only one who says that the policies of the Australian Government are helping the farmers. I am supported in my comments by our own Deputy Premier.

I refer to the *Western Farmer and Grazier* of the 27th March, 1975. The article refers to a woolorama held in Wagin. I am sorry the Deputy Premier is not in his seat to hear this. We have all heard him speaking in this Parliament in the last 12 months and castigating the Australian Government for the shocking decisions it has made in regard to farmers; but on this occasion this is what the report said—

Mr McPharlin tossed a surprise bouquet to the Federal Government for its provision of loan monies to stabilise the industry.

I am speaking, of course, of the wool industry.

Mr Davies: What date was that?

Mr McIVER: The 27th March.

Mr Davies: That is not long ago.

Mr McIVER: That is right. The following is what the Deputy Premier said—

"To give credit where credit is due—the Commonwealth Government is helping in a very constructive way to stabilise your present economic position," he said.

"I came here also to tell you to keep your heads. Not to press the panic button and get frightened into implementing short-sighted measures to your long term detriment," he added.

The main context of his address was how he was being assisted by the Australian Government. That is a different attitude from the one he adopted six or nine months ago when no doubt he had to join forces with the Premier to castigate the Australian Government.

Mr Old: What did he say about beef? Did you read that bit?

Mr McIVER: He was speaking at a woolorama, and naturally he could not speak on beef.

Mr Old: He did.

Mr McIVER: Well, I will touch on that in a moment. I come from an area in which there is little beef production; I am a sheep and wheat man.

It is no wonder that, along with the Deputy Premier, the people of Australia have suddenly realised what a fine Government they have. I am merely echoing their sentiments.

Mr Sodeman: Would you like some copies of letters from another area?

Mr McIVER: In the *Daily News* of the 2nd April we find the headline, "Poll shows dramatic jump in Labor popularity". So it is no wonder we do not now hear talk of an early election. There is no longer talk of blocking the Supply Bill; that has gone by the board. Now it is a case of. "Hold on to the ship at all costs before it sinks."

Mr Bryce: Fraser wants time.

Mr McIVER: Yes, Fraser wants time, but it is too late. The boat has departed. Twelve months ago I would have been the first to say the Federal Opposition had a fighting chance, but that chance has passed; and when one is in the big ring one gets only one punch and if one misses one is carted out. That is how it happens on the national scene. The Australian Government wanted time to implement the policies for which it was given a mandate on two occasions within a short time.

Mr Laurance: To run a criminal-type deficit.

Mr McIVER: The Australian Government has a mandate given to it by 700,000 people over and above those who support the party of the member for Gascoyne and the other little groups which support his party. The member for Gascoyne is buried up there in that little centre of Carnarvon and does not see the outside

world. He is so bigoted and biased, only expressing the opinions he feels are so righteous and pious.

Mr Laurance: I am entitled to do so.

Mr McIVER: The honourable member is not entitled to say what he did say earlier in this debate.

Mr Young: How do you think the State Government would go if it had a deficit of \$250 million?

Mr McIVER: If we had an election next Saturday what a fiasco it would be.

Sir Charles Court: There would be a new member for Avon.

Mr McIVER: The only thing I would be disappointed about is that we would be talking to ourselves because there would be no members opposite.

Mr Young: Would you like to hazard a guess on what the inflation rate will be at the end of the year?

Mr McIVER: I wish also to touch on the Premier's visit to Japan. Since he has been the Premier it is appalling and saddening to find that when he visits other countries he knocks the Australian Government, and as the Premier of Western Australia and an Australian I think it does him very little credit. I do not quarrel with the fact that he visits overseas countries, because it is most important for our State that he should do so; however, I think he could put up a better performance. He knocked the Australian Government from Tokyo. He also knocked our Prime Minister who, in the several visits he has made overseas, has made the Australian nation 15 feet tall throughout the world.

Sir Charles Court: You silly little boy; you go abroad and find the damage he has done to this country.

Mr Jamieson: You are a saboteur.

Sir Charles Court: Take yourself to America, the UK, Germany, or Japan and see what he has done.

Mr Bryce: Didn't you please the tycoons in Japan?

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask members to keep order. It is unfair that the member for Avon should be unable to present his case. The member for Avon.

Mr McIVER: The Premier has sniped at the Australian Government—

Sir Charles Court: I didn't snipe; I gave the facts straightout.

Mr McIVER: Even the leader in *The West Australian* was on our side in relation to this, and that is most unusual.

Mr Bryce: He was un-Australian.

Sir Charles Court: Don't you talk about being un-Australian after what you said about supporting the communist regime in Vietnam. You wouldn't know what being an Australian is.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Avon.

Mr McIVER: If Mr Whitlam has created such a bad image, why is it that he has even received an invitation from the President of the United States to go to the White House for a luncheon? I have not a great deal of knowledge of American politics, but I understand that for a Prime Minister of a country to be given an invitation to a luncheon at the White House is something of which he can be very proud.

Sir Charles Court: It is the least you can expect when you go as the head of a nation.

Mr McIVER: I did not see Mr McMahon or previous Liberal Prime Ministers going to the White House, although I am aware that Sonia gave an imitation of Gipsy Rose Lee while in America.

Sir Charles Court: Do you know what happened on Mr Whitlam's last visit to America? Have you checked on that?

Mr McIVER: Perhaps someone with much better authority than I have would be the best judge of this. I refer to the recently retired High Commissioner in London (Mr Armstrong). When he returned to Australia he said in relation to the trip by Sir Charles Court—

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out that you should refer to him as the Premier and not by name.

Mr McIVER: Mr Armstrong, when referring to the circus tour of Europe by the Premiers of Western Australia and Queensland—

Mr Jamieson: It was a three-ring event.

Mr McIVER: —said in *The West Australian* of the 28th February that the visit had gone practically unnoticed.

Sir Charles Court: That is very different from what Mr Armstrong told me personally in London.

Mr Bryce: Now, we have only your word for that. We just do not accept that.

Mr B. T. Burke: He would tell you anything.

Mr McIVER: I do not know what Mr Armstrong said.

Sir Charles Court: There were 700 people there. That completely discredits Mr Armstrong after the statement he made publicly in London.

Mr McIVER: After 12 months, all the Premier has done has been to belittle the Australian Government. I say this constructively.

Sir Charles Court: I have not belittled the Australian Government; it has belittled itself. I have attacked that Government.

Mr McIVER: If the Premier had unveiled some positive thinking, action, and decisions, the people of this State would be in a far better position than the one they face today. I do not say that because I do not agree with the Premier's political philosophy.

Sir Charles Court: Not much!

Mr McIVER: I say it because I am echoing the sentiments of people who have supported him very loyally over a period of time.

Mr Sodeman: How plous!

Sir Charles Court: Why do you not go back 12 months? You are behind the times. The Labor Party started this 12 months ago.

Mr McIVER: At this point, I wish to deal with this Government's 12 months in office and discuss what it has done.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: That will not take you long.

Mr McIVER: All it has done has been to place imposts upon the people of Western Australia far greater than any other Government has imposed previously. I say this in all fairness to the Government, bearing in mind the inflationary trend which we are experiencing.

I refer firstly to increased water rates. Surely those members sitting behind the Government who support rural areas will agree with me that the increased water rate is seriously affecting rural people and producers in Western Australia. The rate of 6c in the dollar was increased to 7.5c in the dollar, not only to the ordinary householder but also to sporting bodies throughout Western Australia. The sporting bodies have been affected to the tune of thousands of dollars.

