BILLS (9): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Factories and Shops Act Amendment Bill.
2. Hairdressers Registration Act Amendment Bill.
   Bills received from the Assembly; and, on motions by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Education), read a first time.
3. Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act Amendment Bill.
   Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice), read a first time.
4. Environmental Protection Act Amendment Bill.
   Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion, by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Education), read a first time.
5. Anzac Day Act Amendment Bill.
   Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice), read a first time.
6. Reserve (Kwinana Freeway) Bill.
   Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. N. E. Baxter, (Minister for Health), read a first time.
7. Education Act Amendment Bill.
8. Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act Amendment Bill.
9. Registration of Identity of Persons Bill.
   Bills received from the Assembly; and, on motions by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Education), read a first time.

House adjourned at 6.12 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 23rd April, 1975

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

BILLS (2): MESSAGES

Appropriations

Messages from the Lieutenant-Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the following Bills—

1. Police Act Amendment Bill.
2. Agent General Act Amendment Bill.

QUESTIONS (42): ON NOTICE

1. SCHOOLS AND HIGH SCHOOLS

Demountable Classrooms

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

(1) Will the Minister advise which—
   (a) primary schools;
   (b) high schools,
   have been supplied with demountable classrooms since schools reopened in 1975 and the dates when either approval for such supply was given or the dates when supply was made?

(2) Who determines the priority for the allocation of demountable classrooms to—
   (a) primary schools;
   (b) secondary schools?

(3) Who determines which priority shall prevail in the provision of demountable classrooms when there is a need for them at both primary and secondary schools?

(4) How many "special" classes in primary schools are accommodated in—
   (a) demountable classrooms;
   (b) other classrooms of a temporary nature;
   (c) ordinary classrooms?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) —

	Date of approval
(a) Yanchep Primary Schoo	10/2/75
Cue Primary School	21/2/75
Boulder Junior Primary (in progress now)	4/3/75
Greenwood Primary School (in progress now)	4/3/75
Warburton	4/3/75
Adam Road Primary School	13/3/75
Warwick Primary School	13/3/75
Glen Forrest Primary School	13/3/75
Pinjarra Primary School	19/3/75
Kingsley Primary School	3/4/75
East Maddington Primary School	3/4/75
(b) Mirrabooka Senior High School	17/2/75
Churchlands Senior High School	17/2/75

(2) and (3) The final responsibility for the allocation of demountable classrooms rests with the Director-General of Education.

(4) (a) 2.
   (b) and (c) No other information is available concerning the number of "special" classes in permanent classrooms or other types of temporary classrooms.

2. CARCOOLA SCHOOL

Extensions and Enrolment

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

(1) Has there been an accommodation problem to date this year at the Carcoola Primary School?

(2) (a) When is it anticipated that extensions will be made to the Carcoola Primary School;

(b) what is likely to be the extent of those extensions?

(3) What was the enrolment at the Carcoola Primary School—

(a) when school resumed in February 1975;

(b) on 17th April, 1975?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) (a) and (b) The transference of the "special" class from Carcoola Primary School to Pinjarra Primary School on 21st April, 1975, has eased the accommodation pressure at the school and, as a consequence, future extensions at the school are not required in the immediate future.

(3) (a) and (b) The enrolment of 181 pupils at the commencement of the 1975 school year had reduced to 169 pupils by 17th April and this enrolment was further reduced by the transference of the "special" class of 14 pupils on 21st April, 1975.

3. HOUSING

Esperance: Mr L. A. Anderson

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

Is he now in a position to advise whether Mr L. A. Anderson of 134 Lyall Street, Kalgoorlie, about whom I wrote him on 11th March last (which letter was acknowledged on 14th March, 1975) will be provided with a suitable sized home in Esperance to enable him to establish his family at Esperance prior to taking up duties at that centre on 8th May next?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

It is a long standing policy in relation to Housing Commission operations that matters relating to a specific applicant or occupant are not made public. The Member will receive an answer to his correspondence within the next few days.

4. RAILWAYS

Porters: Waterproof Clothing

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

Will he give favourable consideration to providing waterproof clothing for use by WAGR porters whose duties require them to work in wet conditions (rain)?

Mr Grayden (for Mr O'CONNOR) replied:

Waterproof clothing is provided in accordance with industrial award conditions and consideration is given to specific applications.

5. COUNTRY HOSPITALS

Resident Doctors

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

(1) How many Government hospitals (including those administered by boards) are there in country districts which are not serviced by a resident doctor within the particular district?

(2) What are the names of such hospitals?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(1) Sixteen.

(2) Departmental: Coolgardie, Donnybrook, Laverton, Leonora, Marble Bar, Onslow, Wooroloo.

Board: Brookton, Dumbleyung, Jerramungup, Nannup, Narembeen, Ravensthorpe, Tambellup, Wickepin, Williams.

6. NORTH KALGOORLIE SCHOOL

Substandard Classroom

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

Would the Minister (if he has not already done so) please read page 1 of the *Kalgoorlie Miner* of date 16th April, 1975, and in the light of the statements attributed to the headmaster of the North Kalgoorlie School therein and particularly the statement, "The Minister had possibly been incorrectly advised because of a misunderstanding of statements made by Mr Barker (the headmaster) to an officer of the department" and—

(a) advise whether he now adheres to the answer he gave to part (3) of my question 11 of 16th April, 1975 concerning the use of a condemned pavilion and a storeroom being used to house classes; and

(b) make a statement clarifying the works programme for this school which will overcome the serious accommodation and other problems thereat?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(a) Yes.

(b) A repair and renovation contract for the school is to be undertaken this year. A firm proposal for further building and upgrading has not been determined. The matter must be related to the needs in so many other areas and the major escalation of costs which has had a serious effect on the number of works which can be undertaken.

7. BYFORD REHABILITATION CENTRE

Future Role

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

Referring to question 26 of 15th April, 1975, regarding the future of the Byford rehabilitation centre—

(1) Will staff members transferring to the Drug and Alcohol Authority continue to be employed at Byford?

(2) Will transfer(s) be effected without loss of salary?

(3) If not, what are to be likely differences?

(4) How many and what category of staff will be employed at Byford?

(5) How many patients will be accommodated there?

(6) What structural alterations, if any, will be necessary?

(7) What is the anticipated cost of same?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Those prison officers appointed to the authority will experience only minimal loss in salary.

(3) This matter is subject to negotiations with the Public Service Board and will vary according to the categories of staff.

(4) Final selection of staff has not yet been completed.

(5) Up to 25 patients can be accommodated.

(6) None.

(7) Answered by (6).

8. COMPREHENSIVE WATER SCHEME

Extensions

Mr P. V. JONES, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) Has consideration been given to extending the reticulation area of the comprehensive water scheme east of Pingaring in Kulin Shire?

(2) What extensions are being undertaken in the current financial year?

(3) What extensions are planned for the 1975-76 financial year?

(4) What long-term planning has been undertaken for extensions to the comprehensive scheme?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

(1) No.

(2) and (3) None.

(4) Following recommendations by the Director of Agriculture, of those areas in the State showing greatest difficulty for development of on-farm drought proof water supplies, preliminary engineering studies and estimated costs to supply the first three priority areas have been carried out by the Public Works Department.

These areas embrace—

(a) parts of Westonia and Mt. Hampton;

(b) the West Midlands; and

(c) the Eradu Sand Plain.

These studies have been forwarded to the Department of Agriculture for an economic appraisal, to ascertain if a satisfactory approach can be made to the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance. The capital required to supply water to farms in the wheatbelt areas is beyond the resources of the State and any extension of the comprehensive scheme will depend on future Commonwealth Government support.

9. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Contributory Scheme: Kulin-Pingaring Area

Mr P. V. JONES, to the Minister for Electricity:

When is it anticipated that the State Electricity Commission will extend the contributory scheme to provide power to the areas east of Kulin townsite, and to Pingaring?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

The supply of electricity to Pingaring and areas east of Kulin town depends on the construction of a major power line from Merredin to Kondinin and the establishment of a step-down substation at Kondinin.

In view of the high capital cost of these works it is not possible at present to make a reliable estimate of when supply will be available in the above areas.

10. PINGELLY DISTRICT HIGH SCHOOL

Library-resource Centre and Improvements

Mr P. V. JONES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

(1) Has the redesigning of the library-resource centre at the Pingelly District High School been completed?

(2) If not, when is completion anticipated?

(3) When is it expected to call tenders for the construction of this resource centre?

(4) When is it anticipated the planned upgrading and improvement of the playground area at the Pingelly school will be commenced?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) to (3) Sketch plans have been approved and documentation is proceeding. It is anticipated that the works will go to tender soon after the completion of the documentation.

(4) The Education Department has requested the Public Works Department to give consideration to submitting the development of Reserve 9244 as a play area for funding from the regional employment development scheme.

11. *This question was postponed.*

12. MORAWA HIGH SCHOOL

Upgrading to Senior Status

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

(1) How many fourth and fifth-year students are at present attending the Morawa High School?

(2) Are any of these students bused in from outer areas; if so, how far?

(3) Do any of the fourth and fifth-year students board in the town?

(4) Is there a full range of subjects available?

(5) Were any additional staff required following the upgrading of the Morawa High School to a five-year high school, and if so, how many?

(6) Do any of the present staff at the Morawa High School specialise in teaching certain subjects?

(7) Do they have the use of audio-visual aids in the instruction of any particular subject?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) Year 11—22; Year 12—8 (1st March, 1975).

(2) Yes (25 of the 30). The maximum distance travelled by bus is approximately 35 miles.

(3) No.

(4) No school in Western Australia is known to offer every subject externally examined at the end of year 12. There is thus no indication as to the meaning of the phrase "a full range of subjects".

(5) Yes, three.

(6) Yes. It is normal in all secondary schools in Western Australia for staff to specialise in one or more subject areas.

(7) Yes.

13. HOUSING

Adeline: Jaxon Construction Contract

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

In reference to State Housing Commission contract with Jaxon Construction for the erection of 10 homes at Adeline being tender No. 47/75 and subject to file 163/175—

(1) Is he aware that the commission's tender documents specify the use of "extruded" bricks, which restricts the type of bricks to those of a clay nature?

(2) Is he further aware that an addendum to the said specifications stipulates that locally manufactured bricks may be used provided that such use does not conflict with the drawings, which drawings are clearly marked extruded bricks for six of the ten dwellings to be constructed?

(3) Is he thus aware that the specifications clearly exclude the use of bricks manufactured in Boulder by Boulder Modular Masonary Co. Pty. Ltd.?

(4) Is he also aware that the latter company, the only local brick manufacturer and which employs 10 to 12 men, has in the past supplied bricks for use in new houses built within the district, that it is currently supplying brick/blocks for the Mines Department, for the continuing construction of the new Eastern Goldfields Senior High School and has also supplied for the Kalgoorlie hospital laundry without the company having received complaints as to the quality of its product?

(5) As the builder is ready to place orders for the supply of materials, would he, as a matter of urgency, have the said specifications amended to permit the use of the locally produced brick blocks to enable the local company to offer its product to the builder?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

(1) to (3) Yes.

(4) I understand this to be so.

(5) No. Contractor has already placed orders for this contract.

14. PAY-ROLL TAX

Concessions to Decentralised Industries

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Treasurer:

How much in pay-roll tax concessions has been applied for by decentralised industries for the 1973-74 pay-roll tax year?

Mr McPharlin (for Sir CHARLES COURT) replied:

487 applications have been received for assistance by way of a pay-roll tax concession.

In accordance with the Act, the concession will be granted to businesses requiring it to continue, expand or establish in decentralised areas.

The applications are at present being processed.

15. CROWN LAND TRIBUNAL

Membership and Recommendations

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

(1) Further to question on notice 13 asked on 5th September, 1974, during the life of the Crown Land Tribunal—

(a) who represented the Department of Lands and Surveys;

(b) what were the names, qualifications and "interests" represented by tribunal members?

(2) How many hectares of land were set aside for State Forest as a result of the tribunal's recommendations?

(3) Under which sections of which Act was the tribunal established and its members appointed?

(4) What powers did the tribunal have and what were its terms of reference?

(5) Has the tribunal a successor?

(6) If so, what are the details?

(7) Did the tribunal ascertain the possible utilisation of Crown Land for pine plantations?

(8) If so, why was the Forests Department not represented on it?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(1) (a) Mr S. J. Stokes as Chairman of the Tribunal, who at that time was Divisional Land Superintendent, Surveyor-General's Division, Lands and Surveys Department.

(b) Mr W. T. Walton and Mr A. T. Moulton. Mr Walton had been associated with the timber industry all his life, including 24 years' service with the Forests Department. Mr Moulton was an orchardist at Bridgetown. In April 1963, on the resignation of Mr Walton on account of ill-health, Mr J. C. Usher, an ex-forester was appointed. When he resigned in April 1967, because of ill-health, Mr J. E. Talbot, also an ex-officer of the Forests Department, replaced him. None of these represented particular interests.

(2) The tribunal recommended the setting aside of 88 330 hectares for State Forest. The extraction of information to ascertain the area set aside for State Forest would involve lengthy investigation. However, if desired, the information could be made available in approximately four weeks.

(3) The tribunal was not established under any Statute but resulted from a Cabinet decision.

(4) Advisory powers to the Minister for Lands. Terms of reference were to inquire into the question of utilisation of sparsely timbered Crown lands for future agricultural development.

(5) No.

(6) Answered by (5).

(7) The tribunal considered limited lands in the Jandakot project. There is doubt that this was within the terms of reference.

(8) Answered by (7) and (1) (b).

16. HEALTH

Mercury Poisoning

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

(1) What studies have been made in Western Australia of the mercury content of human blood and hair?

(2) What has been done to alert general practitioners in the medical profession to the need to spot the toxicological symptoms of mercury poisoning?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(1) A report of a survey from Victoria has been closely studied. This reveals that although there is a positive correlation between the amount of fish (shark) consumed and levels of mercury in blood and hair, no ill effect on health was apparent.

(2) The medical profession must be aware of the considerable publicity given to this topic in the media. If and when the Minister is advised of the need to alert medical practioners it shall be done.

17. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY

New Initiatives

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

With reference to question 79 of 27th March, 1975 concerning new initiatives undertaken by the Environmental Protection Authority, how many of the programmes outlined in the answer were the result of initiation by the Court Government and what was the date of inception of each of the programmes?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

The specific programmes referred to and their dates of inception are:—

(a) Hardy Inlet-Augusta estuarine study—June 1973

(b) Conservation Through Reserves Committee—February 1972

(c) Coogee air pollution study—November 1972
Pinjarra study—October 1974

(d) Demographic and Environmental Reserves Committee—June 1973

The answer to the Member's previous question was not intended to be an exhaustive list of projects and most of the projects cited were initiated by the previous Government. However, this Government has actively encouraged a continuation of the programmes and brought to fruition the Coogee air pollution study and the report of the Conservation Through Reserves Committee.

Some examples of programmes initiated by this Government are preliminary investigations leading to future proper environmental management of Cockburn Sound, an environmental study relating to the siting of extensions to West Coast Highway and studies leading to the formulation of a coastal policy.

18. *This question was postponed.*

19. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND CONSERVATION

Functions Undertaken by Government

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

In regard to the Governor's speech when opening Parliament this session, what major reorganisation of environmental and conservation functions has the Government carried out?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

Those Government departments and functions associated with environment and conservation matters have been consolidated under a single Ministry of Conservation and Environment, including Fisheries and Wildlife, National Parks, Swan River Conservation, Western Australian Native Flora Protection together with the Department of Environmental Protection.

20. MINERAL SANDS

Narngulu Project: Environmental Protection Report

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

In regard to mineral sands treatment at Narngulu, could the advice given by the Environmental Protection Authority to the Greenough Shire Council, of the environmental factors needing consideration when allowing the establishment of plants of this kind, be tabled?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

Yes, I have extracted the required information from a letter sent to Mr K. H. Foskew, Shire Clerk, Greenough Shire Council by the Chairman of the Environmental Protection Authority on 20th July, 1973. Much of this letter deals with the proposed establishment of the plant in a coastal area south of Drummond's Cove and I have therefore tabled only that portion which deals with the Narngulu site.

The paper was tabled (see paper No. 164).

21. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Department and Statutory Bodies: Receipts and Expenditure

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

What are the receipts and expenditure for the years 1972-73 and 1973-74 for the operation of the—

(a) Department of Environmental Protection;

(b) Environmental Protection Council;

(c) Environmental Protection Authority?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

Expenditure for the Department of Environmental Protection for the years 1972-73 and 1973-74 was $128 006 and $202 134 respectively.

Included in these were:—

(i) $8 000 for each of the years 1972-73 and 1973-74 being payment of members' fees for the Environmental Protection Authority.

(ii) $1 528.62 and $721.88 for the same periods being members' fees and incidental expenses for the Environmental Protection Council.

All other costs associated with the Environmental Protection Authority and Environmental Protection Council were borne by the Department of Environmental Protection in its role of servicing the authority and council.

There was no revenue collected during either of these years.

22. CROWN LAND AND STATE FORESTS

Lease for Forest Development

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

What steps have been taken by the Government towards implementing the policy of leasing Crown land and State Forest for private forest development?

Mr RIDGE replied:

All aspects of the feasibility of leasing Crown land and State forest for private forest development are being investigated.

23. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Particle Board: Production and Exports

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

For the years 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73 and 1973-74—

(1) How many cubic metres of particle board were produced in Western Australia?

(2) How many cubic metres of particle board from all sources were consumed in Western Australia?

(3) How many cubic metres of particle board were exported from Western Australia—
(a) interstate;
(b) overseas?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) to (3) This department does not collect and keep statistics on this subject.

I suggest the Member refers to statistics published by the Commonwealth Statistician, or the *Timber Supply Review* published by the Australian Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Timber Bureau.

24. STATE FORESTS

"Forest Focus": Publication

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

Considering that the Forests Department publication *Forest Focus* has been published on a quarterly basis, yet at page 31 of the department's 1974 annual report it is stated that only three issues were published in 1973-74, how many issues were published in 1974-75?

Mr RIDGE replied:

The aim has been to publish three issues of *Forest Focus* per year contingent on the availability of staff and printing facilities. At least one issue is expected to be available in 1974-75.

