

ahead of them, were convinced by high pressure salesmanship that there is nothing wrong with this procedure.

I can quite easily believe there are thousands of young—and not so young—couples in this community who could be deceived by arguments such as these, whether they be Australians or newly-arrived migrants.

The second half of the story relating to the couple in my electorate who came to me with their problem is even more sordid. The money that was plugged into their account to bridge a credibility gap came to \$3,148.50. A very generous unregistered second mortgage was then drawn up at an interest rate of 14 per cent. to be calculated on the original principal of \$3,148.50 and to be charged quarterly. The second part of the fourth schedule provided that instalments of interest and capital were to be paid at the rate of \$28 a month, commencing on the 1st August, 1970.

Once again, there are probably some rather clever accountants and other professional people on the other side of the House who may suggest that surely this couple might have taken the time to make the calculations. I feel quite certain that there are hundreds, and possibly thousands of people in this community who would be incapable of working out such calculations to find the right answer. In this instance the payments of \$28 a month over and above the first mortgage did not even cover the 14 per cent. interest. This young migrant couple had been residing in the State for nearly two years, and in this home for 18 months, when they received a letter from Project Finance Ltd. stating, "We find that after 18 months and after making all these payments you have not made any indent in the principal and interest of that which you owe but that you are further in debt to the sum of \$3,333 instead of the \$3,148 borrowed."

Mr. Williams: Is that a flat rate of interest?

Mr. BRYCE: No, 14 per cent. simple interest. This unregistered second mortgage was imposed on this couple to enable them to secure this home. My concern, Mr. Speaker, is to ensure that this practice shall cease. I have other constituents in the Belmont district, where Landall is carrying out a housing construction programme, who are unable to secure copies of the second unregistered mortgage agreement. Many of them are unaware of the rate of interest they are paying. Once again it could be said that they are culpable, but I would point out that this society has laws to protect the weak against the strong in a sense of physical violence, and in my humble opinion it is of equal significance that we should have laws to protect the people whose circumstances I have just outlined. In this sort of situation

I believe that legislative action should be taken to prevent such happenings. To my mind economic rape is no more acceptable than an act of sexual rape.

In this particular instance the company concerned had agreed to discount the interest rate on the mortgage because of my representations. It was no coincidence that I received a telephone call this morning from the company to say it was prepared to discount the mortgage itself for the benefit of this young couple. To save him from his financial predicament the company was prepared, in the first instance, to reduce the rate of interest from 14 per cent. to 10 per cent. following representations by the head of the building society who was extremely annoyed at this improper practice; eventually a pay-out figure of \$2,500 was accepted.

The principal reason for my raising this case in the House is based on the fact that there are many couples occupying homes in my electorate, and hundreds more occupying homes in the metropolitan area who are in a similar predicament, and the matter should be drawn to the attention of all people, to the attention of all migrants, and, in particular, to the attention of the Minister for Consumer Protection in the hope that something can be done about it.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Runciman.

House adjourned at 9.55 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 29th March, 1972

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

QUESTIONS (2): ON NOTICE

1. NATIVE RESERVES

Tabling of Plan

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

Will he lay on the Table of the House a plan of Western Australia showing the various Native Reserves which have been declared and are current at the present date?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

I table herewith a map of Western Australia, in two parts, showing all native reserves in excess of 100 acres at present declared under the Land Act.

I would like to add that we do not have a plan showing the lesser reserves, which are contiguous to various towns. It is not proposed

to include the lesser reserves in the lands to be handed over to the land trust.

(See paper No. 84) *The map was tabled.*

2. **TRAFFIC** **Seat Belts**

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER, to the Minister for Police:

How many persons, being drivers or passengers in motor vehicles not fitted with seat belts, have been—

- (a) killed;
- (b) injured;

since the 1st January, 1972?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

Information in the form requested by the Member is not available as it is not known if death or injury suffered by persons not wearing seat belts were in cars not so fitted or in cars fitted with seat belts and not worn.

Statistics maintained relate to death or injury resulting from use or non-use of seat belts and not directly to fitment in motor vehicles. Information available is—

Accidents attended by Police Officers in Western Australia:

- (a) Persons killed or injured not wearing seat belts:—

January, 1972—

(i) Killed	6
(ii) Injured	90

February, 1972—

(i) Killed	11
(ii) Injured	222

- (b) Vehicles involved not fitted with seat belts:—

January, 1972 .. 145

February, 1972 .. 371

Figures for March are not available.

BILLS (3): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Police Act Amendment Bill.
2. Traffic Act Amendment Bill.

Bills introduced, on motions by The Hon. J. Dolan (Minister for Police), and read a first time.

3. Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

Bill introduced, on motion by the Hon. A. F. Griffith (Leader of the Opposition), and read a first time.

SALES BY AUCTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by The Hon. J. M. Thomson, and read a first time.

Date of Second Reading

THE HON. J. M. THOMSON (South) [4.46 p.m.]: I move—

That the second reading of the Bill be made an order of the day for Wednesday, the 12th April.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You can't do that! It is up to the Leader of the House to arrange the notice paper.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [4.47 p.m.]: I am rising, Mr. President, not on a point of order but perhaps more on a matter of decorum. I suggest that the honourable member should just follow the normal procedure and I will arrange the position of the Bill on the notice paper in accordance with his wishes.

The PRESIDENT: Order! My attention has been drawn to the fact that the honourable member is quite in order to nominate the date on which he desires the second reading of the Bill to be taken.