At this stage of my speech on the Address-in-Reply, I make a special plea to the Government on behalf of the Northam Race Club, the Northam Bowling Club, and other sporting bodies throughout Western Australia. As sports-minded Australians, we sometimes like to relax and enjoy the hospitality offered by various sporting clubs throughout this State.

Last year, the Northam Race Club used 39 600 kl of water and, at 5.5c a kl, the total charge was \$2 182. This Government came to office and immediately altered its status from general purpose to commercial. If the Northam Race Club uses the same amount of water this year—in fact, it will use in excess of that amount—the cost will be \$8 628, an increase of 395 per cent.

I say in all fairness to members: How can a country race club meet those charges? The increase relates to one item only; namely, water. This is the Government which says it is going to do everything for country people and everything to increase decentralisation. Here is just one typical example of how it intends to crucify the country people.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes remaining.

Mr McIVER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. A householder now has a minimum rate of \$20. The person who previously paid \$16 now pays a minimum of \$20.

Sir Charles Court: You have got it base over apex; it is a maximum of \$20.

Mr McIVER: The minimum water rate is \$20. Thus, the low income earner has had his rate of \$16 increased to \$20.

Sir Charles Court: No.

Mr McIVER: But the person who lives in a \$100 000 home will only pay \$20 in water rates. I agree that the charge should have been increased, but that person should have been paying \$72, not \$20.

Sir Charles Court: It is a maximum.

Mr McIVER: It is typical of this Government; there is one rule for the rich and another for the poor. Members opposite have always agreed with this philosophy.

Sir Charles Court: It is a maximum of \$20.

Mr McIVER: Let the Premier talk to officers of the Public Works Department and see what they think.

Mr Sodeman: You are wrong. It is a maximum of \$20.

Mr McIVER: I am not wrong; I am absolutely correct.

Mr Sodeman: May I say this to you—

Mr McIVER: No, the honourable member may not.

Mr Sodeman: You do not want to be corrected.

Mr McIVER: It is unfortunate that the Minister for Education is not a member of this Chamber. In fact, it is a shocking situation. Education is an important issue, yet we cannot question the Minister for Education directly on educational matters. No doubt this represents another tactic of this Government.

I should like to bring a few matters to the attention of the Minister for Housing. I refer particularly to State Housing Commission activities in country areas. Too many companies are tendering for the construction of State Housing Commission homes and are going bankrupt in the first three weeks of operation, or within a very short period after that.

I believe the Housing Commission must examine this matter. It must either allow people to build more houses or make its tenders more attractive to builders if it is to construct the required number of houses in country districts, which are badly needed to assist people in these areas.

As the present Minister for Housing was also Minister for Housing in the previous Liberal-Country Party Government and has great experience in this portfolio, I



am sure he accepts that my remarks have substance. Too many builders and contractors are going broke building State houses and the shocking situation is that we are still not getting the houses built because they must be retendered and go through the whole process once again. In the meantime, of course, the country people are not getting State houses constructed.

The final matter to which I wish to refer is a trivial one relating to the allocation of hot water systems. The officers of the Housing Commission must be advised whether or not finance is available to provide hot water systems, rather than send letters to constituents such as the one sent to a man who was 83 years of age asking him to supply a doctor's certificate indicating whether or not he could chop wood. What a ludicrous situation!

I do not like to use the time of this Parliament to raise such a trivial matter, but I am sure the Minister is not aware of these problems. He must examine the operations of his department and put his officers in the picture in relation to the submissions made by members of Parliament. Members of Parliament should not have to write to the Minister about such trivial problems as maintenance to State houses and hot water systems.

If I were Minister for Housing, I feel sure I would not be pleased to receive such trivial requests from members of Parliament and I ask the Minister to do something about the situation.

I say finally that the people of Western Australia are in no way impressed by the 12 months of this Government. I know that according to today's issue of the *Daily News*, the Government is supposed to be going great guns. That may be so in St. George's Terrace among the people with whom the Government is familiar; but members opposite should go over the ranges and out into the rural areas and talk to the people there and see what they have to say.

Sir Charles Court: I have been.

Mr McIVER: I feel I am justified in saying that in 1977 Mr Tonkin will be returned as Premier of this State.

Mr Coyne: The Leader of the Opposition is staying on then, is he?

MR HARTREY (Boulder-Dundas) [9.48 p.m.]: I have pleasure in supporting the motion proposed on opening day with such grave and weighty earnestness by the member for Katanning. It is not inappropriate that I should quote it—

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.

Unfortunately, the Excellency to whom that expression originally was directed has retired in circumstances which I am sure we all regret. It is a convention to deem that he was pleased to deliver the Speech in question, however much it might have been against his personal inclination.

However, I am always happy to associate myself with expressions of loyalty to our Gracious Sovereign, the Sovereign of our State, our Commonwealth, and all her realms and territories beyond the three great oceans whose waters lap our silver shores.

Mr Davies: Not the yellow seas!

Mr HARTREY: Order!

As a matter of fact, in this year of grace which is dedicated to international womanhood, it is not irrelevant to remember that Salic law has never had anything to do with English law, or Scottish law, either, and that for the last 900 years no woman has ever been excluded, solely by reason of her sex, from wearing the highest diadem bestowed by an English-speaking nation, the Crown of the realm.

I am happy also to be reminded by this motion that we are the Legislative Assembly in this Parliament assembled and that, together with our colleagues in another place, we are the Parliament of Western Australia. All too often, I am afraid, we are inclined to overlook that point; that we are elected by the people of this State. We hear so much about the "Australian Parliament" which has arrogated unto itself a title which has not been given to it under the Australian Constitution, and it is as well that we should sometimes recall that we are still the Parliament of Western Australia.

Not many prizes have fallen to my lot in the course of a long and misspent life, but one I will always keep in mind is that I have twice been elected to represent my birthplace in the Parliament of my State. Hence on first being elected to this House, I resolved that not only would I, as in duty bound, uphold the rights and privileges of the House, but also that I would continue, as I have always done, to resist any erosion, any annexation, and any subversion of the rights and privileges of those residuary powers of the State guaranteed by the Constitution of the Australian Commonwealth, to which I hope, I am loyal as any man in Australia.

Under section 107 of the Australian Constitution it is expressly provided—

Every power of the Parliament of a Colony which has become or becomes a State, shall, unless it is by this Constitution exclusively vested in the Parliament of the Commonwealth or withdrawn from the Parliament of the State, continue as at the establishment of the Commonwealth, . . .

Those words mean that the residual powers—the powers not given by the Constitution to the central Government—are essentially the powers of the States. I am not however much given to the expression "State rights", because a State does not need rights; it is the people in the State who need them, so that the rights of a State are the rights of the citizens of the State. That is a very important consideration, for fairly obvious reasons.

I need hardly remind members what are embraced by those residual powers that are guaranteed by section 107 of the Constitution. You, Mr Speaker, are very familiar with them yourself. They are vitally necessary to any tolerable human existence. They include water supplies, with their concomitants of drainage and sewerage. There are also public health and hospital services, medical services, and the preservation of a proper standard of purity in food and drugs. What could be more vital? There are roads, bridges, railways, State shipping, and all other means of transportation and communication. I go on to mention fire brigades, police, penal institutions, courts, both civil and criminal, and including some domestic. There is also education, in schools, in secondary and tertiary institutions, in universities, through public libraries, art galleries, and even through the humble zoological gardens. All of these are essential and important functions.

