

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: It is the policy of the Labor Party to introduce a unicameral parliamentary system in Western Australia, and it is also our policy to abolish the Senate.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L. D. ELLIOTT: To sum up: I believe the time is long overdue for parliamentary and electoral reform. I believe that in this State we should have a unicameral Parliament elected by men and women whose votes, irrespective of where they live in the State, are of equal value.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. R. J. L. Williams.

*House adjourned at 8.51 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 21st March, 1972

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

### QUESTIONS (28): ON NOTICE

#### 1. TOWN PLANNING

##### *Housing Project: Kwinana Industrial Complex*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) Will he justify to the House by diagrams and explanation the siting of the 1,500-acre housing project near the Alcoa aluminium refinery at Kwinana?
- (2) Does not this housing project inhibit the future of the Kwinana industrial complex?
- (3) Will not this siting of in excess of 5,000 units of housing (20,000 people) close to the heavy industrial area and in the path of the prevailing winds prejudice the establishment of the proposed steel works at Kwinana?
- (4) If some planning for the housing project is prepared, will he make this available to the house?
- (5) Has a report from the Environmental Protection Authority been received regarding this urbanisation against heavy industry?
- (6) If "Yes" will he make the report available?
- (7) If "No" will he have the Environmental Protection Authority examine this housing project and report the authority's findings to the House in due course?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) and (2) The land in question is under the control of the Industrial Lands Development Authority and is zoned under the Metropolitan Region Scheme for industrial use. For a number of reasons, including the configuration of the land, it has not proved attractive for industrial usage, and it is now considered that a more appropriate use would be for residential purposes. Discussions are taking place between the Industrial Lands Development Authority and the Rural and Industries Bank on the possibility of the bank undertaking comprehensive development of the land. These discussions are at an early stage and it cannot be assumed that residential use will proceed. Obviously, if housing is undertaken on the land there would be a corresponding reduction in the area of land allocated for industry. I do not believe, however, that the future of the Kwinana industrial complex would thereby be inhibited.

- (3) Leaving aside the assumption in the question that a 5,000 unit housing project will eventuate, it is not the Government's intention to permit industrial development that would result in pollution sweeping up the coast across this land.

In any event, the standards set under the Clean Air Act determine the controls over industry in Kwinana, irrespective of the zoning and use of the land in question.

- (4) If and when a decision to proceed with housing is reached, plans will be made public.
- (5) No.
- (6) Answered by (5).
- (7) No. The Rural and Industries Bank will no doubt pay full regard to the possibility of the land in question being adversely affected by industry at Kwinana before it reaches its decision on the possibility of developing the land. The bank may, if it so wishes, ask for advice from the Environmental Protection Authority.

#### 2.

### SYNTHETIC MEAT

#### *Use of Term*

Mr. W. A. MANNING, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has he noticed reports that foods being reported as "synthetic meats" are being manufactured for human consumption?

- (2) Has he taken any steps to prevent the misleading names of "meat" or "steak" or "pork", etc.?
- (3) If not, what action does he propose?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Under the Food and Drug Regulations of the Health Act pertaining to the definition of meat (C.01.001) and labelling (A.01.004.a.i) it would appear that the practice referred to is illegal.
- (3) More specific requirements with regard to labelling are under consideration by the Food and Drug Advisory Committee in order to ensure that no doubt will be in the purchaser's mind as to the nature of his intended purchase.

### 3. SCHOOL CANTEENS

#### *Food Services*

Mr. STEPHENS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many Government—
  - (a) secondary;
  - (b) primary,
 schools in Western Australia have facilities for food services (canteens)?
- (2) What is the total capital cost of facilities and equipment for food services—
  - (a) provided by the Education Department;
  - (b) provided by parents and citizens' associations?
- (3) What is the gross and net income from secondary and primary school food services for each of the last three years ended 31st December?
- (4) Is there a departmental policy on bookkeeping and auditing for school food services?
- (5) Has the department a policy on the control of lines and/or food-stuffs sold at school food services?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) (a) It is Government policy to provide canteens in high schools. At present 45 high schools have these facilities. At three high schools (Collie, Busselton and Karratha) canteens are at present under construction while Carnarvon is listed to receive these facilities in the 1972-73 financial year.
- (b) Canteens are not provided in primary schools but subsidy payments are made to parents and citizens' associations.

- (2) (a) The Education Department provides the canteen building for secondary schools and subsidises certain items of equipment. Canteen projects at primary schools are subsidised under buildings and related projects where eligible.

No record of the total capital cost is available.

- (b) No information is available of the total capital cost to parents and citizens' associations.
- (3) No information is available on the gross or net income from school food services.
- (4) No.
- (5) No. Guidance and recommendations are provided by the federation of parents and citizens' associations.

### 4. SCHOOL CANTEENS

#### *Food Services*

Mr. STEPHENS, to the Minister for Health:

Has the Health Department any policy with regard to school food services (canteens) in Western Australia?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

School canteens are run by the parents and citizens' federation. School medical officers report on canteens when visiting schools.

The Department's dietary consultant is a permanent member of the Parents and Citizens' Federation Co-ordinating Committee on canteens and is available to advise on suitable foods for sale at school canteens.

### 5. EDUCATION

#### *Secondary Students' Union*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What is his or the Government's attitude towards the reported functioning of the Western Australian secondary students' union?
- (2) Is this union incorporated or registered under any Statute or regulation, and, if, so, in which form?
- (3) Does he allow and/or encourage distribution of this union's publications?
- (4) Is membership by secondary students of this union permitted?
- (5) What fees does membership entail?
- (6) Which is the way members join this union?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) No official approach has been made to the Education Department for recognition of this body.
- (2) No.
- (3) This has been left to the discretion of the school principals.
- (4) to (6) The Department has no information with regard to these matters.

## 6. FLOREAT SCHOOL

### *Fire Escape*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has the fire escape exit at the Floreat primary school, about which I have already enquired in a question and which was promised by the then Minister for Education on 25th August, 1971 (*Hansard* page 1018) been built?
- (2) If not, when does he anticipate that the job will be done?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) An order has been placed for the necessary steel stairway and when this is available work will commence. It is anticipated that this will be in approximately four weeks' time.

## 7. UNEMPLOYMENT

### *Government Financial Assistance*

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

- (1) What amount of additional money has been provided by the State Government this financial year to assist unemployment in Western Australia?
- (2) How was the money used?

Mr. GRAHAM (for Mr. J. T. Tonkin) replied:

- (1) and (2) The whole of the \$2,990,000 additional works and housing loan funds allocation made available to this State in February has been directed to works with a high labour content that were able to be commenced at short notice.

## 8. UNEMPLOYMENT

### *Percentage Registered*

Mr. O'NEIL, to the Minister for Labour:

What percentage of the Western Australian work force was registered as unemployed in the month of March for each of the years 1953 to 1971?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

This information is only available from June, 1958. The percentage of the Western Australian work-

force registered as unemployed in the month of March for the years 1959 to 1971 is as follows:

Year	%
1959	2.4
1960	1.8
1961	2.1
1962	1.9
1963	2.1
1964	2.0
1965	1.3
1966	1.0
1967	1.1
1968	1.0
1969	1.05
1970	1.07
1971	1.46

## 9. COUNTRY HIGH SCHOOL HOSTELS

### *Upgrading of Junior High Schools*

Mr. McPHARLIN, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) In view of the decision to upgrade junior high schools in country areas to district high schools, have plans been made to provide hostel accommodation in the selected towns?
- (2) If no plans are at present under discussion, is it the intention of the Government to endeavour to provide this very necessary accommodation in towns such as Wyalkatchem?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) No plans have yet been made.
- (2) Within the limits of available finance the Government will endeavour to provide accommodation where there are sufficient boarders to justify the economic running of a hostel.

## 10. MINING

### *Fitzgerald River Reserve: Environmental Protection*

Mr. W. G. YOUNG, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Has the Mines Department been supplied with a report from the Environmental Protection Authority regarding the right to explore the Fitzgerald reserve montan wax deposits?
- (2) If not, when is this report expected?

Mr. H. D. EVANS (for Mr. May) replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The Environmental Protection Council is at present giving consideration to this matter and this will be followed by a reference to the Environmental Protection Authority. It will, therefore, be some weeks yet before a decision on the matter is made.

# 11. ROCKINGHAM-KWINANA HOSPITAL

## Commencement

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) How does the reported comment by the Minister for Works, who was the Tonkin Government's representative at a public meeting called at Rockingham on 20th January, 1972, that the Government did not intend to build the Rockingham-Kwinana hospital until 1975-76 at the earliest, tie up with the Minister for Health's statement in *The West Australian* Fremantle supplement last week that the Brand Government's programme for this hospital will be maintained?
- (2) Does this mean then that tenders for the construction of the hospital will now be called this April or May?
- (3) Are the plans and specifications now ready for calling of tenders?
- (4) Has the leased hospital site now been recalled from the lessee to enable a start to development of the hospital buildings and grounds within the next six months?
- (5) If "No" to (4) when will the lessee be given notice?
- (6) Why was this hospital not included in the Government's allocation of the Commonwealth Government's recent substantial additional grants and loans to Western Australia for works for the relief of the unemployed, amongst which the numbers of building employees in the Rockingham-Kwinana districts are very substantial?
- (7) Will the unallocated Commonwealth funds now be directed to the Rockingham-Kwinana hospital to enable an early commencement with this hospital?
- (8) How many acres have been set aside for the—
  - (a) Rockingham-Kwinana hospital;
  - (b) major public hospital with reasonable access to the Jandakot airport?

Mr. DAVIES replied:

- (1) I understand that the Minister for Works indicated that the hospital would not be available for use until 1975-76. My statement was to the effect that this Government in no way repudiated the Brand Government's intention to build a hospital at Rockingham as soon as planning is complete and finance available.

(2) to (4) No.

- (5) I understand that the terms of the lease are such that when access to the site is needed it will be available. The lessee is already co-operating in this regard by allowing access for test bore holes and site surveys.
- (6) The Rockingham Hospital project would involve expenditure which was much more than could be financed from this source.
- (7) No.
- (8) (a) The boundaries of the site are not final, but the area is approximately 40 acres.  
(b) Site boundaries have not been finally determined and negotiations with private owners are still under way. The site for an ultimate comprehensive medical centre will exceed 200 acres.

# 12.

## NATIVES

### Community Centre: Pinjarra

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) What progress has been made by the Murray Aboriginal Council in obtaining land for an Aboriginal community centre at Pinjarra?
- (2) Does he approve of the council's request?
- (3) If so, what are the Government's intentions to assist the project?
- (4) Is it correct that the Commonwealth Government has promised assistance?
- (5) Can he give any details of the Commonwealth's interest in the project?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) to (3) In view of the fact that departmental inquiries have shown that there is almost no possibility of securing a site elsewhere in Pinjarra and the association has now sought part of the reserve, the Minister has approved of a grant of one acre of the Pinjarra native reserve to the Murray Districts Aboriginal Association conditional upon it becoming an incorporated body and obtaining local authority approval for its proposed building programme.
- (4) and (5) The Commonwealth Office of Aboriginal Affairs has shown interest in the project and has invited the association to submit a specific request for whatever finance is required after local sources have been explored.

13.

**HOUSING***Pinjarra and Mandurah*

Mr. RUNCIMAN, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How many homes were planned to be erected in 1971-72 at—
  - (a) Pinjarra;
  - (b) Mandurah?
- (2) How many of these homes are in the course of erection?
- (3) How many have been completed?
- (4) When is it expected that the 1971-72 programme will be completed and what has been the reason for the delay?
- (5) How many applicants are there for State Housing Commission homes in—
  - (a) Pinjarra;
  - (b) Mandurah?
- (6) How much land is owned by the Commission in—
  - (a) Pinjarra;
  - (b) Mandurah?

Mr. BICKERTON replied:

- (1) The 1971-72 programme intention was for—
  - (a) 15 units at Pinjarra, and
  - (b) 14 units at Mandurah.
- (2) Contracts have been signed for five units at Pinjarra and six units at Mandurah. Work is yet to be commenced.
- (3) Nil.
- (4) Five units at Pinjarra and six units at Mandurah are due for completion in August, 1972. Balance expected to be completed December, 1972. The programme is being implemented in line with original intentions as to timing.
- (5) Applications outstanding for—
  - (a) Pinjarra 42, and
  - (b) Mandurah 71.

Normal experience would indicate a wastage in applications of 45% in both of these towns. In addition the turnover rate of rental properties in recent years has been six at Pinjarra and one at Mandurah.

- (6) Land owned by Commission:—
  - (a) Pinjarra—49 individual sites and a broad acre holding of 130 acres.
  - (b) Mandurah—61 individual sites, two sites for group housing and one acre undivided.

**14. STATE SHIPPING SERVICE***Acquisition of Vessels*

Mr. COURT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What are the details of the two ships recently acquired by the State Shipping Service and in particular—
  - (a) the names of the ships when they were offered for sale and their present names;
  - (b) their D.W.T.;
  - (c) the year they were built;
  - (d) the names of the owners, and the type and amount of service during their life before acquisition by State Shipping Service;
  - (e) the state of their survey at the time when the ships were bought;
  - (f) the immediate commitment for survey and any survey commitments that follow the acquisition of the ships over the next three years?
- (2) What price was paid for each ship?
- (3) What additional costs were borne by State Shipping Service including amongst other costs—
  - (a) modifications (with details of such modifications);
  - (b) surveys—
    - (i) immediately or fairly soon after acquisition; and
    - (ii) within periods of 12 months, 24 months and 36 months respectively?
- (4) What other ships were offered to the State Shipping Service during the time the new ships were being negotiated?
- (5) What were the specifications of such ships, their state of survey, the price and degree of modification, etc., necessary to make them suitable for our Western Australian coast?
- (6) Why were the ships acquired selected in preference to others?
- (7) (a) What were the details of ships on offer to the State Shipping Service at lower prices than the ships acquired and on a basis that a decision on purchase could be made after satisfactory trial operations;
  - (b) Why were these offers rejected?
- (8) What additional ships are contemplated and what are their specification, survey condition, price, modification requirements, etc.?

Mr. JAMIESON replied:

As the answer to this question is rather detailed, I ask permission for it to be tabled.

The SPEAKER: Permission granted.

*The answer was tabled.*

## 15. LOCAL GOVERNMENT

### *Boundary Adjustments*

Mr. COURT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) What local government boundaries are currently under review?
- (2) Have any specific local government boundary changes been recommended to the Government, and, if so, what are they?
- (3) What changes in boundaries are currently contemplated by the Government?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) The Local Government Boundaries Commission has been requested to review all metropolitan municipal boundaries.
- (2) and (3) Changes in municipal boundaries in the Pilbara region reducing the number of districts from six to four and adjustment between the boundaries of the Town of Kalgoorlie and the Shire of Boulder as from 1st July, 1972 have been recommended and are expected to be implemented.

## 16. RURAL RECONSTRUCTION

### *Applications to Banks*

Mr. W. G. YOUNG, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many applications for rural reconstruction assistance have been received from clients of—
  - (a) private trading banks;
  - (b) Rural and Industries Bank;
  - (c) Commonwealth Development Bank?
- (2) How many applications from each of the above have been—
  - (a) rejected;
  - (b) approved?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) (a) 840 including Commonwealth Trading Bank;
- (b) 230;
- (c) No record kept. Their customers are included in either (a) or (b) above.

- (2) (a) (i) Private trading banks plus Commonwealth Trading Bank .... 488
- (ii) Rural and Industries Bank .. .... 119
- (b) (i) Private trading banks plus Commonwealth Trading Bank .... 240
- (ii) Rural and Industries Bank .... .... 87

## 17. STATE SHIPPING SERVICE

### *Efficiency and Economics: Improvement*

Mr. COURT, to the Premier:

What review is contemplated by the Government and State Shipping Service in conjunction with unions, major users, northern local authorities and Northern Territory Administration to improve the efficiency and economics of the operations of State Shipping Service and especially the service to Darwin and thus try and avoid the benefits of the new Commonwealth \$2,500,000 grant for an additional ship being lost through rising labour and other costs and conditions that are pricing Australian coastal shipping out of business?

Mr. GRAHAM (for Mr. J. T. Tonkin) replied:

The economics and efficiency of the State Shipping Service in the past have been most adversely affected by old and outmoded vessels clearly unsuited to meet changing demands and rising costs of sea transport operations to the north.

Because of limited funds available the re-equipping of the fleet must be undertaken progressively.

The initial step was taken in October last when two unit-load vessels replaced four older ships inherited from the previous Government.

The benefits of the faster ships *Wambiri* and *Beroona*, with much improved cargo handling gear and greater cargo space, which ships were purchased by this Government, have been recognised and supported by shippers, residents of the north, and by those who sail these ships and handle the cargoes.

The full advantages of the newer techniques will not be achieved with a "mixed ship" operation.

The replacement of the remainder of the existing fleet by two additional unit-load type ships has been authorised.

Within the framework of relevant industrial legislation, the service maintains contact and encourages the maximum co-operation with the maritime unions.

The Commonwealth grant of \$2.5 million falls short of the State Government's request for assistance with the service to Darwin. Without a subsidy, operational losses on that particular section will continue until the Darwin trade tonnage increases substantially.

Last year the Northern Territory Administration appointed a special commissioner to investigate the sea transport situation covering supplies to Darwin. This commissioner was informed of State Shipping Service plans for improving the sea service between Fremantle and Darwin.

The Minister for Development and Decentralisation (Hon. H. E. Graham) and the Minister for Transport (Hon. J. Dolan) propose visiting Darwin early next month for talks with shippers and commercial groups, the Northern Territory Administration, the port authority, and local waterside unions.

The Ministers will be supported by members of the Darwin Shippers Group of the Chamber of Manufacturers from Perth, and Shipping Service officers.

