

Mr. Graham (Deputy Premier): "Are you sure of that. For months the Minister (Court) could not even talk to them."

There is an error there and it is strongly in favour of Hancock and Wright. This is where the error occurs—

Mr. Graham (Deputy Premier): "Are you sure of that. For months the Minister (Court) could not even talk to them."

In actual fact what he said was that he "would not even talk to them," and that is infinitely worse. They did not go to the Press and complain about that error, yet we have a member on this side of the House asking a Dorothy Dix question which indicates there is an understanding between members on this side and members opposite on an issue which I deplore.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Jones.

House adjourned at 9.43 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 23rd March, 1972

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (8): ON NOTICE

1. EDUCATION

Kindergarten Assistance

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

- (1) (a) What amount does the Government pay by way of annual grant to local kindergarten committees; and
- (b) on what basis is this money distributed?
- (2) (a) What amount does the Government pay by way of annual grant to the Kindergarten Association;
- (b) what is the formula for arriving at this figure; and
- (c) for what purposes is the money used?
- (3) (a) What was the formula for providing for grants adopted; and
- (b) is it the intention of the Government to consult with the Kindergarten Association with a view to reviewing the needs of the Kindergarten movement, particularly in respect to revising the formula to provide for substantial increases in grants?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

(1) (a) Building grants	\$54,000
Needy Kindergartens Grant	\$12,000
Total	\$66,000

- (b) Building grants are allocated in order of application. Needy kindergarten grants are distributed on the basis of need.
- (2) (a) The amount varies on the basis of pupil enrolments. The amount paid in 1971 was \$448,567.
- (b) Annual Grant = College grant + Administration grant + Child subsidy.
College grant = \$40,000 + 5% cost rise per annum × current maximum teachers' salary at 1st July ÷ Base year salary of \$3,397.
Administration grant (as for College grant).
Child subsidy = \$50 × % increase in teachers' salary at 1st July ÷ Base year salary of \$3,397.
- (c) Salaries, college costs and contingencies.
- (3) (a) The original formula was adopted in 1954 and most recently revised in 1970.
- (b) The Government will consider a request from the Kindergarten Association for a revision of the formula.

2. and 3. *These questions were postponed.*

4.

HOSPITALS

Leonora and Laverton: Office Accommodation

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) What office accommodation is provided for the recently appointed Secretary at the Leonora and Laverton Hospitals?
- (2) Is the office accommodation considered adequate?
- (3) If the answer to (2) is "no", what action is proposed to improve the situation?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) At both hospitals the Secretary will use existing office accommodation.
- (2) No.
- (3) At Leonora the question of rebuilding certain sections including office accommodation is being investigated at present. At Laverton no final solution to the problem has yet been found, but ways

of providing better accommodation for the Secretary are being examined.

5. ROADS

Yanchep Park Area: Closure

The Hon. J. HEITMAN, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) How many roads have been closed in the Yanchep Park area?
- (2) Have they been closed in conjunction with the Wanneroo Shire?
- (3) If not, who has been responsible for the roads closed?

The Hon. J. DOLAN (for The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs) replied:

- (1) 2.
- (2) No.
- (3) National Parks Board.

6. TRAFFIC

Seat Belts

The Hon. T. O. PERRY (for The Hon. N. E. Baxter) to the Minister for Police:

Since the introduction of compulsory wearing of seat belts in motor vehicles—

- (a) how many vehicle drivers have been fined for not wearing a seat belt;
- (b) how many of such drivers have had reportable accidents in the past twelve months?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (a) For metropolitan traffic area only—
536 Cautions have been given. 306 Infringement notices have been issued, however, 100 of these have elected to be dealt with by Court procedure. Briefs and summonses have been prepared.
- (b) This information is not available.

7. UNIVERSITY

Adult Education

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH (for The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon) to the Leader of the House:

- (1) With reference to my question on Wednesday, the 8th December, 1971, regarding Adult Education, when the Government advised that the University would "in the very near future" be advertising the positions for three vacant administrative posts in the department handling adult education, including the post of Director of Extension Services, will the Minister advise whether this has been done?

- (2) As the answer to part (2) of the same question indicated that the Government had agreed to extend the Adult Education facilities in this State—would the Minister please advise what progress has been made in this regard?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) Since December, the University has been responsible for the largest summer school which has so far been held and is now involved in winding up administrative details arising from the organisation of the Festival of Perth.
Meantime, the question of the status of the position of Director of Extension Services has been under consideration. It is expected that a decision on this will soon be reached and when this occurs, consideration will be given to the advertising of administrative positions.
- (2) Adult Education activities for 1972 in the Perth Metropolitan area and in country districts are being organised by the Technical Education Division of the Education Department, but it is too early to report on the full extent of these activities.

8. EDUCATION

Additional Commonwealth Grant for Schools

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS, to the Leader of the House:

Further to my question on the 21st March, 1972, relating to the allocation of funds for education, and the reply to part (b) thereof, would the Minister advise—

- (a) whether any specific Commonwealth grants were included in either of the figures stated; and
- (b) if so, how much in each case?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (a) Yes.
- (b) 1970-71—\$1,785,000.
1971-72—\$3,495,000.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SIXTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 22nd March, on the following motion by The Hon. D. K. Dans:—

That the following Address be presented to His Excellency:—

May it please Your Excellency: We, the Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia, in Parliament

assembled, beg to express our loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to deliver to Parliament.

THE HON. CLIVE GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [2.42 p.m.]: I am pleased to have the opportunity to make a contribution to the debate on the motion so capably moved by Mr. Dans on opening day. I am not going to mention the trying conditions which existed on that day because other members have already done this; but I do want to congratulate Mr. Dans on the manner in which he spoke and on the very interesting contribution he made on that occasion. He has in the past proved that he is well informed on the subject on which he spoke—indeed, he is well informed on most subjects on which he decides to speak and he is always interesting.

This afternoon I would like to make a few brief comments on several subjects, and although I may not cover all I have in mind, I will do my best. The first item I wish to raise concerns an article in this morning's *The West Australian* under the heading of, "Cigarette warning." The article indicates that the Minister for Health will probably introduce legislation in the latter period of this session for the purpose of making it compulsory to place warning labels on cigarette packets to indicate there is some disadvantage connected with cigarette smoking. I merely wish to say I will wholeheartedly support such legislation. The only criticism I have, if it be criticism, is that the legislation will not be introduced during this first period of the session.