Then there is the control of traffic, the responsibility for industrial safety, the determination of hours and conditions of labour, workers' compensation, and superannuation. Are not all of these matters the very warp and woof of the daily life of a civilised community? These are the functions that are entrusted under the Constitution to this Parliament. Now, are we in any danger of being deprived, as citizens of this State, of the right to exercise those functions as we see fit? I say we are.

Why is it of any importance to the citizens of this State that the State Parliament should retain control over those functions rather than any other Parliament? It is because of the fact that this Parliament is much more under the control of the people of this State than any other Parliament could possibly be. A very eminent historian—Lord Acton—said, sagely and wisely, that all power corrupts, but absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Mr Davies: Who said that?

Mr HARTREY: Lord Acton. That is the difficulty we are up against. Great indeed are the powers of the Federal Parliament, and rightly so. It is only right that the Federal Parliament should have powers over the greatest, although the most remote functions of government, such as peace and war; national defence; trade and commerce with the world

outside and between the States; the imposition of duties of customs and excise; the institution of a common currency and banking system. All of these matters are of common interest to the whole people of Australia, are rightly entrusted to the central Government, and are serious enough at present to absorb a great deal more of its attention than they seem to do.

The Commonwealth Government also has control of a railway which runs from Port Pirie to Kalgoorlie. It used to run from Port Augusta to Kalgoorlie. That railway is not as well managed as some of the carriages that run from Kalgoorlie to Perth. I can assure members of that from my own personal experience, because I travel on it weekly when the Parliament is sitting and the train is running. I have found that when it is supposed to be leaving at 8.30 p.m. it often leaves at 10.30 p.m., 11.30 p.m., or some other time at which it is not supposed to leave. Two years ago I asked a question of our then Minister for Railways as to how many times the train had arrived late in Kalgoorlie in the previous six months. He replied that he was not in a position to give that information because it was the responsibility of the Commonwealth, although he well knew what the position was. Kalgoorlie is a State railway station!

Therefore the functions the Federal Government already has are not that well attended to that it must necessarily thrust its hands into all sorts of other functions. Some of them are not of great importance. The Federal Government is doing this, of course, because bureaucracy is of the essence of government, and the greatest menace to government, and the larger the government unit the more the people will suffer from bureaucracy.

I know that you, Mr Speaker, do not look kindly on members who quote excerpts from documents, but I crave leave to quote a dissection of the psychology of bureaucrats provided by a rather remarkable author in a rather remarkable book. The title of this novel is, *The Song of Bernadette*. It is written by a Jew about a Roman Catholic saint, but my quotation has nothing to do with the saint or the Jew. It has to do with what the author has to say about bureaucracy. He said—

The deepest motive of most people seems to be one of arrogance, or, more accurately, the burning desire for a constant feeling of superiority. Social conventions demand that this passion be more shamefacedly concealed than even the passion of sex. Now, every class has its specific kind and degree of arrogance. It may be fairly argued that the arrogance of bureaucrats, when provoked, surpasses that of all other classes of society. For in his own eyes the bureaucrat is not simply a chance functionary of the power of

the State. At his desk he has the feeling that he himself is that power. Even though he is only stamping letters, he deems himself of another, and higher, order than the public, as, let us say, an angel is of another, and higher, order than mortal man. In his capacity as judge, chief of police, collector of taxes and imposts, he has a far more tangible control over the affairs of men than Providence itself. All surround him with an obsequiousness born of fear, for the law is as putty in his hands. . . . He knows very well that in actual fact he is less, and knows less, than any scholar, physician or engineer, or even than any smith or lock-smith who has learned his trade. Rob him of the magic which power radiates, and there is left a rickety and declassed scrivener. Human arrogance tends to defend itself with bitterness in proportion to its vulnerability. If a bureaucrat is made ridiculous, so is the divine principle of power itself. That cannot be endured.

Bureaucracy is no stranger to municipal government, and it would appear that both the City of Stirling and the City of Perth are going through a phase of it. However, the ratepayers of those two cities have the right to vote at the annual election of councillors, at which they alone can vote and so enter an effective protest against such petty bureaucrats as they may be discontented with.

The State of Western Australia is no stranger to bureaucracy either. Far be it from me to say there is no bureaucracy in the Government of Western Australia, but at least the people of this State have the right of access to 51 members of this House and 30 members of the other House, and to Ministers of the Crown who are no strangers to small and large towns throughout the State. Lastly, we have the ombudsman to whom there lies an appeal against many aspects of bureaucracy.

So, whatever powers exist in Western Australia are better exercised solely at the dictation of 81 members of our Parliament, all of whom are elected in and for Western Australia, and so are better retained in our own hands than in the hands of a monolithic bureaucracy at Canberra, where there are determined not only such great matters as peace and war, but such minuscule matters—as how long it will take a returned soldier to have repaired the fence of his War Service Home, which was burnt down nine months ago by a fire started on the vacant block next door. If it takes so long for a person to have his fence repaired after interminable correspondence with Canberra, we can imagine how onerous and burdensome to Western Australia would be control of the affairs of the State by Canberra. Thank God Canberra does not have this control, but it is well on the way to having it. It is definitely

the function of this Parliament to see that Canberra does not have this power. That such a Constitution as a truly federal one is not only best suited to the needs, but best accords with the sentiments of the Australian people, is clearly exemplified by the fact that Australians have often rejected constitutional amendments calculated to increase the powers of the central Government.

Although the Constitution of the Commonwealth has much to recommend it, and was the product of great industry, professional and legal knowledge, and any amount of goodwill, nothing can change the fact that it has suffered from three congenital defects which have increasingly imperilled the balance of power which a Federal institution ought necessarily to have. That a Federal constitution can succeed is established by historical examples in various parts of the world. For example, that a small but very diverse ethnological community—I refer to Switzerland—has had 900 years of comparatively continuous peace proves that a Federal constitution is satisfactory for a small country.

Another example is a homogenous country, like the United States of America, which is spread over a vast area and is still exploiting huge and undeveloped resources. This country has operated for 200 years under such a constitution—although marred by one civil war between the States, as incidentally was Switzerland similarly marred in 1848 for a short time. This proves that the people of the USA are satisfied with and are best governed by a Federal institution.

That a truly Federal Government is most in keeping with the sentiments as well as the needs of the Australian people is proved by the fact that almost invariably the people reject proposals to increase the power of the Government at Canberra, and so diminish the powers of the respective State Parliaments. So, when the members arrogate to themselves the title, "the Australian Parliament", they are not attracting to themselves a great deal of Australian sentiment, because each time they hold a referendum it comes a cropper.

Let it be understood clearly by members opposite who are in agreement with what I am saying now that the centralist policy in Australia has been advocated most by the national Liberal Party, and more blows have been struck at the fabric of Federation by the Liberal Party in the State Government than have been struck so far by the State Labor Party. This is a rather terrifying thought, because it appears that by reason of the three congenital defects in the Constitution I spoke of we are in grave danger of being caught in a vortex—a centripetal whirlpool—and being drowned in a terrific maelstrom of red tape, the red tape of Federal bureaucracy. This is worse than a State bureaucracy or a municipal bureaucracy, because a

Federal bureaucracy is so much more removed from the people that they have no power to control it.

Mr BERTRAM: And protected by a High Court appointed by the Liberal Party.

Mr HARTREY: By both sides. To deal with the congenital defects, firstly the Federal Government was given absolute power of taxation—direct as well as indirect. In the days when Federation first came into being, indirect taxation—I refer to customs and excise—had been previously the chief source of revenue to the colonies. An unsuccessful attempt was made to ensure that the States derived a permanent share in the revenues from customs and excise.