Question put and passed.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: EIGHTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 28th 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. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West) [4.48 p.m.]: It would appear that my slight discomfort which caused my absence on the opening day of Parliament was perhaps only a little worse than the discomfort of members who were present in the Chamber on that day, because from my reading of the newspapers the most noteworthy event was the heat and discomfort suffered by members on opening day, and the various arguments advanced by them as to whether they should or should not wear coats. This was, perhaps, not what one might have expected at the start of a session after a new Government had had time to get its second wind; one would have expected a fairly vigorous and energetic start. However, that was the way the opening day of Parliament was reported upon by the Press.

Referring again to my temporary indisposition at that time, I thank members for their expressions of sympathy and the

kindness they have shown to me. To me, the solution to the discomfort of members on opening day was expressed by The Hon. L. A. Logan who suggested that now we have tried two sessions of Parliament in the one year and have found that this does not, in fact, reduce the number of sitting days, we should abandon the two sessions and revert to only one, because it has been found, as Parkinson would have said, that the two sessions merely provide more time in which members can speak. Therefore the two sessions of Parliament have not served any real useful purpose.

One of the main disadvantages in not being able to attend on opening day and other initial days in a new session of Parliament is that one misses a number of speeches and therefore it is possible that I am not quite *au fait* with some of the statements which have already been made, because I have not read all the speeches made to date during this session, or as many as I would have liked to read in the time available to me. I did, however, read one that excited me considerably. That was the speech made at some length by Miss Elliott, and also the one by Mr. Cloughton on the reform of our parliamentary system.

In this connection I was sorry I missed the speech made by Mr. Clive Griffiths, because the report I read of it interested me immensely. It would appear to me that the Labor Party—or the Democratic Socialists, which Miss Elliott prefers the members of her party to be called—should realise that our system of Parliament has been tried and proven, and, accordingly, I feel the more desirable reform would be to change the form of the A.L.P.

This would seem very clearly to be the major fault in the functioning of this Parliament. For example, Mr. Cloughton said that he would like more committees appointed with the ability to investigate the subjects in depth, the obvious reason being to change the Act concerned in order to get better legislation, regulations, and the like. In the same breath he said that if his executive decides, by what he terms a democratic process, that such-and-such is the policy of the Australian Labor Party, he must vote for that, irrespective of what it might entail; and he says he sees no conflict in this. When a party has such rules and regulations governing it, it is axiomatic that a House of Review does not function.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Your party does not have a policy?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Yes, but not that sort of rule.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: You do not have to conform to it?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: One could count on one's hand the number of times members of the Australian Labor Party

have crossed the floor in this Chamber. Mr. Stubbs did it on what he considered to be a matter of very deep principle; on a matter which interested me very deeply at the time; that is, fluoride. Mr. Dolan did it only last year, and we all have vivid recollections of what occurred on that occasion and we commiserated with him for the sort of vilification, one might almost say, he had to face because of his action.

It is this type of behaviour which prevents the system working. It does not make our system of Parliament a bad one; it makes the system of the party a bad one, for we must have a degree of freedom if we are to be honest in having members elected to a second Chamber—a House of Review.

It can be done; witness Mr. Stubbs, who is now a Minister, but who crossed the floor on a matter which was a subject of tremendous moment with the Premier.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I think we had better get this straight. Fluoride was not part of the party policy at that time.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The honourable member's interjection surprises me immensely because it is my recollection that it was the party's policy only a matter of a day or two either way. A report was compiled and signed by Mr. Stubbs, Mr. Berrinson, and one other whose name I cannot recollect, but it was never made public. It is a very excellent report indeed and is in favour of fluoride as is every report which has been compiled by men of any note. It was a good report also from a political standpoint. It was an excellent report in its enunciation of the powers of Parliament and it is a pity every member could not read it.

It spoke of the rights of Parliament to legislate in fields such as this and it laid down why one should not submit this sort of problem to a referendum. This was a negation of the right of an elected Government to govern. As I understand it that excellent report was not accepted by the Executive of the State Labor Party. Of course this is going back a long way in history now. It was made policy to vote against fluoridation; if not, in fact, policy, it was very close to it. How can we have a matter properly reviewed in a second Chamber when that sort of situation exists; and we know it does exist?

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Because you have told us?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: No, because we have had evidence of it time and time again.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: You are very good at telling everyone what the Labor Party does.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The facts are printed in the newspapers and we have been members here a long time and we know the sort of things which occur.

Let us examine the historical reason for the existence of the second Chamber—and it is worth examining in the light of the controversy which seems to be raging. In actual fact, this Chamber is the first Chamber and the picture on the wall to your right, Mr. President, indicates that. The House of Assembly came subsequently.

A tremendous amount of the history of Parliament and the forms it took date from the reign of the Stuarts and the problems which ensued as a result of a monarch trying to retain the absolute control which was known as the divine right of kings. The battle was fought over many years and even the American Civil War was part and parcel of that battle. It finally resulted in the form of Cabinet Government we have now; but let us make no mistake about the fact that virtually every person who has examined the situation of parliamentary government has warned that the danger of control by an Executive still exists and that a watch must still be kept in order that we might safeguard against not so much the divine right of kings these days, but the divine right of the Executive or the bureaucrat.

Let us imagine the situation of a party with a type of constitution similar to that of the Australian Labor Party.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: What about telling us more about the Liberal Party?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: If we had only one House—the unicameral system—and a matter of policy arose, that House need not exist. We might just as well have the election and then after Caucus and the Cabinet were elected, the rest of Parliament could go home.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I wonder what you would be saying if the boot were on the other foot.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That situation has arisen on many occasions in Canberra recently and I still believe in the bicameral system because I consider far more dangerous to the man in the street, the community, and you, Mr. President, and I as citizens, is the terrible threat of absolute government, without any hampering of the particular party in power at the time.