The problems associated with cigarette smoking must be faced by the whole community. Sweeping evidence has been provided by experts from all over the world to indicate that humanity is killing itself off by cigarette smoking. We make a big noise about people killing themselves in motorcars and by other means, but it seems to me that if we are concerned at all about saving human life and preventing human suffering, we ought to do something positive and quickly about warning our people—and the young ones particularly—of the disadvantages which can accrue as a result of smoking cigarettes.

So, I repeat, I am pleased to read that the subject will be submitted for the consideration of Parliament, but I am dismayed that this will not occur until the latter period of this session.

I now wish to refer to the funds being made available by the Government to schools in Western Australia. I have asked questions more especially relating to the Commonwealth grant made earlier in the year to the State Government, and I

was interested in the replies, particularly having listened to the Governor's Speech in which he said—

... the Government is determined that there shall be no retreat from its policy that education is the most rewarding investment an administration can make, and its record keeps faith with its policy.

One of the questions I asked the Leader of the House concerned how much was granted to the State by the Commonwealth at that particular Premier's Conference and his reply was that the amount was something like \$3,000,000. I also asked how much of that grant was allocated for schools, and I was told the amount was \$32,280. Considering the Government believes that education is the most rewarding investment that an Administration can make, this seems to me to be a paltry sort of contribution. I am no brilliant mathematician, but after some time I was able to work out that this figure represented 1.08 per cent. of the total and it occurred to me that perhaps it ought to have been a little more.

I was then concerned as to how the \$32,000 allocated to education was to be spent and I asked a question to that effect. The Minister kindly gave me an answer in which he indicated that the \$32,000 was being well spent. I have no criticism of the manner in which it is being spent, because the list he gave was impressive. It involved little jobs around the schools, these including parking areas, a few fences, fixing up retaining wall steps, and filling in sites and so on—all vital to the education system.

As I have said, I have no quarrel with the way the money has been allocated, but it occurred to me that perhaps the Government should have been interested in some other facets of education and provided more of the \$3,000,000 for them. However, I was able to gain also from the answer that the Government thought that the allocation of \$32,000 out of \$3,000,000 was reconcilable with the statement contained in the Governor's Speech, which I quoted.

The Leader of the House said it was reconcilable for the reasons given in his answer, part of which is as follows:—

(b) Yes. The relatively small proportion of funds for unemployment relief work that could be allocated to schools indicates the high priority given to the needs of Education by the Government when framing its capital budget this year. The total capital allocation to the Education Department in 1971-72 amounts to \$16,695,000 compared with expenditure of \$13,138,000 in 1970-71 which was provided in the last Budget of the Brand Government. Consequently there were

no outstanding major school projects which were at a stage where tenders could be let immediately when additional funds for unemployment relief became available. It must be appreciated that the primary purpose of the additional loan allocation made available to the State in February was the relief of unemployment. Therefore the funds were allocated to labour intensive works which could be implemented at the earliest possible date.

I refer back to the first answer wherein it was stated that the only works which could be implemented quickly were the establishment of a few parking areas, some fencing work, steps on a retaining wall, paving, and the sanding of a sports area. I repeat I have no quarrel with such works and I think they ought to be done.

The second answer contains a strange statement. I have noticed over the last 12 months that many strange statements have emanated from the Government or from some of its Ministers. The Minister stated, as I have said, that only a relatively small amount of money was able to be allocated from the amount of \$3,000,000, because there were no outstanding projects. However he also said in the same answer—

In addition, \$83,219 was allocated to school works from the further allocation of funds for the relief of unemployment approved on 20th March.

Incidentally my question was asked on the 15th March. On that date the Minister had said that only \$32,000 of the total of \$3,000,000 could be used on available school works. However, on the 20th March suddenly works to the value of \$83,000 have appeared from somewhere or other.

It is quite obvious the allocation of 1.08 per cent. of the original amount is a clear indication of the Government's attitude towards the necessity to spend funds on education compared with other works. Three or four days later, I was given the information the Government was able to find works to the amount of \$83,000. Either the Government did not know what was going on in the Education Department and did not know works would be coming available—and, therefore, it would be able to allocate some of the original \$3,000,000—or it simply had no regard for education, excluding expenditure to the tune of 1.08 per cent. of the total available.

Be that as it may, in the second part of the answer the Leader of the House said that 1.08 per cent. of the total is reconcilable with the Government's statement that it is convinced that education is the most rewarding investment an Administration can make.

Further in that answer the Minister indicated the reason the Government did not have to allocate any more than \$32,000 was the immense increase made by the present Government to the capital allocation made available in the last Budget of the Brand Administration. It is something like \$3,000,000 more, in round figures.

On the face of it that seems fair enough. It appears the present Government saw fit to allocate an extra \$3,000,000-odd this year. I do not want to talk about increased costs, inflation, and the like, but I reserve the right to believe that this would take care of a fair amount of the \$3,000,000. However, I will not argue that point. I will argue another point because I have looked at the details of Estimates and Expenditure of the Government of Western Australia from the General Loan Fund for the year ending the 30th June, 1971, and the 30th June, 1972 respectively. It works out that in the year 1971-72 the present Government has a total of \$88,894,000 of which it has allocated \$15,290,000 to education, namely, 17 per cent. of the total. In the year 1970-71 under a Liberal Administration loan funds totalling \$76,769,000 were available of which \$13,151,000 was allocated for schools. This constitutes 17 per cent. of the total. Members will see that exactly the same percentage was allocated to education in the two consecutive years. Any inference we are supposed to draw from the answer given by the Minister to the effect that the present Government believes education to be more important than the Brand Administration thought it was is certainly discounted by that little bit of arithmetic. There is always the possibility that my mathematics is not the best, but as some members in this House are allegedly fairly good mathematicians, they should be able to inform us whether the figure of 17 per cent. in each case is right or wrong. I suggest it is right.

Let us assume, however, that we will not accept this as an argument. When the Leader of the House answered a question which I asked on the 21st March he advised that an amount of \$16,695,000 had been allocated by the present Government compared with an amount of \$13,138,000 allocated by the previous Government. I asked a question today as to whether or not either of those two amounts included any specific grants made by the Commonwealth for the purposes of education.

The answer I received proves my point, because it indicates that in the year 1970-71 the State Government had made available to it by the Commonwealth \$1,785,000; whereas the present Government has had made available to it by the Commonwealth \$3,495,000.