One of the provisions was that for the first 10 years three-quarters must be returned to the States, and thereafter the Federal Parliament could determine. Of course it did. It determined on a system called a *per capita* payment. That brought to each of the States substantially less than the share previously received, but at least it was a substantial revenue and a substantial contribution to the very great costs which the provision of those vital functions I have already recited entails in each of the States.

However, it was a nationalist Prime Minister—one of the most arrogant persons to occupy that distinguished position, Viscount Stanley Melbourne Bruce—who, in 1927, abolished the *per capita* payments; and in 1928, as a result of a cunning conspiracy with his arch enemy, the Labor Party, he inflicted upon the whole of the people of Australia section 105A of the Constitution, which I strongly recommend members of all parties to read.

The second of these defects to which I have referred is that there is no way which is obvious—there may be a way which I hope to point out, but there is at the moment no obvious way under the Constitution—by which we can amend the Constitution except by vote of the Federal Parliament. Knowing human nature as it is and bureaucracy as I have already defined it, or rather, had it defined by a much more competent person than myself, it is only natural that every attempt at reform of the Constitution—except a purely mechanical reform such as altering the date of an election from one time to another, say from January to July, and one or two other mechanical alterations—has been in the direction of increasing Federal powers. However, that is not what I am afraid of, because the public will never swallow serious upsets of the Federal Constitution or serious imbalance of Federal distribution of power between the central authority—which quite urgently needs it for the benefit of all of us, but already has very great power, which very often it does not take too much notice of, or do much about it very often—and the residuary powers of the States, dealt with under section 107. That defect is serious.

The third defect is also serious; that is, that the determination of the meaning of the Constitution is vested exclusively in the High Court. There is nothing wrong with that in America where every person appointed to the High Court must have a majority of the Senate vote before he is appointed and the Senate in the US really does represent the States and so there is quite an impartial High Court as between State and Federal Governments.

However, in Australia the Federal Cabinet appoints all the judges of the High Court. Now it surely is not wholly by coincidence that there has never been a Western Australian High Court judge. We have had some very good judges in Western Australia.

Sir Charles Court: I agree.

Mr HARTREY: I am not speaking with the slightest disrespect to the High Court itself, which has a very high standing in the judiciary systems of the world. I say that quite seriously. Its civil and criminal decisions, and even its constitutional decisions, are quoted as authorities even in the United States, and of course are respected by the British courts as well. They are quoted in the English Court of Appeal, not as authorities because they do not govern that court at all, but as persuasive quotations because they are determinations of very learned jurists.

But when it comes to constitutional law, Sir Robert Menzies let the cat out of the bag by stating in a series of articles recently published in *The West Australian* that the interpretation of the Constitution is not merely a matter of interpreting a Statute, but giving effect to political philosophy.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: That is right.

Mr HARTREY: It is not "right", but it is true. Is that not wonderful? What a magnificent way to determine a question of justice between people?

Supposing two citizens have an argument in a court of law and a judge decides it is a matter of political philosophy and as one of the two persons is on his side politically, that is the end of the matter. That is the astounding part.

This is not a right principle, but it is invariably applied. The right way to interpret Statutes is to apply Lord Wensleydale's "Golden Rule" of legal interpretation. I have repeatedly referred to this and will no doubt do so again before concluding my association with this House. It is a very simple rule and seems so logical it hardly needs repeating, but it is this—

Take the words of a Statute in their plain ordinary grammatical sense.

Unless such words present an ambiguity, that will be their sense. If there is an ambiguity in the words when taken in their plain ordinary grammatical sense, then a number of other rules come in to solve the problem of the ambiguity.

Members must bear in mind that the Australian Constitution was adopted holubolus by referendum in every one of the six colonies. Also it must be borne in mind that in those days quite a number of people could not read or write. It was not a compulsory vote so the majority of the people of the various colonies who did vote were people who could read and write because those who could not were not obliged to vote and so therefore the majority of them most likely did not. On the other hand, those who could read and write could read and write only plain English, not judge-made law and certainly not those to be made 25 to 50 years still ahead of them. Consequently when section 114 was enacted it was believed to mean what it said and those concerned were very annoyed that they did not know what it meant. Section 114 reads—

A State shall not, without the consent of the Parliament of the Commonwealth, raise or maintain any naval or military force—

That was perfectly right of course. What right would it have to do so? It was to avoid that that we had Federation. The section continues—

—or impose any tax on property of any kind belonging to the Commonwealth—

Quite rightly and justly. To continue—

—nor shall the Commonwealth impose any tax on property of any kind belonging to a State.

Yet in 1908 the State of New South Wales bought four locomotives in London. It borrowed the money in London and paid for them there, and the four locomotives became the property of the State of New South Wales. When they arrived in New South Wales the collector of customs demanded customs duties on them and refused to allow them to be landed until he received payment. The case went to the High Court. All the judges gave different reasons, but the same judgment; that is, that it was all right to demand the duties. Some judges said that custom duty was not a tax. Let me remind members that we lost the American colonies by imposing such duties. The famous duty on tea caused the Boston Tea Party. The slogan there was—and it was well received by many compatriots in England, of which the elder William Pitt was one—"No taxation without representation".

Nobody thought that the duty on tea was not a tax; nobody in the colonies or in England. Anybody who knew the English language would not have thought it, but it was thought to be so by the High Court of Australia. That may be good law but, frankly, I do not think it is. However, I am not here to tell members whether or not a decision on law is good; I am here to tell members what has happened. Members

should try to put themselves into the position of those who voted for section 114 of the Constitution and then found it to mean nothing like what they thought it meant.

Section 101 of the Constitution states quite emphatically that "there shall be an interstate commission". It states—

There shall be an Inter-State Commission, with such powers of adjudication and administration as the Parliament deems necessary for the execution and maintenance, within the Commonwealth, of the provisions of this Constitution relating to trade and commerce, and of all laws made thereunder.

That seems pretty definite. Section 103 of the Commonwealth Constitution states—

The members of the Inter-State Commission—

- (i) Shall be appointed by the Governor-General in Council:
- (ii) Shall hold office for seven years, but may be removed within that time by the Governor-General in Council, on an address from both Houses of the Parliament in the same session praying for such removal on the ground of proved misbehaviour or incapacity:
- (iii) Shall receive such remuneration as the Parliament may fix; but such remuneration shall not be diminished during their continuance in office.

Where is the interstate commission? There has not been one since 1920. The first was appointed in 1913 for a period of seven years. The High Court of Australia simply said that the powers of adjudication did not have anything to do with judgments. The commission cannot give a judgment; it cannot do anything, so it has never been re-appointed. The High Court said that did not matter because Australia still had an interstate commission. It just did not have any commissioners. That is a rather surprising interpretation of the Constitution.

When one bears in mind that that is the way the High Court has been interpreting the Constitution in the past one must face up to another serious proposition: the High Court is now saying that section 96 of the Constitution in effect enables the Commonwealth to take from the States all of the States' money. Grants are provided to the States. Section 96 simply stated that and, of course, it was never expected that what is now being done would occur. However, Sir Robert Menzies said this was the key to increasing Federal powers, and Mr Whitlam has said the same thing. As a consequence, the

States are backed into a corner where they cannot afford to keep their rights. Section 96 of the Constitution states—

During a period of ten years after the establishment of the Commonwealth and thereafter until the Parliament otherwise provides, the Parliament may grant financial assistance to any State on such terms and conditions as the Parliament thinks fit.