I could go on about the odd Bill that is defeated, and no doubt this annoyed Mr. McMahon, Mr. Gorton, or Mr. Menzies at the time; but this is a lesser threat to the welfare of the community than is the threat of the totalitarian type of Government one could get with the greatest of ease in a unicameral system.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not think New Zealand has a totalitarian system.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: No, and why? It is because they, like every other country with a similar system, have been forced to the situation where some other

group has moved in to fill the gap; and this has happened in New Zealand as members will realise if they study the situation. It has virtually the equivalent of this State's Barristers' Board to which most of the State's legislation is submitted for examination. It has no statutory power, but sheer authority, because it has the respect of the people, plus the fact that the constitution of the New Zealand Labour Party is different from that of the Australian Labor Party. Mr. Dans is knowledgeable enough to know that is correct. This is the major problem in Australia.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: What about explaining the structure of the Liberal Party and how it is different?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I will come to that.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: I will be interested to hear you.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: On matters of policy, a Liberal is not bound by decisions of the State Conference. He is bound by requirements of the constitution and by his conscience. The honourable member can read our constitution just as easily as I can read his. Both of these constitutions can be bought and referred to.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: That is why you go in different directions.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Certainly we go in different directions. This was apparent on the daylight saving measure in connection with which the Liberal Party had laid down that we were to vote for it.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: There is no power structure in the Liberal Party?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I personally did not vote for it.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Some members of the Labor Party were happy about that, too.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That is right.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I think they might have been.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Mr. Griffith and I have been members for long enough now—indeed he has been a member for longer than myself—to have seen Bills introduced—not perhaps by this Government but by a previous Labor Government—at the instruction of Trades Hall. This has been a fairly open secret and I am sure a number of other members would also recall this. Acting on their consciences a number of intelligent A.L.P. members in the Chamber voted to defeat those Bills. As I have said, this is an open secret.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: We have a few like that ourselves.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Maybe.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Speak for yourself.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I am.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: We have a bicameral system for a very good reason.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I hope we have it for a long time.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The reason is historical and the circumstances have not changed. If we were to make radical reforms, perhaps the most radical and most effective would be to do as I have suggested; namely, for the Assembly to select its leader and Cabinet by whatever means Labor's constitution dictates, and then allow all members to go home—because, under the present constitution of the Labor Party there is no possibility of any defection of voters in that House—and to allow the Cabinet to put Bills forward for debate by members of this House who, by virtue of the six-year term, are in reality removed from many of the pressures brought to bear on members who are elected for a three-year term.

At the same time it would be a necessary requisite for the constitution of the A.L.P. to be changed to do away with the unseemly disciplining of any member who crosses the floor on a matter of conscience. Perhaps this would be a more sensible way to approach the problem, because I do not believe there is any need for further reforms to be executed in this Chamber.

The standard of the Legislative Council is in the hands of the electors and those whom they return to Parliament. It depends, too, on the degree of work members like to put in. I am trying to recall what Sir Walter Murdoch wrote in an essay which I read, I would say, 20 years ago. As far as I can recall he said that people get the Governments they deserve but from his observations in Australia we have always and consistently had better Governments than we deserve. I think that was the purport of his comment which appeared in one of his famous essays.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I can remember Frank Wise saying that good seasons make good Governments.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Yes, if it rains at the right time everybody is happy.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Malcolm Muggeridge said the opposite some years later: that we got Governments we did not deserve.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I would also like to comment on the old hoary chestnut of "malapportionment," a word which owes its popularity to a famous member of the Federal Parliament, Mr. Kim Beazley, because, to the best of my recollection, he was the first to stop using the false expression "gerrymandering" and start talking about malapportionment.

On this, too, I disagree with the concept expressed by Miss Elliott. One can talk of all sorts of methods and say, "This is a good Government; this is a bad Government." Really one can be quite wrong. There is nothing intrinsically bad in a dictatorship and, indeed, some dictatorships have been very benign and good. Others, of course, have been shocking but this probably applies to any form of government.

We talk about methods of electing members of Parliament and history shows that all kinds of methods have been adopted. However, in this day and age everybody seems to have a democratic government. It does not matter whether it is China, Russia, France, or anywhere else; they all have democratic Governments. It also does not matter whether there is only one political party; elections are held from time to time and the resulting Parliament is still democratically elected. In view of all this one tends to lose appreciation of what the word "democracy" really means.

I believe we have representative government in that we endeavour to represent groups of people. So-called malapportionment is not malapportionment at all but, instead, just and equitable distribution. I am always quite sorry for Mr. Collard, the Federal member—and a democratic socialist, I assume—who represents probably the largest electorate in the world. I am given to understand Mr. Collard is a conscientious and hard-working member; it must be an arduous task indeed for him to travel around his electorate. What is worse is that it must be extremely difficult for his electors to see him to express their points of view. Probably he needs contact with his electors and, also, they would like to see their ideas acted upon.

On the other hand it is not a difficult matter for anyone in the metropolitan area to talk to his member of Parliament if he so wishes. An individual can drive his car to Parliament House and ask to see a member.

This would be an extremely difficult task for a person in Mr. Wordsworth's electorate, because the trip to Perth is a long one and at 10c a mile it would probably cost a person \$100 to make the return trip.

The Hon. J. Dolan: They can talk over the telephone.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: At great expense again, Mr. Dolan.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Or write a letter.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It costs a person in the metropolitan area only 5c to have a limitless conversation on the telephone, but I imagine that if a person in Esperance were to speak for half an hour the cost would probably be about \$10 or \$12.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: More likely \$50.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Mr. Collard represents an area of 899,000 square miles and there are 976,000 square miles in Western Australia.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I do not believe a division whereby one member represents fewer people than, say, a member who represents an electorate in Sydney is undemocratic. Instead, it is just, fair, and equitable to people who want to express points of view and who have every right to express their ideas. If those ideas are worth while they should be acted upon.