This makes the \$16,000,000 of this Administration when compared with the \$13,000,000 of the previous Government

look pretty sick and, indeed, it looks very much to me as if this Government was not prepared or willing to give the same percentage out of its own funds as was the previous Government.

So I wonder what sort of notice we are supposed to take of the glaring and glossy statements that come forth from time to time from the present Government—statements which are made to indicate to the people that this particular administration is providing for those people in every facet of government, and not only as it relates to education, and also implying it is providing something in excess of what was provided by the previous Government.

I cannot swallow that and I can assure the Government that neither will the people of Western Australia swallow it; and they will let them know about this in due course.

The Minister for Police who happens to represent the same province as I do will recall one very deserving building project in his province and mine about which he suggested to the people concerned, at the same time as I did, that the Government should do something whether it could provide funds or not.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Could you be specific?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I will in a minute. I will surely be specific. I do not expect the Minister for Police to be clairvoyant and read into my mind, but I also do not expect him to anticipate what is in my mind.

The Hon. J. Dolan: That is why I asked.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Surely the Minister does not think I am not going to tell him what I am talking about? I was referring to the gymnasium at the Cannington High School, which is a very important facet of education; a facet of education which I have endeavoured for the past seven or eight years since that school has been in existence to get the Government to appreciate should be finalised.

I have not done this because we have suddenly dreamed up the fact that we wanted a gymnasium at that high school. I did it because when the school was constructed seven or eight years ago the entire gymnasium was not completed—or I should say a certain percentage of it was only completed—and no roof or walls were built.

The Hon. J. Dolan: What did the previous Government do about it?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Had the previous Government done something about it I would not be mentioning it now.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Why do you not be fair?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am being fair. Of the \$3,000,000 which the Commonwealth gave to the State Govern-

ment for use for educational purposes the State Government can only find use for 1.08 per cent.; money which should have been used for the huge numbers of unemployed in the building industry.

In spite of that the Minister has the audacity to suggest that because the previous Government did nothing about the matter—and I condemn that Government for not doing anything—this Government should do nothing. He seems to forget that the present Government has had made available to it oodles of money by way of special grants from the Commonwealth Government. This money was not available to the previous Government. It was as simple as that. I am told in answer to my question that there was no work available in schools that would provide employment for building tradesmen because of the specific nature of the grant, yet we have our Cannington High School with a partly-completed gymnasium, about which I have made representations to the Government over the years. I know the Minister for Police has also done so, because he represents the same province as I do and he advocated to the people in that area that he would do everything he could to get the job done.

I notice the Minister for Police has not been quite so vocal since he has been in Government. He also has a colleague in the Cabinet who represents this area in the form of the Minister for Works.

Surely these people should have some say as to how this money should be allocated. Had I been in Cabinet when the \$3,000,000 was available to be whacked up and I knew that education was the greatest investment an administration could make, and I was frantically racking my brains to see how I could possibly spend more than 1.08 per cent. of it for building tradesmen, I would have at least given passing consideration and thought to the completion of the gymnasium for the Cannington High School.

The money that we have had invested in the partially-completed work in that gymnasium is lost because the gymnasium is deteriorating.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Are the doors open or closed?

The Hon. R. Thompson: Did you take into account the added salaries given to teachers and the deficit when working out your figures?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I did not miss the point; I made reference to it.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: A very good point.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I said I did not particularly take that into consideration, but I made some sort of reference to it, and I am certainly not going over it again.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The Minister for Police does not like the expression you used when you talked about "oodles"; he thinks "bundles" might have been better.

The Hon. J. Dolan: He could have said "bundles" and he might have been nearer the mark.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: If the Government has so much money—and I do not know exactly how much the building would cost, but it would certainly be a long way short of the \$3,000,000 provided—I should hope in all sincerity that now that I have refreshed the Minister's memory about the needs at this high school, he will report back to the Premier post-haste and ask him to make the necessary allocation.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I do not make the allocations; you should know that.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: If I were in the Minister's job I would have something to say about it.

The Hon. J. Dolan: You could say what you liked but you still would not get an allocation. You ask any Minister about this. They do not get what they want.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I may not, but the Minister would have a darned sight more chance if he asked for it.

The Hon. J. Dolan: How do you know I have not asked for it? I do not tell you what happens at Cabinet meetings, nor does any Minister; or he should not, anyway.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Obviously not very much seems to have been done. I have come to that conclusion.

The Hon. J. Dolan: A poor conclusion.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is a matter of opinion.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I wanted to make that point because I do not believe that the statements made are reconcilable with the action taken. I propose to finish there on this particular subject. I again say that I do not think the statement made is reconcilable with the facts and the action taken.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You are aware the majority of these funds will be expended on labour? That is a Commonwealth condition.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It is nice to hear a back-bencher helping out a silent Minister.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I would conclude by saying I am aware of the conditions that obtain.

The next matter I wish to mention on the topic of education is in reference to an article which appeared in *The West Australian* this morning. As a matter of fact, I am pleased that I received a copy of this morning's newspaper because it has provided me with quite a few things to talk about.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Is today the only day you get it?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: As a matter of fact, I receive *The West Australian* every day except Sunday. The article to which I refer is headed, "Fund aids schools." I think I should read this article to the House. Obviously members have read it, but I think it indicates two things: firstly, the desire of students to help other people and their acceptance of the fact that it is necessary to help others in the community; and, secondly, that funds may be provided for needy schools. The article states—

Students at the W.A. Institute of Technology have started a school aid scheme because they claim that the method of allocating money for school facilities is inefficient.

An organiser of the scheme, Mr. Peter Woodward, said that a raffle at the institute this week had raised \$59 . . .

Perhaps I should not have read that out.

The Hon. J. Dolan: The Chief Secretary might have something to say about it.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am sure they would have received permission to run the raffle. The article continues—

. . . which would be given to the East Perth Primary School.

More would be given during the year. Other schools would also be involved.

The headmaster of the East Perth school, Mr. W. J. Daly, said that the school had only a small core of active members in its parents and citizens' association and had difficulty raising money.

I think that action of the students at the Institute of Technology deserves commendation, and it will certainly receive it from me. I feel the students are doing a wonderful job to alleviate the situation which prevails in regard to schools located in areas where the parents are not as affluent as the parents of other areas. As a result the children are not able to enjoy the facilities that are easily obtainable by schools located in districts in which the parents are affluent and easily able to raise money with which to provide facilities for their children.

In the main, parents and citizens associations have to provide half the money required for a project and the Government then provides the other half. I think this is a very worthy contribution by the students of the Institute of Technology.