25. WOODCHIPPING INDUSTRY

State Forests Blocks

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

Further to page 10 of the Forests Department 1974 annual report, which forest blocks were involved in assessment concerning the first five years' operation of the Marri chipwood project?

Mr RIDGE replied:

The forest blocks involved in assessment during 1974 concerning the first five years of operations of the Marri woodchip project were:—

Andrew
Boorara
Brockman
Crowea
Dombakup
Easter
Gardner
Gordon
Graphite

Iffley
Leeuwin
Mataband
Mindanup
Nairn
Poole
Strickland
Sutton
Warren
Weld.

26. STATE FORESTS

Timber Zone

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

Under the heading of "land alienations" in the annual report of the Forests Department, reference is made to a "timber zone"—

(1) What are the boundaries and definition of the timber zone?

(2) What is its approximate area in hectares?

(3) What are the boundaries of the area described as being "outside timber zone"?

(4) What is its approximate area in hectares?

(5) Will he table a map showing the boundaries referred to in (1) and (3) *supra*?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(1) The timbered zone is a statistical region adopted by the Forests Department for recording land alienations. The boundaries are as shown on the plan submitted for tabling.

(2) Approximately 6 926 000 hectares.

(3) That section of the State not included in the timber zone.

(4) Approximately 245 624 000 hectares.

(5) Yes. The boundaries of the "timber zone" are shown, bordered red, on the plan submitted herewith for tabling.

The plan was tabled (see paper No. 165).

27. EXPORT MUTTON

Price to Producers

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

What has been the average monthly price per kilo paid to farmers for sheep sold for the export mutton trade since the beginning of 1974?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

The average monthly prices paid to farmers at Midland saleyards for export quality wethers, 18.5-22.0 kg, were as follows: (Source—Australian Meat Board).

1974	C per kg
January	50.9
February	53.6
March	42.5
April	41.4
May	48.7
June	38.1
July	32.0
August	27.1
September	19.6
October	15.8
November	13.5
December	19.0

1975	C per kg
January	16.9
February (Department of Agriculture estimate)	17.8
March (Department of Agriculture estimate)	16.5

28. LIVE SHEEP

Exports

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

(1) What has been the average monthly price paid to farmers for wethers used in the live sheep trade since the beginning of 1974?

(2) What number of live sheep were exported in 1974?

(3) To what markets were live sheep exported in 1974, and how many sheep to each market?

(4) What firms exported live sheep from Western Australia in 1974, and how many did each firm handle?

(5) What has been the average monthly price paid to farmers in South Australia for wethers used in the live sheep trade since the beginning of 1974?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

(1) Monthly average prices paid to farmers for wethers used in the live sheep trade since the beginning of 1974 are not available.

I have been advised that the average price for wethers to farmers from one large exporter for 1974 was $13.02.

(2) 793 121 live sheep were exported in 1974.

(3) The markets and number of live sheep exported in 1974 were:

Singapore	95 519
Mauritius	3 391
Arabian Gulf	693 204
Malaysia	1 007

(4) Farms exporting sheep and the approximate numbers (source, animal inspection office, Fremantle,) are as follows:

Western Livestock	140
G. Booth & Sons	5 200
Dalgety Australia	1 007
Gray Robins Pty. Ltd.	21 387
Gardiner Smith	2 380
Wesfarmers	26 346
Emanuel	68 711
Livestock Exports	3 690
Clausen Steamship Co. Australia Pty. Ltd.	482 004
Amalgamated Industries	113 535
Patton Exports	47 301

(5) Not available.

29. WOOL SALES

Albany

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) Is there any intention on the part of Albany Wool Sales Pty. Ltd. to direct bulk class and/or interlotted wool to Fremantle for sale?

(2) How many bales of each of these classes of wool were sold in Albany in 1974?

(3) What was the amount of subsidy met by the Government in having wool railed by farmers to Albany in 1974?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) It is understood that Albany Wool Stores Pty. Ltd. has decided to close down its bulk classing operation at Albany. It is not envisaged that interlotting will be affected.

(2) As interlotting is not involved only bulk classing totals have been obtained. The figures for the last three seasons are as follows:

1972-1973 12 198 bales (7.8% of total receivals).

1973-1974 5 659 bales (5.1% of total receivals).

1974-1975 8 210 bales (4.9% of total receivals) (to date).

(3) The 50% concession on wool railed to Albany for sale from Narrogin and points south totalled $35 401 in the 1973-1974 financial year. It is estimated that the cost for 1974-1975 will be $75 000.

30. APPLES

Processing: Government Financial Assistance

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

Did the Western Australian Government make any approach to either or both of the fruit juicing firms, Plaimar Ltd. or Bush, Boake and Allen Aust. Ltd., to ascertain if it would be possible, with Government assistance, to keep the plants for processing apples for concentrated juice operating in the 1975 season, and if so—

(a) on what dates were such approaches made;

(b) to whom were they made;

(c) what were the details of propositions suggested or discussed with the firm or firms?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

Both companies advised that there is no market in Australia or overseas for concentrated apple juice.

A Committee of Government and industry representatives was formed to examine the possibility of utilising the existing or modified plant for the production of alternative products.

On the committee's recommendation, the State Government has approached the Commonwealth seeking funds for a survey of the total available market for apple juice products and financial assistance in acquiring and re-establishing a juice operation in this State.

No reply is yet to hand.

31. PINE PLANTATIONS

Privately Owned: Area and Production

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

(1) What is the total area of private pine plantations in Western Australia?

(2) Who are the owners of these plantations and what area does each owner hold?

(3) What is the expected production of soft-wood timber from privately owned plantations in each of the next ten years?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(1) Approximately 5 770 hectares as at 30th June, 1974.

(2) and (3) At the request of some of the owners, this information is not available for release.

32. PINE PLANTATIONS

Privately Owned: Sale of Products

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

Having regard to the extent of the operation of the proposed Wesply complex to be constructed

at Dardanup, which will result in low cost production through economy of volume and the limited Western Australian market for pine products, to what extent will the growers of private pine plantations in this State be faced with problems of disposal of their product at an economical level?

Mr RIDGE replied:

On account of its large scale and manufacturing efficiencies, the proposed Wesply complex at Dardanup should provide private growers, as well as State plantations, with a hitherto non-existent economic outlet for small thinnings.

33. GERALDTON HIGHWAY

Traffic Count and Communication Facilities

Mr CARR, to the Minister for Traffic:

(1) Does he have traffic count details for usage of the new Geraldton Highway via Eneabba, and if so, will he advise the House of them?

(2) How many emergency radio facilities is he aware of between Gingin and Dongara and will he advise their location?

(3) Who owns each of the radio facilities?

(4) What radio networks are the frequencies of these radios plugged into; e.g., police, R.F.D.S.?

(5) Is he aware that a fatal accident occurred on the highway at the weekend and that some difficulty was experienced contacting emergency services?

(6) Does he agree that emergency communication facilities are inadequate in relation to usage of the highway?

(7) Will he conduct an urgent investigation into the possibility of improving the services and advise the House the results of such investigation?

Mr Grayden (for Mr O'CONNOR) replied:

(1) Yes. Details of traffic counts appear below.

(2) Six radio and telephone facilities located at—

Telephones—

Todds service station (5 km north of Gingin)

Esso Service Station, South Cataby

Cataby

Eneabba

Radios—

32 km south of Dongara

16 km south of Dongara.

(3) and (4) These facilities are privately operated and I am not aware of any details.

(5) Yes. The difficulty experienced was the result of the nearest communication facility being out of order.

(6) No. Communication facilities are much better than those existing on many other highways throughout the State and we must rely on passing traffic.

(7) An investigation is not considered necessary.

Geraldton Highway

Traffic Counts

Location	Average Daily Traffic 1973/74	Jan. 3-Jan. 23, 1975 (Holiday peak)
36 km north of Muchea	918	1 103
70 km north of Eneabba	606	844

34. TEACHERS

Trainees: Book Allowance

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

(1) How many student teachers are presently training under the auspices of the Teacher Education Authority?

(2) How many of these are entitled to a book allowance?

(3) By whom is the book allowance payable?

(4) What is the value of the book allowance?

(5) Has this book allowance for 1975 been paid yet?

(6) If "Yes" to (5), when was it paid?

(7) If "No" to (5)—

(a) why has it not been paid and when is it proposed to be paid;

(b) have students had to pay their book bills at the various colleges or have they been given credit to the extent of their book allowance?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

(1) 5 361 as at 28th February, 1975.

(2) 3 531 are entitled to a WA Education Department teacher education scholarship book allowance.

(3) The teacher education scholarship book allowance is payable by the Western Australian Government through the Education Department.

(4) The teacher education scholarship book allowance is $55 per year for all scholarship holders, with the exception of final year students in courses other than home

economics, manual arts and the Diploma of Education who receive $35 per year.

(5) Teacher education scholarship book allowances for 1975 have been paid to all scholarship holders except in cases of late applications, changes of course, and a small group of students whose records were incorrect. These exceptions are currently being processed.

(6) The book allowances were available for collection during the first week of April 1975.

(7) See answer to (5).

35. RAILWAYS

Land at Wexcombe: Transfer to State Housing Commission

Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) Is the Western Australian Government Railways negotiating with the State Housing Commission for the transfer to that authority of an area of 77 acres in the Wexcombe district?

(2) If so, how many homes are involved and when will the transfer of the land be effected?

(3) In the event of the land being transferred will the WAGR ensure that its tenants will receive favourable consideration from the SHC in the following ways—

(a) that the present tenants are housed in suitable alternative accommodation during any redevelopment of the area;

(b) ensure that they would have priority above all others to re-occupy homes in the redevelopment?

Mr Grayden (for Mr O'CONNOR) replied:

(1) Some preliminary discussions only have taken place.

(2) 56 Nissan huts and 14 Thermabau type houses. No indication has been given of when land transfer will be made if and when agreement is reached.

(3) (a) and (b) The points made by the Member will certainly be a consideration if and when detailed negotiations take place.

36. STATE HOUSING COMMISSION

Land at Wexcombe: Transfer from Railways Department

Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Housing:

(1) Is the State Housing Commission negotiating with the WAGR for the transfer of an area of 77 acres in the Wexcombe district?

(2) If so, are there any delays being experienced in the transfer of such land and what are the reasons for such delays?

(3) If no delays are being experienced, when will the transfer of land be effected?

(4) What type of redevelopment is envisaged for the land?

(5) How many homes will be erected?

(6) Will the present tenants of the existing WAGR dwellings receive priority for allocation of the homes erected?

(7) When will the project be completed?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

(1) As part of the normal programme of examining possible land acquisitions for future requirements, a preliminary inquiry has been made of the WAGR as to the possibility of the land in question being available for purchase by the Housing Commission.

(2) to (7) Answered by (1).

37. TEACHING HOSPITALS ADVISORY COUNCIL

Meetings and Subcommittees

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

(1) On what dates did the Teaching Hospitals Advisory Council meet during 1973, 1974, and so far this year?

(2) Were any THAC subcommittees operative during that time, and if so, what was their purpose and on what dates did such subcommittees meet?

(3) What are scheduled dates for future meetings of THAC?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(1) 1973—
31st January
1st March
5th April
10th May
14th June
12th July
9th August
11th October
8th November
13th December

1974—
14th February
14th March
11th April
9th May
13th June
8th August
10th October

No further meetings have been held.

(2) Yes.

Formed 5th April, 1973—

(a) Committee to examine provision of renal dialysis facilities at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital.

(b) Equipment review committee to examine proposed purchases by teaching hospitals of equipment costing over $30 000.

(c) Animal holding committee to advise on the provision of animal holding facilities.

Formed 10th May, 1973—
10 year plan committee to formulate a proposed ten year teaching hospital plan for Western Australia.

Formed 12th July, 1973—
Committee to examine a proposal to establish a nuclear medicine facility at Fremantle Hospital.

Formed 9th August, 1973—
Committee to examine the implications of associating the Chair in Cardiology with a second cardiac investigatory unit.

Formed 8th November, 1973—
Second committee to examine provision of renal dialysis facilities at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital.

The meeting dates for all subcommittees are not available as each subcommittee arranged its own meetings.

(3) Meetings scheduled monthly on second Thursday of each month but actually meet as business comes forward.

38. STATE HEALTH COUNCIL

Meetings and Subcommittees

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

(1) On what dates did the State Health Council meet during 1973, 1974 and so far this year?

(2) Were any State Health Council subcommittees operative during that time, and if so, what was their purpose and on what dates did such subcommittees meet?

(3) What are scheduled dates for future meetings of the State Health Council?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(1) 31st January, 1974.
28th February, 1974.

(2) Yes.

(a) Coronary care ambulance committee. 24th August, 1973.

(b) Medical computer co-ordinating committee.
23/1/73
6/4/73
24/5/73
17/7/73
19/2/74
30/4/74
21/5/74
18/6/74
20/8/74
17/9/74
15/10/74
19/11/74
21/1/75
18/2/75
18/3/75

(c) Maternal and child health committee.
6th June, 1973

(3) No date has been determined.

39. PREMIER

Supreme Court Case: Finalisation

Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

(1) By reason of its relevance to the *sub judice* rule which thus far has precluded discussion in this Parliament since 1972 of certain matters of great public importance and interest, will the Minister state the progress position in Supreme Court action number 3878 1972 in which Charles Walter Michael Court, K.B. is the plaintiff and Incorporated Newsagencies Company Pty. Limited, Richard Walsh, George Munster, John Albert Hepworth, J. R. Walsh, Gordon and Gotch (Australasia) Limited and Graeme Pratt are or were the defendants?

(2) Amongst other things, will the Minister state—

(a) whether the case has been finalised;

(b) if so, when, and on what terms;

(c) whether it has been set down for trial, and if so, when, and what date has been fixed for the trial?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

(1) A summons to a Judge in Chambers seeking an order for further and better particulars of statement of claim was filed by the solicitor for the defendants on the 28th November, 1974 for hearing on the 12th February, 1975. By agreement between the solicitors for the plaintiff and the defendants the matter was adjourned *sine die*.

The Court file discloses that no action has been made since then.

(2) Answered by (1).

40. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Wesply Agreement: Profitable Levels

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

In reference to the proposed agreement between the State and Westralian Plywoods Pty. Ltd. relating to the establishment of a particle board manufacturing industry—

(1) For the purposes of clause 24 of the agreement what is the meaning of the phrase "profitable levels" in line nine page 23 of the Bill?

(2) What is the minimum percentage of profit on paid up capital which would be construed as being at a profitable level for the purposes of clause 24 of the agreement?

(3) Will he table for 48 hours the Registrar of Companies Office file, relevant to Westralian Plywoods Pty. Ltd.?

(4) What practices, if any, is it contemplated will be indulged in by Westralian Plywoods Pty. Ltd. pursuant to its proposed agreement with the State which may justify the provisions of the Trade Practices Act being invoked?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) "Profitable levels" is a general term the meaning of which varies from industry to industry and from time to time. In the context of the agreement, if the company and the State are unable to agree as to whether prices for products of the company had fallen below profitable levels for the purposes of Clause 24 then the matter would be determined by arbitration pursuant to Clause 26.

(2) Answered by (1).

(3) No. It is a document available to all members of the public.

(4) I would refer the member to my remarks when introducing the Bill.

41. BEEF

Commonwealth Aid Scheme

Mrs CRAIG, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) What amount of funds have been made available to Western Australia under the most recent Commonwealth beef aid scheme?

(2) Has the requirement that 85% of income be derived from beef been relaxed?

(3) Is the interest rate prevailing under this new scheme 4%?

(4) Under certain circumstances of hardship will the interest payments be forgiven for a period of 12 months?

(5) (a) How soon will beef farmers be allowed to apply for these funds;

(b) to what authority will they apply;

(c) how soon will applications be processed?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

(1) to (5) The Prime Minister has advised the Premier that:

(i) $800 000 of Commonwealth money will be provided to match the announced State assistance of $800 000.

(ii) This will be available to people who are predominantly beef producers at 4% per annum over 7 years with a first year repayment holiday and interest in the first year capitalised.

Conditions of eligibility and administrative arrangements will be discussed at a meeting of Commonwealth and State Ministers next week.

42. MILK

Contracts and Boundaries

Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Further to question 28 on 17th April, 1975 would he advise whether the increased distance from a plant processing market milk and subsequent increase in transport costs will prevent some producers from consideration of obtaining market milk licenses?

(2) If "No" would he indicate whether eligible producers in the Augusta-Margaret River area would be eligible for production of market milk?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

(1) The circumstances stated would not prevent a producer from being licensed by the Dairy Industry Authority for the production of market milk. Whether he were granted a market milk quota by the authority could depend on his ability to obtain a milk collection service without adding to industry costs. That is, his willingness to pay any increased costs of transport himself would be a consideration.

(2) The Dairy Industry Authority could be expected to apply the same considerations to producers in the Augusta-Margaret River area as in other milk producing areas.

QUESTIONS (3): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. MARKETING OF EGGS ACT

Amending Legislation

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Has the Minister received any requests from the Egg Marketing Board in 1974 and/or 1975 to introduce legislation to amend the Marketing of Eggs Act?

(2) How many requests were received, and on what dates were they received?

I should add that I have given the Minister's office notice of this question.

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

(1) and (2) The honourable member should note there is a Bill on the notice paper to amend the Marketing of Eggs Act, it being order of the day No. 22.

Mr H. D. Evans: That is not the answer to the question asked.

2. PASSENGER VESSELS

Soliciting for Passengers

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Works:

(1) Has the Minister been made aware of any complaints in recent days on the Perth waterfront by representatives of various passenger vessels, in respect of touting or soliciting for fares on those passenger vessels?

(2) Has he also been made aware of physical clashes which have occurred in this area, and of personal abuse which has resulted from such clashes?

(3) Is he aware of a regulation made under the navigable waters legislation which covers nuisances on jetties? Among other things regulation 32 states that a person shall not by any means tout or solicit anyone to proceed as a passenger in any vessel or vehicle.