For these reasons I simply do not believe in the principle of one-man one-vote. Such a system could not be democratic because of the disparity in population and the disparity of problems that exist. Members in this House, such as Mr. Willesee, Mr. Wordsworth, Mr. Withers and others, who represent remote electorates would know that the problems of their electors are more onerous and, in many instances, they want to take the opportunity to talk about them to somebody in government. Surely to goodness if one member represented virtually the whole of the rest of Western Australia outside the metropolitan area, the chance of ever seeing a member or talking to him would be remote indeed. I consider this would be most unfair. I will not use the word "undemocratic", because I am not too sure I know what it means. However it would certainly be unfair and it would not lead to representative Government in its proper form.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Particularly in developing areas.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Yes, that is so, because, there again, problems are greater and all problems seem to touch the Government these days. In the main development is occurring in more isolated areas.

If there is to be any modification in the workings of this House, let it start by ensuring that any party which returns members to the Legislative Council gives those members freedom to speak. I am not speaking about freedom to act like a rabbit, but about freedom to act as members think right on the 90 per cent. of measures which are not measures of basic fundamental policy. We all know that only one measure in 10 embodies basic, fundamental policy on which one can say, "Labor will oppose it and Liberal will vote for it," or *vice versa*. This is where there should be modification and this is where reform should start. Today we have the same franchise as the Legislative Assembly and I do not believe any other modification is required to make this House work in the way in which it ought to work. Let the critics look to where the blame lies. The blame lies fairly and squarely on that particular section of the constitution and organisation of the Australian Labor Party.

There are many matters which a member would like to discuss but, in fact, one has to decide to speak on one subject at

great depth or to deal more superficially with a number. I have chosen the latter course, but before I go further I would like to pass on a personal greeting from an old friend of many members in the Chamber.

When Mr. Medcalf spoke yesterday I was reminded of Sir Keith Watson. In fact, when I closed my eyes I thought that Sir Keith Watson was speaking. I took the opportunity to visit Sir Keith at Shenton Park where, unfortunately, he is in hospital. He is as bright as ever and he had thoroughly examined Mr. Medcalf's speech. He was able to tell me where his figures were right, where they were wrong, and all sorts of things. We spent an interesting hour together and he asked me to convey to all his old friends his very good wishes. He was somewhat nostalgic in his remembrances, particularly of you, Mr. President.

I do not ask a tremendous number of questions, but I am interested to note that two questions I asked last year have brought forth some response. One concerned a family planning clinic and we shall hear more about this later on today when a Bill is read a second time. I will not say any more on this subject because I know, Mr. President, you would stop me on the spot.

I also asked a question on adult education. By some peculiar coincidence, within a week all sorts of announcements emanated from both the Government and the university in regard to the wonderful things which would happen in adult education.

Some of them did take place and some of them did not. One of the things which they did say they were going to do—and I asked a question on this subject last year—was to advertise almost immediately for a director of extension services. That is what they called him. Again nothing happened.

The other day I again asked a question on adult education to which I received a reply which said—

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.

Again, within a day or two an announcement was made in the newspaper to the effect that—

The W.A. University senate's decision to permit the director of the extension service to join the university's professorial board was welcomed in Perth yesterday.

The acting director of the extension service Mr. John Birman, and the former director of adult education, Mr. Hew Roberts, said they both supported the move.

A university spokesman said that the position would probably be advertised in Australia, New Zealand and Britain.

I am delighted that the questions I asked have received such prompt attention and that they have achieved the desired results.

The Hon. N. McNeill: They were probably Dorothy Dixers!

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That is not so, because I do not have any inside knowledge of the university or of the workings of the present Government.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: It might be because you do not ask too many questions.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That might be so, but I will have to consider that interjection a little further. Nevertheless I believe we must keep a fairly watchful eye on adult education in this State, because I do not think it is making quite the progress it should. It is a matter which I feel the Government should watch very closely, because there is a tremendous need for it; it is of vital importance to a tremendous number of people who nowadays need and seek additional education when they reach a mature age.

There is, however, one thing which we are likely to miss this year and this saddens me a little, because one got used to looking forward to hearing The Hon. Ron Thompson perform in this House year after year on Kwinana.

I commenced to make a little study of his speeches, because something about Kwinana appeared in the newspaper the other day. I got out some of the *Hansards* of the previous year and had a look at Mr. Ron Thompson's speeches on Kwinana.

From the number of *Hansards* I have before me members will see the amount of reading one would require to pursue to study all the points of view put forward by Mr. Thompson on this subject. So, of course, this matter, must have been very well known to the present Government and, if the situation were reversed, one wonders to what kind of speech we would have been subjected had it been based on the heading contained in the newspaper which reads, "200 homes to go at Kwinana," as a result of plans by the Government to further take housing from this area.

Mr. Ron Thompson is a long way from being the least eloquent among his Labor Party colleagues and I would hazard a guess that for a long time we would have been listening to what he had to say on this subject; that our ears would have

been ringing with his remarks in connection with that matter. What was even more distressing was to find that his fellow Minister and he are, in effect, having their little argument through the pages of *The West Australian*.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I know of other people who have argued through the Press.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That may be so, but one would not expect two members of the same party and in the same House, who are sitting about five feet from each other to be having their little spat through the newspapers.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Are you suggesting we are not so well controlled as you were saying?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: This is not the Trades Hall at work; Mr. Claughton has me quite wrong. This is just a little argument between Mr. Stubbs and Mr. Ron Thompson.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: Have I mentioned Mr. Thompson's name?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I think the Minister was very careful not to do so.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: That shows I have no argument.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: In *The West Australian* of the 21st March there is a headline in regard to the quarry at Wattleup where there was a fairly fiery meeting. Part of this article reads—

The Labor M.L.C. for the district, Mr. R. Thompson, who attended the meeting, said later that Mr. Stubbs had not given any reason for his action.