I make a suggestion here, and perhaps the Minister may mention it to whoever he mentions these matters: perhaps we should have a longer look at this situation. I know that in my province there are many schools and some are located in districts which are populated predominantly by people on very low incomes. The children of such people are at a decided

disadvantage when compared with the children in other districts. I know I am not the first to mention this subject, and what I have to say has been said before during the reign of the previous Government. I am not suggesting that the present Government is any more to blame than any of the previous Governments, because it has tended to relieve this situation.

I feel that when a school is built to accommodate the children of people living in low-income housing developments, additional thought should be given to providing assistance to the parents and citizens associations to help them in their efforts to provide libraries, canteens, etc. The associations in affluent districts not only have the benefit of being able to provide cash, but they also have the benefit of having people in the district who are in a position to know where facilities can be obtained at a lower price. They have the know-how, and they know of avenues which are not available to people on lower incomes; therefore, they get better value out of a dollar.

I do not think we should persist with this state of affairs. It seems to me—and this does not apply only to the Education Department, but right throughout the whole of our society—that the person with the least amount of money pays the most for his goods. The person with plenty of money who can well afford to pay the top price invariably pays the least.

The Hon. R. Thompson: If we have seven or eight years of continuing Labor Government we will rectify all these complaints.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Obviously Mr. Ron Thompson wishes to divert me from speaking about the record of his Government as far as education is concerned. He wants me to move to another topic. Obviously this is rubbing him up the wrong way.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Not at all.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is easily done!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I will do two things: firstly I will not continue with that subject; and, secondly, I will not answer the honourable member anyway.

Another matter I believe should be considered a little more carefully than has been the case in the past—and certainly it should be considered by many more people—concerns something which has been receiving some publicity during the last few months. I refer to the Kwinana-Balga power transmission line. It seems to me that the Government is paying scant regard to the people and is blandly going about its business with no concern whatsoever about how this power line will affect the community.

Just prior to the 1971 State elections Sir David Brand gave an assurance that the proposed route of this transmission line would be submitted to the Environmental Protection Authority before a final decision was made. I do not think anybody can say that any assurance given by Sir David Brand during his term of office has not been subsequently fulfilled. Therefore, I was a little appalled to hear the present Government state categorically that it is not prepared to submit this proposal to the Environmental Protection Authority before making its final decision. That is a strange attitude to adopt, especially on the part of a Government which condemned the previous Government whenever it made a decision to do anything at all which looked like interfering with the environment.

Here we have a gigantic scheme which will have a tremendous effect on the escarpment and on the environment of a huge part of the metropolitan region, yet the present Government says it is not prepared to submit the proposition to the Environmental Protection Authority for its views.

The Hon. J. Dolan: What environmental protection authority would Sir David Brand have referred it to?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The one that would have been set up.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Which one?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: My leader has answered the question. He has said precisely what I would have said. Sir David Brand would have referred the matter to the authority that would have been set up under the legislation that had been passed. The Government can now say what it likes, as to whether it would or would not have done that. All I am saying is that Sir David Brand said his Government would have done that.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You are on safe ground in saying that at this stage.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: There is one thing which is absolutely sure and about which there is no speculation: This Government has said quite definitely that it will not submit the proposition to the Environmental Protection Authority. There are no ifs, buts, or maybes about that.

In a recent session of Parliament—it was not the present session, I am not sure whether it was in the last session, and it could have been the one before—or certainly within the last seven or eight months the following motion was moved by the member for Darling Range in another place:—

That, in the opinion of this House, no decision should be made on the construction of the high voltage power lines from Kwinana to Balga until

a survey by the proposed Environmental Protection Council or a competent independent authority has been submitted to the Government, and laid on the Table of the House.

That request was rejected out of hand by the Government.

However, the present Minister for Works who, at the time, was also Minister for Electricity made a statement to the effect that the proposition was being submitted to the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority, as an independent authority, for its views; and that that would suffice so far as the Government was concerned.

To all intents and purposes perhaps that proposal was not unreasonable, bearing in mind that the Government had refused point blank to submit the proposition to the Environmental Protection Authority. So, there was an indication that the Government had some concern as it was prepared to let the M.R.P.A. look into the proposal. To my knowledge the M.R.P.A. made a clear recommendation to the Government that this power line ought not to go through the land owned by Guildford Grammar School. It also recommended, bearing in mind this was to be a dual line, that one line ought to follow a route through the escarpment and the other through the valleys.

It is pretty difficult to explain this on a plan, and particularly difficult for *Hansard* to record the locations, so I shall make little reference to the plans except to point out that I have them in my possession. These are plans from the State Electricity Commission which show the routes the two lines are to take.

What the Government has done in respect of the M.R.P.A. recommendation is to accept the part which suits the State Electricity Commission, and to reject out of hand the part which does not suit it. It seems to me to be a waste of time to ask competent authorities to make recommendations if the Government will accept only the part which suits the department concerned. In this case the Government is prepared to accept a deviation of the power line across the escarpment, but is not prepared to deviate the line which will run through Guildford Grammar School. This is a crying shame.

This school has been in existence for many years, and has provided educational facilities for a great number of students in Western Australia. Some people are opposed to independent schools, but I am not one of them. I did not attend an independent school, and certainly not the Guildford Grammar School. I attended a State school, and on one occasion I spent a week in a class of which Mr. Dolan was the teacher. I then decided immediately to become a Liberal!

The Hon. J. Dolan: You learnt more that week than you did subsequently.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Yes, he did. He decided immediately to become a Liberal during that week. This is a very good point.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Mr. Dolan did not notice me in the class at all. I was subsequently transferred to another class. Guildford Grammar School has operated under difficulties for a number of years, because its premises are separated by tracts of land, and this makes the running of the school inconvenient. However, in recent times the school negotiated to purchase the land in between its premises. On the portion which faces Great Eastern Highway the school wants to erect certain buildings, and on the portion at the rear the school wants to develop playing fields, but the transmission lines will run across the school land. There is a three-chain easement which cuts across this land completely, and there are to be 170-foot high towers which will create a danger and cause difficulties to the school. Looking at the plan I see there is absolutely no reason why the transmission line—which I will refer to as the southern line—cannot be diverted so that it runs parallel with the northern line.

I fail to understand why the Government has not intervened and advised the State Electricity Commission that in view of the extreme hardship that will be caused to Guildford Grammar School through the Government's pigheadedness—for want of a better term—the southern line should be diverted to run parallel to the northern line.