(4) If the Minister is not aware of the complaints that have been made, will he arrange for an investigation to be made so that inspectors of the Harbour and Light Department can visit the area in question and furnish a report?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

(1) to (4) Firstly, the honourable member himself made me aware of the fact that he intended to ask a question relating to this matter. I have to say that other than the notice given to me I am unaware of any complaint, and I am unaware of any fisticuffs. I am now aware of the regulation because the honourable member has quoted it and I will arrange to undertake an investigation.

3. LAMB MARKETING

Press Report on Statements by Minister for Agriculture

Mr CARR, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Was the Minister correctly reported in *The Albany Advertiser* of Monday, the 24th March, in relation to his meeting at Mt. Barker as saying of the lamb marketing controversy—

> . . . there was colossal pressure brought to bear by vested interests, so much so that the Premier had requested him to take the matter to Cabinet and he was obliged to do so.

And further—

> In a Cabinet where the numbers were nine to three against the Country Party it was a difficult job to get a favourable decision but his members had fought tooth and nail and had it not been for the Country Party the board would have been scrapped?

(2) If the Minister was correctly reported, is he suggesting that the nine Liberal Ministers have been excessively influenced by this "colossal pressure brought to bear by vested interests"?

(3) Does not the Minister agree that this situation demonstrates the ineffectiveness of a minority party in a coalition Government, and the inability of his party to represent country people?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

(1) to (3) How often have we heard it said, by members on the other side of the House, that one does not believe all one reads in the papers? It has been said so many times. If the particular reporter desires to report in that manner that is his business, and what I said is my business.

BEEF

Commonwealth Aid Scheme: Grievance

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [5.02 p.m.]: I have a grievance which emanates from the way in which the Western Australian beef producers have been disadvantaged when compared with their counterparts in the other States of Australia through the lack of effort and a lack of appreciation of the difficulties of the producers by the State Government. Not only is there a lack of help by the State Government, but the lack of help has brought about a

decrease in the aid which could have been given, which aid was received from the Commonwealth in the other States of Australia.

Mr Blaikie: Like South Australia.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The Commonwealth aid has been in two separate parts. Firstly, an amount of $20 million was made available at 11 per cent interest, and that money was available to beef producers who were 85 per cent dependent on beef for their incomes.

Secondly, and more recently announced, a supplementary scheme involving $18.8 million has been introduced to assist beef producers, and that money will be made available at 4 per cent interest. An additional concession is that no interest will be payable during the first 12 months of the loan which, I understand, will be over a period of seven years.

The qualification for participation in the second scheme—and this is an essential part of it—is that the Commonwealth Government would match funds which were made available to beef producers by the various State Governments. In Queensland, this amounted to $10 million; in New South Wales, $5 million; in Victoria, $2 million; and in South Australia and Tasmania provision was made for up to $1 million.

Mr Stephens: How was that money made available?

Mr H. D. EVANS: They have not received the $1 million yet. We can proceed with the fact that it is agreed Western Australia provided a sum of $800 000 and, obviously, the Commonwealth has taken into account the amount which the State has considered necessary to meet the crisis situation which has occurred. A sum of $800 000 in Western Australia has been described by one political commentator as no more than a token gesture. The State contribution of $800 000 is to be made available in loans of up to $2 500 at 5 per cent. A sum of $2 500 does not cover the interest bill on a property of 450 acres. That is the extent of the assistance given to beef producers by the Western Australian State Government.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Western Australia has been disadvantaged when the Commonwealth has taken into account the recognition of State efforts.

Mr Blaikie: It has taken the Commonwealth a long time.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I point out that the Western Australian herd comprises something in the order of 9 per cent of the Australian total.

Mr Blaikie: Leave out the bulls and stick to the facts!

Mr H. D. EVANS: We have 1 282 000 cattle in Western Australia, or in excess of 9 per cent of the Australian total. Also, something in excess of 7 per cent of the Australian total of cows and calves has been slaughtered in Western Australia.

The *pro rata* of Commonwealth aid is 4½ per cent, or slightly under, so the proportionate allocation is not there.

While the Minister will probably say it is the fault of the Commonwealth, the treatment which has been accorded Western Australia has come from the efforts of the State Government itself. The efforts were hopelessly inadequate in the first place, and that inadequacy has resulted in the action of the Commonwealth Government. The fault comes back to the State Government of Western Australia.

Because of the paltriness and parsimony of the Western Australian Government the producers in Western Australia have been very seriously affected. The failure to recognise just how seriously they have been affected was demonstrated in a statement attributed to the Premier upon his return from the southern region which differs markedly from that made by the President of the Farmers' Union who, in a Press article published on the 8th April, pointed out that in the Margaret River, Manjimup, Denmark, and Albany regions beef producers had reached a crisis point. This point apparently has not been recognised by the Government, as shown by the Press statement of the Premier and in the aid made available to those farmers.

Of course, the trouble is not just the amount the farmers have not received from the State Government, it is the amount they could have received from the Commonwealth Government at the same time. The ineptitude of the present Government in its failure to meet the most recent development in the problems of the beef industry is once again demonstrated, and is deserving of the strongest censure.

MR McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall—Minister for Agriculture) [5.08 p.m.]: The honourable member's criticism of the amount of money made available by the State Government to the beef producers who are in a situation where they have reached the point of desperation, I think reflects a lack of complete fairness on his part. For many months the Federal Government has said that it would allocate funds for distribution through various channels.

Mr H. D. Evans: The other States did not wait, as you did.

Mr McPHARLIN: The Commonwealth Government did make available a sum of $20 million through the Commonwealth Development Bank at 11½ per cent interest.

Mr Blaikie: That was as a result of the Queensland elections, too.

Mr McPHARLIN: Of course, since then only about one-third, or a little more, of that money has been used because of the high interest rate.

This matter was taken up at the Agricultural Council level where the Minister did say that the Government planned a further allocation of finance. We put forward a case for the allocation of larger sums of money, and we were talking in terms of about $100 million. We suggested that it be made available through the rural reconstruction boards or authorities in each State.

The Commonwealth Minister said he would give the matter consideration and put forward to the Federal Cabinet what he considered to be a fair proposition. The matter was deferred, so much so that the States of Queensland, New South Wales, and Victoria decided they could wait no longer. It was because of the procrastination on the part of the Federal Government that these States decided they would do something and Queensland came in with assistance of $10 million at 2½ per cent for the first 12 months, with a revision after that period. There was no assurance that the money would be available at that rate of interest for the whole term of the loan.

New South Wales came forward with $5 million and we in this State decided we, too, could wait no longer. We called a meeting of all concerned—the Pastoralists and Graziers Association, the Farmers' Union, stock firms, associated banks, the R. & I. Bank, the Treasury, the Department of Agriculture—and they gave us an assessment of the situation. As a result of that meeting we appointed a committee to work on the problem. The committee made recommendations that the amount of money referred to should be made available as quickly as possible to those people who were making applications, and who were in desperate need of some form of assistance necessary to tide them over the immediate situation.

Cases submitted will be analysed by the committee, which is already working. The committee first met last Friday. Applications will be directed to the committee for analysis and assistance will be given to those who are in need of this sort of finance.

Since then the Federal Government has allocated an amount on a dollar-for-dollar basis equal to that allocated by the States. The method of this allocation is that the Commonwealth envisaged it being directed through the rural reconstruction authorities. In answer to a question today it was said that the system will have to be worked out when the Ministers meet in Melbourne next week. So we do not know the present arrangement under which the fund will be administered but, as I said, I understand it will be through the rural reconstruction authorities.

The State made a quick decision for immediate relief without any red tape attached to it.

Mr H. D. Evans: There was nothing quick about it because it was brought to the attention of the Government last October.

Mr McPHARLIN: We believe there will be no unnecessary delay for those people who channel their applications through the committee for loans at 5 per cent.

In the case of the second scheme, the Federal Government is talking about a maximum term of seven years. After the first 12 months the scheme is to be reviewed.

I believe the criticism is unfair because the Government made money available quickly and without any undue delay in responding to the situation which exists in the beef industry, and that money will help those who are in need of it.

Mr H. D. Evans: Too little, too late.

POLICE AND CENSORSHIP

Increase in Crimes: Grievance

MR GREWAR (Roe) [5.13 p.m.]: I have a grievance which is also the grievance of a large section of the law abiding citizens within the community. One has only to read the public opinion columns in the newspapers in the past few weeks to gauge public feelings on the subject of the decay of moral standards and discipline within our society.

The pack rape by nine bikies in a Perth suburb some months ago shocked most self-respecting people. This despicable act followed a spate of crimes of this nature committed during the past decade. There has also been a dramatic increase in the number of crimes involving violence, especially by gangs, and inflicted against women and others incapable of protecting themselves.

Any crime involving the deprivation of one's freedom is abhorrent and must rank as the foulest act that man can commit against man. It illustrates the level of depravity and degenerateness to which some members of the community have sunk. No punishment is good enough for these criminals. It is my hope that no compassion or mercy will be given to those sentenced until their debt has been fully paid and their repentance is complete.

In the meantime, society has a responsibility to compensate the victims. Nothing should be spared to ensure that those innocently involved are justly compensated for the failure of society to protect them.

The rise in the crime rate in the last 20 years or so indicates that we, as parents, have gone wrong somewhere in the rearing of our children. Have we given too much freedom and too many choices to those individuals who cannot cope with them adequately? Should we now be looking at

more rigid disciplinary measures for those deviants who are unable to adjust to unlimited freedom? It is my belief that we should.

Every citizen has a responsibility to society, authority, and his fellow man. If the individual cannot learn this lesson by normal restraints, more severe forms of discipline should be applied in the schools and by society. I will be decried for suggesting a return to corporal punishment but the only discipline some people understand is physical punishment.

It is almost with guilt feelings that the law passes sentence on offenders. We must get our perspectives right and become better orientated to place law and order above the freedom of some individuals. The physical crime of brutality should surely be matched with equal treatment.

I suggest that consideration be given by society to the person offended. After all, the innocent party is the loser, whether he is the victim of violence, a criminal assault, or any other crime. The criminal, on completing his sentence, has paid his debt to society, but not to the victim of his act. It is my suggestion that where possible, and after release, the convicted person should pay the victim for his misdemeanour, in cash or in kind. The sentence should match the crime and also the damages caused by the criminal.

The type of punishment meted out by the law courts today is causing people to question the values of justice and fairness in our society.

While on the subject of sociology, I would like to make the plea that higher standards of censorship be imposed on society, especially as regards films and literature dealing with crimes of violence or human perversion. I make this plea principally on the ground that the only standards many young people have to guide them today are those which are available through the media. It could easily be construed by the young and gullible mind that what occurs in films, on television, or in printed material is normal and acceptable social behaviour.

It would be fair to say that the great majority of our young people are capable of assessing what is socially acceptable behaviour and what is not. It could be considered a form of injustice to be stricter with censorship gradings but I feel the best interests of society would be served by not exposing the general public to perverted or "kinky" films or to films in which are featured crimes of violence beyond what could be classed as socially acceptable.

It is far from my belief that we should ever again become as narrow-minded or puritanical as the Victorians. There is a midway position where the emphasis is on the quality of the material and subject, rather than on unnatural behaviour. Our society has become sick when it "pushes" films and literature which are in bad taste before consolidating values of worth.

While on this subject, I suggest that the rules of censorship be extended to the printing of slogans on T-shirts. Many of these display the most perverted and crude forms of expression one is likely to see anywhere. The evil of this type of pornography is that everyone is exposed to it. At least one has the choice of going or not going to a blue movie, and reading or not reading a smutty book; but in the case of printed T-shirts the freedom of choice is not available—we are all forced to see them.

My concern is not for the well-adjusted people in our society but for those who cannot readily sort out socially acceptable values. We tend to focus too much attention on the right of the individual, to the detriment of society as a whole. While we must recognise the right of the individual and his freedom, we must not give those aspects priority over the traditional values of society.

PRE-PRIMARY EDUCATION

Election Promises: Grievance

MR B. T. BURKE (Balga) [5.20 p.m.]: My grievance involves the very poor performance of the State Government in the field of pre-school education, and it also involves a warning to the Parliament and the people of the approaching crisis in this area.

There are 16 000 children attending some 350 pre-school centres in this State. Prior to the last election the Government promised, with regard to pre-school education, that it would encourage kindergarten attendance on a noncompulsory basis for all children. With regard to primary schools, the then Leader of the Opposition promised his Government would lower the admission age to the year in which a child turns five. Let us look at what has happened to both of those promises, before we move on to the impending crisis in pre-school education.

After 13 months in Government, the man who made those promises has been able to achieve only one thing; that is, the operation of two pre-primary centres. Not only has he failed to deliver the goods but he has also created a very inequitable and unfair situation which will become more inequitable and unfair in the near future.

Let me illustrate the situation by reference to my electorate of Balga. The parents of children attending a kindergarten within the Balga electorate are paying $3 a week. The parents of children attending a pre-primary centre just half a mile away are paying absolutely nothing. The children attending each of those facilities come from families of a very

similar nature. The Government has consistently refused to acknowledge that its policy, at the time it was announced and at the present time, is unworkable.

Mr Clarko: Is it not a good thing that pre-school education should be free to some, rather than—

Mr B. T. BURKE: It is certainly not a good thing to make promises which one cannot keep. The Government said children would enter school a year earlier than the age at which they entered school at the time the promises were made. That has not happened. What has happened is that the children of families living close to each other are being treated disproportionately. Some are being allowed to attend kindergarten at a cost to their families of $3 or $4 a week; others are going to pre-primary centres at no cost.

Mr Clarko: That is precisely why we started it.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The impending crisis is due to the inaction of a very inept Minister who told a member of the Pre-School Education Board that as far as he was concerned the board could be written off. He told the same Pre-School Education Board member that as far as he was concerned the fees for kindergartens would rise. There is no doubt that at the meeting of the council delegates of the Pre-School Education Board next Monday night the Government will be called upon to state its position unequivocally. If the Government intends to take over the activities of the Pre-School Education Board, let it say so. If it is unable to keep the promises it made in its policy speech without taking over these pre-school centres, let it say so. We will then have a fight as to whether the Government's action is correct or desirable. But please do not let the Government double-deal all the time.

In 13 months the Government has been able to provide two pre-primary centres. Working on that basis, it will take about 150 years to replace the 350 pre-school centres which are at present taking in children.

I will allude to some of the statements which have been attributed to the officer of the Education Department who is responsible to the Minister for this area of education. The officer is constantly telling members of the Pre-School Education Board that theirs is a tin-pot show. Is he reflecting the attitude of the Government? If so, does the Government not have the gumption to stand up and say the Pre-School Education Board is a tin-pot show and will be taken over?

While I am speaking about the taking over of the Pre-School Education Board, let me sound a warning to the Government. Embodied in the actions and personnel of the Pre-School Education Board are some 70 years of experience in developing flexibility to meet the special needs of children who are being educated at that age. It must also be remembered that the Pre-School Education Board fulfils a vital function in that it allows parental influence at the higher decision-making levels. If this function is to be taken over by the Education Department, can we expect the 70 years of experience now incorporated in the Pre-School Education Board to be usefully employed? Can we expect that parents will be promoted to the decision-making ranks as far as the education of their pre-school children is concerned?

Let us see this matter in perspective. The Minister has constantly denied that he intends to take over the functions of the Pre-School Education Board, yet this morning he was willing to tell a member of the board that as far as he was concerned that body was written off and fees could rise, and as far as his principal officers are concerned the Pre-School Education Board is a tin-pot show. The Government cannot fulfil its promises. If it continues at this rate, it will take 150 years to do so.

Let the Government say it intends to take over the pre-school centres which are now run by the Pre-School Education Board in order that it may fulfil its promises. There comes a time in the life of every Government when it must either put up or shut up. That time is not when it is making a policy speech, and we are now tasting the bitter fruit of that policy speech.

ROAD TRAFFIC AUTHORITY

Absorption of Shire Traffic Inspectors: Grievance

MR OLD (Katanning) [5.27 p.m.]: I am reluctant to raise this matter now.

Mr B. T. Burke: No reply?

Mr Grayden: I would welcome the opportunity.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Katanning.

Mr OLD: I feel that I would be remiss in my duty to my electors if I did not refer to the newly-formed Road Traffic Authority which is causing some concern to shires in my electorate. Indeed, it is also causing great concern to shire traffic inspectors, who could justly be described as the meat in the sandwich.

It appears to me that the spirit of the legislation is not being observed by the traffic authority, and I feel the Minister should make an investigation and issue a statement for the benefit of members in this House. I hasten to assure the House that I am convinced the Minister is as concerned as I am that the spirit of the legislation is not being interpreted correctly by the newly-formed authority, and the longer this situation is allowed

to continue the harder it will be to bring the legislation back into its proper perspective.

It was expected that by this time some part or parts of the State would have been taken over by the Road Traffic Authority and that we would have had a chance to assess the efficiency of the authority and the way it was running. However, due to the breakdown in relations between the Government and the authority this state of affairs has not been reached. I would like the matter to be expedited.

Meanwhile, some local authorities are becoming embarrassed financially by the burden placed upon them through the necessity to keep up patrol work. The old concept of shires filling the coffers with fines and thus subsiding their revenue certainly does not prevail in my electorate, and I can assure members that a number of shires can ill afford to subsidise the Road Traffic Authority today. The point I make here is that road patrol officers are currently operating within town boundaries and issuing infringement notices, and to the best of my knowledge the revenue from such infringement notices is going into Consolidated Revenue.

My understanding of the matter in the first place was that no traffic patrol officer would operate in a townsite area unless he first obtained the approval of the shire or the traffic inspector for that district.

The matter which seems to be holding up the implementation of the traffic authority is the conditions of employment of traffic inspectors. I feel this is something which should and could be resolved quickly to the mutual benefit of all parties. I do not believe the traffic inspectors are asking for any concessions to which they are not justly entitled. They seek equity in the new force with officers of the Police Force transferring into the authority, and I do not think anyone should deny that to them.

A good number of traffic inspectors probably are not entitled to any preferential treatment as they are reasonably new in the field of traffic inspection. However, there are some—and these are few in number—for whom I am concerned. I am not surprised that the Police Union is keen to protect the conditions of its members, for when all is said and done that is the objective of a union. Therefore I do not attach one iota of blame to the union for that. However, I do feel the union is unnecessarily obstructing the efforts of traffic inspectors to obtain justice in the new authority.