Mr. Court: You forgot to mention that the funds for the two new unit-load ships were accumulated by the Brand Government.

## 18. KALAMUNDA HIGH SCHOOL

### *Female Staff Toilet*

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it true that only one female staff toilet exists at Kalamunda High School and that, for the obvious reason, considerable discomfort is caused to some of the 40-odd ladies on the staff?
- (2) If this is so, will he take urgent action to provide more toilets for the female staff?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

It is understood that question (1) is designed to indicate that some 40 or more are on the staff of the particular school and that the word "odd" does not qualify the word "ladies." This being so, the answer to the question is as follows:—

- (1) Yes.

- (2) Drawings and documents for building additions are at present being prepared by a private architect. These additions will include male and female staff toilets.

## 19. MIDLAND JUNCTION ABATTOIR

### *Effluent: Disposal*

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has he received a report and/or recommendation from the Midland Junction Abattoir Board on proposals to dispose of effluent from the meat works?
- (2) Will he outline the contents of the report and advise of the costs expected to implement the proposals?
- (3) When will he give his decision on the report?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) The consultants' report has been received.
- (2) The report indicates that the effluent standards (20 ppm BOD/30 ppm SS) proposed by the board can be achieved with present day technology and are adequate to eliminate current problems and provide a potential source of water which would be suitable for some re-use within the abattoir; e.g., in saleyards and irrigation of paddocks.  
The estimated cost of the effluent system recommended by the consultants was in excess of \$600,000.
- (3) Technical details of the report are still under discussion and a decision will be made as soon as possible.

## 20. GOVERNMENT OFFICES

### *Disabled Persons: Access*

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Premier:

Will he ensure that all buildings (Government and leased) accommodating Government departments, which are visited by the public, have suitable provision for disabled persons, either in wheel chairs, or aided by other devices, to enter such buildings?

Mr. GRAHAM (for Mr. J. T. Tonkin) replied:

The Government is fully aware of the problem. There are difficulties involved in altering buildings already being occupied by Government departments but a careful consideration is being given to the design of new buildings in this regard.

## 21. LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

*Closed Circuit Television of Council Proceedings*

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Speaker:

So that visitors in the Assembly Chamber on Opening Day may see the proceedings when Assembly Members are in the Council Chamber, will he give consideration to the temporary installation of closed circuit television?

The SPEAKER replied:

From inquiries made previously into such a system, it would require the installation in the Chamber of 12 or more sets in order to give satisfactory viewing to people in the Public Gallery, Speaker's Gallery and on the floor of the House. The stationing of television sets would be difficult and cumbersome.

## 22. LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

*Sound Equipment: Installation*

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Speaker:

In view of the difficulty experienced by Members hearing some speakers on both sides of the House, will he investigate the possibility of installing sound equipment similar to that which exists in other Australian Parliaments?

The SPEAKER replied:

Inquiries were made through the Public Works Department in 1969 into providing an amplification system for this Chamber. The department's Radio Engineer visited Parliament House in Adelaide to inspect their system.

It was found that this system had some defects and would have to be modified to suit this Chamber. The estimated cost at that time was \$4,000.

I will make fresh representations to the Minister for Works with a view to having installed a system more suited to this Chamber.

(2) and (3)—

	30/6/68		30/6/69		30/6/70		30/6/71	
	Charged	Percent. Collected	Charged	Percent. Collected	Charged	Percent. Collected	Charged	Percent. Collected
Northern	\$ 8,351.20	90.2	\$ 11,329.00	96.6	\$ 12,731.90	93.5	\$ 14,791.50	92.4
North west	6,724.85	99.0	8,259.00	95.4	7,588.70	102.9	11,968.50	93.9
North central	10,284.02	94.3	12,895.44	95.6	16,122.06	92.2	20,344.32	84.9
Central	10,397.35	98.5	16,444.91	97.1	35,073.00	90.8	55,284.15	93.5
Eastern	3,686.30	98.1	3,649.90	93.6	6,706.40	95.9	9,131.95	91.0
Southern	17,880.10	89.3	24,068.95	87.2	28,799.15	96.9	32,701.61	98.3
TOTAL	57,323.82	96.41	76,677.20	93.2	107,022.11	94.66	144,172.03	93.02

NOTE: The percentages of collections shown include collections of arrears for previous years.

## 23. POULTRY FARMING

*Hen Licenses: Excess Quota*

Mr. MOILER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

With reference to the licensing of hens, how many poultry farmers who received a quota in excess of their base year received an increase of more than—

- 500 but less than 1,000;
- 1,000 but less than 2,000;
- 2,000 but less than 5,000;
- 5,000 but less than 10,000;
- above 10,000?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- 25.
- 17.
- 28.
- 7.
- 2.

24. This question was withdrawn.

## 25. NATIVES

*Rental Homes*

Mr. W. A. MANNING, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

- How many rental homes were controlled by the Native Welfare Department as at 30th June, 1968 to 1971?
- What was the total annual rent charged for these in the same years in each regional office?
- What proportion of rent charged was received in total and in each region?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

(1)—

	Primary Transitional	Standard Transitional	Conventional	Total
30/6/68	455	225	84	714
30/6/69	452	255	104	811
30/6/70	438	282	222	942
30/6/71	414	293	329	1,036



## 26. SCHOOLS IN KALAMUNDA DISTRICT

### *Ground Improvements*

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What progress has been made with respect to ground improvements at each of the four schools (Pickering Brook, Walliston and Lesmurdie Primary and Kalamunda High) which were inspected by a senior officer of the Education Department last year?
- (2) Will he give full details of proposals at each school, and nominate the dates on which work will commence?
- (3) Bearing in mind that financial provision was made in the loan programme, what is the reason for such a lengthy delay in provision of reticulation equipment to make use of the water stored in the dam at Kalamunda high school?
- (4) Does he consider the area cleared at Walliston School to be a suitable playing field?
- (5) Is he aware that, because of the rough nature of the surface, Walliston children have to travel to the pony club ground which, although a gravel surface, produces less abrasions than at the school ground?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) Pickering Brook—Preliminary investigations are in hand to enable landscape plans to be prepared.

Walliston—Estimate for test bore submitted to Education Department—if sufficient water is available, a reticulation scheme will be prepared.

Lesmurdie—Approval given by Education Department to parents and citizens' association to proceed with bitumen playing area—a subsidy of up to \$1,000 has been approved.

Kalamunda High—Tenders will be called early next month for the mechanical work—drainage and grassing contracts will follow in due course.

- (2) Pickering Brook—Landscaping and ground improvements to commence when estimate is prepared and funds provided.

Walliston—Test bore to prove availability of water supply to be carried out when funds are allocated by the Education Department.

Lesmurdie—Extension of bitumen playing area to be carried out by parents and citizens in collaboration with local shire.

Education Department has set aside \$1,000 subsidy. Work to be programmed by parents and citizens.

Kalamunda High—Reticulation, drainage and grassing. Tenders for reticulation to be called in April, 1972. Grassing to follow.

- (3) Funds were only made available in November, 1971. Survey and documentation in detail are necessary before tenders may be called.
- (4) No.
- (5) Yes.

## 27. NAVAL BASE AT COCKBURN SOUND

### *Garden Island: Use*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Premier:

Adverting to my question without notice on 14th March regarding Garden Island, will he now answer my remaining questions—

- (1) Has his Government decided upon what it considers the best use for Garden Island?
- (2) If not, why not, and will it now do so immediately and acquaint the Assembly of its findings so that the issue can be debated in Parliament?
- (3) Did he take the opportunity when in Canberra recently for the Premiers' Conference to press our Parliament's recommendations for Garden Island?
- (4) Will he advise the Government's decision to the request for transfer to Garden Island of the ship maintenance and building yards planned for by the Fremantle Port Authority for Mangles Bay?
- (5) Does the Government oppose the opinion of the Young Labor Movement against siting of the Stirling Base in Cockburn Sound and, in fact, support the present construction programme?
- (6) Does the Government oppose the Commonwealth Government's invitation to other countries to use the Stirling naval facilities when completed?

Mr. GRAHAM (for Mr. J. T. Tonkin) replied:

- (1) and (2) The view of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority is, briefly, that, subject to the necessary security safeguards for naval installations, the part of the Island not taken up by those, should be available for recreational use by the public, with access by water.

- (3) to (6) These are repetitions of questions asked by the Member last Wednesday and replied to by the Premier.

## 28. INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT

### *Penal Provisions*

Mr. WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Since 1964, on how many occasions have the penal provisions of the Industrial Arbitration Act been used by—  
 (a) employers against unions;  
 (b) unions against employers;  
 (c) unions against workers;  
 (d) employers against workers?
- (2) In general, what were the reasons for the penal provisions being used?

Mr. TAYLOR replied:

- (1) (a) 6.  
 (b) 652.  
 (c) 432.  
 (d) 16.
- (2) (a) Actions by employers against unions for taking part in a strike or unauthorised cessation of work.  
 (b) Actions by unions against employers for non-compliance with award conditions.  
 (c) Actions by unions against workers for failure to maintain financial membership and to apply for membership.  
 (d) Actions by employers against apprentices for breaches of agreement, mainly class attendance and behaviour.

## QUESTIONS (12): WITHOUT NOTICE

### 1. RAILWAYS

#### *Electrification and Sinking of Line*

Sir DAVID BRAND, to the Acting Premier:

- (1) Was he correctly reported in the Press of Saturday, the 18th March, 1972, as having said "that he would not give any more details 'under press interrogation or by questions in Parliament'", regarding an announcement that "in the course of a very few days, the people of W.A. will learn that this State is about to embark on a further extension of our railway system . . . ." ? If so, why his refusal to give Parliament further details on such an important proposal?
- (2) Have the proposals been before the State Cabinet and was the decision made that the Deputy

Premier should make the announcement on the occasion of the opening of the Robb Jetty railway terminal on Friday, the 17th March, 1972?

- (3) Why was the announcement made before the normal detailed information usually available on such an important project could be given to Parliament and the public?
- (4) When will the findings of the Cabinet sub-committee examining the recommendations of Dr. Nielsen in the PERTS Report be made available to the public?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) to (4) In reply to the questions asked by the Leader of the Opposition let me say, first of all, it is well known, not only to me but to everybody else, that the PERTS Report has been before this Government during its life as, indeed, it was before the previous Government.

Mr. O'Neill: For a short period of time only. It was not before the previous Government during its life of 12 years.

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not say for what period of time.

Mr. O'Neill: The Acting Premier said "during its life" and thereby implied during its whole life.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is no need for me to imply anything. When the Government has something to convey to the people or to the Parliament it will do so by a direct statement.

I indicate to the Leader of the Opposition that a Cabinet sub-committee and an officers' committee have been examining the report, some further investigations have been undertaken, and these have been examined. No final decision has yet been made by the Government.

I indicated at the ceremony that the people of Western Australia were likely to learn in the very near future of some further developments in respect of our railway system, and I suggested what form they might take. Since no final decision has been made, as stated at the ceremony—which I now repeat—it would not be proper, nor indeed possible to give precise details with regard to routes, finance, or anything else. All that was sought was to convey to the people present at the ceremony, particularly those directly associated with railway administration, that the freight terminal

which virtually marked the completion of the standard rail gauge project, was not the end of the line but further extensions of railway development and operations are looming. In addition to the metropolitan area, I indicated, too, that studies are being undertaken in the matter of linking the northern system with the southern system and gave the reasons for this, again without supplying details.

I thought it appropriate to give some heart and encouragement to railway officials and this was done. As soon as the Government has made its final determination full details will be made available to the Parliament and to the public.

## 2. RAILWAYS

### *Electrification and Sinking of Line*

Mr. COURT, to the Acting Premier:

- (1) With reference to the announcement he made at the Robb Jetty railway terminal opening on Friday, the 17th March, 1972, about electrification and undergrounding of metropolitan rail services, which particular existing or proposed new routes are to be electrified and which of these are to be underground?
- (2) In view of his comments—"I believe that, in the course of a very few days, the people of W.A. will learn that this State is about to embark on a further extension of our railway operations . . ."—what was the source he had in mind from which the people of Western Australia would learn of the proposal and what is the significance in terms of time and implementation of "about to embark on a further extension . . .?"

- (3) What is the approximate—

- (a) overall financial estimate for electrification, rolling stock, railway track, stations, and all other associated costs including redevelopment of the Perth Railway Station site?
- (b) construction time before which the new services will operate?

I realise the Acting Premier has said he is not prepared to enter into detailed information on this matter, but I believe the general questions I have asked are fair enough under the circumstances.

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) to (3) As anticipated by the questioner, and as stated previously, when a final decision on the whole

concept has been made by the Government ample publicity will be given to the details.

Mr. COURT: The Acting Premier must have a rough idea of cost and time.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am hoping this will be subsequent to the Cabinet meeting next week.

Mr. COURT: It is all a hoax.

## 3. BUSH FIRES BOARD

### *Meeting*

Mr. GAYFER, to the Minister for Lands:

At the State Bush Fires Board meeting held in Beverley last Friday at which the chairman, secretary, and board members of the State Bush Fires Board were present, why was the member for Northam invited to attend and not the member for Avon in whose electorate Beverley lies, and who represents also the Shires of York and Quairading, both of which were represented at this meeting?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

The meeting was not a Bush Fires Board meeting but a public gathering attended by the board, where attention was drawn to this omission by the President of the Beverley Shire Council. The Chairman of the Bush Fires Board said in explanation that he had sent courtesy invitations to four members of Parliament in accordance with a list provided by board staff arranging the Beverley visit. He emphasised that no slight to Mr. Gayfer was intended; he publicly apologised and undertook to write personally to Mr. Gayfer.

The Representatives of the Shires of York and Quairading were present upon their own initiative.

## 4. UNEMPLOYMENT

### *Government Financial Assistance*

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Acting Premier:

My question relates to the answer given to question 7 on today's notice paper. The Acting Premier stated that an amount of \$2,990,000 has been made available for unemployment relief. I ask whether this amount of money was provided by the Commonwealth Government?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

I think the reply given to the question conveys that information.

## 5. UNEMPLOYMENT

*Government Financial Assistance*

Mr. O'CONNOR, to the Acting Premier:

Following replies given to questions I have asked, I assume no money at all for unemployment relief has been provided by the State Government. However, if money has been provided, how much is it in total?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

For reasons which must be rather obvious I am not familiar with the detailed workings of the Treasury Department. I can see the point sought by the honourable member and I will undertake to make inquiries and subsequently supply him with a reply.

## 6. MURDOCH UNIVERSITY

*School of Veterinary Science*

Mr. THOMPSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has the Government scrapped the plans of the previous Government to build a school of veterinary science at the Murdoch University in 1973?
- (2) If so, will he state what alternative plans the Government has for providing this very necessary facility for the rural community?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) No. The Government is proceeding with plans to establish a school of veterinary science at the Murdoch University which is not expected to open until 1975.

The date when the school of veterinary science opens for teaching is dependent on the availability of funds in the 1973-75 triennium for buildings and equipment.

## 7. MURDOCH UNIVERSITY

*School of Veterinary Science*

Sir DAVID BRAND, to the Minister for Education:

Will he lay upon the Table of the House a copy of the letter he wrote to the Commonwealth Government on the question of the opening of a veterinary school at the Murdoch University?

Mr. T. D. EVANS replied:

I wrote to the Federal Minister for Education and Science to seek Commonwealth assistance for the first triennium prior to the opening of the school of veterinary science. I am prepared to lay a letter such as this on the Table of the House.

## 8. WOOL

*Rail and Shipping Freights: Albany*

Mr. NALDER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What is the minimum number of bales of wool required to qualify for the minimum freight?
- (2) What is the freight on wool from—
  - (a) Narrogin to Albany;
  - (b) Wagin to Albany;
  - (c) Katanning to Albany;
  - (d) Kojonup to Albany;
  - (e) Lake Grace to Albany;
  - (f) Gnowangerup to Albany?
- (3) What is the freight for wool consigned to Fremantle from Albany on—
  - (a) farm pressed bales;
  - (b) dumped bales?

Mr. H. D. EVANS replied:

- (1) One bale.
- (2)

	Freight rate per bale	Charge to client per bale
	\$	\$
(a)	1.90	.95
(b)	1.75	.88
(c)	1.50	.75
(d)	1.75	.88
(e)	2.15	1.08
(f)	1.50	.75

Where loaded or unloaded by the department a charge of 10c per bale per service is additional, of which half is chargeable to the client.

- (3) (a) \$2.75 per bale.
- (b) \$2.75 per bale, with special arrangements for volume shipping traffic.

Where loaded or unloaded by the department, a charge of 10c per bale per service is additional.

## 9. "REVOLT" PUBLICATION

*Government Action*

Mr. MENSAROS, to the Acting Premier:

- (1) Has he seen the mimeographed publication headed *Revolt! Radical High School Student Broadsheet No. 5?*
- (2) Is he aware that this publication says that the Director-General of Education is a fascist, a despot and, being so, deserves nothing but liquidation?
- (3) Is he aware that the same publication directly incites secondary students physically to take over high schools, giving them detailed instructions of organisation to occupy first the administration

building, P.A. system, duplicating equipment, telephones, and electricity supply?

- (4) What is the Government's view on this type of anarchist propaganda being distributed in our high schools?
- (5) What is the Government—through the Police Force or other means—doing to inhibit the publication and distribution of such “broadsheets” and to lay charges against its publishers?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) No.
- (3) I am informed that the publication seeks to promote antisocial behaviour.
- (4) The Government deprecates this type of propaganda being distributed in centres of education.
- (5) I understand that the Minister for Police, pursuant to exhaustive inquiries and research by his department and after consultation with the Minister for Education and Attorney-General, is preparing a Cabinet submission.