Some engineers suggest that it is not wise to run transmission lines parallel to one another because of mechanical difficulties. A certain group of engineers believe this theory. Indeed, I am given to understand that some senior engineers in the State Electricity Commission believe in this theory, and have always advocated it notwithstanding the fact that the original plan had the lines running parallel to each other for their entire length. Only last year was the plan deviated from and the separate routes came into being.

The senior engineers who have always advocated that it is safer and sounder to run the lines separately have got their way. However, I would point out to the Government that on the plan at which I am looking the proposed final routes are running parallel from the northern terminal, where the line will end, right back to the intersection of Bennett, Brook, and Marshall Roads. If the argument is sound that it is better to have the lines running separately, and not alongside one another, then that argument should apply for the entire route.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Is the honourable member prepared to disagree with the State Electricity Commission's ruling?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I previously earned my living in the electrical business and I have been disagreeing with the State Electricity Commission for 20 years. Returning to the power line dispute, I am not qualified to argue the point with senior engineers of the State Electricity Commission, but at least I have had a passing interest in electrical transmission over many years.

I do not profess for one minute to be an expert on this matter, but I do not believe that one needs to be an expert, because the same argument could be presented if I knew nothing at all about electrical transmission. Indeed, if I knew as much about the situation as does the Leader of the House I would probably still advance the same argument. I have spoken about the northern end of the transmission line, and I will now refer to the southern end. In the area of Kelm-scott the lines are brought together and run parallel to one another. My suggestion to deviate the southern line—where it passes over the Guildford Grammar School—a little further north so that it will run the balance of the distance parallel to the northern line, will mean there will be absolutely nothing to hinder development. Certainly, my suggestion will make it easier for the Guildford Grammar School authorities to fulfill their plans to provide additional facilities for the education of children.

I now come to another point which has been spoken about for many years. I refer to the proposal to construct a run-over from Great Eastern Highway across the railway line—opposite the Guildford Grammar School—to the old Woodbridge Hotel, so that the traffic would then proceed along Helena Street and back on to Great Eastern Highway. This proposal has been bandied around for a long time with the idea of closing off the road which runs past the Guildford Grammar School.

If such a run-over were eventually constructed it would be directly in the path of the pylons which will carry the line across the Guildford Grammar School property.

So I wonder why, when these plans were concocted, the Main Roads Department and the State Electricity Commission—and other people involved such as the Railways Department—did not get together and find out what each department intended to do. Such planning would have avoided much heartbreak and apprehension.

The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority categorically said that the line should not go across the Guildford Grammar School site. Despite that recommendation the Government does not intend to intervene in an attempt to do something. I cannot follow that reasoning.

A letter from the Minister for Electricity addressed to the President of the Kalamunda Shire Council has been laid on the Table of the House in another place. The letter, in part, reads as follows:—

My decision is to uphold the two routes proposed by the Commission.

In coming to my decision, I have been impressed by the strong desirability of meeting the Shire's representations in respect to the Maida Vale and Forrestfield sections as far as it is practicable. In respect to the Maida Vale Section, I am pleased to inform you that I have personally ascertained from the Department of Civil Aviation that they will agree to the S.E.C. proposals to amend the route so that it will be possible to avoid the Maida Vale Primary School, skirt the established housing area and the playing area of the golf course now being planned.

The Minister is prepared to deviate the route to avoid the Maida Vale Primary School, and the golf course under construction—if you do not mind. However, in the present situation we have a college with playing fields and land on which it intends to build additional school facilities—one of our very respected independent schools—and we find the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority recommending that the line should not go through that property, but the Minister is doing absolutely nothing about it.

Does the Minister have a violent dislike for private schools? I do not know. I am not suggesting that is the reason for his action but I find it very difficult to understand why he is prepared to deviate the line in order to avoid a proposed golf course—not even a golf course that is completed—when he is not prepared to recommend a deviation to avoid Guildford Grammar School, notwithstanding the recommendation he received from the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority. I think there is a complete lack of appreciation on the part of the Government of the situation that exists, and a total disregard for the community in this matter.

I have another note that was tabled in another place. It is a copy of a minute submitted by the Minister to the Premier and it says, amongst other things—

Following an inspection of the proposed route of the 330KV Transmission Line—Kwinana to Northern Terminal the Director of Environmental Protection submitted his verbal opinion to the Hon. Minister.

The Hon. Minister's submission to the Hon. Premier (In Cabinet) contained the following information:—

Dr. O'Brien is of the opinion that the second route behind the ranges is acceptable and believes

that this line should be built initially. At the same time effort should be made to survey a route for the second line in roughly the same path. However, the General Manager of the State Electricity Commission states the both lines must go in simultaneously.

In view of the explanations given to me, it appears there is little alternative but to agree to the present submissions which have been very carefully considered—particularly when it is recalled that the plan has been under consideration and investigation since 1968.

I will leave the matter at that. I fail to comprehend why, under those circumstances, the Government is not prepared to give some consideration to what the people of Western Australia are asking to be done. A large number of people in this State are concerned about that matter. I have no axe to grind for Guildford Grammar School. My interest was aroused by what I read in the paper concerning the school.

The next point I wish to make is directed to the Minister for Police. I suggest that he look at this particular situation. He may well be familiar with it and consider it is a satisfactory state of affairs, but I do not consider it to be so.

I refer to procedures followed at the East Perth Police Station and the difficulty encountered by a person who is called upon to go bail for another person. I have some personal experience of this and I will relate my experience to the House. If the Minister is satisfied this is the correct procedure, I can do nothing about it, but I believe if he has a good look at it he will agree there is room for some improvement.

Last Sunday evening I received a phone call at my home from a young person I knew, who said to me, "Mr. Griffiths, I have got into some trouble and I am at the East Perth lock-up. I need to be bailed out."

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.01 p.m.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: As I was saying earlier, I received this phone call from a young man I know. He told me he needed to be bailed out and asked was I prepared to provide bail. I asked him the reason for his arrest. He told me and I replied that I would go to the station and provide the necessary bail. He then asked me to have a word with a policeman. I do not know the name of this policeman but I was asked my full name and address, my occupation, and whether I was a justice of the peace. I told him I was not a justice of the peace. He asked me how long I would take to get to the station and I told him I would be there in about 20 minutes.