Surely there is no need to create a situation in which policemen transferring to the Road Traffic Authority are disadvantaged as far as promotion is concerned by the fact that we are able to give a handful of traffic inspectors rank within the new authority. Could not a system of acting rank be implemented within the authority which would not necessarily have any effect on the establishment of the Police Force? It is well known that during the war acting rank was conferred upon members of the services and it in no way impaired the opportunities for promotion of those people serving in the permanent arms of the services. I cannot see why that could not be done in this case.

I find it hard to believe that the Road Traffic Authority has made a genuine effort to solve the problem. I know meetings have been held between the interested parties, but it seems to me that the only people prepared to concede anything are the traffic inspectors. They have offered to allow their years of service to be calculated on a *pro rata* basis for entry into the authority. In a submission from the Institute of Highway Patrolmen a suggestion was made that as after five years of satisfactory service in the Police Force an officer can expect to attain the rank of first-class constable, a traffic inspector with 10 years of continuous service should be accorded the same rank. I understand that a member of the Police Force can expect to attain the rank of senior constable after nine to 11 years of service, and it is suggested that traffic inspectors should achieve this rank after 15 years of service. It is reasonable to assume that a policeman can attain the rank of third-class sergeant after 13 to 15 years of service, and it is suggested that traffic inspectors should attain the same rank after 20 years of service.

I do not think the traffic inspectors are asking too much. It is inconceivable that these men should be required to enter the new authority as first-year constables, regardless of their experience and service. This is a situation which will be faced only once in the life of the authority, because once the traffic inspectors are admitted to the authority they will become part of it and any future recruitment will be purely a normal police-type operation.

Some of the men concerned are amongst the most experienced traffic operators in the State. In fact, many junior policemen have been the recipients of their advice and help whilst on duty at country police stations or on country traffic patrols. Surely such experience should not go unrecognised.

During the debate on the Road Traffic Bill on several occasions the Minister for Traffic gave an assurance to the House regarding the employment of shire traffic inspectors. Such assurances may be found in *Hansard* of the 30th October and the 12th November, 1974. On the 30th October, in reply to a query I raised, the Minister said—

> The member for Katanning asked for some details in connection with the conditions of employment of inspectors, and I think I have covered

that point. I give an assurance that we do not intend adversely to affect anyone, but to take them all if possible. If some are over-age or are in similar category problems will be created, but we will certainly study the situation to see what can be done.

The SPEAKER: The member has three minutes.

Mr OLD: Those remarks of the Minister were reassuring to members, and I am certain they were made in all sincerity. I am convinced of this by statements the Minister made during visits to shires in my electorate when he indicated that he is as keen as I am to see these men fairly treated.

I do not intend to labour the point, so I shall conclude with an appeal to the Minister to hasten a decision on this matter in view of the fact that within the next five weeks I understand some members of near-metropolitan traffic authorities will be taken over by the new authority. Naturally those concerned are very apprehensive regarding the conditions under which they will be employed. Therefore, I ask the Minister to give the matter his urgent attention.

PRE-PRIMARY EDUCATION

Election Promises: Grievance

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Labour and Industry) [5.35 p.m.]: A little earlier the member for Balga made some comments in respect of the Pre-School Education Board. I did not rise immediately he resumed his seat because I expected another member to rise. Quite apart from that, I was also hesitant to rise because most of his comments amounted to nothing more than cheap abuse of the Minister for Education.

The point I want to make is this: The member for Balga referred to Mr Gregg, an officer of the board; and most of the matters raised by the member apparently arose from a personal conversation between Mr Gregg and the Minister for Education. I am not aware of precisely what was said, but no doubt the Minister for Education at a later date will take the opportunity to read the remarks of the member for Balga and will adequately reply to them.

However, I want to make the point that the remarks of the member for Balga highlight the difficulties the Minister for Education experiences in dealing with the Pre-School Education Board, or members of the Board.

Point of Order

Mr B. T. BURKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I made no reference to receiving information from any person named by myself during my speech. I wonder whether it is proper for the Minister to attach his own name to my source of information.

The SPEAKER: The Minister may make an explanation.

Grievances Resumed

Mr GRAYDEN: It highlights the difficulty the Minister experiences in dealing with the Pre-School Education Board and its members when personal conversations are leaked in this manner.

Mr B. T. Burke: The truth came out.

Mr GRAYDEN: It is a disgraceful state of affairs that a Minister cannot deal with a board of this kind without information being channeled to people like the member for Balga. I do not know where he got the information. Why does he not let me know by way of interjection?

Mr B. T. Burke: The Minister is afraid to say anything in public.

Mr GRAYDEN: The member should own up to the House and state where he got the information, because his remarks were based on a personal conversation. However, he expects those on this side of the House to answer the sort of rubbish he speaks. I again ask the member for Balga to disclose the source of his information.

Mr B. T. Burke: You have not denied that the Minister made the statement.

Mr O'Neil: You would not have said it if the Minister for Education were in this Chamber and able to reply.

Mr GRAYDEN: The Minister for Education will have the opportunity to read the remarks of the member for Balga and will be able to sheet home the blame to the responsible person. I again emphasise that this situation highlights the difficulty with which the Minister is faced.

The SPEAKER: Grievances noted.

BILLS (2): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Public Trustee Act Amendment Bill.

   Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr O'Neil (Minister for Works), read a first time.

2. Health Act Amendment Bill.

   Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr Ridge (Minister for Lands), read a first time.

BILLS (3): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Companies Act (Interstate Corporate Affairs Commission) Amendment Bill.

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

2. Acts Amendment (State Energy Commission) Bill.

   Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Mensaros (Minister for Fuel and Energy), and read a first time.

3. Small Claims Tribunals Act Amendment Bill.

   Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Grayden (Minister for Consumer Affairs), and read a first time.

BILLS (6): THIRD READING

1. Factories and Shops Act Amendment Bill.
2. Hairdressers Registration Act Amendment Bill.

   Bills read a third time, on motions by Mr Grayden (Minister for Labour and Industry), and transmitted to the Council.

3. Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act Amendment Bill.

   Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Rushton (Minister for Local Government) and transmitted to the Council.

4. Environmental Protection Act Amendment Bill.

   Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Stephens (Minister for Conservation and Environment), and transmitted to the Council.

5. Anzac Day Act Amendment Bill.
6. Reserve (Kwinana Freeway) Bill.

   Bills read a third time, on motions by Mr O'Neil (Minister for Works), and transmitted to the Council.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Labour and Industry) [5.46 p.m.]: I move—

> That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie [5.47 p.m.]: I would like an assurance from the Minister, representing his colleague, the Minister for Education in another place, that he drew that Minister's attention to my remarks yesterday evening when I used this Bill as a vehicle to criticise the Government for its long delay in coming to grips with the problem of allowances — now cum-scholarships — for the training of teachers at the various training institutions. Will the Minister advise whether he has, in fact, drawn the attention of the Minister for Education to my comments so that we may, perhaps wishfully, and at least hopefully, obtain some favourable decision?

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Labour and Industry) [5.48 p.m.]: I cannot accept the statement that there has been a long delay on this question. The Minister has had it under consideration for a long time for good reason. I have not had the opportunity to draw the attention of the Minister for Education to the remarks made by the member for Kalgoorlie, but I will certainly give him the assurance that I will.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILLS (2): THIRD READING

1. Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages Act Amendment Bill.
2. Registration of Identity of Persons Bill.

   Bills read a third time, on motions by Mr Stephens (Chief Secretary), and transmitted to the Council.

NATIONAL SONG AND NATIONAL ANTHEM

Use at Functions: Motion

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.50 p.m.]: I move—

> In the opinion of this House, in the State of Western Australia, the playing of the National song "Advance Australia Fair" should supersede the playing of "God Save the Queen" at all functions, the only exceptions to be where the Queen, her representative, or a member of the royal family is the official guest, when the anthem "God Save the Queen" will have precedence.

In moving this motion I do so without any disrespect for any monarch, head of State or for any other persons who may consider such a matter to be repugnant when brought before them.

I believe we have to come to grips with this situation before long, otherwise we will cause confusion among the people of this State, which is quite unnecessary. Indeed, I would have preferred to have the debate on this motion a little earlier so that we could have made a determination prior to the forthcoming Anzac Day activities, as many bands and members of organisations will be assembled to play or to hear various hymns, national anthems, and so on during the respective Anzac Day services. I feel that the members of those organisations would like to have some guidance as to exactly where we are heading in regard to this matter.

On a number of occasions the Premier has said that he will not have a bar of "Advance Australia Fair" being played as our national song or anthem—whatever

we may call it—and prefers that we continue to recognise "God Save the Queen" as our national anthem. That may be his personal opinion, but I do not know from where he gets it or what deep-rooted association he has with the anthem of "God Save the Queen" as against an anthem or a song associated specifically with Australia.

First and foremost, we are all, basically, classed as Australians. This has been so for a long time; as a matter of fact, since about 1901 when the Constitution of Australia, by action of the Whitehall Parliament determined that we were a separate entity. Since then we have moved along on our own fairly well, subject, of course, to our ethnic ties with the people of the United Kingdom with whom the majority of Australians are still associated as a result of their backgrounds. Many migrants, of course, have existing associations, but other Australians have associations with the United Kingdom through parents, grandparents, great grandparents, and some have associations even further back than that.

However, despite all this, once a country cuts its ties with its mother country and is on its own to make its own way in the world and to take action unilaterally in the United Nations or in any other world council, surely it is entitled to have some degree of national spirit through the medium of a national song, national anthem, or whatever one cares to call it.

It is passing strange that of the 34 nations constituting the British Commonwealth of Nations, only two, recently granted independent status, have no national song; they are Granada in 1974 and the Bahamas in 1973. With the exception of those two Commonwealth nations, the other 32 of longer standing have all taken some action to adopt a national song or anthem of their own. There is an exception among that number which I will deal with later in my speech; that is Fiji. Because of the attitudes adopted by these various countries I intend to indicate to the House the national anthems or songs of the various countries to show the nationalism that is inherent in the various national tunes that have been adopted by them.

To our way of thinking no doubt, some of the titles will appear to be fairly corny. The first of these titles reminds me of the attitude that we may adopt. Nevertheless the country in question feels that this is desirable, I suppose.

The first country I mention is Bangladesh. It has "My Bangal of Gold, I Love You." Barbados has a tune titled "Barbados"; Botswana has "Fetshe la rana"; Canada has "God Save the Queen" and "O Canada" as its national song. Canada uses "God Save the Queen" only in the presence of the Queen when she is visiting that country. On all other occasions "O Canada" is used as the national song, in the two languages that are spoken in that country—depending on the area in which the national song is played—that is, in English and in French.

Mr Blaikie: That is Canada's national song?

Mr JAMIESON: Yes, or anthem. Some countries refer to it as an anthem, and some refer to it as a song. The difference is that an anthem has an ode recognising the god of the country in question. In some countries, because of religious problems, it would be natural for such an ode to be avoided, because if such an anthem were played in one part of the country it could be taken as an offence by the people there, and if played in another part it could be recognised that the anthem was used in deference to a god more than the country concerned.

It is interesting to note that Cyprus does not use "God Save the Queen". It is one of the 32 nations in the British Commonwealth of Nations that uses the national anthem of Greece, no less, as its national anthem. I am not certain whether Cyprus has its own words to that anthem, but it is the Greek national anthem that is recognised in that country.

Earlier I mentioned Fiji. This is one of the few countries that does use "God Save the Queen" as its national anthem but in such circumstances that "God Save the Queen" is played first on State occasions, followed immediately by "Blessing Grant O God of Nations on these isles of Fiji." Therefore Fiji has a joint national anthem—"God Save the Queen" and its own anthem.

Gambia has as its national anthem "The Gambia"; Ghana has "Ghana"; Guyana has "Guyana"; India has "Jana-gana-mana", but "Vande Mataram" has equal status with that national anthem. India cannot separate them. Jamaica has "Jamaica"; Kenya has "Kenya"; Lesotho has "Lesotho"; Malawi has "O God Bless Malawi"; Malaysia has "Negara Ku"; Malta has "Innu Malti"; and Mauritius has "Motherland". In Mauritius this national anthem is played after "God Save the Queen" when the Queen or her special representative—but not the Governor-General—is present, or when musical honours accompany the Loyal Toast.

Mr Blaikie: You are doing very well.

Mr JAMIESON: Thank you. New Zealand uses "God Defend New Zealand" as its national song, but it does play "God Save the Queen" in the presence of members of royalty or the Governor-General. Otherwise, on all occasions, including sporting events, "God Defend New Zealand" is sung.

In Nigeria the national anthem is "Nigeria"; in Sierra Leone it is "Sierra Leone"; in Singapore it is "Majulah Singapura"; in Sri Lanka it is "Namo Namo Matha"; in Swaziland it is "Swaziland"; and in Tanzania it is "Mungo Ibariki Afrika". In Tonga the national anthem is "Tonga"; in Trinidad and Tobago it is "Trinidad and Tobago"; in Uganda it is "Uganda"; in Western Samoa it is "The Flag of Freedom"; and in Zambia it is "Zambia".

I did mention Granada as being one of the latest States which has joined the British Commonwealth. There is some doubt whether it uses "God Save the Queen", but my research has not brought to light the exact situation there.

So far as is known in the Bahamas, which only recently became an individual State, "God Save the Queen" is used.

A nation does not decide lightly to use a different tune, hymn, song, or anthem. As early as 1941 Malta had its own national anthem and as recently as 1968 some of the other nations changed their anthems. As the nations have reached a state of independence, they have felt it desirable to have an anthem to call their own. No doubt this has been because of a degree of national pride they have developed in their own community, but, as I have said, the decision has not been made lightly or without some definite reason.

I think it advisable to record the attempts which have been made to establish a suitable anthem or song in Australia. The earliest attempt was made in 1826 when John Danmore Long composed and published the "Australian Anthem and Australian Hymn", but it was not very well received. Then, "Advance Australia" was described as the Australian national anthem in 1946. This anthem is not to be confused with "Advance Australia Fair" which was a different one altogether.

In 1961 Carl Linger tried with "The Song of Australia". Then there was formerly an anthem of Queensland. A revised version was composed in 1880 and sung to the tune of "God Save the Queen". By this I mean that different words were sung to the same tune.

In 1903, 74 entries were received for a national anthem competition, the first prize being £2 2s. Apparently those offering the money did not consider the competition worthy of a very high prize. It was shared between J. Alexander Allen for his "Battle Hymn" and a person known as "Gumtree" for a song "The Cross and the Great White Star".

Although many people were trying hard, the overall opinion was against a national anthem. In 1913 the Musical Association of NSW offered £200 in prizes for the production of a national anthem and the one judged best of these was written by Arthur H. Adams for his "Fling Out the Flag", and he received £100 for his efforts, but still the people of Australia would not accept it.

The next reference to a national anthem was on the 11th April, 1933, when J. T. Lang, then the Leader of the Opposition in New South Wales, rebuked the people of Lidcombe in that State for not respecting "Advance Australia Fair" when it was played at a function he attended. He evidently assumed that, having been the Premier of the State, he had a right to stipulate that "Advance Australia Fair" should be the recognised Australian song or anthem. It was composed about 1878 by Peter Dodd McCormick under the pen name of "Amicus". He was a Scot and this was probably the reason that for many years the Presbyterian Church received the royalties from the tune, but I will deal with that aspect later.

"Advance Australia Fair" was first sung as a patriotic song at a St. Andrew's Day celebration in New South Wales in 1878. It will be recalled that during the war years the late Arthur Calwell endeavoured to popularise it by having it introduced as a signature tune for the ABC news programme and indeed this was the situation for a considerable time until the Labor Government left the Treasury bench in Canberra and the Menzies Government assumed office. Then of course it was changed. Many of the older members will recall that Arthur Calwell vowed that when the Labor Government was returned to office "Advance Australia Fair" would be restored as the signature tune for the ABC news. However that has not come to pass. It is interesting to note that considerable debate ensued and concern was expressed in the national Parliament of that day as to the reason the tune was no longer used.

The Prime Minister of the day gave some rather weird answers to questions on the matter and indeed one of the answers was that he felt that as the copyright of the tune was held by the Presbyterian Church the playing of it on the ABC news programme could be construed as indicating that the Government was assisting a religious body, thus contravening the Constitution. That long bow was drawn, but it was certainly one of the reasons given at the time by Robert Gordon Menzies as to why the tune should not be adopted.

The ABC continued to play the tune for a time, as I mentioned, as the signature tune during the war years and for some time afterwards. Indeed, as Minister for Information, Mr Calwell was successful in persuading picture theatres to introduce it in 1943, but after a while most theatres decided to drop the tune and to use "God Save the Queen".

In 1948 another competition was held and this time the ABC offered a prize of £70 which Marie E. J. Pitt won for her "Ave Australia". That apparently was not popular because other than having seen a reference to it in official records, I cannot recall having heard of it even though it was composed not long ago.

In 1951 the Commonwealth Jubilee competition resulted in "This Land of Mine" by John Wheeler, but this met a similar fate to that of "Ave Australia".

In 1956 when the Olympic Games were being planned for Australia, the powers that be realised the necessity to play the national anthem of the nations which were victorious in the events. The national anthem is played as the victor is decorated on the dais. Although a great deal of thought was given to the matter nobody was able to make a decision. At the time it was suggested that "Advance Australia Fair" or "Waltzing Matilda" should be used. The subject was even raised in Federal Parliament where an alteration was again vetoed by the then Prime Minister Menzies, and further action was not taken.

So, from a reference to the annals of history in Australia it will be realised that although many endeavours have been made to produce something with unique popular appeal, no-one has yet been successful. The more popular choice has been "Advance Australia Fair" because of its Australian content.

I do not know the reason behind the choice of those who want to retain "God Save the Queen" as against "Advance Australia Fair". For jingoism at its best I suggest they refer to the second verse of both these songs. The second verse of "God Save the Queen" reads—

O Lord our God arise,
Scatter her enemies,
And make them fall:
Confound their politics,
Frustrate their knavish tricks,
On Thee our hopes we fix:
God save us all.