Now this was done in 1926 under the provisions of the Federal Aid Grants Act and the constitutionality of that Act was challenged by Victoria, South Australia, and New South Wales. The gentleman who challenged it was one, Robert Gordon Menzies. He made an excellent speech in support of the challenge and he referred to the case of the King v. Barger, which was declared by the High Court to be good law. About 1908 Alfred Deakin, who was one of the leaders of the Federal movement, and who won a lot of support from the Labor Party, although he was wholly a Liberal himself, introduced what he called "The New Protection" in the form of duties of excise. He said that Australian manufacturers who did not pay a minimum wage fixed by Parliament would have to pay excise on the goods they manufactured. Of course, the manufacturers thus had to give the Federal Parliament the power to fix wages but the High Court said it could not be done. The power to impose duties of excise could not be used to arrogate powers. The Constitution did not give that power not associated with excise. That was a perfectly good decision, and good law, it was essentially the view of Robert Gordon Menzies. At the time he was not even a QC, but he was a very able man and a much better lawyer than politician. He put his argument forward but it was overwhelmed and, practically speaking, it was dismissed without argument.

It is rather interesting to look at the decision because it was such a cursory one. When a man of the undoubted ability which Robert Gordon Menzies had as a lawyer, puts forward a case one would think the judges of the High Court would have shown him the courtesy of explaining where his arguments were wrong. The judges simply said that the action was unnecessary. One judge had the courtesy to add that the other States should have been called in as defendants so that all the States could have had an opportunity to put forward their views. That was Justice Higgins. However, Chief Justice Knox just quietly knocked it out. There was no explanation beyond the statement that they were now to give to the Federal Parliament the right to arrogate to itself, by a constitutional pretext, powers it could not possess any other way.

These things are happening and will continue to happen. The proposition is now being put forward that the Commonwealth Government, quite rightly, possesses power over international affairs. Certainly, we do

not need the six States to have six diplomatic services independent of each other. That was one of the main reasons for the Federation. Yet, on the other hand, if the Commonwealth Government has an agreement on any subject at all with the rickety looking organisation called the United Nations, that agreement may affect any subject whatsoever—education, colour discrimination, or any other subject. If the United Nations agrees that something should be done, then the people of Australia have to do it. That has not been officially declared to be the law in this country yet, but if it is ever so declared it will have to be obeyed unless we are prepared to do something drastic to prevent it.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blaikie): The member has five more minutes.

Mr HARTREY: Thank you; that will be sufficient time for me to conclude. What I am recommending to the Premier—who has personal and strong opinions on the subject—is that if he is really dinkum and not just like Mr Snedden, Mr Gorton, Mr Fraser, and the other Federal leaders of his own party—who are centralists just the same as the Labor Party in the Federal Parliament—

Mr Bertram: That is the policy of the Liberal Party.

Mr HARTREY: I do not care if it is; it is not my policy. I was saying that if the Premier of the State, and his Government, are genuinely interested in preserving the rights of this State in these various important matters, the Constitution gives us—the 81 people elected to this Parliament, and no-one else can interfere—the opportunity to have a Federal convention similar to the Federal convention which originally drafted the Constitution. It was a Federal convention on which there was no Federal representation because there was nothing Federal involved.

A Federal convention consisting of all the States meeting together could draft a constitution which repairs these three congenital defects in the original Constitution and which provides safeguards against the possibility of any Federal Government making a treaty with Samoa, for example, to solve some problem of education by obliging us to provide for the people of Samoa the same standard of education as our people receive, or any other fantastic notion of that kind.

Let us have a really Australian constitutional convention, not a Canberra constitutional convention dominated by the financial powers of Canberra. Let us have a meeting of legally, politically, and constitutionally qualified persons to look into what is happening to the rights of the individual people of the States to exercise control over their most vital functions.

I conclude by reminding members that these functions of the States which I have enumerated, and do not need to repeat,

are absolutely vital to a tolerable human existence. They are the warp and woof of a civilised community, and it is therefore essential that we safeguard them. We will not do that by simply holding conferences with Federal authorities, because they treat us like dogs and we get nowhere. Let us stir up enthusiasm among the States—plenty of it exists—and return the Federal people to their proper functions.

I am not hostile towards the Federal Government. I am a federalist and I want to see federalism maintained; but I do not want to see centralism from Gorton, Whitlam, Snedden, or anybody else.

Several members: Hear, hear!

**MR FLETCHER** (Fremantle) [10.32 p.m.]: I would not like it to be assumed that there is a difference of attitude between me and my learned colleague on the back bench. I have been listening quite closely and despite his erudite dissertation on the matter of the Constitution I want to deal with things as they are and not as he would have them. No doubt many of us would like things to be as he would have them, but the situation is as it is at the moment, and I do not like it.

Like other speakers, I will open my remarks on the Address-in-Reply by deploring the present Government's use of our State Governor to criticise the Australian Government. I suggest that if the Premier wants to use a mouthpiece in the future, he should use someone who has a less distinguished record than our Governor has. I felt uncomfortable and sad when listening in another place to what the Governor had to say on the occasion of the opening of this session of Parliament. There was denigration of the Australian Government in such a forum. I submit to the House that the Premier has been doing this *ad nauseam* both here and overseas, as has been pointed out by the member for Northam; and I will later give examples of the generosity of the Australian Government, which does not deserve the kind of treatment it is receiving from this State and other anti-Labor States.

The duet of the Premier and his deputy on the alleged centralist and socialist intentions of the Australian Government, has become tiresome to me and many others. The Premier apparently relies on the theory that if one repeats nonsense often enough the public will believe it.

**Mr Bertram**: And a little bit of fear.

**Mr FLETCHER**: I have a high regard for the intelligence of the general public, and I point out to the Premier that propaganda can reach saturation point. It has done so in this House and it is doing so throughout the electorate. Like the member for Northam, I have heard comments from unexpected sources—which have not been Labor orientated, either—and I think some members opposite may

also have heard them and be starting to feel rather concerned about the matter. The theme song is wearing thin.

The average fair-minded Australian knows that Australia is the victim not of Whitlam but of a world economic situation, if not a crisis. I will later produce evidence to support my contentions. The carping criticism to which we have been listening lately will not help, but constructive comment might. My learned friend on my left indulged in some constructive criticism of the situation which exists. However, I am consoled by the fact that even popular song and dance bands ultimately acquire diminishing audiences, and that the Premier and his deputy will acquire diminishing audiences. The accusations about the Australian Government's centralist and socialist objectives will, I suggest, also be reaching a similarly diminishing audience.

I submit we have a national Government with a national outlook and that this State and other States will benefit in proportion to the Australian Government's ability to assist.

**Mr Clarko**: Not enough.

**Mr FLETCHER**: Later on I will give some figures to demonstrate that the Australian Government is doing as much as it can. The unholy, unhappy, and unnatural alliance opposite tries to conjure up a Berlin Wall between this State and other States, established somewhere in the Nullarbor Plain or somewhere between the Labor Government States and the anti-Labor Government States, or between a prosperous east and a deprived west existing on parsimonious handouts from the Commonwealth. I will show presently just how parsimonious the handouts are. An endeavour is made to imply that they are handouts from foreigners in the Eastern States who are in charge of the national purse. One would almost think they were, from the hate campaign engendered on the other side of the House.

Not even for political advantage could I make such manifest misrepresentations. I believe it is a transparent exercise to divide and conquer; and it is transparent to an ever-increasing number of people in Western Australia because, as I have said, I know members opposite who are concerned about the theme song and song and dance to which I alluded earlier.