From memory this was about 8.30 p.m. on Sunday. I hopped in my car and drove to the station. I was not familiar with the premises and I was not familiar with the procedure to be followed. However, I believe that would be the case with the vast majority of the people in our community. Indeed, most of us endeavour to live our entire lives without entering these places.

I walked up to a door with a button which said "Press." I did just that and I was not very surprised when a policeman answered the door. I told him my business and he said I would have to wait for a while because a justice of the peace had not arrived. I asked why a justice of the peace was required and I was told he had to sign a document. I said, "How long will this be?" I told you I would be here in 20 minutes." I also asked where the justice of the peace would be coming from. The policeman replied, "We will have to find one." I said, "Is that likely to be very long?" He replied, "No." I then asked could I enter the building to wait and I was told I would have to wait outside. I said, "I beg your pardon?" but the reply was the same. I was assured I would be told when the justice of the peace had arrived.

This experience of mine occurred at the East Perth lockup, and I do not feel this is an area to be wandering about indiscriminately. However, I decided I could do nothing about that so I waited. I waited and waited, and as there were many people coming and going I thought perhaps I had been forgotten. I am a very patient individual but at the end of 40 minutes my patience was wearing thin. I saw two policemen talking to other people at the door so I went to one of them and said, "Excuse me, I was wondering if I have been forgotten." He replied, "Oh, no, we are having difficulty locating a justice of the peace."

I said, "Surely this is not the normal procedure? Every time somebody asks for bail does the person putting up the bail have to come and stand around here in the backyard half the night while you cover the metropolitan area trying to find a justice of the peace?" He said, "Oh, yes. These men do work to a partial roster but you must remember they are all old men—60 or 70 years old. They do this work voluntarily."

I commented to the policeman that not all justices of the peace were 60 or 70 years old and that I knew a number of people who were desperately seeking an appointment as a justice of the peace. I am sure every member in this Chamber has had multitudinous inquiries from people fighting tooth and nail to be appointed justices of the peace. I do not feel that the policeman's supposition that these men were all elderly and working on a voluntary basis accounted for the fact that he could not obtain a justice of the peace.

The policeman then said, "We do not have any cars to get them." I said, "Surely you do not have to get them." He told me that the police had to send a car or taxi out to the justice of the peace. I told him that if this was the normal procedure I thought it was crazy.

When I originally informed the policeman on the telephone that I would be at the station in about 20 minutes he did not tell me not to come in for a while as there could be a delay. He did ask if I was a justice of the peace but he did not elaborate and tell me how essential it was to have one. I told the policeman at the door that had I been told this there were in the building in which I live perhaps half a dozen justices of the peace who I could have approached. I told him I should have been informed of the necessity to have a justice of the peace present and the fact that I may have to wait. The policeman told me that this is the way the system works. I again complained that no waiting room was provided.

While I was talking to the policeman, 45 minutes after I arrived, the justice of the peace turned up. I do not intend criticism of justices of the peace, but I do suggest that a respectable waiting room should be provided for people asked to stand bail for a prisoner.

I have another suggestion to make to the Minister and that is that an inspector of police or a person reasonably permanently at the station should be authorised to sign the bail bonds. It is obvious that during the course of Saturday and Sunday night several people will be arrested and will require bailing out. It seems most inefficient to have to send out patrol cars and taxi cabs on every occasion.

It is not reasonable that a person who intends to stand bail for a prisoner should be left to wander aimlessly around the backyard of a police station with passing policemen peering at him every now and then and perhaps wondering whether he is stealing petrol from the petrol tanks or knocking off tyres. I do not know what these policemen thought, but I do know I do not enjoy being viewed like that.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Are you not sorry for the justices of the peace who have to get out of bed at any time?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: My proposal is that somebody at the station should have authority to sign the bail bonds. I stated earlier I am not criticising the justices of the peace but I am criticising a system which makes it essential to race around the metropolitan area looking for a justice of the peace every time somebody wishes to be bailed out.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Sometimes this happens at three o'clock in the morning.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: This is all the more reason to have a person authorised to sign bail bonds at the station.

I made inquiries to determine whether this was an isolated incident. I spoke to solicitors and other people and I was told this has been going on for years and years, much to their distress.

The Hon. J. Dolan: You have a Minister who might fix it up for you.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: This is my reason for bringing the matter up. Had the Minister listened to my speech and said, "This is a reasonable state of affairs," it would have been fair enough. However, I am quite sure the Minister will not agree it is a reasonable state of affairs.

I am not asking for any special treatment for Clive Griffiths. I believe any individual who attends a police station for the purpose of standing bail should be extended the courtesy of somewhere to wait.

Of course, we must not forget the other aspect of the situation—the poor unfortunate who is incarcerated. He may be an innocent individual. The law says that every individual is entitled to seek bail and may be released on bail except in the case of major charges. Perhaps the police were endeavouring to make it more difficult for him to get out. If that is the situation the matter should be examined.

Every individual who has been arrested has the right to seek bail and I believe that right involves the granting of bail as soon as possible. The prisoner may be ill or there may be a number of reasons why he should be bailed out quickly. He may have a wife and family desperately anxious as to his whereabouts. It is not necessary for him to be delayed in a cell while a justice of the peace is found to sign the bail bond. This situation should not be tolerated.

There are several other matters I could raise, but I feel the only fashionable one at the moment is the question of the abolition of the Legislative Council.

I do not intend to say a great deal about this. I make the simple comment that I believe in the bicameral system. Our system is a good system and works very well indeed.

I do not suggest that there is not room for some improvement in our system, but, in the main, I believe it is a system that works satisfactorily for the State of Western Australia. Many members, presenting varying points of view, have commented on the Legislative Council. On Tuesday evening, Miss Elliott made a contribution based on her philosophy and it was an extremely good presentation. I did not choose her speech for any particular reason except that the honourable member made it only recently and it is at least fresh in our minds.

I did not disagree entirely with all she said, but I did disagree with some of her statements, notwithstanding that she did put forward some interesting points of view to indicate the way in which she views the

situation. Miss Elliott put forward four questions and suggested that if we answered them in a certain way we should come to the conclusion that the Legislative Council in Western Australia should be abolished. The honourable member did not say what would happen if we answered the questions in some other way. I can only assume that if we did not answer them in the order that she suggested she would be of the opinion that we do not agree to the abolition of the Legislative Council.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: She is pretty fair minded.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I do not intend to deal with the four questions put forward by Miss Elliott, because the answers to two of them are purely a matter of opinion. We could debate the issues all day and still not arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. I have a corrected copy of Miss Elliott's speech and I have made a few notes on it. The second question that Miss Elliott put forward was the one that aroused my interest. She said—

Secondly, is the unicameral system working in a democratic and effective way in other countries?