I think, though, that the jingoism of the second verse of "Advance Australia Fair" would take the prize. That verse reads—

When gallant Cook from Albion sail'd,
To trace wide oceans o'er,
True British courage bore him on
Till he landed on our shore.
Then here he raised old England's flag,
The standard of the brave;
With all her faults we love her still—
"Britannia rules the wave".

We could not get anything more jingoistic than that. If it is jingoism we want, that out-jingoes anything in "God Save the Queen".

Mr Blaikie: Could you put that to a tune to give us a better feeling?

Mr JAMIESON: If the Premier were here with his trumpet he may be able to oblige, but for my music abilities I must score one of his zeros, which I will probably score from him anyway for raising this matter.

If we are worried about offending the Crown by adopting one as against the other, I think if we study the verbiage we would probably come down on the side of "Advance Australia Fair" because it still is very loyal to our British background; not that I worry much about the wording because, as a rule with the anthems, only the first verse is used. As a matter of fact usually it is only the air which is the status symbol.

I have said quite a deal about "Advance Australia Fair" and I think it is fitting that we should examine the background of "God Save the Queen" and the tune associated with it. Its origin seems to be obscure, although in the John Bull manuscript of 1619 there was a song which could be likened to it. It had been altered a great deal since that time. The fact remains that there is an indication that even before that date a similar tune had been sung.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr JAMIESON: Prior to the suspension I was mentioning the fact that "God Save the Queen" was originally a folk music tune in Britain and gradually developed as a national anthem. The information available on its origin in the United Kingdom is in doubt because at the same time the tune was developed on the continent and, indeed, the French and the Germans had a tune—folk music—which ran to the same beat as "God Save the Queen". So nobody knows really where it originated.

In more modern times the American people developed a tune, with a martial air, which runs to the same tempo. So, the origin of the tune is very difficult to determine and it is one of those things which has developed. I am only mentioning these points to demonstrate that it is something which grew like Topsy; it is not something which was specially written by a poet laureate and put to music. It is something which has been acquired over the years.

I am no expert on music and I do not know, as a musical score, how "Advance Australia Fair" rates. I assume it is not very high, but at least it is original to Australia and it has come to the fore time and time again. Despite the fact that endeavours have been made to impose other tunes on the public of Australia none has lasted for very long at all. Indeed, it is of interest to note that the tune of "God Save the Queen" is used also by the Swiss as their national anthem.

To confuse the issue by using a similar tune for so many different national anthems does not help us very much. I suggest it is high time we adopted our own tune as other countries have done.

I point out the situation which exists at sporting events, such as the Empire Games. When a competitor from one of the other 34-odd countries wins an event the national tune or national anthem of that country is played. However, when one of our athletes wins an event in which a member of the United Kingdom competes, we play the United Kingdom national anthem. That seems unreal.

I do not know that we should be so presumptuous at this stage of our history to say that we should retain "God Save the Queen" as our national anthem because I do not think we are entitled to do that. The United Kingdom is not likely ever to say that we shall not use it, because of our background and association with that country. However, without being disrespectful, I point out that 34 other nations have seen fit to choose something which symbolises their own countries. The least that can be said is that "Advance Australia Fair" does symbolise Australia.

I hope good sense will prevail in regard to this. Whether we adopt "Advance Australia Fair", or whether something better comes along, we should be looking for general agreement so that we will know exactly when the national anthem of the United Kingdom should be played and when the accredited national anthem of Australia should be played.

If we are to play around with this matter on the basis of who is in control of the Treasury bench in Canberra it will only lead to further confusion. The situation will be stupid. I do not think the present Prime Minister of Australia has rushed into this matter. In the first place, he indicated his position very clearly. On the 7th November, 1973, while answering a question in the House of Representatives, the Prime Minister said—

> During the election campaign last November I undertook that if my Party were elected to government a quest would be held for a distinctly Australian national anthem. A statement was made by me to the same effect for Australia Day, 26 January. There had been no subsequent demur until some synthetic indignation was stirred up in the last week or so. In the meantime arrangements have been made for the Statistician next February to hold a larger poll than has ever been held on any subject—60,000 people will participate—on whether 'Advance Australia Fair', 'Waltzing Matilda', or 'Song of Australia' should be that anthem. When the Queen is visiting Australia 'God Save the Queen' will be played. All this has been made plain for the last 12 months.

Mr Watt: That is where the biggest objection to the system occurred. "God Save the Queen" was not included in the list.

Mr JAMIESON: Nor do I think it should have been; that is the point I am making. If it had been included people for various reasons, may have chosen it in preference to other tunes. However, it certainly would not be something distinctive to Australia; it would be part of the heritage of some other country. I say again we are being presumptuous when we say we will impose the United Kingdom national anthem on the people of our country. Australia is independent of Great Britain, and votes independently of that country in matters of foreign policy, and on all other matters. However, we still symbolise a tune associated with Great Britain.

Mr Sodeman: What if the majority of the population want to retain it?

Mr JAMIESON: I do not think they would, if the case were put to them in a rational way.

Mrs Craig: Why not place "God Save the Queen" on the list?

Mr JAMIESON: I suggest that in the case of the 34-odd countries I mentioned earlier, if the people had been asked whether they wanted to retain "God Save the Queen" they probably would have said they did. However, that does not justify the retention of the tune because, the people of those countries were part of the colonisation of the world and when they broke away as separate entities they retained the anthem of their mother country until their own was developed. Canada and New Zealand have got away from it, and those countries are occupied by the same sorts of people as we have in Australia. They are not disloyal or disrespectful to the Crown, which seems to be the impression of Government members. It seems that if a proposition such as this is accepted we are moving away from loyalty to the Crown.

When the present Australian Government did get around to doing something about its election promise it looked at the possibility of a national anthem contest, but it was advised against that course for the very reason I mentioned earlier. That method had been tried many times and it had failed. A number of anthems were suggested but nobody wanted them because they had not grown up with the country as, evidently, "Advance Australia Fair" did.

The Bureau of Census and Statistics conducted a poll and experts interviewed members of the public. The result was that "Advance Australia Fair" received 51.4 per cent of the vote; "Waltzing Matilda", 19.6 per cent of the vote; and "Song

of Australia", 13.6 per cent of the vote. The result of the poll was announced by Mr Whitlam on the 7th November, 1973.

The matter reached the stage where one would have thought a decision could be made and we could accept "Advance Australia Fair" and try it out as the national anthem of the Australian people. But party politics came into it and Premiers in the various States, including our own Premier, began objecting to it. Perhaps the lyrics of "God Save the Queen" rate higher than those of "Advance Australia Fair"; but I read out the second verses of both songs and I am sure it will be agreed that the lyrics in the second verse of "Advance Australia Fair" were more appropriate to the United Kingdom than the lyrics in the second verse of "God Save the Queen". One does not know where the opposition to the change is coming from unless it is a matter of party politics.

It will not help the people of this State or any other State to adopt out of cussedness, because the Labor Government is in office in Canberra at the present time, the attitude that "God Save the Queen" must be retained as the national anthem. Obviously the Prime Minister had the sanction of the people for doing what he indicated he would do about the matter. Had I been in his position, I would not have included, "God Save the Queen" because I think it belongs to another country, and we might as well have retained it as our anthem and put up with all the difficulties that would be involved as a result.

I mentioned all the countries which have adopted the same tune. If a Swiss or a British person wins an event at the Olympic Games, the same tune is played. I do not think we should adopt a diehard attitude in relation to one particular tune or another, and I am not in a position to criticise it from a musical point of view. The tune is no longer under copyright. The Presbyterian Church's rights to it expired in 1969 and it is now public property. Perhaps we could use it until such time as we find a more suitable tune. In the future one might grow upon Australia.

Our experience in this country has been that in the past people have put forward many different songs—amongst them "The Song of Australia"—in response to competitions, but none of them has clicked and I daresay in these circumstances they never will. The titles of the national anthems of most other nations include the name of the country. I think this is one feature in favour of "Advance Australia Fair". It indicates that this is a young country which is moving forward, and that is the impression we want to convey abroad.

I think I have said all I need to say about the matter. I do not think we can do any further research to find out why any other tune should be adopted at this juncture or why "Advance Australia Fair" should not be adopted.

As a matter of fact, "Advance Australia Fair" has been adopted, although it is clearly meeting with problems. The Prime Minister recently announced in *The Bulletin* that the bands of all the armed services must play the accepted Australian anthem on Anzac Day—the one adopted by the Government of the day, which is "Advance Australia Fair" and not "God Save the Queen". Many of the returned servicemen's organisations are taking the attitude that this is a form of disloyalty. I quickly deny that and suggest it is one of those cases where there is always opposition when it is sought to change an established habit, whether it be genuine opposition or merely related to the fact that people do not understand the reason for the change.

Another feature is that organisations can be placed in an awkward situation. Representatives of both the State and Federal Parliaments attended the San Nicola ball the other night, and the organisers were confused about what was to be played as the national anthem. In view of the fact that the Prime Minister was present, they were advised that "Advance Australia Fair" should be played, and I understand it was played. The point is that if the matter is not sorted out soon we will have the stupid situation that when a representative of the Federal Government visits a district "Advance Australia Fair" will be played, and when a representative of the State Government visits a district "God Save the Queen" will be played.

The local people should not be expected to have to keep up with the machinations of party politics, which are not really important enough to be involved in this kind of argument. It would be far better to give "Advance Australia Fair" a trial as the national anthem.

I have moved the motion for those reasons. I think it is clear to everybody what it is all about. I will read it to the House again, and leave it at that—

> In the opinion of this House, in the State of Western Australia, the playing of the National song "Advance Australia Fair" should supersede the playing of "God Save The Queen" at all functions, the only exceptions to be where the Queen, her representative, or a member of the royal family is the official guest, when the anthem "God Save the Queen" will have precedence.

I think the motion gives a clear indication that there will be no disrespect. When the Governor or a member of the royal family is present, "God Save the Queen" will be played, and when no representative

of the Queen is present people will know it is correct to play "Advance Australia Fair".

Mr BERTRAM: I second the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr O'Neil (Minister for Works).

KWINANA FREEWAY EXTENSION

Summoning of Witnesses to the Bar of the House: Motion

MR A. R. TONKIN (Morley) [7.48 p.m.]: I move—

> That the following be summoned to the Bar of this House on a date to be fixed to give evidence relating to the construction of a southern extension to the Kwinana Freeway and matters relating thereto:
>
> Dr Edward Maslen of 31 Roebuck Drive, Manning
>
> Prof. Martyn Webb of 102 Circe Circle, Dalkeith
>
> Cr Paul Ritter of 76 Brookton Highway, Kelmscott
>
> Prof. Desmond C. O'Connor of 118 Forrest Street, South Perth
>
> Mr Gordon Barrett-Hill of 8 Bindaring Parade, Claremont
>
> Mr Lauchlan Miller of 19 Larundel Road, City Beach
>
> Dr Alison Baird of 9A View Street, Peppermint Grove
>
> Dr Brian W. Logan of 18 Alness Street, Applecross
>
> Dr Byron Lamont of 12 Flamingo Run, Burrendah
>
> Mr L. A. Tilly of 195 The Esplanade, Mt Pleasant
>
> Mr George H. Playford of 184 Lockhart Street, Como.

This seems to be a radical departure as far as this Parliament is concerned. I do not know why it should be radical to seek the opinions of experts. I might add that I think the Minister for Transport made the comment that he thought some of the people on the list were rather biased and that it was not a very balanced list.

Of course, I point out there is nothing to stop the Government moving a similar resolution to bring to the bar of the House people it thinks fit to give evidence. I did not in actual fact include civil servants in my list, and that is probably an omission; I included only the names of people who had indicated their willingness to come here, although of course, this Parliament can summon to the bar anyone at all.

I believe it is the first time that such a motion has been moved in this House. People have been brought to the bar of the House for contempt of parliamentary privilege, but not to give expert opinion. The Premier stated that by calling these people to give evidence, the place would become a shambles; that is, similar to the floor of a slaughterhouse. I do not know how Parliament would be reduced to a shambles if we called very eminent people here to give evidence. They would be asked questions by members of the House, through you, Mr Speaker, and I am sure you would not allow the place to degenerate into a shambles.

Indeed, my motion does not arise out of of the standing orders of the Australian Labor Party, but under the provisions of the Standing Orders of this Parliament. The people who drew up our Standing Orders obviously thought that at some time in the future the Parliament might want to know what the experts have to say on a particular subject. Apparently the Government does not want to know what the experts think, because I asked the question of the Premier and he said that the place would be a shambles. So we are to stumble on, blindly making up our minds without valuable information, or perhaps I should say that the Government, with its numbers, will pass measures through the House irrespective of what the Opposition says. The time has come to wonder whether there should be an Opposition at all.

Mr Nanovich: You would hardly think so, the way it has been the last 12 months.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: We will finish up with a one-party Government such as we have seen in some countries of the world —the Opposition is deported, shot, or put out of business—because we are not given the information, and no notice is taken of our arguments in any case.

If we could hear expert opinion given at the bar of the House, we could truly make up our minds. However, it seems that this Parliament will continue to be a farce, because of the attitude of the Premier. We will not be permitted to enter our deliberations in a proper manner such as occurs in the House of Commons, which is supposed to be the mother of Parliaments—although I think if she looked at this offspring, she would wish it had been aborted. Certainly we are not following the best practices of the House of Commons which introduced a committee system in 1882. Obviously the members of that Parliament wanted to know the opinions of experts.

I want to know why the Government is afraid of our having this knowledge. Does the Government fear that if we have some information we may be able to change the course of events? I believe Parliament is being treated with contempt—

Mr Bertram: And the people.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: —and as a consequence the people are being treated with contempt. This is supposed to be the place where the representatives of the people meet. I believe the people are not getting their money's worth from this Parliament;

they are not getting their money's worth because we do not have a proper committee system, and we cannot even bring witnesses to the bar of the House. We are denied knowledge.

I believe Parliament should take its responsibilities seriously. It is claimed that Parliament is sovereign; agreements are brought here, amendments to the metropolitan region scheme are brought here, but the whole thing is a joke because we know the Government decides on agreements and amendments before it lays them on the Table of the House, and it does not matter what we say from then on, we may as well go home, because the Government will use its numbers. We all know that, so what are we doing here? What am I doing here?

We now have a genuine one-party State, and because of that, Parliament has been emasculated, and it has lost any semblance of what it should be. I believe the Government is to blame for this because, by using its numbers, it has refused to allow people to be brought to the bar of the House, and it has refused to establish a genuine committee system. Of course I can understand the Government back-benchers supporting their leaders in this way, because they are lazy and they do not want a committee system to be instituted.

Mr Nanovich: At least they have some sense to know what they are talking about.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Parliament has been treated with contempt.

Mr Grayden: You are a bloody ratbag!

Points of Order

Mr H. D. EVANS: I rise on a point of order. The member for Morley may not take exception to the fact that the Minister called him a ratbag, but I do, and I would like the remark withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: Which member said this?

Mr H. D. EVANS: The Minister for Labour and Industry.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Minister for Labour and Industry to withdraw the term as it is offensive.

Mr GRAYDEN: I withdraw the remark.

The SPEAKER: The member for Morley.

Mr Grayden: He cannot get away from cheap abuse. He would not have the courage to come outside to do something about it.

Mr Nanovich: I could not agree with you more.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I wish to address myself to a question of privilege that has arisen. Mr Speaker, you have heard that the Minister for Labour and Industry, a Minister of the Crown, has suggested that I should come outside to sort things out. Now, Mr Speaker—

Mr Rushton: You called all our members lazy, and that is offensive too.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: —I believe that the remarks are interfering with my duty, as a member of Parliament, to speak as I see fit.

Mr Grayden: Just keep off the cheap abuse, that is all you have to do and we will get along much better.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: We have the Minister for Labour and Industry threatening physical violence, and I believe that is a breach of parliamentary privilege.

Mr Sodeman: You are misinterpreting it; he asked you to come outside to discuss it.

Mr Jamieson: What shower did you come down in?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: This is a matter of privilege. If members of the Opposition or members of the Government, for that matter, are to be subjected to threats of physical violence as we have heard here tonight from the Minister for Labour and Industry, we have reached a sorry state. This is not the first time that the Minister has threatened me personally.

Mr Grayden: I am not prepared to sit here to listen to that type of abuse from you.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Therefore, I would like to hear a determination from you, Sir, on this matter of privilege which has suddenly arisen, because certainly, as I indicated, this is a one-party State. The Opposition is prevented from obtaining information, and certainly it is a one-party State if members of Parliament and Ministers of the Crown—people holding the highest office under the Crown—are going to resort to physical intimidation. This is the type of situation to be found in the blackest of black Africa.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr A. R. TONKIN: If that is so. I would like to hear your ruling on this matter Mr Speaker. It is a matter of grave concern. We find, going back through the centuries, in various Parliaments this question of the right of a member of Parliament to speak as he sees fit—subject, of course, to Standing Orders, and subject to your request, Sir—has been jealously guarded. A very grave precedent has been set in this Parliament; I never thought I should live to see the day when a Minister of the Crown would act in such a way.

The SPEAKER: I presume this is in the form of a point of order?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: That is right, Mr Speaker.

Speaker's Ruling

The SPEAKER: I rule there has been no attempt to stop the member for Morley from making his speech. At times in this House I have mentioned the fact to members of the Chamber that there have been what appeared to be attempts to really prevent a member from making himself heard, and I have appealed to members to allow a member to make his speech. This is a place wherein a member may be heard, and must be heard, no matter whether his views are agreed or disagreed with.

I do not like any threats; but this form of threat has been used over a long period. There is nothing to stop the member for Morley from rejecting it and ignoring the matter completely. I rule that there has been no attempt to intimidate the member and to prevent him speaking in this Chamber.

Debate Resumed

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Thank you, Sir. As I was saying, I believe it is not in the interests of back-benchers on the Government side to have a committee system.

Mr Nanovich: It is. We have one.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: If it is in the interests of the member for Toodyay, when will he move to have a system instituted?

So we have a situation in which members opposite are quite content to sit back and not take their parliamentary obligations seriously, because they will not agree to a committee system. We have a Government using an iron fist to prevent proper information being given to members of the Opposition. I believe in a proper system of committees, because Parliament would be more knowledgeable.

Mr Clarko: Once again, why didn't your Government do something about it between 1971 and 1974?