#### 10. NAVAL BASE AT COCKBURN SOUND

##### *Garden Island: Use*

Mr. RUSHTON, to the Acting Premier: I refer to the answer given to question 27 on today's notice paper wherein the Acting Premier referred to questions I asked on the 14th March.

Since the Premier did not answer my questions on the 14th March is the position that the Acting Premier, and the Premier, simply refuse to answer them at all.

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

The questions were asked by the member for Dale on the date he mentioned. I was somewhat surprised to see he was permitted to ask identical questions almost immediately following the replies given.

As the Premier has answered the questions in the terms chosen by him it would be a sorry state of affairs indeed, I suggest, if I were to seek to answer them in a different form.

#### 11. TIMBER

##### *Railway Sleepers Contract*

Mr. GRAHAM (Minister for Development and Decentralisation):

Last Thursday the member for Vasse asked me a question without notice relating to question 35 on the notice paper of that day. He

asked me to ascertain and, if possible, to give the reasons for the loss of the contract for sleepers to South Africa.

I have made inquiries of the President of the W.A. Sleeper Export Association but I am informed that he has been given no reasons to date. In fact, he only received a cable advising that Western Australia had not won the contract.

However, the Sleeper Export Association has written to the South African Government Railways for advice regarding the failure to win the contract.

This is the only information which has been supplied at the present moment until advice is received from South Africa.

#### 12. FREMANTLE PORT

##### *Outer-harbour Development*

Mr. COURT, to the Acting Premier:

Last Thursday I addressed to the Acting Premier, without notice, some questions regarding the Fremantle Port Authority and Cockburn Sound. In view of the problem of placing these questions on the notice paper for today the Acting Premier agreed to answer them today, whether they were with or without notice.

I do not know whether he wants me to read them out or whether he has a copy of them. I read out parts (1) to (8) on Thursday and the Minister was not able to answer them then but said he would answer them today.

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

The answers to the questions are—

- (1) No.
- (2) and (3) The report will be laid on the Table shortly.
- (4) No.
- (5) The Government is aware that in a master plan the Commonwealth has reserved an area on the island for such a facility.
- (6) Yes, in the long term.
- (7) Answered by (6).
- (8) Facilities capable of meeting foreseeable demands can be provided in the Woodman Point area.

I now ask for permission to lay on the Table of the House a report of the Premier's committee for the development of Cockburn Sound and Kwinana.

*The report was tabled.*

## PUBLIC WORKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Jamieson (Minister for Works), and read a first time.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: FOURTH DAY

#### *Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 16th March, on the following motion by Mr. Brown—

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

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

**MR. A. R. TONKIN** (Mirrabooka) [5.17 p.m.]: I wish to support the motion before the House. First of all, I want to refer to the question of Friendly Society chemist shops or pharmacies. I regret that in answer to a question the Minister for Health indicated a legislative barrier was erected to prevent the opening of more Friendly Society pharmacies, which means the people in my area are prevented from exercising their choice; that is, they cannot go to a Friendly Society shop in the area in order to buy their goods. Of course, there is nothing to stop them going to Subiaco, Leederville, or Applecross for that purpose; but as there are very good shopping centres in Morley and Dianella it is inconvenient for people in the area to go elsewhere and naturally they tend to shop locally. Therefore I feel the people of Mirrabooka are being discriminated against in this matter.

I realise the law as it stands is not the work of the present Government, but I hope the Government will legislate to give relief and allow this freedom of choice to the people of Mirrabooka. I believe this would help those people, especially pensioners and parents of young children, to meet the problem of rising costs.

Turning to another problem, I want to say a few words about the large number of people who are in prisons in this State. Many of them are in prison for inability to pay fines. I understand the idea is that when a person is fined the punishment should be a deterrent. If a fine is to be a deterrent, it should be commensurate with a person's ability to pay.

A fine of \$30 is fairly common for some offences. To a businessman in the prime of his life who has an income of \$15,000 a year, \$30 is 1/500, or  $\frac{1}{500}$  of 1 per cent., of his income. To a tradesman earning

\$5,400 a year, a fine of \$30 is 1/180, or just over half of 1 per cent., of his income. In the case of an unskilled workman earning \$2,700 a year, a fine of \$30 is 1/90, or 1.1 per cent., of his income. An apprenticed lad of 18 years of age might be earning something like \$1,800 a year, in which case a fine of \$30 would be 1/60, or 1 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., of his income. To a pensioner whose income is \$845 a year—I hope my arithmetic is correct—a fine of \$30 would be 1/28, or 3 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., of his income.

I suggest these people are not being treated equally. The pensioner who has to pay a fine amounting to 3 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. of his income is being punished much more severely than the person who pays  $\frac{1}{500}$  of 1 per cent. of his income. The injustice is compounded by the fact that the wealthier person is less likely to be convicted because he can afford counsel to defend him and is therefore more likely to contest the case. The poorer person may not be in a position to brief counsel and he is therefore more likely to be found guilty. If convicted, the wealthier person is more able to pay his fine and is less likely to be gaoled in default.

If the purpose of a fine is to deter, it is clear that a fine of 1/500 of a man's salary is much less likely to deter than a fine of 1/100 of someone's income. I am not asking for special treatment for pensioners or low and middle income earners. All I am asking is that they should be treated in the same way as everyone else—in the same way as those who are better off financially. I envisage a system in which a magistrate would fine a person  $\frac{1}{500}$  of 1 per cent. of his income, which would mean a person earning \$15,000 a year would pay \$30, a person earning \$2,700 a year would pay \$5.40, and a pensioner whose income was \$845 a year would pay something like \$1.69, which would probably be rounded out to \$1.70 or \$2, for the sake of simplicity.

I believe this is one step towards the ideal we should all be reaching for—the ideal of equality before the law. There are no doubt some arguments against a system such as I have suggested but I believe it should at least be discussed.

**Mr. Rushton:** Do you agree with the Minister for Labour that those fines imposed against union members the other day should have been withdrawn?

**Mr. A. R. TONKIN:** I am discussing a question of principle and not what the Minister for Labour said the other day. The problem of the inability of people to defend themselves because of their financial position still exists. It is not good enough to say legal aid is available in such cases. In my opinion, legal aid is not working very well; the waiting list is too long, and so on.

I would now like to refer to a large high school in the Mirrabooka area; that is, the Morley High School. In 1970 first-year

students of the Morley High School attended classes in buildings in the grounds of the John Forrest Senior High School. Stage 1 of the Morley High School was being built but these students were not housed there because the building was not ready. At the beginning of 1971 the students went into the new building, but by then they were first and second-year students who really needed stages 1 and 2. However, only stage 1 was available.

I do not wish to criticise the Brand-Nalder Government. I realise that Budgets are relatively inelastic and there is never enough money for education. I am merely stating the fact that in 1971 first and second-year students at Morley High School were housed in a building designed for first-year students only. As a consequence, for some periods each week the second-year students had to go to the Mirrabooka and John Forrest Senior High Schools.

Because of the position that existed, I could foresee that the students who were inconvenienced in their first year would be inconvenienced in their second and third years and would bear the brunt of the crisis in education right through their school years.

Mr. Thompson: Has this been rectified yet?

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: It has, indeed. At that time, I approached the Premier and Minister for Education with a plea that special efforts be made to enable the high school to catch up a stage by building stages 2 and 3 in one year. The Premier and the Government as a whole saw the force of this argument and agreed that the initial students should not continue to be disadvantaged in this way. As a result, both stages 2 and 3 were built in 1971. I believe it was a very generous decision, in view of the Government's financial difficulties.

Mr. Rushton: It was not unique, though.

Mr. Thompson: It is a handy precedent.

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: I think it also indicated that the Government was sincere and very much in earnest when it stated that education was to be in the forefront of the Government's priorities.

At the present time, however, the students are disadvantaged to some extent because they do not have lockers. An experiment was made with this school by omitting lockers. The students are being inconvenienced and many of their parents are worried. The students have to carry their bags and cases, loaded with books and weighing up to 12lb., back and forth to school, which is dangerous for those who ride bicycles. They also have to carry their loaded bags and cases around the school. Once again, the decision not to put lockers in the school was not a decision of the present Government, but nevertheless it should be rectified.

A very refreshing departure from traditional forms of education is the appointment of youth education officers, whose job it is to look after the needs of the 15, 16, and 17-year-old young people who have perhaps left school. The youth education officers help them to make the most of their leisure, to establish and maintain satisfactory social relationships, which is often a very difficult problem for adolescents. They also help the children to adjust to the problems of employment and to further their cultural and sporting affiliations.

I believe that in the past we have neglected the social nature of man and we have paid for this in some respects with the increased vandalism that seems to occur in modern societies. I suggest that vandalism has, perhaps, two main causes, one being the rejection of a child by his parents. That is a very complex problem and I have not time to deal with it now. In any case, it does not really fit into the point I am making. The second reason for vandalism is the alienation of the person concerned from society. He does not feel that he is part of society. He does not feel that the property of society is his and does not see why he should not destroy it.

Mr. W. A. Manning: Is this any fault of the education system?

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: I would say it is to a degree. It is a fault of society and to some extent it must be a fault of all the forces which have helped to produce this type of person. It is in this context that the work of the youth education officers is carried out. In the past year such an officer has been appointed to the Mirrabooka High School, for which we in the area are very grateful. I point out to the Minister for Education that there are still gaps in the service in the northern suburbs associated with the John Forrest, Hampton, and Morley High Schools, but I am sure he will do his best to appoint another officer when the funds become available.

I now want to speak about the new school text book scheme. It is a pity that to some extent this has become a political matter, because educationally I believe it is a very sound scheme. First of all, I want to deal with one particular text—although I do not like to use that word because it is inaccurate—that has been produced by the curriculum branch of the Education Department. I refer to the publication entitled *Soviet Society*.

There has been much criticism of this book and it is considered that it has faults. I agree. There are faults in the book. One of the problems has been that the writers in all honesty, have tended to deal with the constitutional framework of the Soviet Union. The rationale behind this is that when we are dealing with the Australian Government, the United States Government, or the British Government, we tend

to deal with the constitutional framework. So in this case the authors said, "We will be consistent; we will deal with the constitutional framework of the Soviet Union."

However, of course, we know that there are great differences between the constitutional framework and some of the political realities of the Soviet Union. So there has been a great deal of criticism of this book because it was felt that it is glossing over the Soviet society, generally.

Mr. Court: It was justifiable criticism because of the loading of it, and because of the loading the other way of the other book, *Industrial Society*.

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: I agree that *Soviet Society* as a book does have faults; and I agree that one should teach the political reality of a country and not just the constitutional framework. However, we must be consistent in this regard. If we are going to teach the political reality in the Soviet Union we must teach the political reality in Australia, the United States, and Britain. I do not think a double standard should apply here. We must be consistent in our application of this principle.

Mr. Reid: Do you think it is a good idea having to hand school books back if a student is transferred? There is no responsibility of ownership.

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: I would rather deal with some of the more important points at the moment.

Mr. Reid: But you said you consider the school book scheme is a very good one.

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: Yes, I think it is a good one in many ways. However, perhaps I could continue with what I have to say on this subject. A very pleasing feature of the book *Soviet Society* is that it deals with the nature of bias. This has not been fully recognised. We must realise that every book is written by a person or persons and, therefore, every book will have bias. There is no disputing that fact. But very few books admit this and draw it to the attention of the students and actually help them to appraise and allow for bias. This book does that at the very beginning by discussing the nature of bias. Not only does the book do this, but later on it deals with an interview with a Russian attorney, as outlined in an extract from *Look* magazine of October, 1967. Then it gives an extract from *Soviet Weekly* of the 19th June, 1971. Those two extracts are, of course, at variance with one another. However, after each of those extracts the book refers the student back to the section on bias and suggests that the extracts should be examined from that point of view.

I think that is an excellent feature of the book and it is a very desirable step in the right direction by its authors. We must remember that literacy—the enabling of people to read—makes those who

read more vulnerable to propaganda. If people can read it is so much easier to get propaganda across to them. So I think more and more we must teach our students propaganda analysis, and teach them to understand the nature of bias.

I know that good teachers have been doing this for a long time, but we have only scratched the surface. In Britain, the United States, and other countries much more of this is done. We are just at the beginning in this field.

With regard to the text book scheme as a whole, I was asked whether it is good that the books should be handed back. I suppose if the books were kept by the student it would be a great waste. However, knowing the nature of students and the nature of the books, probably the books would not be worth handing back after a year's use.

Mr. Reid: What happens when a student transfers half-way through the year?

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: I am not saying there are no flaws in the scheme; I am saying it has some advantages. However, first of all we must realise that the term "text book" is a misnomer. In fact, it is educationally unsound to speak of text books, because the term presupposes a field of knowledge which the student is required to swallow and regurgitate at the required moment in order to achieve the desired pat on the back. These are not text books to that extent.

Mr. Thompson: How many units would be covered in, say, social studies in the one year, and how much time in terms of hours per week would a child have to deal with a specific topic?

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: I am not in a position to say. Does the honourable member refer to the hours in school?

Mr. Thompson: Yes. During the course of the year they have a number of units to do in social studies, as in every other subject. Would not the situation arise where a child is confronted with so much work that he reads just that one book?

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: I do not think there will be a great increase in work load. These matters are being looked into. Constant liaison takes place—which was never the case with commercial publishers. The officers of the curriculum branch are continually in touch with the schools, and they discuss matters with the teachers. Often there is a cross-fire of criticism of the book concerned. I do not think there will be an overloading in this respect, but if there is, teachers will say—as has occurred at meetings I have attended—"There is too much in this topic." The curriculum branch were producing books five and six years ago. Sometimes the comment was made, "There is too much in this topic and we cannot get through it," and revisions were made and are constantly being made.



However, I wish to get on to the broader point of view and say that the old concept of a single text book is outmoded. The new books will not be an orthodox stream of argument and knowledge from a central bureaucracy so that every student is brainwashed; that is educationally indefensible. For a long time good teachers have tried to ensure that all points of view are considered. I believe this scheme will make the position easier. The library will be the key to the scheme in which the Government will be providing a wide selection of books to which the students will be referred.

Whilst on the subject of libraries, I would like to comment on the wonderful work done by parents and citizens' associations throughout the State. In my area four new libraries have been built by parents and citizens' associations within the last year. I think the parents of children in this State are to be congratulated for the great sacrifices they have made and the efforts they are making on behalf of their children. I believe the Government should, when it is possible to do so, make greater help available to parents and citizens' associations. I would make a plea on behalf of all parents and citizens' associations for a greater amount of assistance.

Mr. Reid: Can we get back to this book scheme?

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: I have limited time available. I will discuss it with the honourable member later.

I believe that remedial teaching is one of the most neglected aspects of our educational system, particularly when we compare our system with that of education systems overseas. Children are suffering severe emotional stress because they are forced to work at levels for which they are not really fitted. It is all very well to say that a good teacher allows a child to work at his own rate; but it is also true that there is peer-group pressure, and a child does not wish to fall behind his mates. So I believe this is one area in which we will have to endeavour more and more to expand and to improve our remedial teaching programme. A frustrated child very often will fail to mature socially, and many behavioural problems are associated with this lack of maturation.

Mr. Lewis: Have you any particular area of remedial teaching in mind?

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: I am thinking of reading English as a foreign language and mathematics in particular. I think those are the main areas.

A need exists for more parks and halls in areas such as that which I represent. The districts of Morley, Dianella, and so on are expanding rapidly and I believe it is beyond the ability of local authorities to keep up with the great development. Parks tend to be developed only when the suburb is old and its children have grown up.

Young married couples are finding it most difficult to provide kindergartens in new areas. I believe the Government must begin to assist those shires which are bearing a heavy burden as a result of the unequal development which occurs from time to time.

I believe State revenue is fully committed, and I can see no solution of the problem until the Federal Government shoulders at least some of the responsibility. I think the whole question of urban development will become a bigger and bigger issue in politics in the future. So I would hope that development schemes—such as the sewerage main coming through from Yokine—will not be impeded in any way.

In my area many people living on urban deferred land are being rated off their properties. Many of these people are pensioners and others on low income and they are not permitted to develop or subdivide their land as a result of the lack of sewerage. I would hope that this area will be developed as quickly as possible.

I turn now to something which is near and dear to my heart—the question of national parks. Only 0.57 per cent. of Western Australia is devoted to national parks, and most of that land is not accessible to the majority of Western Australian people. I believe this country is in a good position to be able to devote more and more land to public purposes. We are one of the empty countries of the world and we have a wonderful opportunity in this regard. I realise that the present Government has created a park in the vicinity of Cape Leeuwin, and this indicates its interest in this aspect. However, I believe we must ensure for the sake of our children that all the land is not taken up for private purposes.

I would like to refer briefly to a matter that has been debated in both this and the other House; that is, the question of the political representation of the people of this State. It has been stated that I have been vague; that I have been deceitful on this matter. An attempt has been made to denigrate me by describing me as a minor member of the Labor Party. I would like to make it clear that I am not interested in petty and spiteful attacks on individuals. Last year in this Chamber I was the subject of some ill-mannered comments about my physical appearance. However, I would certainly not indulge in that kind of childishness. I believe the personalities involved in a debate are not important; the principles speak for themselves. So I will state the principle simply and without equivocation.

In our society people are grouped together to elect representatives to speak for them in Parliament. If the 20,000 people of the electorate I represent—Mirrabooka—have only one representative then I believe that any other 20,000 people in

the State should have only one representative. To allow approximately 70,000 people to have six representatives in the Legislative Council whilst another 70,000 people have only one representative is to degrade the latter and treat them as second-class citizens. In effect we are saying to them, "You can make a choice, but you will have far less leverage because your decision will result in only one member to represent your point of view; whereas a similar number of people will have a greatly enhanced leverage upon the affairs of the State because they will have six people to represent their point of view."