He had not consulted the Cockburn Town Council or any member representing the area.

The minister had inspected the site in January, when the residents set out their objections to him.

Mr. Stubbs had told the quarry operators that they must limit the dust nuisance and that the size of the charges to be detonated would be restricted.

Mr. Stubbs then writes back in a letter published in *The West Australian* and says—

Before any decision was made all aspects of the project were examined.

The Cockburn Town Council was written to and requested to submit its views on the case.

The State Mining Engineer was consulted and engineers of the Mines Department investigated the proposal.

He then set out the very proper course of action the Minister should take. I do not criticise that, but I feel sure we can all appreciate the length and the excess of vituperation that might have ensued

had this argument taken place in about 1970 between Mr. Logan and Mr. Ron Thompson. To quote Shakespeare, the welkin would have rung.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: I set it out factually.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am sure the Minister did, but there seems to be that singular lack of liaison by a member who is known to have taken a tremendously keen interest in every stone that was turned in Kwinana. I refer, of course, to Mr. Ron Thompson who has been a veritable watchdog in this matter. He has been very keen.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: He has also done a bit of barking.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It seems strange to me that there should have been this complete lack of informing this honourable member—a senior member; the whip of the Government party—about these matters.

I would have been interested to hear Mr. Thompson's speech on that subject and I bet there would have been some fur flying. I can imagine that Mr. Logan would have been sitting on the edge of his chair interjecting.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I would have been sitting as calm and collected as is Mr. Stubbs.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am delighted to hear that, because Mr. Stubbs has certainly taken it very calmly indeed.

You might recall, Mr. President, that one of the subjects that was very topical last year was the demonstrations that were taking place with regard to the tour by the rugby players from South Africa. In a speech I made at that time I considered it disgraceful that the Premiers of two States should lead the protests. I think I expressed the view then that in our democratic system we have a built-in right to protest every three years, when the public can return the Government or put it out. The public exercised this prerogative when it defeated the Government in this State at the last election.

The idea of going out on the streets and protesting was not a happy solution; it did no-one any good; it only created innumerable difficulties for the Police Force. Accordingly I was interested to receive from the Australian Federation of Police Associations/Unions a letter which all members have received, and from which I notice a number of excerpts have been read into *Hansard*. At page two the letter states—

There is a real need for all members of Parliament from both sides of the House to support a campaign designed to provide better police services and to assist the police in

achieving their objective of making the community free and safe for all persons.

There can be no argument about that. That is the very essence of our form of Government; for what we have done over the centuries is to trade our rights to punch an annoying person on the nose personally, with the guaranteed protection and the knowledge that no-one can punch us on the nose.

As a famous English jurist once said, "Your freedom lies in swinging your arms and stopping half an inch short of my nose." Demonstrations of the kind I have mentioned must add unnecessarily to the work of the Police Force, because tempers get frayed and when there is congestion in a crowd it is possible for people to get knocked and pushed which eventually results in a fracas.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Do you not think we should have football matches?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Of course we should. That is quite reasonable, but I would draw the line at the sort of processions we saw over here—the rioting and that sort of thing, to the extent that the police have found it necessary to write a letter asking that members of Parliament from both sides of the House should try to think in terms of assisting the police. Members of Parliament cannot possibly assist the police if they take their place in a parade, a march, or a demonstration.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: That is your opinion.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Exactly, and it is the opinion of a tremendous number of people.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You should have said that at election time.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: This whole question of marches, parades, and demonstrations is quite unreasonable. We are members of an institution which is designed to govern; we are pledged of necessity to submit our names for election every three or six years, or whatever the Constitution might provide, in order that people might be given the opportunity to protest and not elect us if they see fit.

Yet we have seen members taking part in what might be termed extra curricular activities designed to influence the very Government and Parliament of which they form a part. If this is not the height of nonsense I do not know what is.

I wrote back to the Police Union straightaway and pointed out that in my speech last year I made my position extremely clear. I said that I supported the point of view expressed and mentioned that they had enough to do with policing the ordinary criminal activities that take place, quite apart from their trying to keep down any carnage that might result;

and also quite apart from their controlling the sort of nonsense that goes on during football matches, to which Mr. Cloughton referred.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: What about the carnage in Vietnam?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I do not know what that has to do with the matter under discussion; I cannot see how it applies.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: You are talking about protest marches. Are you not concerned about Vietnam?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I do not know whether this is a trick question like the one asked of the man in the witness box as to whether he had stopped beating his wife. Miss Elliott's interjection has no bearing on the question at all.

If sufficient people did not like what was happening in Vietnam they have had ample opportunity to put the Federal Government out. The last two elections have been fought on this issue with the A.L.P. backing the wrong horse. I am as concerned as Miss Elliott as to what is happening in Vietnam, but I cannot see the necessity to join protest marches, parades, and demonstrations about the matter. At least two elections were fought on this issue and on both occasions the Liberal Party has won handsomely. There is no argument about that, because it is a matter of history.