Mr Bertram: We did plenty. You cannot build the world in one day.

Mr Clarko: Why didn't you do it?

The SPEAKER: The member for Morley.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: We have no committee system in this place and there will be no such system—

Mr Clarko: There is a committee now.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: —while the Government continues to operate as it is at present.

Mr Clarko: We already have the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Mr Speaker, do you think I might be able to be heard?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morley.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: We have no committee system and we will not have one because members on the Government side refuse to allow it. The Ministers are busy; they hold the reins of power, and they are not interested in seeing to it that the Opposition can become an alternative Government by making available to it the knowledge it should have. The back-benchers opposite are sitting pretty and are not interested in attempting to alter the situation, because that would mean more work for them.

Mr Nanovich: How can we believe in a proposal like the one you are putting forward? Your proposal is like a pair of trousers without a backside.

Mr Jamieson: The performing horse is at it again.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morley.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: I believe there is a great difference between information publicly given and that which is secretly given. It has been stated that it is quite possible for members of this House to speak to officers of the Main Roads Department in respect of a matter that is relevant to this motion; but very often information gleaned in that manner cannot be attributed to its source. It is not possible to quote the Commissioner of Main Roads or any other officer if he does not wish to be quoted publicly. In any case, a comment made to myself by such an officer may be wittingly or unwittingly different—whether it is wittingly or unwittingly so does not make any difference the comment may be different—not only marginally but significantly, from the comment he made to the Minister.

The great advantage of having information publicly given at the bar of this House, as the motion seeks to achieve, is that the information would be given to all members. The information given to the Minister would be the same as that given to me. Therefore, it would stand up and would be capable of cross-examination; and it could be refuted, accepted, or modified. However, when information is given in a hole-in-the-corner fashion the Commissioner of Main Roads and other bureaucrats can give advice to the Minister and then speak in confidence to a member of the Opposition saying different things and that is a most unsatisfactory state of affairs.

We hear often about the power grab from Canberra. If this Parliament continues to be as inept as it is at the moment that grab will continue and we will not be able to do anything about it. The House of Representatives set up a Select Committee which deals with road safety. That committee has produced a useful document. The members of the House of Representatives, in spite of having duties more onerous than those of members of

this House, have not been frightened to work and to form committees. As a result they have produced the very worth-while document to which I referred earlier in this session.

What is wrong with this Parliament that we have not done something similar? It has been claimed that this House is much smaller than the House of Representatives. However, we have 51 members and the Senate has 60 members; so our House is numerically almost equal to the Senate and I cannot see why a committee system which is possible in the Senate—and has revitalised that Chamber—is not possible in this place.

The document produced by the House of Representatives Select Committee on road safety was ignored in the Main Roads Department booklet dealing with the Kwinana Freeway extension. That document contains findings which seem to throw doubt on the whole freeway concept, so I cannot see why it should have been ignored. If the findings are not valid they should have been challenged and refuted in the booklet of the Main Roads Department.

That is why we would like to call before the bar of the House people who are experts and whom we could question about the validity of some of the arguments put forward in the report of the Select Committee of the House of Representatives. But that has not occurred. We do not know why that document has been ignored in the papers tabled by the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning. We would like to know why the report was ignored. Is it true that the conclusions drawn by the House of Representatives Select Committee on road safety throw doubt on the extension of the Kwinana Freeway? Is it true that the conclusions of that committee are invalid? We would like to hear the rationale of this alleged invalidity.

We believe we have shown that the Narrows Bridge capacity will break down before the extensions to the Kwinana Freeway are completed. We were told by the Minister for Transport that the bridge will take 120 000 vehicles a day, but that capacity has never been reached anywhere else in the world in respect of a bridge of that kind. So what is so special about the Narrows Bridge that it can take that number of vehicles in 24 hours when the Golden Gate Bridge and the Oakland Bay Bridge in San Francisco cannot? The Minister has not answered that question. He has not explained how I am wrong in my calculations using the figures provided by his department to show that the Narrows Bridge capacity will break down before the extensions are completed.

I take my job seriously, and I believe other members, although not all, do the same. Therefore we should have the right to ask the experts what is wrong with our reasoning when we say the Narrows Bridge will not be able to cope with the excess traffic it will be required to take.

The people have a right to know the truth. If we are wrong the people have a right to hear the reasons why we are wrong. They have a right to know whether further portions of the Swan River will be reclaimed as a consequence of the reclamation of the Canning River. It is as inevitable as night follows day that that will occur. The Minister has come to this place and told us that only two small portions of the Canning River are to be reclaimed. That sounds very nice, but in five years' time the people will be told that only a small portion of the Swan River will be reclaimed.

We have not received an assurance from the Minister in that respect. He made no attempt to assure the House and the public that what I have said about the future reclamation of the Swan River is untrue. He has made no attempt to deny that reclamation of the Swan might be necessary to enable the Narrows Bridge to be duplicated.

We want to ask these people why ring roads cannot be developed for Perth; we want to ask them about the alternatives, not just to the preferred route that has been looked at in such a narrow way, but to the whole question of a radial or near radial freeway.

When we look at the Main Roads Department booklet, we find that the cost-benefit analysis does not include what will happen if public transport is left as it is compared with what will happen if public transport is upgraded. So, the cost-benefit analyses given to us by the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning are quite inadequate; however, we have not been told why these omissions have occurred. We want to be able to ask people whose ability we respect to answer that kind of question.

We want to know what is going to happen to the 6 000 vehicles which at present get onto the freeway system via Bickley Street in South Perth. Will they filter onto the freeway via Judd Street? If so, the Minister's figures are wrong, because they have subtracted those 6 000 vehicles and assume they will travel along the Canning Highway and across the Causeway where now they travel along the Kwinana Freeway and across the Narrows Bridge. Will those vehicles filter through South Perth, represented by the Minister for Labour and Industry? One of the reasons for this extension, we are told, is to ease congestion in South Perth. But what is to happen to those 6 000 vehicles? Will they percolate through South Perth to Judd Street? If they do, certainly this extension will not do for South Perth what the Government claims it will do.

We want to hear the case against the preferred route. We have seen and heard the case in favour of the preferred route, but not against it. We believe we should have this right, in order to make up our minds. I mentioned earlier that, at the very brief meeting held upstairs, officers from the Main Roads Department spoke contemptuously of the Olivero system, which caters for a six-way interchange. To date, the Main Roads Department has been unable to develop a reasonable five-way interchange, and it certainly does not behove that department to criticise a six-way interchange in this way. We want to know whether such a system can work, and whether it is possible to introduce it.

As has been said time and time again on this subject, this Parliament should take its responsibilities seriously and should come to a decision based on knowledge. Members should not just make a few bleating noises when the Government brings in a Bill and then allow it to go through merely because the Government has the numbers in any case. In the absence of a proper committee system, we should be able to call these experts to the bar of the House. If in fact what I have said about Government supporters and laziness is not true, I should like to see it demonstrated. I would be very happy to be proved wrong and to have my arguments refuted in a proper, intelligent and rational way. I do not know whether knuckles ever proved a point, although it might give satisfaction to some people.

I would hope that if there are good and cogent reasons that these people could not be brought to the bar of the House, and that we could not have a proper committee system, these reasons will be shown to us, rather than for the House to be treated to a display of the Government using its numbers in order to quash a proposal which is provided for in our Standing Orders and which would show that we, the representatives of the people in this place, take our responsibilities seriously.

The SPEAKER: Is there a seconder to the motion?

Mr CARR: I second the motion, Mr Speaker.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Young.

EDUCATION ACT

Disallowance of Regulation: Motion

MR T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [8.14 p.m.]: I move—

> That subregulation 2, paragraph (b) of regulation 120 made under the Education Act, 1928-1974, published in the *Government Gazette* on the 31st day of January, 1975 and laid on the Table of the House on the 18th day of March, 1975 be and is hereby disallowed.

This move is made pursuant to section 36 of the Interpretation Act, which provides that where a regulation, rule, or a by-law has been brought into effect by being published in the *Government Gazette*, and hence taking legal effect from that day, if within six days of the Parliament next being assembled the regulation concerned is tabled within the Parliament, it is competent within 14 sitting days subsequent to the laying of the regulation on the Table of the House for any member of the Parliament to move in the manner I am moving now; namely, for the disallowance of the regulation.

The disallowance can be effected by a motion being carried through either House of Parliament. I emphasise, "through either House"; the disallowance does not require the determination of both Houses of Parliament to be made, although it has become the practice for separate motions of disallowance to be moved in both Houses of Parliament. However, I point out that this is not necessary.

Perhaps I could be excused for having been influenced by the previous speaker, the member for Morley, when I mention briefly that if we did have a committee operating within this House similar to the Public Accounts Committee, but dealing with subordinate legislation tabled in the House, the move I am making now would not necessarily have to be made by one member seeking to influence 50 other members.

If there were a subordinate legislation committee and if that committee had come to the conclusion that for some reason a regulation was harsh or unconscionable or for any other reason should be disallowed, naturally, in the course of its duty, it would report so to Parliament; I would think its determination would be far more persuasive than any argument any single member of Parliament could put forward, particularly when we have regard for the fact that although regulations are made under the auspices of Government, I am afraid in all cases they are in fact born in the bureaucracy and on many an occasion have slipped through the surveillance of Ministers to become effective as law and are said to have Government support.

I repeat that this instance is not an isolated one. I am not referring specifically to the regulation which is the subject of my contribution; I am speaking generally. However, I agree that as regulations appear to have the backing of Government, and as the majority party or series of parties within the Parliament, sitting as a coalition, constitute the Government, it would seem to be an uphill battle for any member who is not a member of the Government party or parties to be able to convince a majority of the House that a regulation needs attention or disallowance. However, that is what I seek to do on this occasion.

The subject of the subregulation I wish to have disallowed relates to sick leave entitlement to which teachers from time to time have recourse, because of ill-health, during their teaching career, as distinct from the time spent in a training institution.

Prior to the 31st January, 1975, when subregulation 2, paragraph (b) of regulation 120 made under the Education Act, was promulgated, the regulation provided—

> In determining the sick leave for which a teacher is eligible, his service as a monitor and as a student in a teachers' college counts as service on the permanent staff.

Another subregulation, being paragraph (1) of regulation 120, has not been amended, but because of the proposed amendment to subregulation 2(b) of regulation 120, it will prescribe different conditions for different teachers in the future, depending on whether the teacher entered a teachers' college before or after the 31st December, 1974, and whether, in fact, that teacher was a bonded student or an unbonded student before or after that date.

Regulation 120(1), which sets out the sick leave entitlement of teachers, provides, from the date of permanent appointment, five full days on full pay, in terms of working days to which a teacher is entitled. When that entitlement is exhausted, if the need still exists, a teacher becomes eligible to two days on half pay. I will not go through the whole series of sick leave entitlements, but I will refer to the entitlement of a teacher after the completion of three years' service on the permanent teaching staff. For most purposes, in the argument I will present, three years' service on the permanent staff is material, because most students now spend three years in a teaching institution. The subregulation dealing with sick leave entitlement reads as follows—

> On completion of each additional 12 months' service on the permanent staff, 10 full days . . .

Then, where the need exists, this is followed by five half-days on full pay.

So one does not need to have recourse to a slide rule to realise that after three years' service on the permanent staff a teacher who had not been sick for an extended period, would have accrued 30 days on full pay, followed by 15 days on half pay.

Prior to the deletion and re-enactment of subregulation 2, paragraph (b) of regulation 120 on the 31st January, 1975, a teacher who had spent three years in a teachers' college, provided he had not, as a student, eroded that entitlement, was able to carry that entitlement with him into his teaching career on the permanent staff. So for the sake of argument, let us assume a student, prior to the 31st December, 1974, spent three years in a teaching institution, and took up a teaching career this year, as a teacher. He would already be accredited with three years' sick leave entitlement because of the three years he had spent as a student in a training institution. That leave would have been accredited to him.

Suppose at the end of this year, having completed another 12 months' service, that student was plagued by a serious illness, he would have a sick leave entitlement of 40 days on full pay plus 20 days on half pay, because of his having spent three years in a teachers' college or similar institution, plus one year's service as a teacher. However, since paragraph (b) of subregulation 2 of regulation 120 has been re-enacted, and has been effective as from the 31st January, 1975, the situation has changed, because that subregulation now reads—

> Where a teacher was appointed as a monitor—

That condition is still a common denominator. Continuing—

> —or accepted as a student with allowances in a teachers' college—

Note that it states, "a teachers' college". Continuing—

> —prior to the 31st day of December, 1974, he may count his service as a monitor or as a student as service on a permanent staff of a school in determining the sick leave for which he is eligible.

So it is quite clear that a student who enters a teachers' college after the 31st December, 1974, will no longer be entitled to count the three-year period—in some cases a four-year period—he will spend in a teachers' college to give him future sick leave entitlement.

At this stage I mention that this situation was brought to my notice by the General Secretary of the W.A. State School Teachers' Union. I preface my further remarks by indicating that Mr Trevor Lloyd, who is the general secretary, advised me that for the past 20 years he has been associated with the Teachers' Union in an administrative capacity. It is only recently that he became the general secretary of the union. He has assured me that during the time he has been associated with the Teachers' Union, and to the best of his knowledge, recollection, and research, he was unable to find any instance where the Teachers' Union had made any approach of this kind to any member of Parliament—politics aside—to seek the disallowance of any regulation.

However on this occasion the Teachers' Union views this subregulation and its implications with such concern that it believes an approach should now be made

to Parliament to have the subregulation disallowed and this is the reason I am now making that approach.

I have a copy of a letter addressed to the union dated the 24th February of this year under the hand of the Director-General of Education. I make no secret of the fact that a copy of that letter was provided to me by the General Secretary of the State School Teachers' Union.

This particular regulation was not gazetted in isolation. It appeared among others referring to students about whom I spoke last evening, and they set out the machinery for the payment of scholarships, which is another name for the bonded allowances of the past.

This particular regulation was gazetted together with others. Apparently it was the subject of a letter to the Director-General of Education from the union. I now refer to the letter from Mr Barton to the union dated the 24th February, 1975. It states—

> I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated the 22nd January, 1975.
>
> As you are probably aware the amendments to the Education Regulations relating to teacher education students were published in the Government Gazette of 31st January, 1975. These amendments have been processed by the Crown Law Department and sent to the Government Printer on 24th of January, 1975. You will appreciate that this action had to be taken to ensure that the new conditions with reference to teacher training now that it is conducted in autonomous institutions were operating legally by the time the academic year began. I regret that at this time your Executive was in recess and did not have an opportunity to study and comment on the amendments before the legal processes were completed.

I make the point that I am omitting the third and the ultimate paragraphs, because they are not relevant to the subject matter of the debate. I now refer to the fourth paragraph of the letter which states—

> The administration of sick leave for students has been difficult for many years and becomes virtually impossible now that training institutions are autonomous. It is not possible to obtain from them records of students' absences through illness. As a result all students complete training with their leave credits intact although many of them have had periods of absence through illness during their period of training. Under the new provisions there will be no necessity for students to apply for sick leave and they will suffer no penalty with respect to their scholarships if absent through sickness. Since sick leave as such will no longer have any application to them, students could not reasonably expect to accumulate sick leave credits for use when they become teachers.

I make two comments in respect of the two parts of the letter I have quoted. I say this with all due respect to the Director-General of Education: one would assume that autonomy in the case of the five orthodox teachers' colleges was something that was brand new in 1975. The letter I have mentioned states there was a need to have the legal conditions operating before the academic year began this year. I would like to point out that I introduced the Teacher Education Act which set up the autonomy of the five existing teachers' colleges way back in 1972; so, they operated on an autonomous basis at least in 1973 and 1974.

For that reason I say the haste in doing these things was not as great as it might appear to have been. The need to do this in haste, without referring the regulations to the union for consideration and comment, does not appear to be justified by that argument.

Mr Barton goes on to say in the letter that because the institutions are autonomous, the department finds it impossible to obtain records of student absences from the colleges or institutions on the ground of illness. I would point out that the general secretary of the union, Mr Lloyd, is a college member of the Graylands Teachers' College board; so, he busied himself to find out what the position was at the Graylands Teachers' College. In the letter I have accompanying the other documents, he makes the point that he had discussed the matter with the principal of the Graylands Teachers' College who assured him there was no worry in relation to that institution. In fact, the situation prevailing at the Graylands Teachers' College would be common to all the teachers' colleges. They do, in fact, maintain an attendance register and a record of student absences. The fact that they are autonomous would present no difficulty to the department in gaining access to this information.

Mr Skidmore: Mt. Lawley Teachers' College certainly keeps a record.

Mr T. D. EVANS: To use a favourite expression of the member for Karrinyup—I have to be polite to him because I am almost a constituent of his—the domino theory seems to operate. The two dominoes have fallen. I say this with respect to the Director-General of Education: I think he was putting up an argument to defend the method by which the regulations were brought into operation. However, I am challenging one of them only. The domino theory seems to apply to them.

This argument could be used: I hope to be excused if I come up with the wrong figure, but I assume there would be something like 5 000 students now undergoing

teacher training. I would hazard—a little more than a guess—an opinion that of those 5 000 trainees, only about 3 000 would be under some form of contract, or the recipients of scholarships or under some bond to the Education Department.

The existence of the unbonded students is not something which has mushroomed overnight; this type of student might have been rare some years ago, but today he is common. So, while the number of unbonded students has grown, their presence has enabled the Education Department to become aware of and accustomed to the existence of unbonded students.

Looking back on the recruiting experience of the Education Department and on the graduates from the teachers' colleges, one could find that the department has, in fact, leaned heavily towards—many would say quite rightly—students who were bonded, in offering them first preference of employment within the Education Department. There is every reason to expect, indeed to believe, that this practice will continue, and the department will be inclined to give first preference to graduates who have worked their way through the training institutions and during that time were bonded or were the recipients of scholarships.

This becomes relevant, if the argument is put forward that there might well be in the future—as there is almost now—an equal number of bonded and unbonded students.

So the department must draw a distinction between the bonded and non-bonded students who find themselves in the teaching service later on. This may be a legitimate argument, but under the old regulation, no such distinction was drawn.