We believe an attempt should be made to have the same number of electors in each electorate. That is what we mean by one-vote one-value. I realise, of course, that country representatives and people have special problems, and I believe special efforts should be made to ease those problems. However, I do not believe we are justified in playing around with the numbers.

Mr. McPharlin: What special efforts do you recommend?

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: There is the question of transport, and special allowances for telephones, the provision of secretarial assistance and so on. I believe country representatives have special problems which I have not even begun to realise. I am certainly not unsympathetic towards those members or to country people.

Mr. Stephens: How many miles do you have to travel to attend to your electors within a period of 12 months?

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: It is quite possible that greatly enhanced majorities in some seats will blur the relationship between the percentage of vote obtained and the consequent representation, as was pointed out by the member for Floreat. It is also true that some electorates will grow faster than others and, therefore, they will become out of balance after a short period of time. But if we start off from the same basis then the distortion later on will be less.

Mr. Rushton: Are you still claiming there is gerrymandering?

Mr. A. R. TONKIN: Finally, I would remind members that we are here as representatives of the people; not of acres, or heads of stock, or income. I believe our importance in this place is that the people have sent us here. If we play around with the numbers so that one number of people send six times as many representatives to this Parliament as the same number elsewhere, then we are guilty of contempt of the people.

MR. RUSHTON (Dale) [5.46 p.m.]: I wish to support the motion expressing loyalty to the Crown and our support of the democratic system. In this debate I wish to express a few comments, and

the first is a sad one. I make reference to the untimely death of Mr. Hulme. He was one of our highly-rated public servants, and it was only a week ago that I shook hands with him on the opening day of this session of Parliament. I would like to place on record my high regard for Mr. Hulme who is one of a band of public servants who have served this State particularly well. I had the honour of knowing him from the time he served in the Treasury to his recent appointment as Under-Secretary for Works.

I now wish to make reference to the opening day of Parliament. I am one of those who are not enthusiastic about the selection of a day in March for the opening of Parliament. On this occasion the selection of the date detracted from the opening, and took away some of the atmosphere. The Government would be well advised to change the opening to another date. Possibly this matter can be reviewed. In all seriousness, the weather on this occasion detracted from the opening of Parliament in comparison with former years.

I now turn to a matter that has been raised regarding the wearing of coats by members in the Legislative Assembly. Sitting in a rear bench next to a doorway, I would ask members to have regard for myself and also for the member for Avon who is similarly seated. They should have regard for our health, as we may catch pneumonia!

Mr. Gayfer: What do you think of my hall and hearty colleague sitting beside me?

Mr. RUSHTON: It would benefit wool-growers if consideration were to be given to providing wool covers to the seats occupied by members. I understand that wool is cool, and if woollen seat covers were provided they would do much towards making conditions bearable when we have to sit long hours in hot weather.

Mr. Nalder: I am sitting on wool now!

Mr. RUSHTON: I thought he was sitting on leather.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I would like to know why the Leader of the Country Party, in the 12 years that he was Deputy Premier, did not ask the question of previous Speakers.

Mr. Nalder: Because we were not sitting in March.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You did sit in March while you were in office.

Mr. RUSHTON: Although these comments are made in a light-hearted vein, I think some benefits could be gained from my last reference.

I now wish to refer to a statement made by the Premier in Japan, not that I think my remarks will be transmitted to Japan. I would like to refer briefly to the trip that is being undertaken by the Premier

to Japan. To me the timing is strange. Here we have an autumn sitting of Parliament—and he was a great advocate of introducing an autumn sitting—but then only two days after Parliament opened he was off to Japan. People are putting forward all sorts of reasons as to why he has gone there.

Mr. Graham: That was very largely as a result of requests by mining companies in this State, and the fact that the Japanese financial year commences on the 1st April.

Mr. T. D. Evans: There must have been a few requests from members on your side of the House for the introduction of an autumn session commencing in March.

Mr. RUSHTON: It is somewhat passing strange that the Premier should make a comment while in Japan about his desire to give the Japanese confidence in the Labor Government of Western Australia, and about the honesty and uprightness of his Government.

In this regard actions are far more telling than words. For this very reason I think the Government could set about to act in such a way that it will attract people like the Japanese, to trade in a more confident manner than they are at present. It is somewhat worrying to see a statement such as that from the Premier. I think when the Deputy Premier was in Japan he made statements like this one, in an effort to reassure the Japanese. This Government, after being in office for a year, should not have to do that; I do not see why that is necessary. I suggest that a party which has used propaganda when it was in opposition—such as the displaying of little Japanese flags all over the north-west and the accusation that the present Opposition, which was then in office, was selling out the State—will have great difficulty in convincing people with whom we wish to trade to an increasing extent that they themselves are sincere.

I now wish to turn to the subject of Garden Island, and to draw attention to the fact that both the Premier and the Deputy Premier have refused to answer a number of pertinent questions asked by me. This is somewhat strange. This matter is of vital importance to many people in Western Australia. I would like to enlarge on this question, and ask the Government to act in a certain way to develop this project. I find it passing strange that the Government has evaded my questions. They were straightforward enough and were without any real bite, because they deal with a recreational asset and a naval facility which is vital to Western Australia. If it can be said that the Tonkin Government is sincere about the future of Garden Island then the Premier should be prepared to answer these questions.

We have been furnished with a reply that the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority has put forward some proposi-

tion for Garden Island. This is not good enough. Although the Commonwealth Government was not prepared to join in undertaking a specialised survey, this Government should have prepared a plan in respect of Garden Island, or should have put forward the recommendations which it will make to the committee of inquiry into this question. It should have prepared plans setting out its recommendations on the use of Garden Island. The Government should do this before it indicates to the Commonwealth Select Committee the proposals for the State, because this Government speaks for the people of Western Australia. It was hoped that the Government would have prepared some plan which the people could have backed.

I also hoped that the Government would invite members of all political parties to join in the planning and recommendations. Will the Government reconsider the position, and invite at least one member of each party to confer with it on the recommendations that are to be made?

Mr. T. D. Evans: Can you quote a precedent where your Government extended a similar privilege?

Mr. RUSHTON: I did not know there were two Garden Islands.

Mr. T. D. Evans: We are not speaking about two Garden Islands. I am speaking in respect of any question. The honourable member should not be so narrow minded.

Mr. RUSHTON: I thought that in respect of the gold issue members of the different parties had representation on the committee. This brought about a very effective result.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It took a long time.

Mr. RUSHTON: That was a precedent.

Mr. Graham: This will be a matter of a case or separate cases being prepared and submitted by Government departments or instrumentalities. It is not a matter of representation by members of this Government or members of the Opposition.

Mr. RUSHTON: If that is the approach then I am disappointed. If ever there is need for responsibility to be shown by the present Government it is in this case; it should have prepared a collated programme and framed recommendations to put forward to this committee and to the Commonwealth Government setting out what we want for the people of Western Australia in respect of Garden Island.

Mr. Graham: You are talking about a parliamentary committee. I was telling you that in connection with a parliamentary committee representations have been made by the Premier of the State to the Prime Minister. That is at the parliamentary level. This is at a different level altogether.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Deputy Premier has said in answer that the Government has asked to be heard at this inquiry. Surely this is to be the Government's submission. If it is to make a submission in that manner it will be a sell-out of the people of Western Australia.

Mr. Graham: Of course it is the Government's submission.

Mr. RUSHTON: It is accepted as a Government submission.

Mr. Graham: Apparently you do not understand.

Mr. RUSHTON: Because of the interest in this question, I am putting it to the Deputy Premier that the Government needs to put forward its submission on the basis of acquiring the best for the future of the State. We accept the establishment of the naval facilities; we do not wish to inhibit that activity. The question arises as to how the rest of the island can be utilised. All I am asking is that consideration be given to broadening the approach. The Deputy Premier has answered the question and says the Government does not wish to broaden the approach. I suggest that in the last few days it should have prepared some plan and declared what the Government wants to take place in the development of Garden Island. It has done nothing.

Mr. T. D. Evans: How do you know?

Mr. RUSHTON: The Government has said in answer to the question that the M.R.P.A. has made some recommendation.

Mr. Graham: Is not that an arm of government?

Mr. RUSHTON: That was done a long time ago.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Who said so?

Mr. RUSHTON: It has been published before.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Where and when?

Mr. RUSHTON: The Minister can look into the back issues of the newspapers.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Be more specific.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Minister can read the comments that have been published in respect of Garden Island.

Mr. T. D. Evans: You should do your homework before you make a speech.

Mr. RUSHTON: Let us look at the question squarely. The Government has refused to answer the questions. Has the Government decided what is to be the future of Garden Island?

Mr. Graham: I think you are doing a signal disservice to the case. You are trying to create bickering on an issue on which there should be complete unanimity.

Mr. RUSHTON: I want unanimity. The people of Western Australia should be told what will be the recommendation in relation to Garden Island. Different opinions

are held, and I will give my opinion. Despite all the requests that have been made to the Government to do something, and despite the fact that the Government has said to the Press and to the people, "We are recommending entry by the people into Garden Island" it has not prepared a plan or announced its recommendations. That is what worries me. It is now only a week before this Government will be putting forward its submission. That seems to be the reason for our questions not being answered. We have the instance of the Young Labor Movement recommending that no naval facility be established there.

Mr. Graham: You have a mind like a tin of worms.

Mr. Court: Is the Labor Party in favour of a naval base there?

Mr. T. D. Evans: We have also had some opinions expressed by the Young Liberal Movement.

Mr. RUSHTON: The Government should answer the question as to whether it believes there should be use of Garden Island by the public.

Mr. Jamieson: This has been a policy of the Labor Party long before you were elected to this Parliament. You know about this matter, and all you are doing is to try to fiddle with a few words to make some political gain out of this issue. That is stupid.

Mr. RUSHTON: I am not trying to make any political gains. It was the unanimous vote of this House. Talking about fiddling with words, when the Prime Minister of Australia was talking about our naval facilities being made available to other nations, what did the Premier of this State say? I would like him to come back here now to do something about a matter which is vital to the State. It is passing strange that at this late hour we do not know what the State Government intends to do with regard to Garden Island.

Mr. Davies: When the Commonwealth parliamentary committee arrives on the 4th April, the views of the Government will be known.

Mr. RUSHTON: Why should the people not know what recommendations will be made? It will be an open hearing.

Mr. Davies: Why should the people be told before the committee knows our views? Other people are also making submissions.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Are those people making their submissions public?

Mr. RUSHTON: Who will make the submissions?

Mr. T. D. Evans: The honourable member can make one.

Mr. Davies: The report from the committee investigating the Cockburn Sound area will be collated with submissions from other Government departments. I refer

to Local Government, the Department of Fisheries and Fauna, the Forests Department, and others.

Mr. O'Neill: The Deputy Premier is grateful for that information.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Dale.

Mr. RUSHTON: It is interesting to know that we have a departmental committee. However, we do not have a representative from the people who will be affected by this most important issue. Surely the Government should have agreed in Cabinet on what recommendations it would make. This is a nonparty matter.

Mr. Davies: If the honourable member looks at the report he will find out the names of the members of the committee. He has not done his homework, but instead is doing a disservice to the community.

Mr. RUSHTON: I want the Government to get up off its tail and do some work.

Mr. Davies: The Government is up off its tail.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RUSHTON: I would like to refer back to this question and respectfully make some suggestions to whichever Minister or department will be handling the matter. My suggestions refer to the future of the island.

Mr. Davies: The honourable member can make his suggestions to the public works committee.

Mr. RUSHTON: I do not agree with some of the recommendations put forward. Certainly, some recommendations have merit but others are not at all practical. The northern part of the island has been of interest mainly to people from Fremantle and surrounding areas. The southern part of the island has been of interest mainly to those who journey to Kwinana or Rockingham. In fact, an overwhelming number of visitors to the island would be from the Rockingham area because of the short distance across to the island.

I suggested earlier that this whole question should be reviewed and a common-sense decision made. However, such a decision has not been forthcoming. The State Government has not taken us into its confidence so we have not had an opportunity to say whether it is right or wrong. In times of peace the people should have the greatest access possible to Garden Island.

Mr. Bickerton: Has the honourable member a cottage on Garden Island?

Mr. RUSHTON: No.

Mr. Bickerton: Has he any interest in a cottage?

Mr. RUSHTON: No.

Mr. Bickerton: Why hasn't he?

Mr. RUSHTON: I have not been fortunate enough to be able to acquire one. Coming back to the issue, in my layman's view it would be practical for pedestrian entry to be available over the causeway. Facilities for fishing should also be made available on the causeway. I do not think civilian vehicles should have entry but those who are able to walk the distance—such as professional walkers—should have entry.

Mr. Hartrey: Can the honourable member walk to Garden Island?

Mr. RUSHTON: I will be able to do so when the causeway is completed.

Mr. Bickerton: Does the honourable member think that the island will be completely occupied by the big guns!

Mr. RUSHTON: There is no fear of that. However, I think pedestrian entry could be allowed to the west coast. Fishing facilities, also, should be available along the west coast. The naval facilities and installations could be well fenced and given ample protection. Those who have to move should be phased out gradually, and their removal should not be hastened.

We have been assured that certain parts of the island will be retained because of their historical background, and there have been assurances regarding other interests on the island. I do know of people who have been told that it will be some time before their cottages will be removed.

In all sincerity I believe the State Government should be our representative of strength in obtaining the best result possible for the people of Western Australia. Of course, one cannot deny that the public works committee set up by the House of Representatives will carry out its functions in a democratic manner. The meeting will be held in public in Western Australia and we have already been assured by the Prime Minister that there will be access to Garden Island. That statement is to be qualified and we want to know what that qualification will be. The decision will be based on arguments presented at the inquiry. For that reason I submit my thoughts, in brief, because I believe there should be pedestrian access to the island. The dwellings could eventually be phased out.

I believe it is the intention of the Federal Government that historical landmarks and monuments will be preserved and treated with every respect. However, I am very disappointed indeed that our State Government has not seen fit to proceed with more purpose on this issue. We will be able to observe what argument is presented to the committee.

The State Cabinet is formed of members who represent the people and I thought Cabinet would have reviewed all departmental suggestions and would have injected its own views into those recommendations. The members of the Cabinet have been elected by the people and I

hoped that the recommendations put forward by Cabinet would have been those for the people.

It is not too late for Cabinet to review its thinking on that basis. We have already had an all-party approach for assistance for our north-west shipping, and an all-party case was put forward for assistance for the goldmining industry. Surely it should not be too much to expect an all-party representation at the inquiry concerning Garden Island, which is a vital issue.

I will not pursue the matter any further at the moment; I think I have got my message through to the Acting Premier. He has reacted to my comments and I hope that when he reads *Hansard* he will realise I am not attacking him or his Government. My only wish is to stir up some interest and I would like the Government to prepare a case based on the requirements of the people.

Mr. Graham: Does the member for Dale intend to make a submission to the committee?

Mr. RUSHTON: I did not intend to make a submission for the very reason I have given to the Acting Premier. Such an avenue is open to me but I hope our Parliament will be presenting a case which we can all back. I realise it is impossible to get a unanimous opinion on what should be done on Garden Island. Many different views have already been expressed in the Press. I have expressed my views, which are brief. Possibly, my viewpoint is idealistic.

I would like to be able to evaluate the views for and against. There is still scope for pedestrian entry to the southern end of the island. Naturally, I do not know what naval facilities are planned for that part of the island so I cannot be dogmatic about the matter.

Mr. Graham: I think the Commonwealth will be emphatic that there should be no public entry to the southern portion of the island.

Mr. RUSHTON: I cannot see that that is necessary. We are hopeful that ship-building and maintenance will be carried out in Careening Bay and we hope that civilians will service that facility. We would then have civilians travelling to and from work along the causeway.

Mr. Graham: But those workers would be under supervision and travelling on a regular basis.

Mr. RUSHTON: It might be thought that I am too idealistic. Garden Island covers an area of 3,000 acres and I was hopeful that the naval facilities could be sited without reducing their effectiveness. I do not for one moment want to reduce the effectiveness of the naval facilities, but I cannot see why there should not be access for pedestrians. I would not have civilian vehicular traffic.

Mr. Graham: That would not open up the area for very many people.

Mr. RUSHTON: But many people have boats.

Mr. Graham: That access is available now, and that is the most we can expect.

Mr. RUSHTON: A large number of the people who travel to Garden Island now use the ferry service. Environment 2000 seems to be emphasising the need for entry to the northern part of the island. Many clubs visit Garden Island because of the attractiveness of the west coast, and their entry has usually been through the southern access. Access should still be available for those groups of people. The Acting Premier, and I, could probably still walk across the causeway without any undue strain. The western coast is very attractive and access to it would be of distinct advantage.

The views for and against should be considered. One cannot be dogmatic because one does not know the intentions regarding naval installations. I do not suppose anybody knows what the Navy plans to do, but obviously the facilities constructed will be considerable.

I think we have all desired to have the facility in this State, and we want it to be effective. We want it to give Western Australia a strong arm of defence. If anybody disagrees with what I am saying let him speak, but I think what I have said is the general view. It is not my intention to inhibit the naval facilities, but in time of peace I would like every consideration to be given to the enjoyment which can be experienced by those who like to visit the island.

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

Mr. RUSHTON: Before the tea suspension I had spoken in connection with Garden Island, and I do hope the Government will act in accordance with the recommendations I have made.

I pass now to a number of subjects which, while I might touch on them briefly, are most important. Unfortunately I will not be able to develop some of them.

I would mention, however, that one of the most vital questions concerns the Rockingham-Kwinana hospital. The Government has been most tardy about this matter and from the answers I received to questions asked today it looks as though the Government is running away from the issue. This question is of great concern to the area. We had hoped that transport problems to places like Armadale would have been successfully overcome by now; but because of the doubts about the corridor development and other land uses, all development has stopped. We hope that this matter will be cleaned up in the near future.