The Hon. L. D. Elliott: But they have been proved wrong.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: We in this State pride ourselves on being hospitable. Over the Christmas period a person came to me after returning from a camping holiday two weeks earlier than expected. I was naturally a little surprised to see him. He said that he had been to the south coast and had travelled around, and he had found it virtually impossible to find places at which to camp. Subsequently I took the trouble of having a look for myself. I looked around a number of coastal areas. I must admit that I was extremely surprised at the psychological atmosphere which is found in those areas. All one seems to see are signs saying, "No camping"; "Camping not allowed"; or "Camping not permitted." It is extremely rare for one to see a positive approach such as, "Campers welcome here" or "Camping facilities here." The approach seems to be completely negative.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: That is not very surprising after 12 years of Liberal Government.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Mr. President, I must interpolate here to say that it is well known by now that the only parties which set themselves up as God are the doctrinaire socialists. Those are the only people who ever write manifestos which say, "do this and that and we will

achieve Utopia." Of course we made mistakes! After 12 years we still had much to do, because we are realists in politics; we do not pretend to be able to tell God to move over. We do not pretend to be able to write the sort of manifestos under which the doctrinaire socialists live. Of course we made mistakes and left things undone. This may well have been one of them. I suppose confession is good for the soul.

I believe that perhaps a little too much emphasis has been placed on high-powered tourism—the top-class five-star hotel, etc.—and not enough placed on the type of recreation which ordinary people can enjoy and which indeed is a very valuable form of recreation for people of all economic strata. I see no reason why a wealthy person should enjoy camping less or more than a person who can only just afford that type of holiday. Camping is an economic and most enjoyable way to take a holiday.

I think members are aware of my interest in scouting over many years. I have spent a lot of time under canvas, although not so much during the last seven or eight years. I am aware how comfortable tents can be, and particularly modern tents. However, I was particularly struck by this inhospitable approach. In this field we may learn much from New Zealand and the Eastern States. Toilets and washing facilities could be made available at regular intervals along the coast, particularly in those southern areas represented by Mr. Jack Thomson, Mr. Wordsworth, Mr. Willmott, Mr. Ferry, etc. I think we should adopt a more direct, and positive approach to give people a feeling of hospitality. I repeat—because I want to get this simple message across to members—that there should be a more positive approach to campers by using signs saying "Campers welcome here", rather than the never-ending list of signs saying "No camping", "Camping prohibited", "Campers prosecuted", and the like.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What about spitting?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Expectoration.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: No, spitting.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: We could burst into song on that one. A problem which is exercising the minds of, and causing a great deal of concern to, a number of people at the moment is, of course, the first exercise of the Environmental Protection Authority. We have seen and read of the extreme disappointment of the Deputy Premier (Mr. Graham). However, he has perhaps himself to blame. He referred to the original legislation as the "toothless hag" and because it now has fluoridated fangs, which he helped to put there, he seems to want to grizzle. I think that is a little unjust.

What worries me is that I see within the E.P.A. the seeds of its own destruction as a result of the way it is being used and the position into which it has been forced because of the refusal of the present Government to proclaim the original legislation. This worries me. The first thing the authority did was to say, "No, you cannot have this industry"; and unfortunately it came at a time when there is a downturn in employment. I would recommend to members that they read a brochure which I am sure all members received entitled *The Mining Industry and the Environment*, issued by the Australian Mining Industry Council under date March, 1972. I would like to make a short quote from page 2 of that document, as follows:—

All sections of society should, therefore, be aware that any shift towards either goal means some modification of the other. Neither can, nor should be sacrificed altogether.

Yet there is a grave threat that in the first action of the E.P.A. one goal has been sacrificed altogether; that is, the goal of getting more industry and more jobs.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That is not necessarily so.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It is distinctly possible. Of course, the pity is that, owing to its delay in development and utilisation, the E.P.A. was required to examine the question of, "Is this one site suitable or not?" The authority was not in the position to be able to answer questions such as, "Tell us where in this area and within these parameters the industry should be sited."

The Hon. F. R. White: I moved an amendment to that effect, but the House did not agree to it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am fully aware of that. The worst aspect is that it appears—and this is not true statutorily—as though the total decision rests with the E.P.A. and not with Cabinet. Of course, this is a matter on which members have heard me express my views many times before, and with which I violently disagree. I believe that all decisions should rest with the political authority. I do not care whether it is a Liberal Government or a Labor Government; that is where the authority rests and where it should be seen to rest.

I am very much afraid in this exercise the authority appeared to rest with three most worthy men—Dr. O'Brien, Professor Maine, and Mr. Adams. Already we have heard criticism which, under proper management, should never have been allowed to rear its head. I refer to this sort of criticism: "What does he know about business?"; "What does he know about industry?"; and "What does he know about economic needs?"

I believe it was bad management on the part of the Government; because the Government should have been able to foresee and forestall this risk and it should not have allowed the organisation in its first action to sow the seeds of, perhaps, its own destruction, or at least to sow seeds of doubt about its efficacy.

Many members will know the name of Professor McTaggart-Cowan. He is often seen on wild life programmes on television and, with the exception of Mr. Wordsworth who has no television in Esperance—

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: He is not the only one.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON:—most members will have seen Professor McTaggart-Cowan. He was in Australia a couple of years ago and at that time I had the pleasure of speaking to him. He explained to me the sort of situation in which an ecologist of repute can be of use. He had been called in by a lumber company whose function was to exploit a particular area by felling the lumber and turning it into paper pulp. I understand the effluent from paper pulp mills is pretty terrible stuff to deal with. Professor McTaggart-Cowan was asked to form a team around him to study the area, to make proper research, and to advise the company where the plant should be positioned, the method by which the effluent should be disposed of, and the way in which the lumbering operations should proceed. There were two towns in reasonable proximity to the area which were fighting for the industry.