Let us assume that two teachers entered college in 1970, one being bonded and the other unbonded. Let us assume also that they did a three-year course and that they were both offered employment within the Education Department and that during their training they did nothing to erode their right to take an entitlement on into their teaching careers. Let us assume that they both first taught in 1974 with three years' entitlement to sick leave. The new regulation is not retrospective and so that situation will continue. All students, whether bonded or unbonded in the past, who are now teaching are credited with three or four years' sick leave entitlement for the time they spent in college. That entitlement continues. They have the right to accrue sick leave right throughout their teaching careers.

However, the new regulation provides that all students who are bonded and who enter a college in 1975 will have no three years' entitlement for sick leave, or credit for being on the permanent staff, at the time they enter a Government school at the completion of their training three or four years hence.

So the union finds that flesh is being made of one teacher and fowl of the other and it considers this to be an unhealthy situation and rightly complains.

It would be apposite if I were to give a brief quotation from the letter the union handed to me together with a copy of the regulations when I was acquainted with this situation. The letter is addressed to me by the general secretary of the union and is dated the 16th April, 1975. It reads in part—

> The real reason the Union wishes to hold up this Regulation is the fact that teachers in their first 1, 2 or 3 years of service are very prone to requiring sick leave than later in their career.

I pointed out to the general secretary that the expression "hold up" was not quite appropriate because I knew the union desired to have the regulation disallowed and not delayed.

Mr Hartrey: That is typical of school teachers these days; they cannot express themselves clearly.

Mr T. D. EVANS: Present company excepted, I hope!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blaikie): Order! The honourable member will continue.

Mr T. D. EVANS: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. I am glad you came to my rescue.

The union has indicated that the real reason it wishes to have the regulation disallowed is the fact that during their first three years' service teachers are more prone to require sick leave because of natural causes—let us forget about the motor vehicle—than in any other period of their teaching life, with the possible exception of the period just before retirement. I emphasise the word "possible". The letter continues—

> Regrettably, a number of teachers proceeding to the country in their first appointments have accidents in their first year of service due to their unfortunate accommodation circumstances in many cases and their desire to return to the metropolitan area during term holidays, long weekends etc. Also, they are prone until they develop a resistance, to be the recipient of classroom infectious diseases brought in by the children and even the common cold lays young teachers low for periods.

According to the union this is the most vulnerable period in the life of a teacher; yet, if the regulation is not disallowed, the teachers will have no sick leave entitlement at all until they have completed one year's service as teachers. On the other hand, in the past the moment teachers enter a Government school—on the first day of the first year of their teaching service—they have already accrued three or four years' sick pay entitlement.

I have tried to submit the case as calmly as possible and, let me assure the Minister and others, devoid of any political intrigue, and with no intention at all of trying to gain any political advantage. I have submitted my proposal sincerely believing that an injustice has been done. Knowing the officers of the department I would say that the injustice has been done inadvertently. I do not believe that sufficient cognisance has been taken of the consequences of the regulation. I hope it will be in that atmosphere that the Government will give careful consideration to the proposal. I hope the debate will be adjourned—I understand this is so—so that careful consideration can be given to the regulation.

I trust I have been able to convey my sincerity in the matter and that I am not to be used as a political vehicle on this occasion. I hope that when the vote is finally taken on this issue the relevant portion of the regulation will be disallowed.

I make the point, perhaps unnecessarily so, that section 36 of the Interpretation Act provides that notwithstanding the disallowance of a regulation, rule, or by-law, as the case may be, nothing shall be done by the disallowance to affect anything that happened in the past since the regulation, by-law, or rule became operative. Consequently, the disallowance of the appropriate portion of the regulation cannot in any way detrimentally affect anyone.

In any event the impact of the regulation, if it is not disallowed, will not be felt until four years hence when those who entered college this year will have completed their training of three or four years and entered the employment of the Education Department in a Government school.

I urge the Government to study the regulation carefully and to give my arguments the consideration they deserve so that on the deliberative and conscientious vote of this House the appropriate portion of the regulation will be disallowed.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blaikie): Is there a seconder to the motion?

Mr JAMIESON: I formally second the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Grayden (Minister for Labour and Industry).

HEALTH

Mercury Content in Fish: Censure Motion

MR A. R. TONKIN (Morley) [8.50 p.m.]: I move—

That the House censures the Government for:—

1. Its inactivity in failing to respond to the dangers of the ingestion of fish contaminated by mercury;
2. the refusal of the Minister for Health to inform the public of the results of the analysis of fish for mercury content;
3. the ineptitude of the Minister for Health in failing to deal adequately with a potential hazard to the health of the people.

I believe the Government—and in particular, the Minister for Health—has been criminally negligent and criminally careless regarding the health of the people of Western Australia, and that the Minister should be replaced. In the face of the most awful evidence of mercury poisoning which leads to severe damage to nerves and brain, insanity, death, blindness, and affects the unborn child the Government has done nothing to protect the people's health.

The Minister for Health has done nothing but make misleading statements. In August of last year he told Parliament there was no need for alarm. Yet weeks later, as a consequence of an initiative by the Whitlam Government, he was awakened out of his slumber and said that perhaps pregnant women should not eat too much shark. Even worse, he stated that in Western Australia the average levels of mercury in shark which had been tested slightly exceeded the level of 0.5 parts per million. The Minister omitted to say that people do not eat average shark, but that they eat particular shark and he also omitted to say that some of the shark tested had a level of 2.8 parts per million, a contamination which can cause serious consequences if as much as 1½ ounces of the flesh is eaten. I submit that 1½ ounces of fish is not very much.

At the time the Minister attempted to shield himself, by refusing to reveal the actual figures to the public. He treated the matter with secrecy, to which we have become accustomed. At the same time, and even worse, the Minister claimed he had tabled a paper in Parliament which gave results of testing. However, no such paper had been tabled. When it was eventually tabled the paper showed that over many months the Government had done nothing to protect the health of the people.

I do not intend to take very long in speaking to this matter because the case is clear and simple. I will divide my remarks into three main sections: first of all what mercury poisoning will do to a human being; secondly, world experience and in particular the attempts throughout the world to set limits; and, finally, this Government's record.

Mercury poisoning causes severe damage to the nervous system and the brain, and it can cause genetic mutations which, of course, have tremendous implications for

generations as yet unborn. Mercury poisoning can cause insanity. It can manifest itself gradually so that the individual does not notice, and can lead to convulsions and to a coma. There can be a gradual concentric retraction of the visual field which can eventually lead to blindness. It can lead to an inability to coordinate voluntary muscular movement and can eventually lead to paralysis. As I said previously, a foetus can be affected, and in particular its central nervous system.

The point to make here is that mercury is cumulative, because it is not rapidly excreted and the result is that very small portions of methyl mercury, or mercury in its inorganic form, can accumulate over many years and the presence of the poison can be very difficult to detect.

It is interesting to note that the old saying, "Mad as a hatter" probably came from the fact that mercury in the fur of a felt hat affected the brain and the personality of the hatter felting the fur.

The people who are most at risk are pregnant women, nursing mothers, suckling children, and the foetus. Swedish studies have shown that bacteria attack the inorganic mercury and convert it into methyl mercury and it is in this form it enters food, generally at a low level. It is progressively concentrated as it passes along the food chain. Shark is bad because it is at the end of the food chain and man is only one link further along the food chain.

Mr Jamieson: That all depends on whether or not the man is in the shark's environment.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Perhaps sometimes the shark is at the end of the food line, and not man. That is true. It has also been shown experimentally that the toxic effect is due to the methyl mercury in the fish, and not to its presence in the water itself.

The world was first alerted to some of these events when seed wheat, which had been treated with mercury as an antifungal agent, was eaten in Iraq in 1960, in West Pakistan in 1961, and in Guatemala in 1963. In 1970 a family of New Mexicans were poisoned from eating pork from a pig which had eaten mercury-treated wheat. Then, of course, there was the very celebrated case in Minimata Bay, and the Agano River in Niigata, in 1963, where discharges from industrial plants using mercury catalysts—manufacturing vinyl chloride and acetaldehyde—caused poisoning.

It is possible that some of this mercury gets into the water from the activities of man—industrial and other activities. Some of it comes naturally. However, I do not think it really matters where it comes from because once one eats the fish it causes poisoning.

It is interesting to note that coal and oil contain some mercury which is released into the atmosphere and eventually finds its way into water. Mercury can come from factories producing plastics, chlorine, caustic soda, and caustic potash. I have already mentioned the coating of seed for crop planting. Paint preservation is another use to which mercury is put. Mercury is also used in pulp mills because it is a slimicide—a new word to me. It has something to do with destroying mould and is therefore used in pulp mills. Mercury is also used in extracting gold, silver, and rare metals, and it is also found in sewage.

It is not really relevant where all this mercury comes from; what is important is the contaminated shark which is being eaten, possibly at this moment, in Western Australia. The Government has not done anything about it. The difficulty here is one of setting limits, and an arbitrary limit was set by the World Health Organisation and the Food and Agriculture Organisation at 0.5 parts per million.

A far better way to examine the problem is to look at the toxicological symptoms which can be present, and also the blood and hair of people who are believed to have ingested large amounts of shark. This is a more reliable way to discover whether a person is in trouble. It is far better to look at the total dietary intake than at the mercury level in fish. Nevertheless, I think it is up to Governments to see to it that poison is not sold in the shops for people to eat.

It is also very dangerous to talk about the average consumption of fish. It is not the average consumption of fish which people eat, it is a certain consumption; and it is misleading to talk about an Australian average of 15 grams a day, and a Japanese average of 84 grams a day, because, as I say, the mercury is not averaged out over everyone in Australia. Certain people eat more fish than others do, and they will therefore ingest more mercury under certain circumstances.

Rather than speaking in terms of parts per million in fish, it is perhaps better to adopt the recommendations of the WHO and the FAO, which are that no more than 0.3 milligrams of mercury should be ingested per week, and no more than 0.2 milligrams of that should contain methyl mercury.

It is clear that until we can set limits which are not arbitrary but are based on research, Governments must err on the side of caution. This is why the National Health and Medical Research Council set a limit of 0.5 parts per million.

In order to be absolutely fair, we must look at the argument from the point of view of those people who stand to lose most from any reduction in the sales of fish;

in other words, the Australian Fishing Industry Council. Naturally, the council is putting an extreme case, but I am prepared to accept the limit it suggests. If we accept that limit, we find this Government is still culpable. The Australian Fishing Industry Council suggests one part per million. It is prepared to put the limit as low as that, although its members will be affected by any reduction in the sale of fish. I think that organisation's arguments have been very fair.

A preliminary report of the joint investigation into mercury contamination from shark by the Victorian Health Department and the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife indicates that those departments would set a limit of one part per million. Only shark will be affected, at least in Australian waters.

The Australian Fishing Industry Council says it "would not and could not justify any action that would leave the populace open to danger from contaminated fish". The people who make their living from selling fish say they would not and could not justify any action which would leave the populace open to danger from contaminated fish; yet this Government has acted in a way which leaves the populace open to danger, as I will demonstrate.

In Japan, if 20 per cent of a minimum sample of 25 fish contain more than one part per million of mercury, the fish cannot be sold. On looking at the report dealing with fish which was tabled by the Minister for Health a few days ago, I find that in 1974, 24 out of 71 shark contained over one part per million of mercury, and 51 of those 71 shark were obtained from fish shops. So 24 of those 71 shark contained over one part per million, which works out at 33.8 per cent. In Japan the sale of these shark which people are able to buy in Western Australia would have been stopped.

Mr Skidmore: That is over one part per million?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Yes. The figure in Victoria is 0.5 parts per million.

Mr Stephens: What is the figure in South Australia?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: The figure in South Australia is ridiculous. It is 5.5 parts per million.

Mr Stephens: I know it is to be reduced. We are talking about what it was.

Mr Barnett: They are becoming more aware of the danger.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: The South Australian figure is completely unrealistic. We see, therefore, that in Japan a ban would be imposed by the Japanese Government on the fish samples mentioned in the report tabled in this Parliament, and that ban would be accepted by the Australian Fishing Industry Council which suggests a limit of one part per million.

Victoria bans the sale of any school shark more than 41 inches in length. The larger the shark the higher the mercury content.

Mr Watt: It is age more than size.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Had the honourable member seen the figures worked out by the Victorian Health Department and the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, he would see there is a correlation in size, and this has been found all over the world. However, it is not as simple as that; it is not just a question of size. The honourable member indicated it was also a question of age—

Mr Watt: And the species.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: —but the age of the shark is often related to its size and the correlation indicates the cumulative effect which I have already mentioned.

Sweden and Finland have said that if a fish contains more than one part per million of mercury it is unsuitable for human consumption, and if the mercury content is between 0.5 and one part per million the fish should not be eaten more than once a week.

The Minister has mentioned the very high limit in South Australia, which has caused fishermen in Victoria to send their fish illegally into South Australia for sale, and there has been a shortage of fish in Victoria because of the more stringent demands of the law in that State. The petrochemical complex proposed for Redcliffe on Spencer Gulf in South Australia will not be using mercury as a catalyst because of this problem.

It is not clear how much of the mercury in fish is methyl mercury. More research is needed. We also need more research to ascertain the interactions with other elements. For example, it has been suggested that selenium may reduce toxicity, but that is not clear. We are therefore only at the beginning of our knowledge, and it is important that we err on the side of caution.

I would now like to come back to what has happened in this Parliament. In question 38 of the 6th August, 1974, I asked about the testing of wet and canned fish for mercury content. In replying to the question, paper No. 139 was tabled. This paper indicated the location of the fish caught but said nothing at all about the mercury content. Following the matter up, I asked question 31 of the 8th August, and then questions 4 and 5 on the 28th August. The Minister replied to question 5 as follows—

> No useful purpose would be served by tabling a preliminary report, but having regard to the total situation the indications at this stage are that there is no need for alarm.

Mr Barnett: Shameful!

Mr A. R. TONKIN: The Minister said, "The indications at this stage are that there is no need for alarm." This was the Minister talking about 2.8 parts per million. Within weeks of that reply being given to me, in response to an article in *The Sunday Times* of the 22nd September which indicated alarm in Victoria over the high incidence of mercury contaminated fish—up to three parts per million the headline screamed—no higher than we have here for all practical purposes, the Minister who had said there was no need for alarm suddenly found cause for alarm. He warned that pregnant women in Western Australia perhaps should not eat shark.

So it seems to me this Minister is completely inept. In this Parliament he assured us there was no need for alarm but he would not give us the figures. He treated the Parliament and people like children, yet when the figures were released in the Eastern States Press, officers of his department probably said to him, "Maybe you should say something about this matter because the figures are very similar to our figures." He then said, "Perhaps if you are pregnant, you should not eat shark." Why did he not give this answer to Parliament? Parliament has been treated shabbily when we consider some of the answers we receive to our questions. The Minister suddenly found cause for alarm, and on the 30th September, he had this to say in *The West Australian*—

> The major types of fish consumed in W.A. appear to have low mercury levels. But the average level of mercury in the shark tested slightly exceeded the level of 0.5 parts per million laid down by the NHMRC.

Mr Skidmore: Slightly!

Mr A. R. TONKIN: The average! The Minister had forgotten, or perhaps he did not understand, that the consumer of fish does not visit 16 different fish shops, collect a little fish from each one, and in this way achieve an average intake. Surely the Minister has enough nous to understand that from the figures he was looking at! However, he did not say anything for another six months because he was frightened of the figures. Surely he could see that people could be ingesting 2.8 parts per million which is very serious by any standard. Even the Australian Fishing Industry Council, whose main concern would be to look after jobs for its members—and we can understand that—admits the seriousness of 2.8 parts per million.

I followed this up with question 21 of the 2nd October. Once again there was a refusal to reveal results of tests because, I believe, the Minister was afraid that when he did reveal the results the public would know just what was going on. I do not believe he wanted to reveal them this year, but he was asked continually and eventually he promised to do so. I believe he hoped they would not be noticed when they were revealed. The Minister was forced to take some action because of the reports from the Eastern States.

No-one could say that the Minister and the Government were not told frequently of the danger; the matter was brought to their attention repeatedly by the vigilant Opposition. I referred to the matter again when I replied to the debate last year on the motion seeking the establishment of a standing committee on the environment. I pointed out that the establishment of such a committee would enable the people and this Parliament to be fully informed about what was happening. We heard nothing more about the matter. Of course, Parliament was in recess—a very convenient time for Ministers because they do not have to answer questions, not even in the lamentable way they do when we are sitting.

However, the Minister finally broke his silence when the Australian Government imposed a penalty on people who sold fish with a high mercury content.

Mr Stephens: A high mercury content, or a content in excess of 0.5 parts per million?

Mr A. R. TONKIN: A mercury content in excess of 0.5 parts per million.

Mr Stephens: There is a difference, you know.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: The Minister's comment was that the mercury content of fish sold here was a little high, but there was no evidence that anyone had come to any harm from it. Of course there was no evidence—what evidence could there be when no research had been undertaken? Doctors had not been informed that our fish had a high mercury content, so what evidence could there be? When a person is ill, a doctor has many symptoms to look for, and without true knowledge of the situation, a doctor might not look for mercury poisoning. Surely our doctors could have been alerted to the fact that tests show there to be a high incidence of mercury contamination in shark and that they should be on the lookout for mercury poisoning. No blood testing had been carried out, so of course there was no evidence that anyone had come to harm from ingesting mercury contaminated fish. This was one of the silliest statements I have ever heard from a Minister of the Crown.

From overseas experience we know that the results of the ingestion of mercury are quite clear. Surely the Minister could realise what would happen to people who ate shark containing 2.8 parts per million of mercury.

On the 8th April of this year, I asked a question without notice. It reads—

> What are the results of the testing which has taken place in 1973, 1974, and to date in 1975?

The testing referred to is for mercury contamination. The Minister replied—

> The results of the tests on Western Australian fish have been tabled in a report on mercury content of Western Australian fish.

The results of the tests had not been tabled. On receiving this reply, I immediately went to our Clerks—who are so efficient—to ask them whether this paper had been tabled. I would have been very surprised if it had escaped me, but I thought I should check the matter.