The matter of housing is another vital issue and my questions today show that the placing of houses this side of Alcoa in

the path of the prevailing winds is causing great concern. If the State Housing Commission builds houses on the land it possesses adjacent to the Armadale brickworks it will inhibit the brickworks. Regarding the M.R.P.A. scheme for Kelmescott, I hope the Minister for Housing will look at development in this area to see if it cannot be broadly based in a manner similar to that at Calista or Orelia.

We all know that the question of employment is one of the most important and vital with which we have to deal. It is a question on which the Government's credibility is challenged and the matter is of grave concern. It is necessary first to look at the problems confronting the Government because it created the situation of a lack of faith. There were also claims of bankruptcy which caused a loss of confidence in the State in a big way.

The action of the Government in increasing electricity charges had the effect of raising the costs and, indeed, one of the small companies in my area has felt the impact very much and it has been inhibited in its movement forward.

The Government's delay in dealing correctly with the Pacminex issue and its failure to have the matter reviewed, particularly as it affected the site of the refinery, has lost us a refinery which we might otherwise have had. This has been lost as a result of the pig-headedness of the Government.

All the factors I have mentioned, and the action taken by the Government in connection with them, have caused delay and confusion and have also resulted in a loss of confidence.

The daddy of them all, however, is in relation to city transport development. What can be done when one has regard for the fact that with land in the metropolitan region the position is in such a state of flux? No information is available on the matter. This being the case, how is it possible to plan in a practical way for a city transport system?

All this shows clearly how very worrying it is to have a Government which relies on words but not on actions. The Government merely covers any pressures which it might feel by making announcements which, though they might sound good, have no substance at all. This is indeed a source of great anxiety to all of us.

I now want to deal as quickly as I can with the question of the Police Force, and the assistance it can and should be given. I plead with the members of the Government and with other members of this House to do all they can in connection with public assistance and co-operation being given to the Police Force. We all know that without reasonable co-operation from the public the police would be less effective. Our Police Force does a very

fine job indeed, but my belief is that it would be able to work far more successfully if some improved system of co-operation could be worked out; co-operation between the citizens and the police.

If it were possible to do this it would lift the morale of the force and help in other aspects of police work. It is most important to improve the image of the Police Force and any support that the public can give the police would certainly be most effective in helping that body carry out its duties more satisfactorily; it would surely improve the service.

I attended a meeting held recently which was addressed by a very respected member of the Police Force. He mentioned how difficult it is for the force with its lack of members to comprehend and deal effectively with the many crimes that are perpetrated in the community.

For my part I have made representations for an increase in the number of men at the Armadale Police Station. When I was refused it was certainly not acceptable to me. I was told that the Police Force has certain criteria to which it must work. Not only does everybody need to work in this direction of co-operation but the Government also needs to improve its example as it relates to uplifting police morale.

I would now like to refer to an industrial matter and the answer given by the Minister for Labour to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. To my mind the whole set-up is a form of blackmail. The Government, while lifting the fines against a number of shop stewards, will not accord the same treatment and consideration to those who are nonunionists. This sort of treatment is causing great concern to members of the public.

Mr. Lapham: What has this to do with the Police Force?

Mr. RUSHTON: I am now talking about the way the public feels when it sees this sort of thing being done. This of course reminds me of the Premier's remarks when the members of the Press were trying to obtain the reason for a number of charges against a certain person who had committed a number of offences being withdrawn. The Premier told the reporter concerned not to be cheeky. There is little doubt that this issue incensed the Press and the members of the Police Force, and I believe they are still incensed about it.

I would now like to refer to the question of the environmental protection legislation and the right of the Ombudsman to vet a policeman. We must congratulate Mr. Dolan on the stand he took on this matter. Unfortunately, however, a day or two after taking the stand he did he was put on the mat by the State Executive of the Labor Party and all the good work he had done was of no avail—at least this is how the public and the Police Force saw it. We

must, however, still give him credit for the stand he took in the matter.

Mr. Lapham: What are you talking about?

Mr. RUSHTON: I am referring to the action taken by the Minister for Police when he crossed the floor of the Upper House because of what he believed in.

The media could play a big part by supporting any organisation which might be appointed by the Government to help the police work out ways to improve co-operation and co-ordination between the public and the police. I suggest that a group of interested people be formed; people who are practical and who have varying interests in the community. They could work with the police and help find ways and means to obtain co-operation between the public and the police. This is of course, a fairly sensitive area, but there are other ways in which results could be achieved.

In recent times we have heard a plea being made by the father of the young lass who was killed at Medina. The headlines which were very stark read, "For God's sake help the police." There is little doubt as to how the father felt; he had a complete involvement.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has another five minutes.

Mr. RUSHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is something that must be done and the Government's approach would be most constructive if it created a small group of broadly-based people from all strata of society to work in co-operation with the police in an endeavour to help the Police Force in every way possible.

As we all know a number of minor offences occur every day, and the co-operation of the public would help the police in their investigations into these and more difficult and complicated issues. I would now like to quote a plea from the Australian Federation of Police Associations. The following motion was passed:—

21. That this conference express alarm at the growing tendency of certain sections of the community who resort to actions of organized violence and lawlessness at demonstrations in the streets and other places throughout Australia and that this motion be brought to the notice of all members of Parliament throughout Australia.

A further view expressed states—

It is apparent from the information available from the various States that it is becoming increasingly difficult to obtain and retain suitable personnel to maintain an efficient police service in the community.

This is where the Government can help. The Government's example must be greatly improved; it should improve on its performance in the last 12 months.

The Government must set the example to the public—the example of fair play. There must be no discrimination between the justice meted out to one person and that meted out to another. This is most important if we are to sustain the morale of the Police Force.

In all sincerity I ask the Minister for Police to call together urgently a group to work on this question of close co-operation with our Police Force. If we can obtain the necessary co-operation between the public and the police it would greatly enhance public safety, police morale, and police recruiting; apart from which we will have a safer community in which our people can live.

Mr. Lapham: How many would you have in the small group?

Mr. RUSHTON: A small group is more effective than a large one. I would suggest about eight persons. The Government could look at the matter and draw together those who would be most effective in attaining this desired result.

MR. W. G. YOUNG (Roe) [7.43 p.m.]: I rise to make a few comments on this motion in reply to His Excellency's Speech. At the outset I would like to say a few words on the operations of the rural reconstruction authority, and I would point out that I have no argument with the authority as it is established.

On a number of occasions I have seen examples of where it has been most co-operative and has done all it can under the provisions of the Act to assist where assistance is necessary and, in all cases, to see that justice is done.

With the way the scheme is operating, however, I am afraid it is just not achieving the objective we hoped it would. Through no fault of their own farmers have been through varying seasonal conditions in the last two years or so. In some cases they have been subjected to floods in one year and to a drought in the next, and I do hope that conditions will revert to normal in the not-too-distant future.

Mr. Gayfer: And that you will have your car fixed.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: And that I will get my car going. I am sure the Minister will agree that the problem seems to lie in the criteria used to assess the viability of the particular farmer's undertaking when he applies to the authority for assistance.

I have had numerous people come to see me; those who have paid a large proportion of the capital value of the properties which, through no fault of their own, they bought when prices were certainly high. We can all be wise after the event. At that time, however, nobody had the right crystal ball to tell us there was going to be a downturn in the farming industry in 1967-68.



Some settlers have paid more than 60 per cent. of the purchase price of their farms but are now faced with the threat of losing their properties. In some cases they may have invested \$60,000 or \$70,000, but the properties will revert to the original vendors who will then endeavour to resell.

I would like to give one example of this. A man bought a property of some 6,000 acres in 1968, before the downturn. I know this farm personally—it had been operated for about 40 years and was very well developed. This farmer paid \$32 an acre for one portion of it and \$26 an acre for the remainder. I am sure anybody conversant with the value of agricultural land in 1968 would agree this was a particularly good buy because many farms were selling at prices well in excess of this.

Mr. Lapham: What is it worth today?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: Possibly not much less on present valuation if a buyer could be found at this stage.

Members who read the farming journals may have seen a statement made by the Chairman of Directors of Westralian Farmers last week. He said there has been a significant increase in the demand for farming land. This is a reflection of the improved outlook for wool and increased wheat quotas. There is a general upturn in the rural economy.

Although the land may not be worth as much now as when it was purchased, the farmer cannot be blamed for its loss of value. This man has produced a well-documented budget showing that he can generate \$46,000 gross income per annum. He has a wheat quota of over 20,000 bushels and he is running over 4,000 sheep. His working expenses come to about \$41,000, so he has \$5,000 a year credit. At the moment he is being pressed for \$10,000 in settlement of a hire-purchase debt for plant and equipment. The vendors still hold the first mortgage on the property so he is not able to obtain a substantial bank overdraft. If he could obtain \$10,000 on extended terms to pay off his hire-purchase debt his property would be viable. I have his budget in my possession and I would be prepared to show it to any member who wishes to see it.

This man has paid \$30,000 off the principal. He paid \$18,000 cash for the stock on the property and over \$8,000 for principal repayments. This makes a total of about \$57,000 paid on a property valued at \$120,000. For the sake of \$10,000 he will lose his \$57,000. He will be forced to walk off the property.

Knowing this farmer, and knowing the facts, I feel that the intention of the scheme is to help people in this very situation. As a practical farmer I would have accepted this proposition in 1968 and if so I would probably now have been in the same position.

Another case I would like to mention is that of a farmer who has paid \$52,000 on a property valued at \$80,000. This man wishes assistance to pay out the vendor as the vendor has threatened to foreclose in the immediate future if last year's payment is not made. I do not wish to be critical of the people administering this scheme, but I feel their standards could be more flexible. The viewpoint of the authority is that wool is worth only 30c a pound. Wool produced in the blue-wool area of the State—the southern districts—is worth about 15c or 20c more than wool produced as a sideline to wheat. Wool produced in wheat and sheep country is subject to burs and dust which detract from the value.

To say that wool will remain at 30c a pound over the length of the loan is to indulge in crystal-ball gazing. At the moment the Federal Government is guaranteeing 36c a pound and wool grown in the southern districts would be bringing more than this. These facts should be considered when assessing the viability of a property. Nobody knows whether farming will stay where it is, improve, or deteriorate. These cases are being assessed by guesswork.

There has been a 12 per cent. increase in wheat quotas this year because of very good sales by the Wheat Board last year. Nobody can foretell the future—next year we may suffer a cutback to the same extent. However, this is speculation—we do not know what will happen.

The Department of Agriculture carries out some on-the-spot assessments at the moment. However, I feel that every case should be investigated by some practical person to determine the potential of the farm, and the farmer should be given the benefit of any doubt.

As well as the sons of farmers who remain on the land, many English migrants and Eastern States settlers have invested all their capital in farms. This could be the end of the road for some of these people. They have invested their capital for the benefit of their families, but if they walk off they will have nothing. Farmers can seek an alternative form of employment in the city but members are aware of the employment situation. A farmer, good and capable in his own sphere, would be virtually an unskilled labourer in the city. He will have difficulty in obtaining a job in this different environment. Every farmer who moves to the city makes a further impact on the rural economy in the towns. As the children leave the country schools, the schools are downgraded and money invested in classrooms is wasted. The children then have to be placed in metropolitan schools and more classrooms provided.

A little flexibility within the scheme would enable these people to remain on their farms. Back in the 1930s many

farmers were told by the then Agricultural Bank or their private bank that there was no future in farming. However, many stayed on and today own large properties. I do not think these are the people who are looking for aid today as they were able to consolidate over the years.

Money spent now in the country areas through rural reconstruction will keep these families on the farms. The Commonwealth Government has allocated \$14,000,000 over a four-year period. We have already used about half this money, but the Commonwealth Government has assured us on many occasions that further money will be made available when this is exhausted. If we spend \$14,000,000 to keep people on farms now, there will be no applicants in the last year of the scheme.

Mr. Bickerton: The two examples stated could apply to people involved in mining or running a dry cleaning business.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: This could apply to anybody.

Mr. Bickerton: If the farmer has another bad season and the \$10,000 does not see him through, do we give him another \$10,000?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: This problem should not arise. If the farmer cannot prove the viability of the property he does not get help in the first place. However, if he can show the property is viable there is nothing in the Act to prevent his returning for another bite of the cherry. This is the greatest industry we have.

The mining industry in the Pilbara has reached its peak and is now experiencing a downturn. Although this applies to farming in my electorate at present, in the future it may apply to mining in the Minister's electorate.

Some of the farmers in difficulties are new settlers but most of them have been on the land all their lives. If these men walk off their farms all the money invested in schools, hospitals, and amenities in country districts will be wasted. It is better to spend money to keep them on the farms than to spend more money to keep them in the city.

Mr. Lapham: What rate on the mortgage would the farmers be paying?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: The particular person I have referred to is paying 6 per cent.

I hope the Minister for Agriculture will investigate the application of the scheme. I am sure the situation is worrying him as much as it is worrying me. Certainly the farmers are worried. I know the Minister has made representations to the Federal Government but more efforts must be made to seek a solution; because we will have an accentuated drift to the city and ghost towns will appear not only in the mining belt, as we have already seen in the past, but in the agricultural areas too. The sooner we get down to brass

tacks in an endeavour to solve the problem and tell these people that the criteria have been relaxed the sooner we will have a happier farming community and a happier member for Roe, at any rate.

In changing from one aspect of agricultural life to another, I have one other story to relate which is not a very happy one, either. This concerns wheat quotas—one of the things that has brought about the rural recession over the last three or four years, since 1969, when wheat quotas were first introduced. The scheme has raised many problems and many alterations have been made to the system of allocating wheat quotas. Many changes have been made in the short-fall and also in the topcut side of the system.

I know a committee has been investigating this problem and the Minister did make available to me a copy of the committee's report, for which I thank him. Since talking to members of the Farmers' Union I also understand that they do not look favourably on this report and have more or less rejected it out of hand. I admit that all this has taken time. The report was to have been submitted about the middle of September last year, but it was not until New Year's Day or thereabouts that it was finally submitted. We now find that March is drawing to a close and we will soon be into April. Farmers have cleaned their headers and put them away and have ordered superphosphate to store in their sheds in order to gain the full advantage of rebates. But we could, once again, be faced with a late change in wheat quotas.

I do not know whether this has taken place, but I sincerely hope not. I hope the Minister will resist any overtures that are made to him to effect any drastic changes at this point of time. If there are to be any changes I hope they are announced quickly. Time has completely run out and farmers will now have no chance of rearranging their cropping programme to any major extent. As I have pointed out, if they had to make any machinery replacements these would have been made already. Their seed has been harvested and is now in the shed, and any alteration to the cropping programme would bring chaos to the industry.

I now move from the problems of farmers engaged in production to the subject of education for children in rural areas. Earlier in the year I made some overtures to the Minister concerning school buses and I thank him for the response I received. He agreed to look sympathetically at the operation of school buses in country areas which, of course, is coupled with the problem of rural life generally; the downturn in the rural economy; and the gaps that are now appearing in various districts as a result of farmers being forced to leave their properties. Because of these facts gaps have been left in the school bus routes.

We now find that school buses are operating with the minimum number; in fact, some are operating at below the minimum carrying capacity, and it is becoming more evident that eventually the school bus system throughout the State will have to be reorganised completely. If the school population in the country continues to decrease I think we might have to accept a situation where through-buses operate to take children from one centre to another. During this period of difficult times in country areas I think every person in the State—both those who are living in the city and in the country—should insist—and I am certain they would insist—on adequate school bus facilities so that school children in the country can obtain a proper education. A survey of the problem has been made by the Country Education Committee.

Mr. T. D. Evans: For isolated parents?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: I think it is the Stern Committee which studies this problem. In past years sons of farmers could quite safely be accommodated on the land. By a process of expansion and by purchasing near-neighbouring properties farmers could build their resources up to the point where their sons could go on the land. The latest report, however, indicates that today this is not possible.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Are you speaking about the Stern Report? I thought you were speaking about the report made on isolated parents.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: No, I was speaking of the Stern Report. As I have said, it is not now possible to accommodate the sons of farmers on the land as was done in the past. In fact, these times it is rather difficult to set up even one son on a farm instead of two or three, as was done in the past. For country children to compete in the commercial field they must be given an adequate opportunity to reach the same level of education as children in the city. The Government, in its wisdom, did substantially increase the living-away-from-home allowances this year and this has been a help, but it does not go far enough. I know that finance is short and we have problems in obtaining sufficient money to meet all the needs of the State, but in the field of education we have to ensure, somehow, that country children can advance their secondary education and that money is made available for it.

Last year a scheme, based more or less on a means test, was commenced to assist the parents of children who could not afford to send their children away from home to gain secondary school education. Application had to be made for such assistance and naturally a flood of applications followed. Unfortunately the scheme was administered in such a manner that those who were first in were first served and I understand that all the

money has now gone. I know some parents who made up their minds that they would try to battle through. They did their best and managed to battle through to the second term. However, at the conclusion of the second term, and after consultation with their bank manager, they discovered that they did not have sufficient money to meet the cost of their child's board whilst he was absent from home for the third term. Therefore, they applied to the Education Department for assistance but were told that if they had applied on the 1st January they would have been granted assistance but there was no chance of their receiving assistance towards the end of the year.

Mr. T. D. Evans: This fund was instituted by your Government. I understand the sum placed in the fund was \$10,000 and that has now been exhausted. However, I make the point that although the fund has not been replenished, ways and means have been found, through a non-departmental concern, for further moneys to be made available to the same committee that administered the previous fund. I am not saying that invitations are being sought, but applications will be given every consideration on their merits by the same committee.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: How substantial is this fund, and can I tell the people who are writing to me to whom they can apply and when?