The group proceeded with its exercise and selected what it considered to be, within the parameters of ecology and economics, the ideal site for the plant, the best method of effluent disposal, and the like. This was one of the first of these exercises carried out in North America and it was greeted with tremendous acclaim by everyone who took an interest in it. It was very successful.

I say again that the pity of this action by the E.P.A. is that there was in fact time for such an exercise to have been carried out; there was in fact time to have said to the E.P.A. "Find us the ideal site for Pacminex within the parameters of both economics and ecology"; rather than simply ask the question "Is this one site a goer or not?"

It is a great pity that the way in which this was done led to the result it has. I am not saying it was the wrong result because I have read the report and I believe in all the circumstances it was the right decision. There is no doubt of that because I know the calibre of the men in question. But it is a pity that this happened to the first exercise of the E.P.A., because if environmental protection is

to be successful we must have long-range forecasting programmes to tell us where and when various things should be done.

Last year I spoke on a matter concerning the south-west of the State dealing with the price of milk. It will be recalled that just prior to the last election the price of milk in Western Australia was increased by 1c a pint. The report which was considered at that time indicated that a number of factors were placing even greater pressure on the dairying industry and should have led to yet another increase in price last year. There is little doubt that high costs are being incurred in this rigidly controlled industry—and it is an industry about which no-one could say that the producer sells to the highest bidder. It is a rigidly controlled industry. Yet here we are 18 months into a new Government, and no price rise has been given to the industry.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It is not 18 months into a new Government; it is only 13 months.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: As my colleague mentioned we are 13 months into a new Government, and no price rise has been given. I understand that a submission is now before the Government. I hope it will be considered with alacrity, so that this matter may be resolved as soon as possible.

There are very many matters which one would like to discuss in this debate. One would expect new ideas to come from the new Government, but we have not seen any.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I do not know about that. I was only looking at my electricity account this morning, and the charges have gone up by 20 per cent.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: In regard to the subject of electricity charges we were told by this Government at the last election that it intended to bring about equalisation in the metropolitan rates and the country rates; the original promise was that the country rates would be brought down to the metropolitan rates, but just imagine our surprise when the Government not only increased the metropolitan charges for electricity but also hit to leg those who were conducting businesses in the country and who came under the commercial rate. This action of the Government made a very serious impact on them. I think this matter has been raised by Mr. Reid in another place, and also by a member in this House.

I was referring to the sort of imaginative ideas one would have expected people, who had been in opposition for 12 years, to bring forward, but we are extremely disappointed with the efforts of the Government. I am thinking particularly about a warning that was issued last year by the Commissioner of Public Health,

when he was dealing with the laboratory services of this State. In his report the following comments appeared:—

It performs the laboratory work necessarily associated with a Public Health Department and other Government Departments, not the least of these is the vast amount of work required of its Forensic Division for police and coroner.

The work of the Laboratory not only increased from year to year but it increases exponentially. If there is to be an end to this rate of increase there is certainly still no evidence of it.

Further down in the report the following appeared:—

The quality of the work turned out by a laboratory is dependent on the quality and morale of the staff, and the morale can be seriously affected by overwork, inadequate accommodation, and insecurity in the career structure of their service. All these afflictions have been silently borne by the Laboratory staff, while rising to the demands for service made upon them, but I feel certain that unless immediate steps are taken to improve working conditions and to ensure the future progress of their service careers along predictable and acceptable lines, many of the valuable members of the staff will seek careers elsewhere.

So I was very delighted to see the new laboratories being proceeded with on the site of the Perth Medical Centre. However, there is still a very real need to watch the laboratory services of this State, for now and again one sees in the newspapers that there are signs of revolt.

There is one other matter I wish to mention briefly before I conclude, and that is the exercise we witnessed the other day by way of an explanation by Councillor Ritter and his criticism of the corridor plan for Perth. I must admit that I had been absent from the House for a little time, and I was a bit behind, but I particularly wanted to hear the explanation. At some sacrifice I gave up the required two hours and listened to the explanation.

I listened to some very interesting and talented men talking about their jobs and the way a particular exercise might be carried out; but of an explanation of Councillor Ritter's proposed alternative I heard nothing. If an explanation was given it was well over my head. We listened to people with whom I would have loved to talk for several hours in discussing some problems which had exercised my mind from time to time. I have no doubt their comments would have been very lucid and helpful, but as an exercise in explaining a complex plan it was a useless waste of our time.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It was the same as he said that night to the local authorities.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I would not be at all surprised that it was a repeat of the same thing. I have read a couple of times what Mr. Ritter has said. If one lacks the necessary education and expertise in a particular skill, the only way to understand the subject is to read the documents over and over again until the subject gets through to one. I had to do it this way, and it proved to be a pretty arduous exercise. A great deal of what Mr. Ritter has said makes common sense, but I have yet to be convinced that his system is likely to be better than that proposed under the corridor plan.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Has he put his proposal to the test under a computer?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I do not know. One of the gentlemen concerned, Mr. Stafford, enunciated the methods by which a computer test could be made. Most of us are familiar enough with computers to be aware that one can programme a series of tests, and try out the plans in an exercise comparing one with the other. One can put through a programme, and carry out the exercise as a test to find out which plan is likely to be most successful. If all these types of mechanism for testing are available why not use them?

Instead, we had four men standing up and telling us about the sort of procedures that are adopted and the mechanisms for testing these things; but no application of such procedures or mechanisms to the plan in question was revealed to us. So, we were left with the alternative that we did nothing which was 100 per cent. wrong, and we were asked to use the corridor plan which might be 20 per cent. wrong, or use the Ritter plan which might be 15 per cent. wrong. For certain, they were all to some degree wrong.