The paper that had been tabled told us that fish had been caught in various localities in Western Australia. Tabled papers Nos. 139 and 266 of 1974 indicated the mercury content of imported fish, and where the local fish had been caught. It did not mention a single thing—

Mr Skidmore: No research whatsoever.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: —about the mercury contamination of our fish. So the answer given by the Minister was quite untrue—the papers had not been tabled.

The next day, the 9th April, I asked another question without notice and I pointed out to the Minister that his answer the previous day had been incorrect. I have already referred to the result of my question—the report was tabled.

On the first page of the report, we see that from a total of 72 samples, the mercury content of 43 exceeded 0.5 parts per million. Now it may be maintained that the figure is a little low, and I will generously concede that point although it does not mean to say that I believe 0.5 parts per million is a low figure. It is an arbitrary figure, and so is 1.0 part per million an arbitrary figure.

Mr Stephens: And one that is being adopted by an increasing number of countries throughout the world.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: That may be so, but it is still an arbitrary figure.

Mr Stephens: Yes.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: Allowing for the fact that 1.0 part per million is reasonable, and the Australian Fishing Industry Council—which I think would be pushing its barrow as much as it could—has not asked for a higher figure than 1.0 part per million, it means that 33 per cent of the samples on the first page of the report contain more than 1.0 part per million, some even up to 2.8 parts per million. As I said before, it is considered that at the level of 2.8 parts per million, 1½ oz. of fish per week could result in serious consequences.

As a consequence of this report, which was tabled a week or two ago, the Public Health Department has recommended that studies be made of mercury levels in the hair and blood of people who may have consumed excessive amounts of shark. I asked the following question of the Minister representing the Minister for Health today—

> (1) What studies have been made in Western Australia of the mercury content of human blood and hair?

I point out it was a recommendation of the Public Health Department that such studies be made. The Minister replied—

> (1) A report of a survey from Victoria has been closely studied. This reveals that although there is a positive correlation between the amount of fish (shark) consumed and levels of mercury in blood and hair, no ill effect on health was apparent.

In other words no studies have been made in this State. I did not ask for that answer. I wanted to know what studies have been made in Western Australia, and I found that no studies have been made despite the fact that the Public Health Department recommended that they be made. The second part of my question today was as follows—

> (2) What has been done to alert general practitioners in the medical profession to the need to spot the toxicological symptoms of mercury poisoning?

To that the Minister replied—

> (2) The medical profession must be aware of the considerable publicity given to this topic in the media. If and when I am advised of the need to alert medical practitioners it shall be done.

Mr Skidmore: I would have thought the Public Health Department, through its Minister, would be doing a little more than that.

Mr A. R. TONKIN: For months the Minister was aware of the very high amounts of mercury in shark, but he did not do anything to alert the medical profession to the need to watch out for toxicological symptoms.

I believe I have made out a very serious case. The Minister—and the Government—must be culpable for doing nothing in the face of a serious threat to the people of this State: a threat which is much greater than that posed by many other diseases, because many diseases can be cured whereas the damage caused by mercury poisoning is irreversible, and it is damage to the central nervous system. Mercury poisoning is insidious because it is hard to detect.

We have seen the Minister running around like a silly hen saying, first of all, that there is no need to worry and there is no cause for alarm. A few weeks later when the same figures were published in Victoria he changed his mind, saying that

pregnant women should not eat too much shark. Then the Minister attacked the Australian Government and said it was silly to think about very harsh penalties for high mercury levels. If the Minister wished to be constructive instead of being obsessed with the idea of knocking everything from Canberra, he could have said, "I think your penalty for levels in excess of 0.5 parts per million are too harsh; I think the level should be lifted to one part per million."

However, in a destructive manner and in spite of all the evidence facing him he attacked the Australian Government for trying to do something in this matter. It might be argued that the Australian Government was being heavy-handed; and the Minister could have told that Government it was going to extremes and that he believed a level of one part per million to be a more reasonable level. He could have held a constructive dialogue with that Government and pointed out that in various countries one part per million is being accepted; but instead he chose to be destructive and to attack that Government.

I would like to conclude by showing that the results which have been tabled might not indicate the true position. The report itself admits that this was not a random sample of shark. As any person having even the slightest knowledge of statistics will appreciate, random sampling is most important.

The report tabled by the Minister said that the samples were chosen to give mercury levels over the whole range of sizes to enable the most representative regression equation to be obtained. So, deliberately—and quite rightly from the point of view of what they were trying to do—those concerned with the study sought out either larger shark or smaller shark, either of which would skew the result—to use the statisticians' term—and would not give a true random sample. This was done in order to obtain a good regression equation to help them with their correlation of length and contamination.

I do not criticise that, although I think we could be critical and say that could have been done with a certain group, but they should also have tried to obtain a random sample to get a true scatter.

The point I want to make in this respect is that as it was not a random sample—on the admission of the people who collected the sample—the actual position could really be much worse than is depicted by the result. Had a true random sample been obtained there might have been more than 34 per cent of samples with a level of more than one part per million.

The report also admits that there is some chance of bias due to the lack of information on the total landings of different species of shark relative to fishing areas and seasons. The sharks were caught at certain times, and when landings over a whole season are considered the position could be worse. That kind of sample could not be obtained due to the limitations placed on the resources of the department, which is quite understandable. I merely mention this to indicate it is quite possible that the situation is more serious than the report indicates.

I believe the Government is deserving of the censure of this House because it has not reacted with vigour and has not been alert to the dangers. The Minister said that doctors must be aware of the dangers of mercury poisoning because of the publicity given to the matter in the media. Apparently the Minister was not alert, and yet he expects the medical profession to be alert. When we consider the way in which this whole question has been handled, we find we certainly have a very unhealthy state of affairs in Western Australia, when we have such a Minister for Health.

The SPEAKER: Is there a seconder to the motion?

Mr JAMIESON: I formally second the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Ridge (Minister for Lands).

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE, AND DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Water Supplies) [9.29 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the maximum rates which the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board can charge for water, sewerage and drainage services as provided under section 94 of its Act.

The Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board was established as a board in its own right by the then Liberal-Country Party Government on the 1st July, 1964, under the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act, 1909-1963.

The constitution of the board of seven is made up as follows—

A chairman nominated by the Governor for a time not exceeding seven years;

The general manager for the time being of the board;

An engineer;

The Under-Treasurer or his nominee;

A person nominated by the Minister from a panel of names of three

eligible persons submitted by the Perth City Council to represent the ratepayers; and

Two persons nominated by the Minister from a panel of names of six eligible persons submitted by the Local Government Association, each of whom shall represent the ratepayers and at the time of appointment or re-appointment be a mayor, president or councillor of a local authority whose municipal district or part thereof is within the board area.

Each member other than the chairman is appointed for a term not exceeding three years and is eligible for re-appointment at the end of such term.

Under sections 90, 91 and 92 of the Act, the board is required to make and to levy water, sewerage and drainage rates respectively for all ratable land within the board area with the area being normally dissected into several districts. It should be noted that water and sewerage districts relate to the same defined areas while drainage districts are separately defined areas.

Separate rates are made for each to provide funds to defray expenses of general administration of the Act and expenses incurred in the maintenance and management of the water works, sewerage works, and drainage works, and to pay the prescribed interest and sinking fund on the capital cost of such works; as well as to construct, extend, and improve such works as may be provided, constructed, extended, or improved out of revenue.

Under section 94 of the Act the rates in any one year shall not exceed—

water and sewerage

ten cents in the dollar on the annual ratable value of the land; or

one and two-thirds cents in the dollar on the capital unimproved value of the land; and for

drainage

two and one-half cents in the dollar on the annual ratable value; or

five-twelfths of a cent in the dollar on capital unimproved values.

It is proposed that the maximum rates which may be levied for water and sewerage be increased from 10c in the dollar to 20c in the dollar on the annual ratable value and from 1⅔c in the dollar to 3c in the dollar where rates are assessed on the capital unimproved value, and that the maximum drainage rate be increased from 2½c in the dollar to 5c in the dollar on the annual ratable value and from five-twelfths of a cent in the dollar to 1c in the dollar where rates are assessed on the capital unimproved value.

The rates currently being levied on annual ratable values are—

for water, 4c in the dollar for residences and 7c in the dollar for all other services;

for sewerage, 8.3c in the dollar for all services; and

for drainage, 1.5c in the dollar for all services.

The only properties rated by the board under a capital unimproved value are five large industrial complexes in the Kwinana area. The agreements under which these complexes were established decree that they shall be rated under such a valuation. Currently a water rate of 1c in the dollar is levied.

The Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board like other organisations, both private and governmental, is faced with the problem of continually rising costs.

Interest rates on borrowing for capital works have risen substantially and the majority of private borrowings during the current year attract an interest rate of 10.3 per cent whereas in 1973-74 the average rate was approximately 7 per cent.

Salaries and wages have increased since July, 1974, by approximately 40 per cent and material costs during the same period in the vicinity of 50 per cent.

The State's participation in the Commonwealth Government's national sewerage programme, and the consequent high annual capital expenditure on sewerage, is also seriously affecting the board's operating financial position in that the 70 per cent repayable proportion of the financial assistance attracts interest at 9.5 per cent and it is becoming extremely difficult to finance the heavy debt charges on the high cost of sewerage reticulation and associated headworks in built-up areas. The advances from the Commonwealth, 70 per cent of which is by way of loans, are for backlog sewerage programmes and therefore apply to work done in heavily built-up areas.

Members will be interested in the enormous increases in expenditure on sewerage capital works over the last few years. In 1967-68, expenditure was $2 268 646; in 1968-69, $4 275 252; in 1969-70, $6 156 514; in 1970-71, $7 227 660; and, in 1971-72, $7 599 382. In 1972-73 the amount of $15 955 000 included a special Commonwealth nonrepayable grant of $3.5 million.

In 1973-74 expenditure was $17 500 000, including $6.8 million as a first allocation under the national sewerage programme. This money was fully repayable with interest.

Expenditure this financial year amounts to $23 400 000. Of this sum, $11.9 million

is made available under the national sewerage programme on the basis that 70 per cent is a repayable loan and 30 per cent is a grant.

Thus over a period of eight years the annual expenditure on metropolitan sewerage work has increased tenfold or 1 000 per cent.

Preliminary estimates, prepared on the basis of the current rating structure and allowing only 15 per cent for inflation, indicate a very large deficit for 1975-76 and although rates were increased by an average of 34 per cent at the 1st July, 1974, a further increase for 1975-76 is inevitable if the board is to continue to meet its cost of operation and maintain the service expected of it.

There is no intention of increasing the rates to the maximum now being sought, but it is reasonable to allow the board some margin of rating capacity for future years. Any adjustment to the rating for 1975-76 will of course be the subject of a thorough investigation before being passed on to the consumers. The constitution of the board, to which I referred earlier, ensures that ratepayers' interests are adequately represented. I commend the Bill to the House.

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

SUPERANNUATION, SICK, DEATH, INSURANCE, GUARANTEE AND ENDOWMENT (LOCAL GOVERNING BODIES' EMPLOYEES) FUNDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR RUSHTON (Dale—Minister for Local Government) [9.40 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill proposes to amend the Act covering local government superannuation, to allow certain local government traffic officers who transfer their employment from a municipal council to the Road Traffic Authority or to the Police Force for service with the traffic patrol, to retain the superannuation rights which they held in their municipal employment.

Generally, persons who do transfer will be entitled to join the State superannuation scheme. However, under the Superannuation and Family Benefits Act, 1938—that is, the legislation covering the State scheme—a person is not eligible for superannuation benefits unless he is capable of attaining 10 years' service. This could therefore prevent older council officers from obtaining benefits under the State scheme on their transfer. A council officer could also be precluded from joining the State scheme on medical grounds.

Under the provisions of this Bill, a person who is so prevented from participating in the State superannuation scheme but who was a member of a local government superannuation scheme, will be entitled to continue in that scheme.

Clause 1 is a preliminary clause containing the title and other relevant particulars.

Clause 2 amends section 2 of the principal Act so that the Road Traffic Authority becomes a corporation to which the provisions of the Act apply.

Clause 3 adds a new section 3A to the principal Act. Paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of this section provides that a person may be regarded as an employee of the Road Traffic Authority for the purposes of a local government superannuation scheme only if he—

(i) has been appointed to a position as warden under the Road Traffic Act to an office within the Road Traffic Authority under the Public Service Act, or as a member of the Police Force for service with the traffic patrol;

(ii) elects within three months of his appointment to participate in a local government superannuation scheme;

(iii) was previously employed by a municipal council on traffic control or vehicle licensing duties and was a subscriber to a local government superannuation scheme during that employment;

(iv) is not eligible on medical grounds to join the State superannuation scheme or will be unable to attain 10 years' service for the purposes of the scheme.

Paragraph (b) sets down that funds provided by Parliament to the Road Traffic Authority may be used to meet contributions under a local government superannuation scheme.

Paragraph (c) provides that the Audit Act, 1904, shall apply to the keeping and audit of the superannuation accounts of the Road Traffic Authority.

Subsection (2) makes it clear that a person who continues in a local government superannuation scheme is not also entitled to contribute to the State superannuation scheme.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Davies.

Message: Appropriations

Message from the Lieutenant-Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the Bill.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR RIDGE (Kimberley—Minister for Lands) [9.44 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Three of the matters which are included in the measure now before the House have been presented at the request of the Friendly Societies Council, the remaining clause being in relation to the frequency of fund valuations with the intention of giving more flexibility to the registrar and the actuary in their dealings with insurance funds operated by societies.

The first amendment seeks to insert a definition of "member" in the Act, a term which is used throughout the legislation, and also in the rules under which each society operates. The insertion of the definition will remove any lack of certainty as to the meaning of the term as between the Act and the rules.

A further clause in the Bill seeks to effect three changes to section 7 of the Act. These are new matters which do not qualify or reduce the function of friendly societies as they exist.

The first proposal is in relation to friendly societies in other States which have had the authority to establish and maintain holiday homes for some years. These facilities have benefited members and have promoted interest in the movement.

Some local societies have accumulated funds which could be applied to this activity. This I consider a worthy step and I support the request of the Friendly Societies Council that it be permitted to establish holiday homes.

The intention is that priority will be given to members and their families, but should there be vacancies, nonmembers would be accommodated.

The second proposed change is a new provision.

Friendly societies act in a similar manner to life assurance houses, but they are limited to $6 000 in the cover they may offer.

Assurance companies make loans to clients against the value of their policies and it is proposed that similar authority be given to friendly societies, subject however, to the limitation that the residual value of a policy shall not be reduced below $200.

Other States already have a similar provision in the Acts under which they operate. This provides an additional benefit to members of friendly societies, and I am pleased to support the proposal.

A third proposed amendment to this section would permit combinations of the various societies to pool their resources and join in establishing any of the facilities, such as holiday homes, contemplated in the Bill. This would aid the smaller lodges which would not be in a financial position to act alone.

A further clause in the Bill includes a proposal which originated from departmental sources.

The law as it exists requires the benefit funds of a society to be valued by an actuary each five years, the purpose being to ascertain the level of benefits which may be paid from a fund. Several societies are handling an increasing level of endowment and life assurance and changing circumstances can require a need for a valuation within a shorter period than five years.

This amendment then would permit more frequent valuations whenever they are required and thereby allow contributions and rates to be adjusted when the state of the fund requires this to be done.

The final clause in the Bill has been included for the purpose of correcting an error in the Act. On reference to the Act it will be found that paragraph (d) of subsection (1) refers to paragraph (2). The reference should be to paragraph (b) of subsection (1). This clause then will provide for the adjustment.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Davies.

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Labour and Industry) [9.48 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill seeks to amend section 16E and section 41 of the University of Western Australia Act, 1911-1973.

The university authorities have requested, the Government, and it has agreed, to introduce legislation to amend the principal Act in order to clarify the regulation-making powers of the university senate and the procedures relating to the making of regulations, and also to allow some flexibility in relation to the time within which the university's annual report has to be submitted.

The university also requested that provision be included to enable the separate

forwarding of the university's annual report from that of the Auditor-General's report on the university accounts.

With regard to the proposed amendments to the provisions of section 16E of the principal Act, the university authorities requested that provisions similar to section 27 of the Murdoch University Act, 1973, be included following doubts raised as to whether the regulations made by the university senate were regulations for the purposes of the provisions of section 36 of the Interpretation Act relating to disallowance.

The amendment now sought makes it clear that a regulation of the university senate is not, and never has been, such a regulation, and emphasises the time at which it is to take effect.

Section 41 of the principal Act at present provides for the university senate to "within three months from the close of the university year transmit to the Governor a report of the proceedings of the university during the previous year, and such report shall contain a true and detailed account of the income and expenditure of the university during such period, audited at the expense of the university by the Auditor-General . . ." The Act further provides that the report of the Auditor-General on the university accounts shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament at the same time as the university's annual report.

The university has experienced considerable difficulty in recent years in complying with the statutory restriction of three months from the close of the university year in which to submit its report. This has been further aggravated by the need for the report to be submitted together with a copy of the Auditor-General's report on the accounts which, of necessity, is usually not available until later in the following year.

The amendment to section 41 is simple and provides for the senate to forward its report as soon as practicable after the close of the university year, and for the Auditor-General's report to be forwarded as soon as practicable after being received by the university authorities.

I commend the Bill to members.

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

House adjourned at 9.51 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 24th April, 1975

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (5): ON NOTICE

1. *This question was postponed.*

2. QUESTIONS

Replies: Cost and Time

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Justice:

In respect of the answer to question (1) on the 22nd April, 1975, regarding the cost and number of hours spent in answering Parliamentary questions, will the Minister advise—

(a) the individual departments involved in compiling the information;

(b) the number of officers in each department required to research the information;

(c) the total number of hours spent in this research; and

(d) the total estimated cost of supplying the information?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

(a) to (d) Presumably, the question refers to the cost of preparing the answer to question 1, 22nd April, 1975.
If so—

(i) no estimate has been made;

(ii) it will be made if the Hon. Member insists that we further aggravate the cost and disruption already experienced by the preparation of answers to the abnormal number of questions covered by question 1, on the 22nd April, 1975.

3. LUPINS

Research

The Hon. MARGARET McALEER, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Agriculture:

In view of the problems and difficulties besetting the promising new varieties of lupins, most of