She suggested, I think, that if one replied "yes" to that question one would favour her point of view.

It struck me that if I did say "yes", so what? What does it tell me? If I am prepared to say that the unicameral system is working satisfactorily somewhere, in my opinion that does not tell me anything, because there are many countries that may well be satisfactorily using this system, but there are also many other customs and laws that are followed in other countries that are working satisfactorily and which we, in Western Australia, would not have a bar of. However, that is not to say that the system in other countries is wrong, but it certainly does not mean that our system is wrong. I simply say that in answering "yes" to the second question posed by Miss Elliott we cannot assume, in my opinion, that the Legislative Council in Western Australia is not working satisfactorily. I will leave that question on that note.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: That must be looked at in conjunction with the other questions.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Very well; I will deal with the third question. Miss Elliott said—

Thirdly, is an Upper House elected on party lines an effective and just House of Review?

Miss Elliott suggests that if we conclude that the answer to that question is "no" we should abolish the Legislative Council of Western Australia. I question the premise that an Upper House elected on party lines is not a just House of Review. I

cannot agree that it is not. A House elected on party lines can well be a just one and can work effectively as a House of Review.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It has proved that.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I agree it has proved that, but I also agree that there is room for changes to be made in the system and that some improvements could be effected. Whilst I suggest that the findings of the Legislative Council, since I have been a member of it, have certainly been just and satisfactory, they have not always suited my point of view. I cannot count the number of times I have been on the wrong side, or on the losing side—for want of a better term—but notwithstanding that I thought the conclusion that was reached by the House was a just one.

During my time as a member of the Legislative Council I have witnessed, on many occasions, members of the Liberal Party and members of the Country Party, because they have seen fit to disagree on a subject raised in this House from time to time, voting on different sides of the House. I have seen that happen so many times that I think I would be perfectly correct in saying that it was not uncommon. I do not find it difficult to think of the number of times members of the Labor Party, during the course of a vote being taken on a Bill, have voted on opposite sides of this Chamber.

Perhaps, if Miss Elliott is sincere—and I believe she is—she could give some thought to this aspect. I do not believe anybody can be right all the time. I do not believe it is possible for everybody, at all times, to agree on a certain point of view. For some reason or other—perhaps because of the lack of numbers—it is easier to obtain a uniform point of view. Every time the bells ring, notwithstanding where members of the Liberal Party or the Country Party are in relation to their colleagues, the members of the Labor Party will always be on the one side of the House.

I can think of only one occasion, in recent times, when this was not the case. In view of their frequency of late I keep getting confused with the sessions of Parliament, and I am not sure in which session what I am about to relate occurred. However, during a recent session of Parliament I can recall one of the very few times I was able to notice, when the division bells rang, that there was a Labor Party member on the opposite side to that on which the rest of his colleagues sat. I refer, of course, to the honourable member who represents the South-East Metropolitan Province, the Minister for Police (Mr. Dolan). We all know what happened. The members of the Labor Party just about busted a fetlock to get to the Trades Hall to find out what charges should be

levelled against the Minister so that at least he could resurrect himself from the position in which he had been placed.

So if we are to consider a House of Review, elected on party lines, working satisfactorily and justly, we must look at that situation. We must look at the number of times members of the Liberal Party and members of the Country Party do not believe, in accordance with their conscience, that the point of view being put forward by their colleagues is the right one. My colleagues know what my views are on this matter, and I think such views are shared by them. I would have no hesitation, Mr. Deputy President, in crossing to the other side of the House if I saw fit without having any fear whatsoever of having to face up to somebody. The people I have to face are the 60,000 or 70,000 electors in the South-East Metropolitan Province. I face up to those people from time to time as the situation presents itself.

So I repeat that I can see no reason why a House of Review, elected on party lines, cannot work justly if the members of all parties want it to work that way. I will go a little further to say this to Miss Elliott: I believe there is room for improvement in our system. I find it difficult to understand how I should be expected to attend a party meeting sometimes three or four weeks before a Bill is discussed in the House, and be asked to commit myself to a point of view before I have heard the arguments advanced either for or against the Bill.

I think this is basically, and fundamentally wrong. I believe that every one of us would be a hypocrite if we failed to support our basic political philosophy; the constituents we represent would be entitled to reject us if we followed that course. However, I do not believe that any more than 10 per cent. of the legislation we deal with has anything to do with my political philosophy. Of course, I am only making a guess when I put forward that percentage. However, I will say that a very large percentage of the legislation that is put forward does not have the remotest connection with my political philosophy. Therefore, I do not believe, whether it be three or four weeks or just a couple of days beforehand, that I should be asked to enter a party room and commit myself to a Bill that has been presented and supported by the expression of only one point of view.

I suggest to Miss Elliott that obviously the same situation prevails in her party room and I wonder whether she is prepared to suggest to the members of her party that they be allowed to make up their own minds after listening to argument from both sides, and not arrive at a decision in the party room prior to any member of that party even receiving a

copy of the Bill. I say that, because often we do not receive a copy of a Bill before entering the party room but, instead, we have the Minister standing up and saying, "I intend to amend this Act or that Act." However, I am not prepared to go into any detail in regard to that aspect.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: If you are free to exercise your own vote why do you deal with matters in the party room?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I believe that as a member of a House of Review if I am to attend a meeting to discuss a Bill, that meeting ought to be held after I have heard what is going on in my own House, not merely relying on what occurs in another place.