Mr. T. D. Evans: Any needy parent can apply to the Education Department, as was the case hitherto.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: I did obtain approval for some assistance recently.

Mr. T. D. Evans: I gave some indication of this to the member for Mt. Marshall.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: The Minister would not have any idea of the size of the fund or how much money is available for assistance?

Mr. T. D. Evans: Some detail of the fund was given in a letter that was sent to Mr. Munns some weeks ago.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: I thank the Minister for that and I will check on it.

Mr. W. A. Manning: Wrong organisation.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: Yes, it is the wrong organisation. I do think that whilst, perhaps, the amount in the fund was not sufficient, once the scheme commenced the people who did their best to refrain from applying for assistance to educate their children for two terms by paying for the board out of their own pockets should have been given some consideration. To be told that if they had applied in the first term for assistance they would have received it to cover the full three terms of their child's education, after paying the

child's board for two terms, and to be told they would get nothing for the third term, is rather unfair.

As I have said, the main reason criticism was levelled against the scheme was that, once the scheme was commenced, sufficient funds should have been made available to ensure that adequate assistance was granted over the full 12 months. This would have avoided the embarrassment of those who endeavoured to stand on their own feet by financing their children at school for the first two terms, only to be told, when applying for assistance for the third term, they should have applied in the first term and kept their money in their pockets.

Mr. T. D. Evans: This fund was instituted by the Government that was supported by the honourable member. By the time we got into office the fund was exhausted. I have noted your objection, but I make the point that the people who administer the fund at the moment are the same as those who administered your fund, and I am sure that any parent who was not granted full assistance was not refused as a result of an act of bad faith. However, I will bring your point to the attention of the committee.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: In moving away from the field of education, I now wish to refer to the Fitzgerald River Reserve. I put a question on today's notice paper concerning this reserve, but at the time of framing my question I was not aware that the Environmental Protection Authority was making an inspection of the area. Following the assurance given by the Minister for Mines last year, after a motion on the reserve had been debated by this House, it is about time that some move was made to ascertain whether this mining field is to become operational or not. However, I am pleased to see that although the answer to my question this evening has not been forthcoming as quickly as I would like it to be, the matter will be placed before the Minister for Mines in about a month's time.

Mr. Gayfer: The answer might not be to your liking.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: It may not be, but I am anxious to ascertain whether it can be proved to be an operational mining venture.

Mr. W. A. Manning: If they are honest they would be glad to see some exploration work being done.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: As the member for Narrogin says, if the authority is honest it will be in favour of some exploration work being done. Some weeks ago I was interested to see in the Press a report of an inspection made of the Fitzgerald River Reserve by some interested persons. I understand that the inspection was sponsored by the Government. The

member for Albany was a member of the party who flew over the area, and as I am the member for the district I thought an invitation might have been extended to me to join the party. As I have said, I am the member representing that area and last year I introduced the motion in the House concerning the Fitzgerald River Reserve, but despite this the members of the party who flew over the area did not see fit to send me an invitation to join them.

Mr. Graham: This must be a day of mishaps. The Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Country Party are attending a function this evening, but apparently members of the Government were omitted from the invitation list.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: That may be so, but the Deputy Premier cannot blame me for that omission. On the other hand, in view of the fact that I was greatly concerned in this matter, I think it would have only been courtesy for the party to have asked me if I would like to join them in making an inspection of the area.

It was with interest that I noticed the Governor, in his Speech, commented on the takeover by the Police Department of traffic control from country local government authorities. He said—

Since more effective enforcement has been achieved by Police Department patrols where Local Authorities have voluntarily relinquished control, legislation will be introduced for progressive take-over of traffic control from country Local Government Authorities.

I would think that probably these words were written for him and at this stage I would like to know—I do not want to pass too much comment on it because I understand legislation will be introduced to effect such a takeover of traffic control by the police—what evidence has been produced to show that more effective traffic control has been achieved with Police Department control.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Surely the honourable member would not think someone else would write the Speech for His Excellency.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: Of course not! The section to which I have referred was probably written with tongue in cheek because I know of three Shires where the traffic control has been taken over by the Police Traffic Branch and, having talked to the average person in the street and to some of the councillors connected with those shires, I have yet to hear one person say that more effective enforcement has been achieved.

All those to whom I have spoken have been very critical of what is being done. Not many of them say that the control is even as good as that previously exercised by the shires, let alone being more effective. However, I do not desire to say too much

on that point at this stage because this matter will be the subject of debate later on in the session.

Still on traffic, I make the point that since the compulsory wearing of seat belts has been introduced, it is becoming more obvious from day to day that some standardisation of seat belts is absolutely necessary. I am not referring necessarily to the type of belt, but to the type of catch which locks the device.

I was involved in an accident the other night when my car went for a little swim down a creek. My sister-in-law was with me and the car in which she normally drives has a lift-up clasp. The seat belts in my car have the press-button type of clasp. When the water rushed in she tried to undo the belt in order that she might get out of the car.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Did you say your sister-in-law or mother-in-law?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: It was my sister-in-law. I very seldom drive with my mother-in-law.

It is obvious that people who constantly either drive or are passengers in a car get into the habit of using a particular type of clasp on the seat belt. We are all creatures of habit and instinctively, when in a car with a different type of seat-belt clasp, we treat it as if it is the belt to which we are accustomed. My sister-in-law would still have been in the car trying to undo that seat belt if I had not come to her rescue. Fortunately the situation did not become serious, but if a car exploded and caught fire, or if it dropped into very deep water, a person might not be able to learn in time how to undo the unfamiliar belt clasp. Unless a standard seat-belt clasp is insisted upon, the seat belt could be a hazard.

Mr. Lapham: Do you ride in taxis?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: Yes.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Does each make of car feature the one type of seat belt, or do they vary?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: From my experience of taxis, I would say that each car has its own particular type.

Mr. Lapham: That is right.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: Some have a lap clasp which is lifted back, others are lifted a different way, others again have a magnetic clasp, while certain makes have the push-button type. It appears the manufacturers please themselves as to the type of catch they incorporate in their seat belts.

Mr. Gayfer: What about the Standards Association?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: All these seat belts conform with the association's standard, but the clasps themselves should be uniform so that in an emergency a person would not have to think about the type of

clasp, but would be able to undo it instinctively, no matter what car he was in at the time. Particularly is this necessary when water is rushing into the car and it is cold and, naturally, wet.

Mr. Jamieson: Why not include aircraft, too?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: My experience of aircraft, which goes a long way back, indicates that the clasps are standard in planes.

Mr. Jamieson: They are not.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: Is the Minister referring to commercial aircraft?

Mr. Jamieson: I have been in three different aircraft recently and each one had a different type of seat-belt clasp.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: I was more or less referring to the standard Air Force type of seat belt which undoes very easily. It does not have to be unclasped at all. The user merely hits it and it automatically unlocks.

Although I suppose I am rather game standing here talking about eggs when there are some 7,000,000 dozen surplus eggs and no-one knows what to do about them, I would like briefly to refer to the egg situation in Esperance, about which the Minister knows a great deal. It would appear that some reorganisation of the whole industry is imminent. Being a supporter of statutory marketing authorities and control organisations, I would not suggest for a moment that licenses should be taken from metropolitan producers and handed over willy-nilly to producers in Esperance. However, I would suggest to the Minister that when the inevitable massive reorganisation of licensing takes place, the needs of a district should be considered. Of course, I am referring particularly to isolated Esperance which is some 550 miles by rail from Perth. It would appear that those growers in the Esperance area who went out of egg production in 1968 have now lost their entitlement to produce eggs. Those in the district now retain only very limited licenses, and, as a consequence, the egg requirements of the district are by no means met locally.

Mr. Lapham: Where do the town's eggs come from?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: From Perth. They come down by train and are frequently—more often than not—10 days old on arrival; that is, it is 10 days from the time of stamping to the time the eggs reach Esperance.

Mr. Rushton: What is the freight per dozen?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: I do not know off-hand. The van in which they travel is sometimes not even refrigerated and is shunted off the line on arrival. Often the eggs are stale and, in some cases, many are broken. I know one storekeeper there who has on numerous occasions found it necessary to hire extra staff for

the sole purpose of physically washing the eggs before they can be placed into racks and sold. This is because some yolks have run through the cartons as a result of breakages.

This system seems to me to be a retro-grade step in view of the fact that people have the facilities, the know-how, and the ability to produce eggs in the Esperance district. Something must be wrong with the zoning system. I have already said that I agree with statutory marketing and I cannot envisage an immediate solution because the only one that comes to mind is the taking of licenses from those already producing in the metropolitan area in order to permit the eggs to be produced in Esperance.

However, if a reorganisation of the issue of egg licenses is to take place—and this seems inevitable because a 23 per cent. cut has been announced—it is obvious that some producers in the metropolitan area will be put out of business.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member has five more minutes.

Mr. Moiler: Could not a lot of country operators be put out of business?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: Yes. This is inevitable. If these people can supply a local market, like the chaff growers in the district of the member for Northam—and I see he is getting ready to speak—

Mr. McIver: I haven't said a word.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: No, but the honourable member is getting ready. If some egg producers are put out of business, and a complete reorganisation of the licensing system takes place, the Minister should take into consideration the fact that some growers in Esperance should be granted licenses in sufficient numbers to allow them to supply the needs of the Esperance area.

I am not suggesting that sufficient licenses should be granted to the Esperance producers to enable them to compete with producers in other centres, but they are in a rather special situation because of their isolation. As we all know, the railway system is to be upgraded and possibly in a year or so the eggs could arrive in a much more satisfactory condition, but at this time they arrive in a far-from-satisfactory condition.

Mr. T. D. Evans: They might even arrive from the illustrious electorate of Kalgoorlie.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: I am glad the Minister interjected, because another bone of contention in Esperance is the fact that the milk must come from Kalgoorlie when better milk can be produced on the plains at Esperance.

In conclusion, I would like to refer to the resurfacing of roads throughout the State. I know such work is necessary, but recently the entire width of a section of

the Brookton Highway was resurfaced, and one garage proprietor in the hills told me that during the two days of the resurfacing 19 motorists required new wind-screens.

Mr. Jamieson: Not too many motorists could have obeyed the "Slow Down" signs, could they?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: That is right. I nearly suffered a broken windscreen as a result of the action of a motorist travelling in the opposite direction.

If the whole width of a road must be resurfaced in the one operation, the police or the shire should be instructed to have a traffic officer on duty to ensure that motorists do, in fact, obey the traffic signs. Then, once the danger is passed, it is beholden upon the shire, the police, or the Main Roads Department—whoever is responsible—to have the signs removed. One sign reading, "Loose Stones. Caution. Slow." has remained in position since last August.

Mr. Jamieson: How fast did you say you go past that sign?

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: It does not refer to any speed.

Mr. Jamieson: I just wondered how fast you go.

Mr. W. G. YOUNG: The sign has been there for seven months and everyone treats it with contempt. To be effective, a sign must be obeyed, and it must be removed when the danger is past.

MR. HARTREY (Boulder-Dundas) [8.27 p.m.]: I rise to support the motion so ably moved by the member for Merredin-Yilgarn on opening day. I would like to congratulate him on the spirited manner in which he addressed himself to the subject, the remarkable adroitness with which he recited all the Governor's extreme list of decorations and honours, and the grave and weighty earnestness with which he then addressed himself to the subject matter of the Speech. It is a pity the Governor's Speech itself was not as eloquent as the Address-in-Reply moved by the honourable member. In addition to paying that compliment to my colleague, I would also like to congratulate the Government itself on the type of legislation it has seen fit to list as its programme for this part of the session and also, I hope, for the part of the session held in the latter part of the year.

Mr. Court: You must have stirred them up at that conference.

Mr. HARTREY: I wish to refer to subjects close to my heart; that is, industrial relations, workers' compensation, mines regulations, miners' relief, law reform, and interstate and Commonwealth relations. I propose to say briefly something about

each of those in turn, and I begin by remarking that the Leader of the Opposition, who, I am sorry to say, is not present tonight, referred in his address to industrial unrest and rebuked the Government party for a sort of share in encouraging, stimulating, or bringing about in some way or other industrial unrest—a very unfair charge, but one which is very frequently thrown at the party to which I have the honour to belong.

In passing I would like to draw the attention of the House to some industrial unrest—a report of which won a place in the newspapers a fortnight or so ago—and give some idea of the cause.

Members may have read that at Agnew a black ban was imposed upon mining operations being carried out there by shaft-sinking contractors. The union simply refused to let the men work, declared the place black, and, of course, was guilty of all sorts of industrial disorder, turmoil, and insubordination!

As a matter of fact, that was not the position at all. The employers were grossly overworking the men. The average shift worked was 10 hours a day, even by a winder driver who has a most responsible position. It is quite contrary to the actual terms of the Mines Regulation Act to employ a winder driver for such a span of hours except in the gravest emergency, but there was no emergency at all. Obedient to the regulations governing the mining industry, the men refused to work. They declared this place black because the employers would not even discuss the situation with them. Finally they brought the employers to heel by resorting to the law itself.

It is not always the fault of the worker when there is industrial unrest and it is not always the fault of the worker when he refuses to work under conditions imposed upon him by his employer. I say that in passing and by way of a retort to the criticisms that have been offered—and doubtless will still be offered in subsequent speeches by members of the Opposition—to the attitude adopted by this Government and by adherents of the Labor Party.

Mr. Court: You are not suggesting the men were not paid for the full time they worked.

Mr. HARTREY: No, I am not suggesting that: I am saying the men refused to accept the conditions, black-balled the mine, and walked out because they insisted on the law being observed.

Mr. Court: You are not answering my question. Are you suggesting they were not paid for the hours they worked?

Mr. HARTREY: No, I am not suggesting that, and I do not invite the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to suggest it.

Mr. Court: I want to make the point clear because you are giving the impression that they were being sweated.

Mr. HARTREY: I never said they were being sweated. I said they were being overworked—illegally overworked—and in the case of a winder driver dangerously overworked. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition approves of this, I do not.

Mr. Court: I was trying to clear up a point because you were giving an unfair impression.

Mr. HARTREY: If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition wants clearing up, I can do that just as well as he can.

Mr. Graham: And more! I know whose side I would be on.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Boulder-Dundas will continue.

Mr. HARTREY: I am pleased to know Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I am still speaking. So far as industrial arbitration is concerned, certain amendments to the Act are desirable and are proposed. I trust in due course they will be passed by this House and by another place. I have said previously, and will repeat any time, my belief is that industrial arbitration is not the solution of industrial relations. Neither is conciliation which is sometimes put forward as a desirable alternative to arbitration. The only real solution which would bring just industrial conditions to wage earners lies in the formation of some authority with the power to fix rents, interest, prices, and wages, although I realise the difficulties associated with establishing such an authority. To establish such a tribunal would achieve an economic equilibrium which no capitalist country in the world can boast of today for the simple reason that no capitalist country in the world has attempted to do precisely what I am speaking about.

Mr. Williams: How do you get a tribunal to work? I am referring to overcoming blackmarketing when prices are fixed. The member for Boulder-Dundas has seen this himself.

Mr. HARTREY: How does one deal with any breach of the law? It is not possible to exterminate burglary even by hanging burglars, a fact which was proved 100 years ago or more.

Mr. Williams: You have to catch them.

Mr. HARTREY: Of course they must be caught. The member for Bunbury knows that as well as I do.

Mr. Williams: You know better than I.

Mr. HARTREY: Of course they must be caught in the same way as we must catch an employer or employee who breaks the present arbitration provisions. As I said previously, they were caught at Agnew. Of course they are not always caught and it is not possible to enforce every law with

100 per cent. efficiency. We would all be saints if we could do this. It is ridiculous to say because some people will break the law we should not have laws. We should have a tribunal with power to fix rent, which is one of the heaviest burdens working people have to carry, to fix interest, which is another heavy burden, and to fix the exorbitant prices which, as it is now, the entire community does not have to carry. Is there any arbitration court for B.H.P.? The answer is "No." In fact, the Federal Treasurer said that B.H.P. was a company and he could not dictate to it. Those were his very words. However, he would dictate to wage earners any day of the week.

Mr. Court: Are you advocating pegged wages?

Mr. HARTREY: I will not be led aside by questions. I have said what I wish to say and the member for Nedlands will have his turn to speak.

Mr. Court: Are you advocating pegged wages?

Mr. HARTREY: I am advocating pegged prices, rent, and interest.

Mr. Court: You are out of step with Labor in the Federal sphere.

Mr. HARTREY: If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is willing to advocate pegged interest and pegged rents, I will go along with him and advocate pegged wages, and so will everyone else of my persuasion.

Mr. Court: You will not get endorsed at the next election.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Yes, the Federal sphere would advocate this. You try them out.

Mr. HARTREY: If one wants to know anything about the tenets of a particular religion one should ask a man who belongs to it. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition should not be asking me.

Mr. Rushton: What about the abuses of the awards?

Mr. Jamieson: Employers abuse an award every time one is created.

Mr. HARTREY: I come now to the subject of workers' compensation which I look at from the point of view of the working miner, because I had the honour to be born in a mining town and now have the honour of representing a mining area. Certain anomalies which now exist urgently need to be remedied. For example, my learned friends opposite, the Liberal Party, in its more liberal days, gave a direction to the State Government Insurance Office that any miner with the disease of silicosis to the extent of 65 per cent. should be deemed to be totally and permanently incapacitated for work. However, in January, 1970, the same Liberal Government, which was not so liberal at that stage, cancelled that instruction. I ask that this should be written into the law so that nobody can doubt it.

I further ask that there should be written into the law a presumption that, if a man who has been pronounced as having 50 per cent. silicosis or more dies at home or at work of a cardiac seizure, his death is attributable to silicosis. I think the member for Subiaco might agree with me on this.