Despite the centralist-socialist label inflicted on the Australian Government, I suggest a lot of nonsocialists are supporting the Australian Government's objective of conserving our resources for the benefit of Australia as a whole. Later on I will further elaborate on this theme and other issues I have mentioned, and I will produce evidence from other sources to support my contentions.

We are faced with two alternatives. The first is to conserve and husband our Australia-wide onshore and offshore resources on behalf of all Australians in all

States of Australia who are now in existence or are yet to be born; I repeat, all Australians, now and in the future. Those resources must be husbanded on their behalf, and the Federal Government is doing its best in that respect, despite the accusations made by the Premier to the contrary.

We have this alternative: we can support the present Western Australian Government's announced policy of inviting big overseas financial interests—in America and on the Continent—to come to our State on a snatch-and-grab basis; or we can support the plan set out by our Federal Government. The Australian Government insists that any overseas interests which come here to exploit our resources do so on our terms and in the best interests of our people, and not in the best interests of the international combines. I shall mention these combines later, and give examples of their depredations in countries other than our own. I will indicate what could happen here if we follow the course advocated by the Premier. Quite frankly, I do not blame the Federal Government for putting shackles on the Premier to see that he does not carry out his announced intentions.

As I said before, the world is rapidly becoming aware of the mess that capitalism and private enterprise has made of the economy. People everywhere are disenchanted with private enterprise, and I will give evidence about this later. Capitalism and private enterprise have created this mess, and yet we are criticised as socialists and centralists for advocating a cause different from private enterprise.

I will now return to my own electorate, and I will submit evidence of the generosity of the Australian Government in the area of Fremantle. I do not want to be tiresome with too many figures, but I feel I must refer to the details of the grants in the document I have before me. It is marked confidential, but as these figures were given at a local government meeting on the 5th February, 1975—more than a month ago—I can reveal them to the House. They show the extent of the assistance that has been given to the Fremantle City Council. I will not enumerate all the projects, but the following amounts in round figures have been already allocated to the council. The Commonwealth Road Trust, Department of Transport, \$69 000; Commonwealth roads special allocation, \$54 000; an unrestricted grant of \$125 000; planing and design, north bank, Swan River, area improvement, \$25 000; the Hilton Day Care Centre, \$56 000; the Esme Fletcher Day Nursery, extensions, \$11 500; \$587 500 to the Social Centre for the Frail Aged, of which I am proud to be a member—not of the frail aged, but of the board.

A grant of \$35 000 has been made for reconstruction of the Round House, National Estate; restoration of the Fremantle markets, \$25 000; restoration of walls, Fremantle Boys/Princess May site, \$15 000; and \$12 000 for a survey and study of future use of the Fremantle Prison—a very desirable objective. I want the House to listen to the total of the figures on this particular page—it is \$1 164 865. This generous amount has been allocated to the Fremantle City Council from a Federal source for these projects. Now I ask the House: How miserable is that?

Let me also point out that I have calculated some figures in respect of requests made for further assistance. We see here figures such as \$207 000 and \$49 000, and a total of \$1 218 217. With this additional figure the grant to the Fremantle City Council alone will be \$2.3 million-odd. Similar assistance has been given to the Belmont Shire Council. Just recently a Federal Minister opened a \$1 million project in the Shire of Belmont, and yet these grants are played down.

Mr B. T. Burke: A grant of \$490 000 was made to the City of Stirling.

Mr Young: Anything to buy 12 votes!

Mr FLETCHER: Let me point out that other local authorities could receive these benefits if the Premier did not object to the manner in which they were funded.

Mr Bryce: Precisely the point; they have cut off their nose to spite their face and they have missed the boat—Bunbury included.

Mr Harman: They did not get encouragement from the Minister for Local Government either.

Mr Nanovich: I will give evidence that will prove you are wrong.

Mr FLETCHER: Order! I have made the point—

Mr Laurance: Well and truly.

Mr FLETCHER: —that other local authorities could receive \$1 million or more if the Premier would permit his Minister—

Mr B. T. Burke: To breathe.

Mr FLETCHER: —to accept the grants. But no, the Premier will not agree to direct grants to local authorities; he wants the grants channelled through his Ministers so that he and his Ministers can take the credit for the amount made available. There has been no reference in the Press to the Federal source of money spent in the Belmont or the Fremantle areas.

Mr Rushton: Only about 15 times.

Mr FLETCHER: These grants are being glossed over. All local authorities in the State could benefit if the Premier did not think the money is contaminated because it goes directly to local authorities rather than through the Minister. That is the point I insist on making, and as sure as I am standing here, I believe it to be true.



There is collusion between this anti-Labor Government and other anti-Labor Governments throughout the Commonwealth. There is a poison campaign to pull the Federal Government down, and this is only one instance.

Mr Watt: One or two other poison campaigns, are there not?

Mr FLETCHER: As briefly as I can I will give an example of what is being attempted in New South Wales. I wish I had time to read from this news release in more detail. Let me say, Mr Speaker, that I appreciate the fact that you are more generous than other Speakers have been in the past in permitting quotations from the Press—I am thus able to quote from other authorities, and not rely on my own experience. This article is headed, "Road funds available to New South Wales—Statement by the Australian Minister for Transport, the Hon. C. K. Jones, M.P.", and it is dated the 26th September, 1974. I am reading this to illustrate the campaign of denigration of the Federal Government. It commences—

The Minister for Transport, Mr Jones, today strongly criticised a threat by the Deputy Premier of New South Wales, Sir Charles Cutler, who indicated he was going to retrench large numbers of road workers in that State.

Sir Charles had been reported as indicating N.S.W. would receive \$207 million in grants for road works over the next three years. This statement was totally misleading, Mr Jones said.

Further on it reads—

The \$350 million to be received by New South Wales over the next three years compares more than favourably with the \$260 million over the previous three years—an increase of \$90 million, or of 35%.

That is an increase of 35 per cent on the grant from the previous Administration.

Mr O'Connor: We did not get on too well here though.

Mr Sibson: What about inflation?

Mr FLETCHER: Just a minute.

Mr O'Connor: All right.

Mr FLETCHER: The article continues—

In this respect, New South Wales has done better than the overall increase in State road grants of some 30%.

I point out to the Minister that New South Wales is better off now than it was under the previous Government.

Mr O'Connor: But we finished up in a worse position.

Mr FLETCHER: This is an example of the campaign against the Federal Government—

"Furthermore, as a result of representations from State Premiers, the Australian Government agreed to reduce the Bureau's recommended quota by 10%.

He went on to say—

Already the New South Wales Government has announced its own tax on petrol of 6 cents per gallon.

New South Wales increased the tax on petrol by 6c a gallon and blamed the Federal Government for that action. It allegedly had to do so after receiving benefit far in excess of that which it ever received under the previous Administration. I ask members to listen to another comment by the Hon. C. K. Jones made on the 16th October, 1974. The relevant news release reads as follows—

The New South Wales Government was threatening to sack thousands of employees of the Department of Main Roads simply to smear the Australian Government, the Australian Minister for Transport, Mr Jones, said in Canberra today.

That Government was trying to tell the employees and Australia generally that the Federal Government was responsible for unemployment. I have no doubt that all anti-Labor State Governments would be happy to see unemployment they could attribute to the Federal Government; and if they cannot create unemployment they will create fear and make threats such as the one referred to in the statement of the Federal Minister for Transport. Mr Jones went on to say—

If Sir Charles doesn't know that his Government has still not supplied details of the cash it needs, then it's time he checked his office records . . .