Surely in an imperfect world we have learnt that we must accept imperfect solutions. How much longer do we have to wait while looking for the best solution? Some people talk about the prospect of Perth having a population of 10,000,000. If ever the population of Perth were to reach 10,000,000 we would be wasting our time now, for the future of the human race would be nil. There are only two great threats that confront us; one is the atomic bomb about which we can do nothing, and the other is over-population. If this city were to get a population of 10,000,000 then we should give up now, and there would be no need to pass legislation or to make plans, because not only would there be insufficient water, but also insufficient coal, iron, electricity, and other natural resources. If we ever got to the stage of having 10,000,000 people in Perth

we would be living like rats on each other—physically and cannibalistically. There would not be enough of anything to go round.

The Hon. J. L. Hunt: Why not give up now?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Because I think the problem is soluble. To say that we have to plan for that sort of increase in the population is not on at all. I want to express my distress at the explanation that was given of the Ritter proposal.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: It was a lack of explanation.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Yes. I admit it was an interesting mental exercise. I suppose it can be claimed that I am a little bit odd when I, at the invitation of the Minister, go along to hear an explanation, and I am angered when I do not hear one given. This might well have been brought about by modesty on Mr. Ritter's part! He is the one to tell us how good the plan is. It might be characteristic of Mr. Ritter in respect of other matters, but on this occasion I would have appreciated his explanation on how good the plan is and the advantages it confers. In looking at his proposal I think he has raised some good points, such as the sort of developmental procedures he outlined, but I am not sure that they are any better than the proposals in the corridor plan. No doubt, as Mr. Stafford told us, there is no-one in Western Australia who can carry out the exercise that is required to be done.

So, I was extremely disappointed. I do not know who should be blamed, if "blamed" is the appropriate word to use. I think it would be unfair to blame the Deputy Premier, because it was left to Mr. Ritter to tell us—and perhaps Mr. Ritter attributed us with a great deal more of the grey matter than we possess.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: The Deputy Premier got a second opinion.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Yes, he got a second opinion which was paid for, and a second opinion that we expected he would get. With those remarks I support the motion.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [5.58 p.m.]: In replying to the debate on this motion I desire to associate myself with earlier speakers who supported The Hon. D. K. Dans. He gave us a treatise on industrial arbitration and conciliation.

Members who have supported the motion moved include The Hon. A. F. Griffith, The Hon. G. W. Berry, The Hon. N. McNeill, The Hon. Ron Thompson, The Hon. N. E. Baxter, The Hon. R. F. Claughton, The Hon. L. D. Elliott, The Hon. J. L. Hunt, The Hon. W. R. Withers, The Hon. V. J. Ferry, The Hon. L. A. Logan, The Hon.

T. D. Perry, The Hon. R. J. L. Williams, The Hon. Clive Griffiths, The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth, The Hon. J. Heitman, and The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon.

The subjects debated included the following:—

Parliamentary questions
Discomfort of opening day in the Chamber
Timing of opening day
Constitution of the Legislative Council
Desirability of damming the Gascoyne
Kangaroo regulations
Mineral resources of the lower north
Taxation allowances above the 26th parallel
Fruit-fly regulations
Carnarvon courthouse
Upgrading the Carnarvon High School
Provision of adequate playgrounds
Australian Federation of Police Associations
Discomfort of traffic noise
Two-price quota system
Agricultural education
More comfortable dress in the Chamber
Advocation of corporal punishment
Dog nuisance
Press censorship of member's submissions
Aged people's homes
Pacminex and environmental protection
Costs of water and electric power in the north
State ships
Planning for industrial expansion
Hardwood timber industry
Abolition of the Third Party Claims Tribunal
General electricity charges
Capital punishment
Mineral development, generally
Assistance to the wool industry
Farm advisers
Policy on Collie coal
Chiropractors
Mental Health Services
Health warning on cigarette packets
Trends for education
Differential education funding
Kwinana-Balga power line
Waiting room—East Perth lockup
New land areas—production and marketing
Wharf labour
Country abattoirs and water supplies
Veterinary science and agricultural education
Rural education
A treatise on Commonwealth-State financial arrangements
Country traffic control
Pay-roll tax
Stern committee's report
Marketing of goat meat
The Murdoch University

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The Leader of the House should get some good advice out of that lot.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I am sure the advice was well meant.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am sure it was.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: Whether or not the Government will do all the things which have been suggested, I hesitate to say.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Even if it does some of those things it will be gratifying.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I wish to thank members for their discussions on the subjects referred to. I do not intend to endeavour to reply in detail to those who have spoken, as has been the case on previous occasions. I have passed on to the various departments copies of the speeches which have been made, and I have requested that the various matters be taken up and the members concerned replied to directly. In some cases the old habit has prevailed and some of the replies are coming to me. However, I will pass those replies on, over my signature, to the members concerned.

If any member considers there is a delay in the receipt of a reply to his questions, he should contact me and I will follow it up. I feel that to answer some of the queries raised, and not all of them, is somewhat unfair to those who have spoken late in the debate. We realise that all members cannot speak at the one time.

I was heartened by the remarks of Mr. Arthur Griffith, as Leader of the Opposition, in his first speech from that side of the House. He is a man who has spent some considerable time in replying to the Address-in-Reply debate over the last 12 years.

I assure members I have no desire to curtail their rights in any way by not answering their queries today. In fact, I think members will receive greater satisfaction and more detail from my proposed method. I leave the matter open for members to contact me if they do not receive replies to their questions. I support the motion.

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

Presentation to Governor

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [6.04 p.m.]: I move—

That the Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor by the President and such members as may desire to accompany him.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 6.05 p.m.

Added to that list is the recent contribution by The Honourable Graham MacKinnon.