I submit it is medically almost impossible if a man has lost half his lung function and has a diseased heart for there to be no interrelation whatsoever between this and the causation or aggravation of a heart condition. After all, the primary function of a heart is to pump blood and the lungs to aerate that blood. It is perfectly true the heart has extra work to do when pumping blood through withered organs. If a person suffering from the disease of silicosis finally collapses and dies of a heart condition it is ridiculous to say the disease has not contributed to it. At present under the Workers' Compensation Act heart failure is not presumed to be attributable to silicosis. I say a presumption should be written into the Act so that when the Medical Board has declared that 50 per cent. or more of a man's lung function has been lost, if that man dies of a heart attack it should be presumed to have resulted from the disease of silicosis unless his employers can prove to the contrary.

If the employer cannot prove to the contrary, in this way the widow would at least receive compensation. Time and time again I have seen compensation refused by the present tribunal in the circumstances I have described.

The other day I commented privately that in cases where I have acted for workers who are still alive I have frequently been successful. I added that I have frequently been unsuccessful in connection with claims made by widows. I think this should be remedied.

There is a third matter I would like to see remedied. It is a well known maxim of law that justice should not only be done but should be seen to be done. I shall refer to the pneumoconiosis medical board. I do not wish to offer any criticism of the integrity or professional ability of its members, but I do offer the criticism that they are all Government employees and the only insurance office concerned is the State Government Insurance Office. It certainly does not seem as if justice is being done. Not only does it not seem just, it does not at times even seem sense.

Under the Mine Workers' Relief Act the mines medical officer advises the Minister for Mines when a man is declared to have early silicosis and the Minister who, of course, is not a doctor issues a certificate. The expression "early silicosis" is rather a misnomer, because a person must generally have had silicosis for a period of 15 to 20 years before it produces symptoms of



any disabling character at all. If someone has had this for 15 or 20 years we can hardly call it "early." The man is then told, in almost classical words, that the disease may do him some harm. I shall read form "I" of the Mine Workers' Relief Act, which is signed by the Minister for Mines on the recommendation of the medical officer concerned. It says—

Take notice that you are reported as having developed silicosis in the early stage, and that further employment underground at a mine may be detrimental to your future health.

That is the understatement of the year. Form "J" reads—

Take notice that you are reported as having developed silicosis in the advanced stage, and that further employment underground at a mine may be detrimental to your future health.

By this time the man is more than half dead, but the form says that it may be detrimental to his future health if he continues to work in a mine.

I shall mention the case of a man I know who, I am sure, would not object to my mentioning his name, which is Tony Butun. He applied to be assessed by the pneumoconiosis medical board of which the mines medical officer is a member. He was declared to have 50 per cent. silicosis and received compensation on that basis. He applied again and was declared to have 60 per cent. silicosis and he received subsequent compensation on that basis. He applied again 12 months later and was declared to have only 60 per cent. silicosis still. Immediately after his second examination, at which it was found he still had 60 per cent. silicosis, the Minister for Mines in the last Government signed a certificate to the effect that the man had advanced silicosis. This happened on the 23rd February last year after the elections but before the present Government took office. I invite members to tell me how it appears to be just if a man who is examined by a body, of which the mines medical officer is a member, is found not to have advanced beyond 60 per cent. silicosis in a 12-month period but is at the same time certified to have advanced silicosis.

Dr. Dadour: Do you know that silicosis is a progressive disease, even though a person may not go down a mine any more?

Mr. HARTREY: I am well aware of that.

Dr. Dadour: This is probably what happened in the 12-month period.

Mr. HARTREY: I am not saying his silicosis did not advance in the 12-month period, but I am saying that the board, on which the mines medical officer who certified it had advanced is a member, stated that silicosis was still at 60 per cent., the same as it was 12 months previously. This does not give confidence—certainly not to me—in the usefulness of the board.

I would like to see written into the Workers' Compensation Act a provision that the pneumoconiosis medical board shall consist of one medical man appointed by the workers, one appointed by the employers, and one chosen in the same way as a jury is chosen; namely, from a register of qualified medical practitioners specialising in diseases of the chest and chosen by lot. If anyone goes to a jury room he will see that members are drawn out of a box containing the names of qualified persons. As the names come out so the people serve on the jury unless they are challenged. There is nothing wrong with the miner having as the worker's representative on the board his own medical adviser. The person chosen would know a great deal more about the man's condition than anyone else. There is nothing wrong with the employers choosing a medical man to go on the board for the same reason. However, the chairman, who has the casting vote, should be chosen from highly qualified persons who have no interest, governmental or otherwise, in the outcome of the examination.

I now come to another subject I have at heart; that is, law reform. I am pleased to know there is a likelihood of the Third Party Claims Tribunal being abolished in the near future and the jurisdiction being returned to the courts. That is perhaps a little sarcastic. I suppose the tribunal could call itself a court. It is presided over by a district judge, although the other two members are not legal men. In my opinion, when there are large sums of money at stake, it is not good to take jurisdiction from the high courts of the State and give it to inferior tribunals. The Supreme Court is the highest court in this State, although the High Court of Australia, which sits here once a year, has jurisdiction all over Australia.

For that reason, I also advocate that there should be an appeal from the Workers' Compensation Board to the Supreme Court on questions of fact as well as on questions of law. That is very important. There is now an appeal to the Supreme Court from the Workers' Compensation Board on questions of law but not on questions of fact. If one goes into the local court with a claim for \$150 and one loses the case, one has a right of appeal to the Supreme Court of Western Australia on questions of fact and law, but if one goes to the Workers' Compensation Board with a claim for \$11,000 and one loses the case, one can appeal to the Supreme Court on a point of law only. If the decision is wrong in fact, no-one can set it right. The Supreme Court could set it right if it had the chance to do so, but it does not have the chance.

It seems to me to be absurd that a court which has jurisdiction to decide questions of fact and law in matters involving \$150 should not also have the right to decide

questions of fact and law in matters involving \$11,000, which is not quite the maximum workers' compensation payable at the present time.

There is another question of law reform which I consider to be very important, and I understand we are soon to have amendments to the Juries Act. I have spoken about this matter before and I will not stress it unnecessarily at the moment. I will have more to say when the Bill comes up. It will redress an injustice to which I referred in my maiden speech in this House approximately 12 months ago.

I am particularly pleased there is likely to be legislation to abolish capital punishment. I think capital punishment is an antiquated abomination which is quite unworthy of any community that nowadays calls itself civilised. "I hope that I shall never see a sight as ugly as a gallows tree." I will be very happy when this ugly residue of medieval torture is abolished.

Mr. Graham: Hear! Hear!

Mr. HARTREY: A suggestion has recently been made which I also commend very heartily; that is, that trials of persons charged with drug offences should be made triable by jury because of the very high penalties imposed. I think that is thoroughly fair and just. However, I also ask that the awful enormity and gross crime of laying a bet on Saturday afternoon in a pub without the consent of the T.A.B. should also be triable by jury because the minimum fine for that crime is \$1,000.

That seems to be out of all proportion to common sense, but it is on the Statute book. I have not the power to amend it but I have the power to ask that when the question of extending the right of trial by jury is being considered, people charged with that heinous offence should also be entitled to cast themselves upon their country, as the old expression was, and elect to be tried by a jury.

I now come to the matter of State relations with the Commonwealth. I am particularly pleased that during the year an announcement was made of the likelihood of all the States of Australia combining as a body to deal with the Commonwealth Government on the issue of financial relations. I have spoken about this matter before and I do not wish to weary the House with tedious repetition, but it is absolutely obvious to everyone who has the well-being of this Commonwealth at heart that the lifeblood of the people of Australia is to be found in the industry of the people themselves, in the products of that industry, and in the resources of the various States from which those products are derived.

To hear the casual conversations of the ordinary citizens when speaking about financial depressions, and to read the newspapers, one would think it was the

Federal Government that created all the wealth of this country. Of course, no Government ever creates the wealth of any country. If it is wise, the Government can help towards a wise and just distribution of wealth, but it cannot create wealth. It has been well said that one never gets anything from a Government except more government, or perhaps sometimes less government, which is even more desirable; but it must be borne in mind that the revenue for which we are supposed to go on bended knees to the Commonwealth Government is our own money, the money produced in this State and in Queensland, Tasmania, New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia. It is produced by people who are primarily citizens of those States and who are primarily concerned with the industrial conditions of those States.

It may be said that is a very unpatriotic utterance for an Australian citizen to make; it may be said, "Hartrey, you should not be stressing the differences between the States, you should be taking the broad Australian outlook and giving the impression that this thing in Canberra is Australian."

Mr. Rushton: You are opposite to your own Federal party.

Mr. HARTREY: I am not opposite to anyone but the honourable member at this moment.

Mr. Rushton: You are saying something different from the Federal policy.

Mr. Bryce: He knows more about our policy than you do.

Mr. HARTREY: It may well be that in the United States the Federal Government is entitled to lord it over the States because historically all the States except the original 13 are the creatures of the Federal Government. All the States other than the 13 which originally seceded from Britain were made out of the territory which those United States claimed for themselves, and step by step, as they reached a certain population, each one of them was declared by the Federal Government to be a State. So the States of the Union, with the exception of 13 out of 50, are the creation of the Federal Government.

That is not so in Australia. No State was created by the Federal Government. The only thing created by it was Canberra. Canberra still controls the Northern Territory, although it is rapidly losing control over New Guinea. It is a farcical situation that the majority of the Australian people have to crawl to bureaucratic institutions in Canberra for sufficient of their own money to finance their own ventures. This situation should be revised.

The day has come apparently—and I welcome it—when the people of the six States, through their respective Governments, are combining to confront the Federal authority with the proposition

that it is vital to all the Australian people to have roads, bridges, a water supply, hospitals, education, and environmental protection. There are many matters more necessary to the people of Australia than a diplomatic service in Venezuela and a postal service which is a disgrace and one of the most expensive in the world.

If I wish to post a letter of importance I do not dare trust it to the general mail service—I register it. If it is very important I will send it by A. R. card to ensure the return of a receipt saying it was delivered. Many times I receive inquiries from lawyers in other States about information which has already been forwarded. The post office charges are extortionate and the service is bad. That is all I can say for it.

One cannot say that the contribution made by the Federal Government to the well-being of the Australian people is in any way comparable to the States' contribution. Why should the States bow to this authority to obtain money to discharge very great obligations—for example, to assist the farmers mentioned a little while ago? Why should the States be short of money to assist the farmers?

Mr. Rushton: Do you not remember the action of Mr. Chifley?

Mr. HARTREY: I would like to remind the member for Dale of the action of Mr. Bruce in 1928 when he put through the referendum which created the Financial Agreement.

Mr. Rushton: I said Mr. Chifley.

Mr. HARTREY: The honourable member should not commence to tell us about Mr. Chifley. I know much more Australian history than he does and have lived through some of it.

I will now confine myself to my speech and not to the interjections of the member for Dale who is so fond of interjecting irrespective of whether or not he knows what he is talking about. On some occasions he does know.

Mr. Rushton: You can help me on some occasions.

Mr. HARTREY: I will again if the honourable member gives me the opportunity.

Mr. Graham: He needs help.

Mr. HARTREY: I do not want to weary the House unnecessarily. I welcome this development and I hope that our Premier and Attorney-General and the Premiers and Attorneys-General of the other States will see that justice is done. Before very long the States will be evenly divided—there will be three Labor and three Liberal Governments. This is not a party question.

Mr. Court: That is wishful thinking.

Mr. HARTREY: We already have a Labor Government in South Australia and Western Australia and very shortly we will have one in Tasmania. I sincerely hope this move will be successful.

I would like to conclude my remarks with the comments made by a famous Roman senator. This was Cato the Elder and he concluded every speech in the Senate in this manner, "Censeo quoque Carthaginem esse delendam." Interpreted this means, "I think, too, that Carthage should be destroyed." Of course, ultimately it was destroyed. I would like to conclude this speech by saying, "Censeo quoque Canberram esse diminuendam," which can be translated, "I think, too, that Canberra should have its wings clipped."

Mr. Court: You should speak to Mr. Whitlam. He would not like that speech.

DR. DADOUR (Subiaco) [9.00 p.m.]: I rise on this occasion to answer some of the recent criticisms of the medical profession in general. The news media has been bombarded with comments on doctors' fees and the medical profession. I find this very distressing indeed.

I am proud to be a member of the medical profession. It is a very dedicated profession composed of many wonderful men and women who render a valuable service to the public. The medical profession attempts to alleviate pain, cure the sick, and prevent illness. My job satisfaction as a general practitioner is complete and total. I enjoy my work so much that I do not consider it work. I work extremely long hours. I am probably sounding a little sanctimonious, but I would like to justify my following remarks.

There seems to be a unique singling-out of the medical profession. I do not know why this is so unless there are people who desire a totally socialised medical scheme. I do not know whether this would be good or bad. However, looking at the scheme as it operates in Great Britain, we see that it leaves a great deal to be desired.

Mr. Graham: I think you could say that well and truly about our Australian scheme, too.

Dr. DADOUR: Our Australian scheme may not be 100 per cent., but it is a very good scheme.

Mr. Graham: For whom?

Dr. DADOUR: There are no more than 50 doctors in the whole of Australia who are rebelling against the Government scheme. This is a splinter minority group. The Australian Medical Association is not a judiciary association. It is simply an association. It cannot say, "This doctor cannot be part of the scheme." The Government has the final say.

Mr. Graham: There are no communists in it.

Dr. DADOUR: From my inquiries the president and vice-president may be right wing supporters and the rest of the association probably belong to the group. Of course, I can only speculate.

For many years doctors have rendered service in hospitals on a purely voluntary basis. This service is provided willingly, and although it is gradually being phased out, it still operates in many areas. Hospitals frequently charge needy patients but in many instances doctors make no charge whatever. Over the centuries the doctor's attitude has not materially altered with regard to fees.

We now find that Government control is being introduced between the patient and the doctor. Most people can afford medical insurance and there is a special provision for those who cannot afford it. Doctors are still prepared to treat the needy for nothing.

The profession merely asks of people that if they can afford to belong to an insurance scheme then they should pay fair and just fees. There may be some members who would say that fees have not been just and proper. Those who do so are challenged to compare doctors' fees with the charges of skilled tradesmen. For example, take a television repairman. How much does he charge? How much does a washing machine repairman charge merely for coming to the house and not for the time spent on the repair or the parts that are replaced? Members will find that there is a great discrepancy and that a tradesman receives far more than a doctor for making a home visit.

The fact is that fees for medical service and treatment in Australia are by far the lowest in the great western nations of the world. In all those nations a higher fee is charged than is charged in Australia; and very much so. If we compare our medical fees with the basic wage and other economic standards we find that medical fees have risen very little over the past 30 years. If we take the case of general practitioners' fees as a guide it is fair to say that they have been markedly depressed. In 1932 when the fee for a general practitioner consultation was 10s. 6d. the basic wage was £2 12s. 6d.; but in 1972 the price of a consultation—and believe it or not I had to look it up—is \$3.30 and the minimum wage is in the vicinity of \$55 to \$60. So we have a tenfold increase in the basic wage compared with a threefold increase in doctors' fees.

Mr. Graham: Wouldn't you say the existing system virtually ensures that there are no bad debts to the doctor?

Dr. DADOUR: Yes. There are very few bad debts today compared with pre-insurance days.

Mr. Graham: I think that is a factor which should be taken into account. It is a direct benefit to the medical practitioner.

Dr. DADOUR: I grant the Minister that. I would also say that of the \$3.30 paid by the patient, \$2.50 is recouped from his

insurance, so in reality he pays 80c out of his pocket. In 1932 he paid 10s. 6d., or \$1.05. So it costs less today for a patient to see a doctor than was the case 40 years ago.

Mr. Williams: That has confused the Deputy Premier.

Dr. DADOUR: No, he is too foxy for that.

Mr. Graham: I do not know whether I have been complimented or insulted.

Dr. DADOUR: That from me is a compliment. The increase in doctors' incomes has been due to increased utilisation of the doctor. Probably this utilisation is initiated by the patient. The doctor does not ask the patient to come to see him; the patient comes of his own volition.

Mr. Bertram: Not always, by a long shot.

Dr. DADOUR: It depends upon the conditions. Sometimes it is necessary to ask a patient to come back because the doctor is responsible. This must be accepted. He is not doing his job unless in certain cases he asks the patient to come back for follow-up treatment, which is needed with many illnesses. I grant the honourable member that. However the crux of it is that the patients go to the doctor; the doctor does not stand outside his office with a lasso and rope them in. He does not advertise on television or radio, or in the Press or any other media. He simply waits until the patients come.

Why do they come more often? There are two reasons. Consultations with a doctor are now very cheap if one contributes to a medical scheme; and, secondly, the patient has become far better informed. Instead of suffering some ailment or minor illness he goes to the doctor far more quickly—within days—to have his condition checked and to make sure there is nothing wrong; whereas in the old days he probably saved up five or 10 ailments and brought them all with him!

The patient today is better educated and more orientated towards knowing that he must see his doctor quickly. The newspapers are doing a great service in this regard. Quite often one reads that if one finds any lumps in parts of the anatomy one should see the doctor, or that if anything untoward happens, such as suffering from indigestion, one should see one's family doctor. This is initiated by journalists who write the articles and, of course, it brings people to the doctors.

Today we have immunisation programmes, too. People go to be immunised against influenza and they take their children to be immunised against three diseases at once. I refer to what is known as triple antigen which immunises against whooping cough, tetanus, and diphtheria. People receive three separate injections for this and then another one 12 months later.

So it can be seen that much of this increased utilisation is due to education plus the fact that it is now much cheaper for people to see their doctors.

The doctor, unlike members of other professions, and whether he likes it or not, must work extremely long hours because of the work load. I do not ask patients to come back unless I think it is necessary to do so in order to clear my conscience, and it will be found that the majority of doctors, when they ask patients to come back, do not necessarily charge a second consultation fee. Some do, of course, but a great number do not.