He went on further to say—

Doesn't he know that the other States have so far received \$53,979,000 in interim finance for roads? But not New South Wales because, despite repeated inquiries from the Australian Treasury for details of New South Wales' needs, it cannot get an answer from Sir Charles, or his Government.

Yet in a mischievous manner he said it was necessary to sack thousands of people. That is an indecent method to adopt to pull down a decent Government.

Mr Harman: The Minister here used the same tactics.

Mr O'Connor: Quite correctly, and if you are a Western Australian and want money for roads you would support it.

Mr Harman: The week before the Premier said there would be no retrenchments.

Mr Clarko: Mr Jones will be retrenched, too.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FLETCHER: There are so many interjections; may I make an interjection? At that time Western Australia received \$12.249 million, but members opposite were quiet about that aspect. They are so anti-Labor that they forgot about that in their efforts to pull down the Australian Labor Government.

However, the recently lamented and deposed Mr Snedden was offered the job to co-ordinate the State's attack on the Federal Government, and to co-ordinate the method of the campaign to pull it down. I must say he was decent enough not to be used in that manner. He rejected the task; and great credit to him for doing so.

I will give further evidence and written proof of other examples of the generosity of the Australian Government towards this and other States.

Mr O'Connor: How is their deficit?

Mr FLETCHER: We have heard a great deal of criticism of the Federal Government and of its parsimonious handouts. I point out that when capitalism is in trouble then—if we are socialists—it is socialism to the rescue to start public works and local government works and to infuse finance into the economy to create employment opportunities. Firstly, I quote from *The West Australian* of the 26th March, 1975, under the heading of, "\$12.4 m. Commonwealth aid for WA sewerage". The article states—

About 20,000 people in the metropolitan area will benefit from a sewerage works programme to be carried out with funds provided by the Federal Government.

Let me interpolate here to say that country people grizzle about what is not being done in the country; but I live less than three miles from the Fremantle Town Hall, and that area is still on septic tanks. That is a deplorable situation. The previous Commonwealth Government was in office for 23 years, and the previous Court-Brand Government—and I describe it that way deliberately—was in office for 12 years, but nothing was done. Now, at last the Federal Government has put up \$12.4 million to do this and other work which has been neglected for so many years. The article goes on to state—

It includes \$7.9 million for sewerage reticulation works in the metropolitan area, \$1.5 million for treatment works and \$2.5 million for main sewers and pumping stations.

The ministers said the funds would allow a start on works that would eventually cater for more than 45,000 people.

It would also boost the WA work force by creating more than 16,000 man-months of employment.

The construction of additional works in country areas would create about 500 man-months of employment.

Another 95 services would be connected at Bunbury and an extra 100 in Kalgoorlie-Boulder.

Bunbury has had to wait all these years for sewerage because the previous Administration did nothing although for 23 years it had the opportunity to do something.

I refer to another example in *The West Australian* of the 27th March, under the heading of "Agreement near on \$8m. land plan". The article states—

The Federal and State Governments are near agreement on proposals that would allow the State to buy several categories of land with Federal funds of up to \$8 million.

Here is further evidence under the heading of, "\$129 110 for dental care". The article states—

WA school dental services will receive a further \$129 110 from the Federal Government.

It goes on further to say—

The grant is the latest made to WA as part of the national plan to develop free dental services for school-children.

Surely all these examples demonstrate that it is not a niggardly Australian Government. I provide another example which appeared in *The West Australian* of Saturday, the 22nd March. The heading is, "284 jobs approved in W.A.", and the article states—

Projects approved yesterday by the State committee of the Regional Employment Development Scheme are expected to provide 284 jobs.

All this infusion of Federal finance can become tiresome if it is put forward as statistics, but it is real money being used to create real jobs; and it is reflected, as the member for Avon pointed out, in the goodwill that has now been created in respect of the Australian Government. The article goes on to say where the money will be spent, as follows—

The value of the projects was \$986,000, of which \$768,000 would be provided from RED funds. The balance would come from the groups sponsoring the projects.

They would provide, work for surveyors, draftsmen, town planners, biology graduates, research assistants, script supervisors, clerks, gardeners, building tradesmen, labourers and others.

I submit that we have a very good Federal Government, irrespective of the accusations levelled at it about its centralist and socialist ambitions. I have heard members opposite interject and ask, "What is the

definition of a socialist?" The easiest definition I have read is, "From each according to his ability and to each according to his need." If a person is unable to work then he should be looked after and not left behind, as happens under the existing set-up. I firmly believe in the philosophy I have enunciated.

Mr Clarko: That is not a definition of socialism.

Mr FLETCHER: If the member for Barko does not believe it, he would not be sitting on that side of the House; I do not believe his side of the House does not believe in it.

I have already quoted evidence to show how Australia is a victim of a world economic downturn. Without wanting to bore the House, I should like to quote further evidence to support my contention. I quote—

#### Trade outlook still uncertain

Geneva, Tues: The world trade outlook for 1975 remains uncertain, though widespread efforts to curb inflation were starting to show results, an international trade organisation reported today.

The secretariat of the 83-nation Geneva-based General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) warned that prospects for world trade—which last year slowed more than at any time since the World War, is hinged on the level of production, especially in Western Europe, the United States, Canada and Japan.

Did our Prime Minister create the situation for which members opposite so unfairly criticise him? Of course not! He is a victim of it, as we all are. Members opposite should get onside to assist in overcoming these difficulties, instead of coming out with carping criticism.

Mr Laurance: The unemployment resulted from the tariff cuts; that was quite obvious.

Mr FLETCHER: The article goes on to say—

But production in such countries, which belong to the 24-member Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), declined more than expected in the second half of last year.

Is Mr Whitlam responsible for that? GATT sets the rules for four-fifths of world trade. Can the Prime Minister determine on his own what GATT does, and reverse the world trend?

Mr Clarko: The Whitlam Government planned unemployment.

Mr FLETCHER: Yes, of course it did! A lot of poppycock and nonsense!

Mr Clarko: Otherwise the inflation rate would have been 30 per cent.

Mr FLETCHER: The higher the unemployment rate the more members opposite gloat about it. The article goes on to say—

The review said that fears that global inflation might accelerate appeared to be inhibiting increased investment.

Yet members opposite blame Mr Whitlam for the lack of investment in Australia.

An article on the same page is headed, "U.S. deficit predicted to be record", and states—

The Treasury Secretary, Mr William Simon, predicted today that the United States would have at least an \$A58,000 million one-year Budget deficit in 1976, the highest in history.

The last paragraph of the article states—

The highest deficit was \$40,150 million in 1943 when the United States was trying to finance its part in the World War.

Members can get some idea of the world economic situation by those figures. Despite all the evidence to the contrary, the Premier of this State was reported as saying the following on the 19th March, 1975—

The Federal Labor Government had reduced the whole of Australia to ruins in a little over two years. Worse was to follow.

This situation had developed, not because of incompetence by the Government, but because it wanted it that way.

What a lot of poppycock! I have read out to members evidence of the world situation, yet we see our Premier who is supposed to have more intelligence and ability in the field of accountancy, book-keeping and economics, generally reported in the Press as making ridiculous statements like that. Even with the world situation as it is, all members opposite can do is blame the Prime Minister, who is doing his best in difficult economic circumstances.

Mr Clarko: He is doing his worst.

Mr FLETCHER: What a puerile interjection! I should like to refer to another article which appeared in the *Daily News* of the 13th November, 1974, and which is headed "White House: U.S. is moving into a recession". It states—

The White House says that the United States is moving into a recession with a further worsening of the economy.