I might not have many friends on this point. I know some of my colleagues will not agree with me, but I am entitled to my own point of view and I am entitled to express it, well knowing that many will not agree with it; in exactly the same way as Miss Elliott would realise she would not have many friends in regard to the point of view expressed by her. She has many friends, including many in this House. Indeed, I hope I am one of her friends.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You will get on!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Not many would agree with all she says and I concede that many will not agree with me. However, if we are to make some changes in order that this House of Review might be a little more just, let some members of the Labor Party indicate that they are also prepared to do something to encourage this attitude they suggest is lacking. I am not suggesting it is lacking. I agree the system is working admirably. Over the years the Liberal Party and the Country Party have done more to reform this House than has any other group in any other two-House system in the world.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: They are going to be free to vote according to their consciences on the Mining Bill. I will be interested to see whether they are going to be free to vote according to their consciences on greyhound racing.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I have some views on that subject too which I had better not express at the moment because time is passing quickly.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is why I threw the piece of tender meat to you.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I do not agree with Miss Elliott's assumption that if the first two questions are answered in the affirmative and the second two in the negative this indicates that the person concerned believes the Legislative Council should be abolished. The last point I wish to discuss is a remark that Miss Elliott

made which cast some doubt on the mentality of the people I represent. I took strong exception, on their behalf, to this implication. Miss Elliott said—

As I said in my first speech in this Chamber, when I was canvassing for the election last year the majority of people on whom I called thought I was standing for the local shire when I mentioned the Legislative Council. Quite often when I ring a department or an organisation concerning the problem of a constituent, and introduce myself as Lyla Elliott, M.L.C., the people to whom I am speaking wonder why someone from the Methodist Ladies College or the M.L.C. Insurance Company is inquiring into such a matter.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: I was casting a reflection on the education system, not on the people.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Indirectly the reflection is cast on the people, because the honourable member is suggesting that they do not take advantage of the education system which was provided to ensure they were aware of what the Legislative Council stood for and that there are two Houses in the Western Australian Parliament.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Do all your constituents understand?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I did not say they did. Mr. Claughton has the fantastic habit of suggesting things I am not saying. I did not say that.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: I am trying to clarify what you said.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: If the honourable member will wait until I have concluded, he will know what I have said.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I do not know about that.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I know that you, Sir, often chastise me for entering into conversations with members instead of addressing my remarks to you, so I am unable to enter into a private conversation with Mr. Claughton. Consequently I will return to the matter I was discussing.

If Miss Elliott during the course of her campaigning made the discovery to which she referred, it indicates neglect on her part and certainly neglect on the part of her party, because the area in which she has been canvassing has been represented by Labor Party members for so long I cannot remember.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is right, except when I used to represent a big proportion of it.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Therefore, that is an indication to me of a lack of contact with the people by the parliamentary members who have represented these people over the years.

As far as I am concerned the people in the South-East Metropolitan Province know what they are doing at election time. Not every single individual, but the majority of them, know there are two Houses of Parliament and they appreciate the difference between the local authority and the Legislative Council.

I will go further than that, because by interjection yesterday Mr. Dolan suggested that the people in the South-East Metropolitan Province did not know what they were doing when I was elected. I suggest Mr. Dolan go into the South-East Metropolitan Province and inform the people of his belief. I can assure him I have the utmost confidence they will convince him he is wrong. I will go even further and say that the people in my province have indicated on two occasions that they knew Clive Griffiths was standing for the Legislative Council, notwithstanding the fact that those same people saw fit to choose members with a different political philosophy from mine to represent the same area in the Legislative Assembly. The only exception is South Perth.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: You had no informal votes?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Of course, I did. It must not be assumed, merely because people vote informally, that they do not know there is a Legislative Council. They could be like Miss Elliott and have a violent objection to the Legislative Council and so refuse to vote for it. A multitude of reasons can exist for informal votes.

I have been to the people on two occasions and both times they saw fit, after a great deal of consideration, to vote for Clive Griffiths.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: With a substantial majority, too, in each case!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Mr. Dolan has been to them once.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I gathered the impression the other day that he may go to them again.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I hope he goes again because he will win by a million.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: He could not win by 1,000,000 because, according to the statistics on the new boundaries, only 76,000 constituents will be involved.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Let us say percentage-wise he will beat you.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: On the only occasion he has been, he did not.

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

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am sorry about that, Sir, but you know the extreme provocation thrown in my direction in an attempt—

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Bunkum!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: —to deviate me from the line I wish to follow. I can only apologise on their behalf. However, I want to conclude—

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Thank heavens!

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: —by saying that I take strong exception to the suggestion that the people who voted for members of the Legislative Council did not know what they were doing.

I will save for a future occasion the other points about which I wished to speak. I have very much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth.

House adjourned at 4.43 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 23rd March, 1972

The SPEAKER (Mr. Norton) took the Chair at 11.00 a.m., and read prayers.

BILLS (2): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Presbyterian Church of Australia Act Amendment Bill.
2. Transfer of Land Act Amendment Bill.

Bills introduced, on motions by Mr. Graham (Acting Premier), and read a first time.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SIXTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 22nd 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. JONES (Collie) [11.06 a.m.]: I rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply. First of all, I would like to advise the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Bunbury that the matters raised by them during the course of their addresses will be covered by me during this speech. I would also indicate that although the seat I now occupy is on a different side of the House—the seat

I occupied during my first three years in Parliament was on the opposite side—my views on power generation and the coal-mining industry generally have not changed one iota.

I came to this Parliament with an honest approach, and during my submission I will show that I have not changed my opinion, irrespective of the fact that through the change of Government I have changed from one side of the House to the other.

Mr. Williams: Good for you!

Several members interjected.

Mr. JONES: Before referring to the numerous matters I have in mind, I will mention a speech made by the member for Mt. Marshall while speaking to the Address-in-Reply on the 15th March. Members will recall that the member for Mt. Marshall referred to the increases in union fees which had been made by various unions in Australia. He said that in 1962 the annual fees paid to the Amalgamated Engineering Union were \$9.97, but they were up to \$16 in 1972. He also said that the increase in the Australian Workers' Union fees represented a rise of 133.3 per cent.

The honourable member also stated that the amount of profit made on capital invested at the market value of B.H.P. shares today reflects approximately 3 per cent, on investment. The most important part of his speech which I wish to deal with is the reference he made to the company being forced into the position of increasing its charges because of claims made by the industrial unions.

If we examine the share position, and be honest with ourselves, we will see that a number of companies have introduced a policy of issuing bonus shares. Records of such transactions are available at the Companies Office. My studies have revealed that one company operating in Western Australia paid a dividend of 9 per cent. last year. However, since the company was formed there have been four issues of bonus shares.

It will be seen that a person could buy a number of \$1 shares on the share market, and because of the issue of four bonus shares during the period of operation of the company, his actual share asset in the company would be considerably increased. Such an increase in shareholding would provide a greater return in the way of interest.

That brings me to the point where the honourable member referred to B.H.P., and said that the Federal Government approved of the increase in the price of steel. If we examine the history of the B.H.P. company it will become quite clear, in my view, that the honourable member did not do his homework. In fairness to him, he was quoting a submission made in the Federal Parliament.