Mr. Williams: Are you one who does not?

Dr. DADOUR: Yes.

Mr. Williams: I will come and see you more often.

Dr. DADOUR: Because of the fact that he works very long hours the doctor's income must increase. One could contemplate saying facetiously that a doctor probably earns too much and works such long hours that he has no time to spend it.

Mr. Court: The tax man takes care of that.

Mr. Bertram: You could face up to that, surely.

Dr. DADOUR: I am sure a great number of people in this House would gladly help me spend it. However, it takes many years of study and work before a doctor earns what the community would consider to be a reasonable income. As a matter of fact, the general practitioner does not earn a reasonable income until he is about 33 or 34 years of age. I would venture to say that a specialist—be he a physician, a surgeon, or some other specialist—does not earn what one would call a reasonable income until he is 37 to 40 years of age.

Mr. Bertram: What is a reasonable income?

Dr. DADOUR: That depends upon what we use as a yardstick. I think the average doctor in private practice earns between \$12,000 and \$16,000 net, after allowing for 45 per cent. in overheads.

Mr. Bickerton: Overheads! A lot go underground, too.

Dr. DADOUR: Unfortunately, none of that money can go straight into his pocket, as is the case with many other professions where people do not want receipts. Doctors have to give receipts because doctors' fees are taxation deductions and they are also claims on hospital benefits. So unfortunately we cannot do the ducking act.

General practitioners' services depend upon the creation of an intense personal interest. There is a traditional relationship in this country and the proponents of socialised medicine have always contended that a salaried service can provide that

relationship. Common sense and experience of many Government instrumentalities will indicate that this is definitely not so.

It has been well proved in America that when a doctor is a full-time employee of the State or an institution his output falls considerably; it does not increase, but falls. So we find that his operation list becomes smaller and he spends less time in hospitals. Also, the waiting list of patients who seek operations becomes longer. The time spent in hospital becomes longer, and if an overall view of the picture is taken it is found that inefficiency has increased. Under the British medical scheme this has been proved time and time again. Despite this, there are proponents of such a scheme who would like to see it operating in Australia.

Mr. Jones: What is your opinion of the existing hospital benefits contributory scheme where a contributor on \$20,000 a year and another on \$5,000 a year pay the same subscription? Do you think that is a fair scheme? The man on the lower income has to keep up his high contribution otherwise the cost of his hospitalisation would not be covered.

Dr. DADOUR: There are two levels, of course. He may prefer to go into a private ward instead of a public ward.

Mr. Rushton: How much taxation does he pay?

Mr. Jones: I am just putting this forward as a weakness in the scheme.

Dr. DADOUR: I can assure the member for Collie that there are more weaknesses in the other scheme. Members will recall that Clement Attlee, who was the architect of the British medical scheme—

Mr. Jamieson: He was not, of course; Sir William Beveridge was.

Mr. Hutchinson: Was he Prime Minister then?

Dr. DADOUR: I stand corrected; it was Sir William Beveridge. Anyhow, he died in a private ward of one of the large London hospitals. How much faith did he have in his own scheme?

Mr. Bickerton: Attlee or Clement?

Dr. DADOUR: Clement Attlee. How much faith did he have in his own scheme?

Mr. Bickerton: Perhaps other doctors obstructed him.

Dr. DADOUR: Would any member of the House tolerate the delay and the waste of time experienced with a Government welfare medical scheme? Would he be prepared to accept the lack of privacy that is suffered by the ordinary taxpayer under such a scheme?

Mr. Lapham: You get delays and waste of time now. You telephone a doctor to obtain his services but you are still obliged to wait. You do not get medication immediately.

Dr. DADOUR: The member for Karrinyup knows full well that a doctor cannot be in two places at the one time but sometimes people expect a doctor to be in three or four places at the one time. This, of course, is a physical impossibility. Doctors give the best possible service they are able to give.

Mr. Bertram: What can this Parliament do about this problem you are raising?

Dr. DADOUR: I am bringing home to the people of this State that perhaps the medical profession is being maligned.

Mr. Court: Unfairly maligned.

Mr. Jones: You would not do too well through the Arbitration Court.

Dr. DADOUR: The honourable member had better contemplate what I told him the other day about hanging. Despite what members on the other side of the House may say, the primary concern of members of the medical profession is not pecuniary, but the complete care of their patients; it is no more and no less. We aim at giving adequate care to our patients.

Mr. Jamieson: I wish you had been in attendance at a meeting held in Rockingham some weeks ago to hear what some of your medical colleagues said.

Dr. DADOUR: There we have the little left wing splinter group.

Mr. Bertram: No, the right wing splinter group.

Dr. DADOUR: My halo fell down years ago.

Mr. Jamieson: Wait till Dr. Worner gets hold of you.

Mr. Court: You keep to your story! If any of the people on the other side of the House had an ailment the first person they would scream out for would be a doctor and they would expect him to turn out at 3.00 a.m. or 4.00 a.m.

Dr. DADOUR: If any member on the opposite side of the House took ill I would give him the same treatment as I would give to any member on this side of the House. That is a promise and not a threat. Any member on the other side of the House who seeks my advice would receive it. I have received advice from many of them in the past, despite the fact that on some occasions it has been rough advice.

I believe, and I agree, that for the present medical scheme to be successful it would need the support of all members of the medical profession. As it is now we have a small splinter group that is being very vocal and is causing a great deal of concern. However, the attitude of doctors has not changed. As they have done in the past, they are still prepared to treat those who are in need and who require help regardless of whether they can afford the treatment or not.

Mr. Bickerton: So does the R.A.C., as far as a motorcar is concerned.

Dr. DADOUR: But the R.A.C. has authority to do certain things that I cannot do, although at times I would like to be able to do them. If one were to make a study of the activities of the specialists' colleges, and the college of the general practitioners, it would be found that these colleges are becoming more and more conscious of their responsibilities. They bring to bear intense pressure on members of the medical profession to improve both themselves and their methods.

Finally, I would like to point out that members of the medical profession set a very high standard which is too often overlooked and taken for granted. The care that doctors give to their patients is often overlooked and, further, too often is such care taken for granted. The profession has set out to ensure that the high quality of patient care is maintained.

By "high quality of patient care" I mean, firstly, that the patient has the absolute right to choose his own doctor either when he is a hospital patient or when he is being treated at home.

Secondly, if he is dissatisfied with the medical attention he is receiving, or if he desires to obtain a second opinion, the patient has the unfettered right to dismiss his medical attendant and seek a second opinion.

Mr. Bickerton: That would be a little difficult for a patient residing at Nullagine.

Dr. DADOUR: Thirdly, the patient has the absolute right to be able to choose, and have available, the best possible treatment at all times and, within reason, to be able to choose when he shall attend his doctor and also when he shall be hospitalised.

Fourthly, the patient should be afforded the basic right of total privacy; that is, total privacy of conversation, consultation, accommodation, and documentation of his illness. Under the present medical scheme the patient is granted all these considerations. This makes for good, total patient care; whereas under a nationalised scheme, especially under the British nationalised scheme, there will not be any of this same good care.

Let us look at one aspect of the British nationalised scheme; that is, the waiting period in the treatment of patients. In some parts of Great Britain in respect of the treatment of cancer of the breast the waiting period is up to eight weeks before there is a chance of corrective surgery. The longer the period, the less is the chance of success, and the sooner the operation and treatment are carried out the better. In some parts of Great Britain this period of waiting is eight weeks. However, in this country we treat cancer of

the breast almost as an emergency, and we try to get the patient into hospital within one or two days.

One of the hilarious aspects of the British nationalised scheme relates to abortions. Those done privately cost 200 guineas, as against those done under the socialised scheme which are free. The difference is that the waiting list under the nationalised scheme is nine months.

Mr. Bickerton: Does the patient get the 200 guineas back?

Dr. DADOUR: The patient is charged a second time if it is not done properly the first time! Can anyone say that today the high standard which I have outlined is not maintained by the profession in Australia as a whole? I felt impelled to say these things to discredit the recent criticisms of my profession. I thank members for their patient hearing.

MR. BURKE (Perth) [9.27 p.m.]: I would like to take this opportunity, as I returned too late from overseas to do so last year, to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your ascendancy to the Chair in this House. On my return from overseas I felt a void in the death of your predecessor. He was a generous and a genuine man, and he was a great help to me on very many occasions over many years. I recall that as far back as 1956 when he was first elected to this House I supported him in his campaign. In fact, it was shortly after my father was defeated for the Federal seat of Perth. My feelings towards the anti-Labor forces were very strong indeed; therefore, I worked hard on behalf of your predecessor to assure his election. I would like to think that I did my part in helping him to make an important contribution to the State and to the nation in the period he was in this Parliament.

I had the honour in the latter part of last year to visit the United States at the invitation of the American Government. I was one of 70 people from throughout the world, four of whom came from Australia, to make the visit. It was a great honour to me. It is my intention to prepare a report and to make it available to members of this House. I thank members for giving me the opportunity to take advantage of what was in my opinion a great honour; and, in fact, I believe my report will bear this out. I hope that in the contributions I will make from time to time to the debates in this House I will be able to call upon the knowledge I have gleaned from many of the matters I investigated whilst I was in the U.S.A.

I feel I should express publicly my thanks to the U.S.A. Government for inviting me, and I received nothing but co-operation and assistance from the Department of State and the Government in the 40 days that I was in the country.

I was able to meet anyone I wished or to investigate any of the aspects in which I was interested.

As was reported on my return from America, I looked at some rapid transit systems in stages of near completion. In San Francisco the Bay area rapid transit system has cost \$1,500,000,000. It was essential that the money be spent in San Francisco, otherwise that city would have ended up in a mess; and I use the term "mess" after a consideration of the congestion that has resulted in Los Angeles which has just been overwhelmed by the modern motorcar. The pollution which has resulted from this is apparent when one flies into that city.

I also looked at the proposals for similar rapid transit systems at Atlanta in Georgia; and I observed that in Washington, the Federal capital, an underground rapid transit system was in the course of development, without funds having been voted by the Federal Government. In fact, the city fathers of Washington realised that if they did not take the bull by the horns, as it were, the city would soon be strangled by the modern motorcar. Other actions have been taken in different parts of the U.S.A. in an effort to contain or control the complete subjection of the people by the modern motorcar.

On my trip I looked at many other matters, some of which I will raise as they are dealt with in the House. No doubt many will be dealt with. I also intend to raise some of them myself.

In that country I looked at the problems of drug addiction in several centres. I discussed these problems with the Federal authorities in Washington, and I met some people who were involved in dealing with drug addiction in Baltimore and New York. Although I would not for one moment hold myself up as an authority on this matter, one aspect of this problem concerned me there and it concerns me here; that is, we are lumping the so-called soft drugs together with the hard drugs. In the U.S.A. reference is made continually to heroin and addictive drugs of the same family, or similar addictive types of drugs. One rarely hears references to marihuana. In fact, it was suggested to me by certain persons who were involved in this area that the prime reason for heavy restrictions being still imposed on the use of marihuana is that it is a political matter.

In the past I have said that in this regard we are alienating a generation of young people. We are, in fact, interfering with the natural right of a father to discipline his son when we take for granted that the use of alcohol and cigarettes is a part of our daily lives, but at the same time we convict the young man who happens to smoke one marihuana cigarette and impose a fine of up to \$1,000, or the equivalent of six months' incarceration.

It has been revealed that there is, in fact, a law for the rich and another law for the poor; because needless to say the son of a rich man—and the use of marihuana takes place in all areas of society from the poor to the wealthy, as revealed by an examination of the court lists—will have his fine paid, and he will avoid imprisonment. However, the son of a poor man faces the prospect of six months' imprisonment in lieu of a fine of \$1,000 because his father—or the person who is responsible for his discipline—is not in the position to pay the fine.

Everyone is aware of the damage caused as the result of smoking or drinking excessively. However, it has not been proved that this so-called soft drug does any damage or harm. In fact, some people claim it does good. Nevertheless, a poor man's son, having been convicted, is incarcerated and his whole life ruined.

This is despite the fact, as I have already mentioned, that the experts will go no further than to say they do not really know whether the use of the soft drug is detrimental or deleterious. The same experts will tell us quite categorically that cigarette smoking or the consumption of alcohol can be deleterious. This is generally accepted. Very few people are charged for excessive consumption of alcohol. Most charges involving alcohol concern drinking drivers. No charges whatever are made against persons who smoke ordinary cigarettes. In fact this is encouraged continually by the mass media, despite the fact that medical authorities and the people as a whole accept that such smoking is deleterious.

We must study this matter more closely and until we are sure that this so-called soft drug—I am referring only to marihuana—is really damaging, we should ensure that no person's future is ruined merely because of his inability to pay the fine at present imposed in an effort to restrict the use of the drug because we are unsure whether it is harmful. We must ensure that the generation we are subjecting to these fines and incarceration is not completely and irretrievably lost as a useful element to our society. We should reduce the fines which are imposed to discourage the use of this drug, because I do not believe for one moment they are stopping its use.

Young people will use marihuana. This is common knowledge. I have read in the Press statements to the effect that 50 per cent. of the students at our local university are believed to have smoked marihuana and that an estimated 20 per cent. of the population of the United States has smoked it.

It is quite apparent that it is widely used and used by all sections in the community. It is also recognised or admitted that no proof exists that it is deleterious.

In order to retain the respect of the generation which is at present looking to its superiors for guidance—and we present this society as being the best for it—we should ensure that no-one is subjected to penalties which can affect him for many years, and even for the rest of his life.

I had not intended to speak tonight, but members will appreciate that I did so because the debate was about to collapse. I am consequently without notes and so I am perhaps not quite as well prepared as I would otherwise be. However, the point I am trying to emphasise is that we are making laws and the courts are attempting to enforce them. However, the young people involved are being punished for doing something which not even the recognised medical authorities, scientists, and experts can say is necessarily harmful.

I was very pleased to read in the Governor's Speech that it is the intention of the Minister for Labour to introduce legislation to update the laws concerning employment brokers. I raised this matter during the life of the last Parliament and asked for the appointment of a Select Committee to look into it as I felt at the time that as nothing had been done concerning employment brokers since 1918 the matter deserved studying. Parliament declined to grant my request, but I am pleased the Minister for Labour intends to proceed with appropriate legislation in the not-too-distant future.

Another matter I have raised in this Parliament—perhaps since the day I was elected to this Chamber—is legislation for the control of noise. In the past I pressed the former Premier to take some action to control noise, including community noise, but the matter was referred from one committee to another.

Mr. Gayfer: Is there much legislation on this in the States?

Mr. BURKE: Legislation is at present before the House of Representatives in the States. The former Premier parried my request by passing it from one committee to another and it did not get off the ground. Within one month of the election of this Labor Government, the present Chief Secretary indicated he intended to proceed with legislation dealing with noise control. Had it not been for the untimely death of the former Speaker, I am sure the legislation would have been passed prior to this.

In the circumstances I can add little more to my speech on this motion. As I have indicated it is my intention to provide as comprehensive a report as possible to all members of this House concerning the trip I made last year. In view of the fact that while I was away members carried my share of the burden and responsibility of governing this State, I believe I should provide such a report.



In conclusion, I must say I was very pleased to read Press reports concerning proposals for the lowering of the central railway line and the provision of a rapid transit system for Perth in the not-too-distant future.

I was also pleased to note that it is likely this will be provided by the Government, at great advantage to the State and the people of Western Australia. The heart of Perth which went so close to being lost to half a dozen American capitalists during the reign of the last Government will be saved for future generations.

The Press reports—which I am sure will be confirmed by this Government in due course—indicate that Perth will be provided with a modern and very much required rapid underground transport system. In time it will be seen that such a system is an absolute necessity, as was revealed to me by their existence in most major cities in the world. I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Gayfer.

*House adjourned at 9.46 p.m.*

## Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 22nd March, 1972

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

### QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

#### 1. SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

##### *Easter Period*

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH, to the Leader of the House:

For the guidance of members, I seek permission to ask the following question without notice of the Leader of the House in relation to sitting times:—

- (1) Next Friday week is Good Friday, and I anticipate the House will sit on the Thursday prior to Good Friday. The following Tuesday is a public holiday, and I presume the House will not sit on that day. Has the Leader of the House any plans for the remaining part of that week?
- (2) If the House will not be sitting during the remaining part of that week, it will then be a month since the House first sat. Are we likely to have

notice of the introduction of any legislation prior to the Easter break?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied: As far as I know we will not be meeting for a full week after the adjournment for Easter.

In the meantime, as long as it is within the capabilities of myself and my colleagues, we will give notice of any Bills we think we can submit so that they may reach the second reading stage and be adjourned at the will of the Leader of the Opposition.

### QUESTIONS (3): ON NOTICE

#### TAXES

##### *Increases*

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) With reference to the answer given to my question relating to State Taxation on Wednesday, the 15th March, 1972, wherein it was said taxes had been reduced in Western Australia, how does the Leader of the House explain the reference on Page 1 of the Governor's Speech to certain increases in the State's taxes and charges in the 1971-72 budget?
- (2) Does the Minister suggest that *The Australian* newspaper misreported the position, or that there was an unintentional mistake in His Excellency's Speech?
- (3) If *The Australian* newspaper did misreport the position, why did the Minister, whose long experience in Parliament has surely enabled him to know that questions as to whether statements in the press are accurate are inadmissible, in fact quote from a report in a newspaper?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) The reference in the Governor's Speech was factual.
- (2) No.
- (3) It was considered that the information contained in the press report would be of interest to honourable members.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is not an answer, that is an excuse.

#### 2.

#### LAND

##### *Release in Northcliffe Area*

The Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Is it the intention of the Government to release land in the Northcliffe area for agricultural purposes?