The White House press secretary, Mr Ronald Nessen, says statistics to be issued soon show a further slowdown in industrial production and higher unemployment.

It goes on to say—

The U.S. economy has worsened swiftly in the past few months, with

12 per cent inflation, six per cent unemployment, high interest rates, lagging retail sales, and lay-offs in the vehicle and other industries.

Yet members opposite will not accept this as evidence of the fact that the world situation is bad, generally. I submit that it is conclusive evidence that the Prime Minister and the Australian Government are the victims of the world economic downturn.

Mr Sibson: We have still gone from the lowest inflation rate to the highest, among western countries.

Mr FLETCHER: The honourable member is trying to get grains of comfort from somewhere, but they are not real grains.

Mr Sibson: It is still a fact.

Mr FLETCHER: I refer now to an article headed, "U.S. racket in Arab oil alleged", which appears in *The West Australian* of Tuesday, the 18th March, 1975. It states—

American investigators are looking into the possibility of petroleum pricing conspiracies during last winter's Arab oil embargo which may involve thousands of millions of dollars.

Thousands of millions of dollars have been swindled from the American community. The article continues—

The investigation could result in tens of millions of dollars in overcharges being returned to consumers, a Federal energy administration spokesman said yesterday.

I do not wish to read the article in its entirety; I merely use it as an example to show the sorts of rackets that go on, and which would be repeated here if we did not have a vigilant Federal Government, a Federal Government which members opposite do not like because of the policies it has enunciated.

Mr P. V. Jones: What has all this to do with the Federal Government?

Mr FLETCHER: I will ignore the nonsense on the left.

Mr Clarko: You always get nonsense on the left.

Mr FLETCHER: I have given the House an illustration of big oil company rackets in the United States. I am anxious to ensure that these companies do not get their filthy cotton picking fingers on our oil and gas reserves off our north-west coast.

Let me show this House what the big combines can do. I refer to an article which appeared in the *Daily News* of Tuesday, the 14th August, 1973, headed, "Big 10' earn more than 80 nations".

The article states—

Ten of the world's largest multi-national corporations have annual incomes greater than the gross national product of more than 80 nations, according to a U.N. report.

Mr Speaker, I am pleased that you have allowed me to submit such evidence. It is written evidence, not my evidence, but the evidence of a United Nations report. It is not a Harry Fletcher report, not a product of my imagination, but a UN report.

Mr P. V. Jones: Have you checked its authenticity?

Mr FLETCHER: There is no need to check it; it is a UN report which has far greater credence than anything members opposite could produce. The article continues—

The big corporations were so powerful that they often posed a threat to the sovereignty of the "host" nation, it says.

That is the important thing. I hope the Premier is listening. Are these the interests he is trying to invite to our State on their terms?

Sir Charles Court: They come in on our terms and under our laws.

Mr FLETCHER: Just imagine what putty we would be in the hands of one of these huge multi-national organisations; this situation would surely arise if we did not have a vigilant Federal Government.

Mr Watt: Oh, come on!

Mr FLETCHER: The State Government does not like it because overseas interests now cannot come here and invest their finance on their own terms. This they regret as it would automatically enhance the status of this State Government. The Premier and others on that side of the House would prefer that we should obtain finance on any terms so as to gain a reputation similar to that earned by the Brand-Nalder Government in the 1960s.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has another seven minutes.

Mr FLETCHER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. That is what we are anxious to prevent. That is what the Federal Government is anxious to prevent, and yet, despite this, it is maligned for doing so. Let me cite some examples by quoting some newspaper extracts. The first is from the *Daily News* of Thursday, the 31st October, 1974, and it reads—

#### Connor's 11-Point N.T. Uranium Plan

The mine, mill and infrastructure will be financed by the Ranger participants and the commission on the basis of 27½ per cent and 72½ per cent respectively.

Another paragraph of the same newspaper article reads as follows—

The Ranger participants will receive the net proceeds from the sale of 50 per cent of the yellow cake produced at the mill from ore mined at the Ranger deposits.

For the 27½ per cent that private enterprise has to invest, it receives a return of 50 per cent. The Federal Government has made sure that it will receive only 50 per cent and no more, and I do not blame it for doing that. The ambition of all members in this House should be to ensure that our resources remain our own and that these large private combines are prevented from getting their hands on Australian resources which will, I hope, be enjoyed by my grandchildren and the children and grandchildren of members on the other side of the House, because these resources are limited and should be used for the benefit of all Australians, not just Western Australians.

The same principle should apply to the oil and gas deposits that are on our northern shores. I submit that irrespective of the attitude adopted by my learned colleague on my left, those oil and gas deposits belong to Australia and not just to Western Australia. If those deposits existed off the Queensland coast I would say precisely the same. The people in the Eastern States are not foreigners. These deposits are the resources of Australia and I am prepared to share them with the people of Queensland and with the people of other States of Australia, but on our terms and not on the terms of the "Big 10" who have their financial fingers delving into the resources of many nations throughout the world.

I have mentioned in this House previously that in such a situation big financial corporations can dictate not only the economic policy of a Government but also its foreign policy, as evidenced by what occurred in South-East Asia in recent years. Those big financial corporations did dictate to the previous Federal Administration, but because the present Australian Government would not allow them to dictate to it such action is deplored by those on the other side of the House.

In the few minutes remaining to me, despite all the calamity howling from members on the other side of the Chamber, I want to make some quotations taken from the "Business and Investment" page of *The West Australian* of the 25th March, 1975. The first of these reads as follows—

Higher payout, issue by ANI.

Australian National Industries Ltd is treating its shareholders to a big dividend increase and a generous rights issue to celebrate another booming year.

Another extract, taken from *The West Australian* dated the 22nd March, 1975, reads—

J. Gadsden lifts net profit 190 per cent.

J. Gadsden Australia Ltd, the container maker, lifted profit 188.9 per cent from \$893,197 to \$2,580,855 in the December half-year.

That article went on to give some other illuminating figures, but in the two or three minutes I have left let me make a quotation taken from the "Business and Investment" page of *The West Australian* of Saturday, the 22nd March, 1975. It reads as follows—

GMH earnings for 1974 down slightly.

Australia's biggest car maker, General Motors-Holden's Pty Ltd, yesterday reported a slightly lower profit of \$14 million in 1974 after slashing its provision for depreciation and tax by \$10.6 million.

Just imagine! That company had a slightly lower profit—down to \$14 million in 1974! Despite this the Federal Government had to intervene to protect the jobs of the workers of that company which did not want to see its \$14 million profit eroded below that figure. What did that company want to do? It wanted to sack 5 000 workers. So Dr Cairns, the Federal Treasurer, had to appeal to private enterprise—a degrading exercise for him—and to a company which originally was established by the Commonwealth Government. It was set up by the Chifley Government to build motorcars. Australians originally had some equity in that company. However, do the members of this House know that now every dollar profit that is made leaves Australia to go overseas to the USA? Would the Premier condone that sort of action that has been taken by GMH and perhaps other international financial corporations? Would he condone similar action in this State, where every dollar profit leaves this country, merely to achieve his purposes?

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Young.

House adjourned at 11.17 p.m.

---

## Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 9th April, 1975

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

### QUESTIONS (2): WITHOUT NOTICE

#### 1. ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

*Resignation of Governor: Amendment of Motion*

The Hon. R. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Justice:

Has the Minister studied the subject matter of my question without notice of yesterday?